RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne
Canadian Art Review

RACAR
Revue d'art canadienne | Canadian Art Review

Who Should Care About Responsible Conduct of Research in Research-Creation ?

Emilie St.Hilaire

Volume 43, Number 1, 2018

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1050818ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1050818ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)
1918-4778 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

St.Hilaire, E. (2018). Who Should Care About Responsible Conduct of Research in Research-Creation ? *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, *43*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.7202/1050818ar

Article abstract

Cet article explore les débats actuels concernant les pratiques responsables en recherche-création (RC), et les tensions qu'ils soulèvent par rapport au statut de la RC en tant qu'activité de recherche légitime. Cinq profils de chercheurs-créateurs y sont présentés afin d'exemplifier la diversité des pratiques en RC et de démontrer que les modèles de subventions actuellement disponibles pour la RC favorisent les projets orientés vers la recherche académique plutôt que ceux qui cherchent à révéler des connaissances à travers l'expérimentation et l'interprétation artistique. L'auteure invite les chercheurs et les créateurs concernés par les politiques et lignes de conduite responsable en RC à s'engager dans les discussions s'ils veulent que les valeurs de leurs communautés soient représentées.

Who Should Care About Responsible Conduct of Research in Research-Creation?

Emilie St.Hilaire

Cet article explore les débats actuels concernant les pratiques responsables en recherche-création (RC), et les tensions qu'ils soulèvent par rapport au statut de la RC en tant qu'activité de recherche légitime. Cinq profils de chercheurs-créateurs y sont présentés afin d'exemplifier la diversité des pratiques en RC et de démontrer que les modèles de subventions actuellement disponibles pour la RC favorisent les projets orientés vers la recherche académique plutôt que ceux qui cherchent à révéler des connaissances à travers l'expérimentation et l'interprétation artistique. L'auteure invite les chercheurs et les créateurs concernés par les politiques et lignes de conduite responsable en RC à s'engager dans les discussions s'ils veulent que les valeurs de leurs communautés soient représentées.

Emilie St.Hilaire is an interdisciplinary artist currently pursuing doctoral studies in the Humanities at Concordia University in Montreal. —esthilai@ualberta.ca

Research-creation (RC) combines both creative and academic modes of research. Decisions about the status of RC influence funders, evaluators, and commentators, but it is arguably RC practitioners who are the most affected. Much has been written about differing perspectives concerning what *should* and *should not* be considered RC. For students, researchers, and artists in the RC community, the terminological open-endedness of this category of research often results in the creation of new methodologies unique to a practitioner's work, rather than the solidification or inscription of RC as a paradigm. In the years since RC was first introduced as a funding category in Canada, innovative research and groundbreaking artistic works have emerged under this heading, and questions of how artistic practices produce new knowledge are receiving more serious attention and funding than ever before. Along with this attention, however, come further questions. For example, when do RC projects require the approval of a research ethics board (REB in Canada; Institutional Review Board [IRB] in the US)? What issues of responsible conduct of research could arise specifically for artistic researchers? What training should practitioners receive to address these issues and requirements? Recent discourse on ethics increasingly views the responsible conduct of research (RCR) as being composed of both research ethics (largely focused on research involving human participants) and research integrity. While the former has been addressed in RC, as I will summarize in this article, the latter aspect of RCR has received much less attention. A recent initiative by the major Quebec research-funding agency the Fonds de Recherche du Québec (FRQ) to identify issues of responsible conduct in research-creation (RCRC) is making strides toward filling this knowledge gap. Unsurprisingly, this endeavour has reignited debates on the status and definition of RC.

This article provides a brief summary of the history of responsible conduct of research in RC and discusses the RCRC project conducted by a team of researchers at the Université de Montréal (2016–2018).[1] I describe the unresolved characteristics of RC that tend to be scrutinized in the context of responsible conduct of research. Anyone with a stake in RC likely holds an impassioned stance on these issues. Since RC is primarily, if not permanently, housed within academia, it will likely be the subject of increased regulatory scrutiny as it continues to grow as a field of research and practice. An optimistic view of this necessity would highlight the potential for RC to become better established, perhaps rendering it more comprehensible

1. The Responsible Conduct in Research-Creation (RCRC) project discussed in this article involved the following team members: Bryn Williams-Jones (Principal Investigator); Philippe Gauthier, François-Joseph Lapointe, Marianne Cloutier (Co-Investigators); André Éric Létourneau (Collaborator); Nathalie Voarino and Marie-Christine Roy (Coordinators); Sihem Neila Abtroun, Jean-Christophe Bélisle-Pipon, Stanislav Birko, Laurie Cotton-Pigeon, Vincent Couture, Hortense Gallois, Simon Lalonde, Virginie Manus, Charles Marsan, Sara Mathieu-Chartier, Cynthia

to a broader interdisciplinary audience. This establishment may, however, result in the exclusion of some artistic researchers through the inscription of academic—rather than artistic—priorities.

A Brief History of Ethics and Research-Creation

The history of RC in Canada arguably begins in the 1960s and 1970s, when art schools became integrated into universities. "University artist-academics found themselves taking on new duties that would gradually reshape their role, first by transforming them into teachers as much as artists, then by the attempt to treat them as 'researchers' by assigning them to university labs."[2] This shift from stand-alone art schools, which had a range of certificate and diploma granting abilities, can be compared to the Bologna process in Europe, which is frequently cited as one of the main motors behind the rise of artistic research. Artistic research is the term used in several EU countries for research involving creative practice.

The rise of the MFA and, more recently, the Fine Arts PhD has contributed to the increased academization of art instruction.[3] This shift has been met with resistance as well as excitement. "Alongside the progressive turning of art schools into universities, debate over whether art can—or should—count as research, whether research-status is antithetical to good art, and whether research-creation constitutes a specific genre of artistic practice has led to a proliferation of panels and conferences, articles and books."[4] Michael Biggs and Daniela Büchler describe the academization of the creative-practice community as "hasty" no less than seven times in their chapter on the different values of academic and artistic communities in the *Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*.[5]

In Canada, funding for RC was initially conceived as a means of awarding research grants to artists working within universities who were not receiving funds from provincial and national research-funding councils, since their artistic activities did not fit the established criteria for research.[6] Although artists employed by academic institutions can receive grants to support their professional practice from arts-funding councils, such independently awarded money does not factor into their university's tally of research dollars. Some argue that funding from councils such as the Canada Council for the Arts should be reserved for artists without income from steady university employment.[7] When a new research-funding category was established for creative research and practice-led methodologies, researchers from across the social sciences and humanities took notice. The first RC grants were offered by FRQ in 2000, and the federal Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) followed suit with a pilot program for RC grants in 2004.[8] Around the same time, qualitative research methods became a topic of increased discussion and debate due to the failure of the 1998 edition of the federal Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans (TCPS) to adequately address issues particular to qualitative research.

Research ethics and research integrity are both components of responsible conduct of research, but the former is regulated differently than the latter. Institutions that support researchers have review boards that address ethical issues in research, whereas responsible conduct of research is broader

Noury, and Emilie St.Hilaire (Team Members). I was a research assistant on this project from August 2016 to November 2017.

2. Jean-Paul Fourmentraux, "Governing Artistic Innovation: An Interface among Art, Science and Industry," *Leonardo* 40, 5 (2007): 490.

3. It is difficult to determine when the first RC PhDs were conferred in Canada. A student graduated from the Université du Québec à Montreal's PhD in Études et pratiques des arts program in 2000 (Louise Paillé, "Archéologie d'une démarche de création en arts visuels : les livres-livres," PhD diss., Université du Québec à Montréal, 2000). Concordia University's Humanities PhD program has attracted interdisciplinary students since its founding in 1973, and there were arguably creative-practice-led dissertations from this program published as early as 1995 (Elise Bernatchez, "Art and Object-X: Things I found while digging a pond," PhD diss., Concordia University, 1995, https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/6202, accessed April 1, 2018). York University's PhD in Visual Arts was inaugurated in 2008.

4. Natalie S. Loveless, "Towards a Manifesto on Research-Creation," *RACAR* 40, 1 (2015): 52.

5. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, eds., *Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts* (New York: Routledge, 2011).

6. Sha Xin Wei, "The Atelier-Lab as a Transversal Machine," *Revue française d'études américaines* 128 (2011–2012): 67; Glen Lowry, "Props to Bad Artists: On Research-Creation and a Cultural Politics of University-Based Art," *RACAR* 40, 1 (2015): 42.

7. Sophie Stévance and Serge Lacasse, *Research-Creation in Music and the Arts: Towards a Collaborative Interdiscipline* (London: Routledge, 2018): 44–45.

8. Wei, "Atelier-Lab," 67.

9. The Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research oversees both the panel on ethics and the panel on responsible conduct of research for the three federal research granting agencies: Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). Lois Klassen, "Research by Artists: Critically Integrating Ethical Frameworks," *Ethics and Visual Research Methods: Theory, Methodology, and Practice*, eds. Deborah Warr, et al. (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2016):

in scope and may be governed by other administrative structures. Responsible conduct of research affects all research, whereas research ethics review by REBs applies specifically to research involving human participants; animal care committees conduct equivalent reviews of research involving animals. In 2001, the federal Secretariat's Panel on Research Ethics authorized a special committee to specifically examine humanities and fine arts research in response to a survey calling for greater involvement from these practitioners.[9] A chapter specifically addressing the ethics of qualitative research was included in 2010 in the second edition of the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS2); a chapter entitled "Research Involving Creative Practices" was also drafted but never formally integrated.[10]

As Lois Klassen remarks, "The TCPS2 instead offers a 'creative practice exemption' for ethical review, albeit with a proviso. Article 2.6 describes how creative practice activities do not require institutional ethics review unless those activities generate what could be described as research data from participants."[11] Klassen goes on to describe a letter of appeal from artist researchers, authored by Devora Neumark and Sandeep Bhagwati, explaining the concerns of several members of the RC community in response to Article 2.6 of the TCPS2. The letter recommended that "the best solution at this point would be to leave creative research practice entirely alone and let artists doing research-creation at universities apply existing and well-tested professional and contextual rules of ethical conduct in their specific fields."[12] The authors recognized that their appeal to let creators set their own ethical guidelines might not be realistic, given the political and institutional climate in which they worked, and so pleaded for RC to be at least considered on its own terms to avoid a complicated and confusing ethical review process that might result in comparing "apples to oranges."[13] The 2014 revision of the TCPS2 made no changes to Article 2.6.

Since 2010, RC in Canada has seen increased recognition with the appearance of several publications on the topic by authors such as Chapman and Sawchuk (2012), Stévance and Lacasse (2013, 2018), and special collections on RC featured in the *Media-N: Journal of the New Media Caucus* and the fall 2015 issue of *RACAR*.[14] A Canada Research Chair in RC in music was awarded to the Université Laval in 2015, and although Canada has only gained one new PhD program in creative practice in the past few years, existing programs have been producing graduates, thereby increasing awareness of artistic researchers in and outside the academy.[15] These factors could have the effect of increasing the number of eligible applicants vying for RC funding and could result in more highly qualified evaluators for those funds. For better or for worse, university departments now benefit from a growing pool of PhD-bearing applicants when hiring instructors or filling tenure-track positions in creative fields. This third-cycle qualification could be seen as a benefit to the hiring institution in terms of reputation, since international university rankings often take into account what percentage of faculty have doctorates. Nonetheless, there is an ongoing debate over whether a PhD should be required for everyone teaching art at the university level.[16] Art historian James Elkins addresses many facets of this debate in his list of "Fourteen Reasons to Mistrust the PhD."[17] Elkins contends that the PhD is inevitable and calls for critical engagement with

239. Mary Blackstone, et al., *Research Involving Creative Practices: A Chapter for Inclusion in the TCPS* (Ottawa: Interagency Advisory Panel and Secretariat on Ethics, 2008), www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/policy-politique/initiatives/docs/Creative_Practice_Chapter_Jan_2008_-_EN.pdf (accessed April1, 2018).

10. Blackstone, *Research Involving Creative Practices*.

11. Klassen, "Research by Artists," 240.

12. Government of Canada, "Public Participation: Public Comments on the Revised Draft 2nd Edition of the TCPS," *Panel on Research Ethics*, December 2009, www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/archives/participation/comments-commentaires2009 (accessed April 6, 2018).

13. Ibid., 1.

14. See Owen B. Chapman and Kim Sawchuk, "Research-Creation: Intervention, Analysis and 'Family Resemblances,'" *Canadian Journal of Communication* 37, 1 (2012); Sophie Stévance and Serge Lacasse, *Les enjeux de la recherche-création en musique: Institution, définition, formation* (Quebec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2013); *Research-Creation: Explorations, Media-N: Journal of the New Media Caucus*, 11, 3 (Fall 2015); and Natalie S. Loveless, ed., "Polemics: Short Statements on Research Creation," *RACAR* 40, 1 (2015): 41–54.

15. Some Canadian PhD programs known to include a creative-practice option include Concordia University's various RC PhD programs (Communication, Individualized Program, Humanities PhD); the University of Calgary's Creative Writing in English PhD; the Université du Québec à Montreal's PhDs in Études et pratiques des arts and in Communications; York University's PhD in Visual Arts; the University of Western Ontario's PhD in Art and Visual Culture; Queen's University's Cultural Studies PhD; and the Communications and Culture joint PhD program between York University and Ryerson University. The newest program is the University of New Brunswick's PhD in Creative Writing, which was inaugurated in 2016. The inclusion of programs that include practices in music, design, or architecture would surely make this a much longer list. For a detailed analysis of research-creation in music, the newly revised *Research-Creation in Music and the Arts: Towards a Collaborative Indiscipline* by Sophie Stévance and Serge Lacasse offers a thorough history of the integration of conservatories into the university, with an emphasis on the Quebec

what doctoral programs in art offer and for whom they are targeted. As for what effect artists with PhDs and the rise of RC may have on the contemporary art landscape, this remains to be seen. The relationship between the art world and RC is curiously underexamined.

There is no doubt that university-based artists will increasingly be asked to submit their projects for research ethics review, particularly if they receive RC grants. Although it is often perceived as a cumbersome process, an ethics review is not an insurmountable barrier to creative-research practices. Students and artistic researchers may even appreciate being required to reflect on the involvement, status, and potential concerns of their participants. That said, artists are often able to avoid ethical review by carefully choosing the terminology for their research methods. "A pilot study into the perception of the ethics process amongst academics in the creative arts at the University of Melbourne in 2009 revealed that research students tended to shift their research to avoid having to negotiate ethics approval."[18] Unfortunately, some research may never happen at all due to the difficulty (real or perceived) of ethical review.

It is the hope of many involved in the study of responsible conduct of research for creative practitioners that a model of allies rather than adversaries be adopted for everyone involved in the ethical review process and, more generally, when establishing understandings for what constitutes responsible conduct.[19] This goal demands awareness and education on both sides. Since artistic practice usually involves reflecting on decisions and actions throughout the creative process, it should come naturally to artists to further consider the ethical dimensions of their practice, although they may resist the *imposition* of such a task if the priorities of ethics review do not reflect artistic values. As Baghwati and Neumark recommended in 2010, REB members should seek the expertise of those who have an understanding of artistic practices and the ethical conventions established in the cultural sector.[20] Klassen addresses this in no uncertain terms: "Expertise is clearly available to situate emergent research by artists within a dynamic interdisciplinary discourse. For there not to be specific artist-research expertise available to direct the [ethics] review of projects initiated by artist-researchers seems at this time indefensible."[21]

Where responsible conduct of research becomes especially challenging to consider within RC is in relation to research integrity as opposed to ethics. Whereas research ethics govern the involvement of human and animal research participants, and is based on principles, such as the respect for autonomy, beneficence, and justice, the principles articulated in research integrity include honesty, reliability, rigour, objectivity, independence, justice, trust, accountability, benevolence, openness, and transparency.[22] But while these principles are internally coherent within a framework of responsible conduct of research, they have the potential to raise challenging questions about the status of research-creation as "research." Take, for example, the principle that researchers should "conduct research in an honest search for knowledge."[23] Although this principle is aimed at promoting a "fair, open, and reliable" approach to research, by assuming that all RC is based on a search for knowledge, it limits understanding of creative practices.[24]

Henk Borgdorff has written extensively on the ontological, epistemological, and methodological characteristics of research in the arts. In his

context. Sophie Stévance of the Université Laval was awarded the Canada Research Chair in Research-Creation, as well as a Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) grant, to establish the Laboratoire de recherche-création en musique et multimédia (LARCEM).

16. Natalie S. Loveless offers insight on the Fine Arts PhD in Canadian and international contexts in "Practice in the Flesh of Theory: Art, Research, and the Fine Arts PhD," *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 37 (2012): 93–108.

17. James Elkins, *Artists with PhDs* (Washington: New Academia Publishing, 2014), 227.

18. Barbara Bolt, et al., *Research Ethics and the Creative Arts* (Melbourne: Melbourne Research Office, 2010): 19.

19. Susan M. Cox, "From Adversaries to Allies: Ethical Review in the Context of Visual and Other Innovative Methods," in *Ethics and Visual Research Methods: Theory, Methodology, and Practice*, eds. Deborah Warr, et al. (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2016).

20. Baghwati and Neumark, "Artist-Researchers" *Response*, 3.

21. Klassen, "Research by Artists," 247.

22. Fonds de recherche du Québec (FRQ), "Policy for the Responsible Conduct of Research," 2014, www.frqsc.gouv.qc.ca/en/ethique/conduite-responsable-en-recherche (accessed April 2, 2018).

23. Ibid., 12.

24. Ibid.

2006 article addressing the debate on research in the arts, he notes that rather than assuming a separation between object and subject, "artistic practice itself is an essential component of both the research process and the research results."[25] He states that artistic practice is reflexive, in part, because it is saturated with the experiences, histories, and beliefs of the practitioner, a point that throws a traditional understanding of objectivity into question. He proposes the following characterization of research in the arts: "Art practice—both the art object and the creative process—embodies situated, tacit knowledge that can be revealed and articulated by means of experimentation and interpretation."[26] This kind of research addresses "questions that are pertinent in the research context and in the art world," which is why it matters to Borgdorff that the practitioner is familiar with the standards and conventions of artistic practices.[27] He also recognizes that some artistic practices should not be considered research, such as those that do not seek to "expand our knowledge and understanding by conducting an original investigation in and through art objects and creative processes."[28] Here he is describing research in artistic practices specifically and not all forms of art-related research.

Research-creation includes a wide range of practices that will be explored in the following sections. The discourse around artistic research features a heavy emphasis on the artistic competency of the researcher, as they cross-pollinate their practices with other disciplines. Henrik Frisk and Stefan Östersjö describe the potential of interdisciplinary artistic research as follows:

> The potential for novel contributions from the artistic researcher lies in the meeting between artistic research and other disciplines. We regard interdisciplinary research as the future challenge and developmental possibility for the artistic researcher. Again, we make this claim while maintaining the necessity for the artistic researcher to be, first and foremost, an artist whose practice is solidly situated in the surrounding art world. Artistic processes may be studied in a number of ways, but one of the defining aspects of artistic research is that the researcher studies his or her own processes.[29]

A Spectrum of RC Practices

I had the opportunity to work as a research assistant with a team at the Université de Montréal on an FRQ-funded project titled *La conduite responsible en recherche-création*, which was proposed in response to a concerted action request by the FRQ to examine responsible conduct of research in RC.[30] I was not involved in the design of the research project and I never attended steering committee meetings. I was, however, involved in many other aspects of the project over several months. This article will not present results from the research team's data collection or their analyses. Other articles, which will present these results in detail, are currently in various stages of production. What I offer here is a contextualization and a preview of some of the issues that arose throughout the project; these are important to address, as the discussions about responsible conduct of research in RC evolve.

My involvement with the RCRC project began in fall 2016 as part of the first phase of the project: a scoping literature review. Over the course of three months, I and another research assistant each read one hundred published, peer-reviewed articles about RC and responsible conduct of research. In consultation with other research-team members, we decided to highlight the following issues related to responsible research conduct and/or

25. Henk Borgdorff, *The Debate on Research in the Arts* (Bergen: Kunsthøgskolen, 2006), 7.
26. Ibid., 18.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Henrik Frisk and Stefan Östersjö, "Beyond Validity: Claiming the Legacy of the Artist-Researcher," *Svensk tidskrift för musikforskning* 95 (2013): 44.
30. See *La recherche-création responsable/Responsible Research-Creation*, 2018, http://crr-rc-rcr.ca; the literature review poster is available online at http://hdl.handle.net/1866/20005.

research-creation: academic training, definition, position, quality, funding, authorship and knowledge transfer, and conflicts of interest. Through the literature review, and based on my own experiences with RC, I envisioned different "profiles" based on practitioner disciplines and the definitions of RC described in the articles. Different concerns about responsible research could be defined based on the author's unique engagements with RC. For example, some artists find research ethics reviews in their current form to be a hindrance to creation, and thus would prefer to be left to self-regulate according to the conventions of their profession.[31] Another author described the inability of a review board to adequately evaluate a BioArt project.[32] Researchers who work with participants collaboratively have identified concerns regarding confidentiality and anonymity.[33] Many authors who use interview data to create artistic works struggle to find a balance between the authenticity of the data and the entertainment value of their productions.[34]

Peer-reviewed articles were prioritized in this first phase of the project and used thereafter to design a survey that would gather more specific data about RC practices and issues of responsible conduct of research in Canada and abroad. Although I was not part of the survey design, the report from the literature review and the fictional profiles of RC practitioners I created were taken into consideration. The research team members who designed the survey subsequently created profiles for respondents.[35] Below are the five fictional profiles I initially developed from the literature review with the aim of highlighting key issues for RC practitioners based on personal, professional, and disciplinary identifications. My hope is that they present complex portraits (not straw people) and may be helpful in illustrating the variety of practices and beliefs that exist while highlighting points of contention in relation to responsible conduct of research in RC. The gender chosen for each profile is arbitrary; the option of using gender-neutral pronouns was not retained, because of the grammatical challenges it entails.

Profile One: Artist

This artist holds a MFA degree and is an assistant professor at a Canadian art and design university. She works with photography, video, and sculptural installation. She considers herself an artist-researcher who conducts research through creative processes. She considers the creation of artistic works as the production of new knowledge and understanding. This artist is frustrated by the definitions of research-creation put forward by funding agencies, since they require her to speak a language (that of an academic researcher) that is different from the language used in her artistic community. This artist mainly receives funds from arts councils, but has decided to apply for research-creation funds from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada due to institutional pressure to increase research funds for her department.

This artist primarily works independently, but occasionally consults experts or other researchers. She does not credit these reference people as co-creators of her work, although, depending on their involvement, such collaborators may receive acknowledgement in the supporting material at an exhibition. This artist has never published in an academic journal. Instead, she disseminates her work in local and international exhibitions (solo or as part of a group).

31. Glen Lowry, "Props to Bad Artists: On Research-Creation and a Cultural Politics of University-Based Art," *RACAR* 40, 1 (2015): 43.

32. Nora S. Vaage, "What Ethics for Bioart?," *Nanoethics* 10 (2016): 94.

33. K. M. Boydell, et al., "Ethical Challenges in Arts-based Health Research," *The International Journal of The Creative Arts in Interdisciplinary Practice* (IJCAIP) 11 (June 2012); Michael Hodgins and Katherine M. Boydell, "Interrogating Ourselves: Reflections on Arts-Based Health Research," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research SozialForschung* 15, 1, art. 10 (January 2014); R. Mykitiuk, A. Chaplick, and C. Rice, "Beyond normative ethics: Ethics of arts-based disability research," *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health* 1, 3, (July–September 2015): 373–382; Annalee Yassi, et al., "Ethics in Community-University-Artist Partnered Research: Tensions, Contradictions and Gaps Identified in an 'Arts for Social Change' Project," *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 14 (2016):199–220.

34. Sophie Elizabeth Tamas, "Walking the Lines: Art, Research, and Unknowing," *Creative Approaches to Research* 3, 2 (2010): 5–20; Yen Yen Joyceln Woo, "Engaging new audiences—Translating research into popular media," *Educational Researcher* 37, 6 (2008): 321–329; Katherine M. Boydell, Carmela Solimine, and Siona Jackson, "Visual Embodiment of Psychosis: Ethical Concerns in Performing Difficult Experiences," *Visual Methodologies* 3, 2 (2015): 43–52.

35. The survey was disseminated between March 30 and April 30, 2017. It was shared via email with approximately 29,000 potential respondents and it was completed by 759 people. Detailed results will be provided in future articles by members of the RCRC team.

This artist has never struggled with ethical issues except in considering fair use of images in art making, and in relation to the public being photographed. She has never had a project reviewed by a research ethics board. She is concerned that research-creation funding is slipping away from artists and instead funds researchers with no training or formal experience in artistic practices.

Profile Two: Arts-Based Researcher

This arts-based researcher has a PhD and is an associate professor at a mid-sized Canadian research university. She works with participants using photovoice and other artistic methods, but is not herself the creator of any artwork. She employs the following definition when qualifying her work: "Arts-based research is an emerging qualitative research approach; it refers to the use of any art form (or combinations thereof) at any point in the research process in generating, interpreting, and/or communicating knowledge."[36]

This arts-based researcher has been funded by Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) for RC projects working with patients in a medical context. She regularly collaborates with nursing and medical practitioners and has co-authored articles for medical humanities journals. She has also disseminated her research through exhibitions, performances, and participatory events. She is always required to pass a research ethics review for her projects. She regularly works closely with communities and special-interest groups as part of her research. She believes reflexivity and willingness to adapt projects is crucial, which often means going back to the research ethics board to make amendments. She has experienced ethical dilemmas when participants in her research projects wish to be named in an exhibition even though they agreed to a consent form that would protect (hide) participant identities; there could be implications for family and community members if participants are identified. This researcher worries about articulating the value of her research to scholars in different disciplines, while working to advance qualitative methodologies and exploring the possibilities of arts-based research.

Profile Three: Artist-Researcher

As a full professor at a mid-sized, comprehensive Canadian university, this researcher employs research-creation methodologies in his teaching and curatorial work. He considers himself an artist-researcher and believes that practice and theory are inseparable. He insists that RC practice cannot be reduced to a single format or definition, since one cannot know in advance what such methods may produce. He appreciates this definition of research-creation: "A methodology that sidesteps disciplinary allegiance and thereby recognizes artistic cultures and practices across the university."[37]

This artist-researcher usually receives funding from research agencies (within or outside of the university), but he has also been awarded arts-council grants for travel and the promotion of exhibitions. He has co-investigators for his larger projects and he is familiar with the language of both artistic and academic communities. In addition to curated exhibitions, he disseminates his research through single or co-authored publications in academic peer-reviewed journals. His RC exhibitions always feature extensive, written support material presented in an exhibition catalogue.

36. Katherine M. Boydell, et al., "The Production and Dissemination of Knowledge: A Scoping Review of Arts-Based Health Research," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research SozialForschung*, 13, 1, art. 32 (January 2012): 3.

37. Loveless, "Manifesto," 53.

This artist-researcher conceives of ethical conduct in terms of ethical ways of living that balance the professional, personal, and political in sustainable ways. He considers feminist and Indigenous methodologies integral to ethical research and teaching. His present concern is that the increasingly neo-liberalized and corporatized university is averse to research that may not have quantitative results or a measurable "impact" according to the established criteria for assessing research productivity.

Profile Four: Cardiologist

As an associate professor in the medical school at a large research university, this cardiologist has long suspected that the data published from medical studies does not tell the whole story. He recently completed a film-based RC project that involved collecting personal narratives from patients post-surgery. He found this interdisciplinary pilot project interesting, but he is doubtful of the impact, transferability, and validity of the outcome. He is therefore concerned about the viability of RC as a research methodology. This scholar wonders whether certain projects should be considered research at all. He is interested in how art could disseminate knowledge to a wider audience in innovative ways, but he also worries that this may not offer a balanced view of complex issues. He has concerns about artists' lack of experience with the ethical and procedural protocols of health-science environments. He frequently publishes articles and case studies in medical journals with several co-authors (medical researchers, not artists).

Profile Five: PhD Student

As an artist in a Fine Arts PhD program, this student feels frustrated with having to frame her art practice as research-creation. She has never encountered this term previously in her formal art education and she cannot find any guidelines on what RC is exactly or how she should apply it to her own work. For a doctoral funding application, she has therefore decided to describe only the parts of her practice that seem the most like research. She has previously only received funding from arts councils.

Ethical concerns inform her artistic practice, since she deals with social-justice issues in her artwork. She often collaborates with members of the public over a long period to bring visual form to matters concerning local communities. This work results in rogue (unauthorized) exhibitions in public spaces. She is concerned that her art will not be valued on its own if she must frame it as research, whereas her thesis committee members are worried the creative productions will not be enough to satisfy the degree requirements.

These profiles are fictional and cannot possibly capture the full spectrum of practitioners engaged in RC. In attempting to combine multiple viewpoints and characteristics, these profiles may ultimately represent no one. Nevertheless, every practitioner described in these profiles can be said to be doing research-creation and should be considered as part of the RC community. If compared side by side on a spectrum, however, some of these practitioners would be placed closer to the research side (profiles two and four), some would be on the side of creation (profiles one and five), and some would be

in the middle (profile three). When I and the other research assistant, Sara Mathieu-Chartier, presented these profiles to the RCRC team, we wanted to highlight this variation. Indeed, there exists a divide among RC practitioners in relation to this research-creation spectrum that is worth investigating, since it relates both to the profiles discussed above and to the issue of whether or not everyone with a stake in RC will be heard when it comes to defining what constitutes responsible conduct of research.

University-based artists were originally understood to be the primary group accessing RC funds, and this funding category has enabled some truly excellent work—but not only from artists. As different types of researcher-creators emerge, however, questions regarding rigour, evaluation procedures, the qualifications of evaluators, and the definition of RC remain key points of contention. There is dissatisfaction with regards to multiple definitional issues from both the academic and the creative-practitioner communities, as noted by Biggs and Büchler:

> On the one hand, we hear the academic community at large—understood as academic researchers in any academic area and discipline—express the dissatisfaction that what creative practitioners produce is not academic research. On the other hand, we hear the dissatisfaction of the creative practitioner community that their values are not reflected in traditional academic research models and, as a result, when they use these models the outcomes are not relevant to them.[38]

While Biggs and Büchler were addressing the context of artistic research, the same situation exists in RC. Glen Lowry has similarly examined the perceived "good research/bad art" dichotomy from a Canadian perspective: "If research-creation does produce *bad* art, why? Perhaps, despite rhetoric to the contrary, SSHRC's research-creation program is not geared to allow professional artists and designers to bring their best work forward."[39] Artists accustomed to submitting funding applications focused on their creative practice may feel alienated by the need to formalize their work in the language of research. And researchers may jump at the opportunity to incorporate artistic elements into their projects, rather than continue in more traditional, perhaps less-exciting modes.

This persistent artist-researcher dichotomy does not seem to be evolving, although there is an increasing number of practitioners who fit into a middle zone between artist and researcher. This is due to several factors, including the expansion of RC discourses through publications, conferences, and graduate seminars on the topic; a greater awareness of practices through expositions, archiving, and alternative dissemination platforms, such as the RC catalogue by the Society for Artistic Research; and the rise of doctoral programs that enable practitioners to develop a double expertise.[40] Research-funding organizations seeking to support arts-based research further increase the exposure and capacity of creative-practice methodologies, but guidelines for funding these projects, and what to expect as outcomes, remain unclear. This can lead to a default reliance on established modes of academic research.

Collaborative, interdisciplinary RC projects are increasingly common and represent a promising situation wherein the expertise of artists and researchers is united and mutually strengthened, ideally producing good research *and* high-quality art. Unfortunately, it is still common within interdisciplinary

38. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, eds., *Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts* (New York: Routledge, 2011): 83.

39. Lowry, "Props," 44; italics in original.

40. This online catalogue is frequently referenced as a unique platform for the exposition of artistic research. It has been written about at length in *The Exposition of Artistic Research: Publishing Art in Academia*, eds. Michael Schwab and Henk Borgdorff (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2014).

teams for a hierarchy to emerge in which artists' contributions merely support the work of researchers. Unless the voices of creative practitioners are heard in the discussions and debates about RC, this lack of respect for the rigour and depth of knowledge required to produce compelling artistic work will continue, and the role of creative professionals will be further reduced within RC.

I am reminded of a salient note in Natalie S. Loveless's introduction to the Polemics section on RC from the spring 2015 issue of *RACAR*, in which she acknowledges that securing funding for university-based artists is an important political project. At the same time, she also calls for a "both/and" conversation in terms of what RC discourse can accomplish within academia.[41] Here, I am highlighting one side of the "both." This side of the conversation needs greater visibility and, understandably, the voices of artists are absent from most academic publications on this topic. Is it fair to ask artists, yet again, to take up the language and writing practices of the academic research community? If researchers, researcher-creators, and artists wish to interrogate what artistic knowledge can produce, spaces for artistic production and dissemination should be centered, prioritized, and considered with regard for the values of the artistic community. That said, I would encourage RC practitioners who wish to help uphold the place of creative production on the spectrum of RC practices to consider a range of publication venues in which to discuss their practices and disseminate their work.

Even though the first major RC grants were established in Canada more than a decade ago, there is still confusion about what activities are eligible for RC funding and what qualifications researchers require. I have heard frustration from past applicants who were rejected because a project was either too research or too artistically oriented. It is not unheard of to receive both of these criticisms for the same project, if an applicant re-applies after taking the former into consideration, only to be then rejected for eligibility reasons a second time with the latter critique.[42] Of course, funding is never guaranteed, but a lack of clarity regarding eligibility is a problem. Grant applications notoriously take a long time to complete. Knowing if there is even a chance of success helps applicants decide whether or not to apply. Transparent eligibility and evaluation criteria also help shape the application. It would be hard to find a researcher or artist who does not shape a project proposal based on the call to which they are responding. However, this practice can look different depending on whether one is an artist trying to get funding that historically favours research projects or a researcher who does not need to shift a project description as much in order to access RC funds. Creative work necessitates translation, labour, and expertise from creative practitioners to a greater degree than from academic researchers.

The idea that an RC project could receive grants from both research- and arts-funding agencies is interesting. Some see this as "double dipping" and consider it a conflict of commitment, which is why it came up in the context of the RCRC project. To me, this fifty-fifty funding model raises the question of quality in relation to artistic creation. How many projects funded by RC grants have produced artwork of a high enough calibre to be considered for an arts-council grant?

41. Natalie S. Loveless, "Introduction," *Short Statements on Research-Creation*, 42, note 2.

42. Stévance and Lacasse describe the precarious balance of research and creation in SSHRC and FQRSC project requirements as "shrouded in paradox." See *Research-Creation in Music and the Arts: Towards a Collaborative Interdiscipline* (London: Routledge, 2018): 45.

Plagiarism is another issue our team discussed in terms of responsible conduct of research. Over the past century, artists and innovators from William Faulkner to Pablo Picasso and Steve Jobs have paraphrased the well-known expression "good artists copy, great artists steal."[43] In this way, they have expressed the belief that great artists reference artworks within the traditions of a given medium. In this context, an idea is appropriated and transformed into something new—copying alone is not impressive. How would a scientific committee or REB view this culture of remix, collage, and re-appropriation? We are, after all, in the post-modern age of reproduction. How, for example, would one credit the provenance of a readymade? There are unwritten codes of conduct for creative professionals regarding acceptable use of the work of others. This may not be a perfect system, but part of an artistic training involves learning to think through decision-making in the production of an artwork. Art education involves critiques—an open peer-review in which artists are questioned about their process. If a student has not considered the ethics behind their work, their peers or instructors will question their motivations.

Responsible Research Ethics Review

A promising model for REBs seeking to better understand the specificities of creative practice has emerged from specialized art and design universities, such as Emily Carr University of Art and Design (ECUAD) in Vancouver, British Columbia. As Susan M. Cox explains, "The ECUAD Research Ethics Board considers itself to be 'a learning board,' wherein education about research ethics for all those involved in research is a core purpose of the board and a key aspect of its service."[44] This REB fosters a climate of "openness, trust and mutual respect" by working closely with researchers and helping them to prepare their applications prior to review.[45] They offer helpful clarifications where necessary and aim, when possible, for a rapid turnaround. In this context, reviewers are not seen as gatekeepers.

For many researcher-creators working within post-structuralist, feminist, or Indigenous theories, ethical and responsible conduct may be inherent to a project, or even its driving force. This differs from a more biophysical basis for ethics in other fields, such as health, natural, or biological sciences. Stephanie Spriggay, for example, describes an understanding of the ethics of embodiment that transitions from "understanding ethics as epistemological (what do I need to know about the other) and rather problematizes ethics through a relational understanding of being."[46] Kristen Ali Eglinton rejects the idea of a researcher being "emotionally uninvolved, and objectively distant," and seeks instead to "forge deeper ties with participants, often as a means of overcoming the power relations inherent in the research enterprise."[47] These approaches to ethical conduct recognize that a research ethics approval cannot guarantee that no harm will ever be done. Once in the field, situations may arise at any moment requiring an immediate response to ethical dilemmas or other challenges. "There are critical disjunctures between aspects of everyday behaviour in the field and the University's institutional frameworks that aim to guide/enforce good ethical practice, as the very conduct of fieldwork is always contextual, relational, embodied, and politicalized."[48] Klassen asserts a similar point using Sarah Banks' relational theoretical framework:

43. Garson O'Toole, *Quote Investigator: Exploring the Origins of Quotations*, "Good Artists Copy; Great Artists Steal," March 3, 2013, https://quoteinvestigator.com/2013/03/06/artists-steal (accessed April 2, 2018).

44. Susan M. Cox, "From Adversaries to Allies: Ethical Review in the Context of Visual and Other Innovative Methods," in *Ethics and Visual Research Methods: Theory, Methodology, and Practice*, eds. Deborah Warr, et al. (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2016), 257.

45. Ibid.

46. Stephanie Springgay, "An Ethics Of Embodiment, Civic Engagement and A/R/Tography: Ways Of Becoming Nomadic In Art," *Research And Teaching Educational Insights* 12, 2 (2008): 4.

47. Kristen Ali Eglinton, "Between the Personal and the professional," *Young* 21, 3 (August 2013): 256.

48. Farhana Sultana, "Reflexivity, Positionality and Participatory Ethics: Negotiating Fieldwork Dilemmas in International Research," *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 6, 3 (2007): 374–385. As cited in Annalee Yassi, et al., "Ethics in Community-University-Artist Partnered Research: Tensions, Contradictions and Gaps Identified in an 'Arts for Social Change' Project," *Journal of Academic Ethics* 14 (2016): 217.

"Researchers require relationship-based ethics review structures that follow 'ethics of care' models over the rights-based philosophies of principle-based ethics."[49] An "ethics of care" model is a holistic approach that could help prepare researchers to deal with ethical challenges, should something unforeseen arise in their work. This approach often takes a central role in the design of a research project from the start.

Social-science and humanities researchers have noted that REBs sometimes have difficulty evaluating and understanding the risks and benefits from non-health-related research. In the most problematic cases, REBs may have unrealistic concerns, and so require disproportionate means to address risks to participants that may not accurately reflect the research context. Chapter Ten of the Tri-Council Policy Statement on qualitative research methods has helped educate REBs in Canada over the past ten years.[50] Other chapters deal with risk analysis and proportionate review, considerations of justice in the recruitment of research participants, and the use of biological materials. Research in the arts still remains problematic, as it straddles the traditional fields and methods in the social sciences and creative practice.

Cross-Continental Connections

It is difficult to capture the full range of perspectives on research in the arts that exist, whether through a literature review, in an article, or through a survey. For example, many of the respondents to a survey for the RCRC project I worked on expressed unease over the assumptions inherent within the survey questions. I have tried, here, to highlight this diversity of opinions in my proposed RC profiles. There are many similarities between the emergence of RC in Canada and the rise of artistic research abroad. To illustrate this similarity, I will describe briefly how the authors of two different publications independently raised the notion of family resemblances, as modelled by Ludwig Wittgenstein, in relation to artistic research and research-creation between 2011 and 2012. In his essay "Pleading for Plurality," Søren Kjørup questions how entities with little in common can belong to the same category.[51] Building on Wittgenstein's example of games (i.e., "board-games, card-games, ball-games, Olympic games, and so on") that share similarities and relationships, but do not necessarily have any one thing in common, he presents family resemblances as threads that overlap and crisscross members in the same way.[52] What is common to art (i.e., "sonnets, ready-mades, operas, novels, paintings, films, pantomimes, and so on"[53])? What is common to science (i.e., "statistics, history, philosophy, neurology, semiotics, agricultural science, dramaturgy, political science, glaciology, and so on"[54])? Traditions develop over time with the addition of new features and commonalities that persist and come to define cultural phenomena like research, art, and science.[55] Kjørup emphasizes that artistic research should not be squeezed into a single research format or a single concept of research, since there are "many different kinds of sciences using many different methods to solve many different kinds of research problems."[56] There is no reason that artistic research should be any different.

Chapman and Sawchuk's 2012 article "Research-Creation: Intervention, Analysis and 'Family Resemblances'" can almost be read as a response to

49. Klassen, "Research by Artists," 248. Citing Sarah Banks, et al., "Everyday ethics in community-based participatory research," *Contemporary Social Science* 8, 3 (2013): 263–277.

50. Government of Canada, "TCPS 2—Chapter 10," Panel on Research Ethics, February 15, 2018, www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/chapter10-chapitre10 (accessed April 2, 2018).

51. Søren Kjørup, "Pleading for Plurality," in eds. Biggs and Karlsson, *Research in the Arts*.

52. Ibid., 34–35.

53. Ibid., 35.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid., 36.

56. Ibid., 41.

Kjørup, who called for future publications on artistic research to go beyond the theoretical and take examples of artistic-research practices as a point of departure. Chapman and Sawchuk employ examples, not as a substitution for an understanding, but as integral to explaining a phenomenon.[57] "Wittgenstein's insights on the use of examples are part of a theoretical understanding of the ontology of 'research-creation' not as a thing, but as a concept with blurred boundaries."[58] Through concrete examples of RC projects, they offer four possible modes, or articulations, of research-creation practice: research-for-creation, research-from-creation, creative presentations of research, and creation-as-research.[59] "Rather than offering an explanation of what such activities all have in common, the idea of family resemblance asks one to pay attention not only to what is akin, but also what is different."[60] Both texts highlight the significance of examples in the classification of RC. The similarities between these two publications are a good example of how discourses on artistic research, research-creation, practice-based research, and several other creative-practice methodologies have gone through similar transformational phases. No doubt, there are significant differences within these traditions, but here it is the similarities that should be highlighted. Each of these emerging methodological practices faces epistemological and ontological challenges. To ignore these parallel conversations would amount to reinventing the wheel at every instance of the emergence of creative-research practices.

Conclusions

> The conflict of disciplines is not a brake on the development of science, but one of its motors.
>
> Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*, 1999

A large number of the articles on RC that I reviewed for the RCRC project discussed ethics in relation to reflexivity, situatedness, or positionality and feminist theories as described above. By learning about the practices and codes of conduct specific to RC, a more nuanced conception of responsible conduct of research should emerge, with positive effects on research into responsible conduct for researchers across many disciplines. This would require a model of cross-disciplinary allies meeting on equal ground to share knowledge and expertise. "Different disciplines have discipline-specific interests for which discipline-specific answers are required and for which discipline-specific methods must be used."[61] Studying the specificities of creative research practices could help prevent unfair evaluations of RC that compare apples to oranges when applying policy across different disciplines and fields of practice.

Discussions on responsible conduct of research in RC could produce better understandings of creative-research practices. This was one effect of the interdisciplinary discussions that emerged when the 2001 Secretariat's Panel on Research Ethics sought to better understand ethical issues in qualitative research. My hope is that, as a by-product of these timely discussions on RC, artistic researchers can attain a more prominent position from which to voice their opinions on RC and responsible conduct of research policies. Why is this recognition so important? Without access to funding, artistic researchers cannot make significant contributions to their fields. Their departments could be

57. Owen Chapman and Kim Sawchuk, "Research-Creation: Intervention, Analysis and 'Family Resemblances,'" *Canadian Journal of Communication* 37 (2012): 5.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., 5.
60. Ibid., 6.
61. Biggs and Büchler, *Research in the Arts*, 92.

seen as underperforming, which is no small concern if cuts are made to faculty resources. But greater transparency about who is eligible for RC funding is needed in order to address the problems associated with transforming oneself into more of an artist or researcher to access funds—an action that can be misinterpreted as applying for funding without the intention of abiding by the grant guidelines.

The third phase of the RCRC project (which will be completed by June 2018) involves developing tools and training aids for anyone interested in learning about or understanding responsible conduct of research in RC. This could include students, professors, artists, evaluation committees, funding administrators, and research ethics boards. It is hoped that this next step in the promotion of responsible conduct of research will benefit researchers and artists, particularly if there is strong, cross-disciplinary engagement. The RCRC project was a major undertaking on this topic, and it made strides in initiating discussions and gathering data about responsible conduct of research and creative practices. These discussions will continue for years to come and could result in the collection of some foundational examples of artistic research that significantly help move RC forward as a paradigm. "Compared with other disciplines it is rather surprising that after 10, 20 and at certain places even nearly 30 years of institutional commitment artistic research has not developed any generally known classics and no stars."[62]

In my literature review, the uncertainty felt by many RC practitioners was vividly apparent. Indeed, many authors felt compelled to add long, justificatory paragraphs explaining their approach. In their 2012 article exploring kinship in arts-research communities, Biggs and Büchler conducted their own literature review. They concluded that there is a stronger emphasis on research within Canadian RC practices than on creative production; by contrast, the latter is central to artistic research in the UK.[63] As we move into the next decade of defining research-creation practices in Canada, it's time to question whether this research focus has been intentional or incidental. ¶

62. Kjørup, "Pleading," 39.
63. Michael Biggs and Daniela Büchler, "Research Into Practice and A/r/tography: A Study of Kinship," *Visual Arts Research* 38, 2 (Winter 2012): 28–38.

The Responsible Conduct in Research Creation (RCRC) project data presented here represents the efforts of a team of dedicated researchers. I am grateful to have had the chance to participate in the project. In writing this article, I owe a debt of gratitude to Nathalie Vaorino, Bryn Williams-Jones, and Lois Klassen for their constructive and critical comments and revisions. I also thank Vincent Couture and Stanislav Birko for their insightful thoughts on the profiles and survey data. Last but not least, my thanks goes to Cynthia Noury, Darian Goldin Stahl, and Brenda St.Hilaire for their thoughtful feedback.