

## The researcher-creator profile in postgraduate performing arts studies

Victoria Pérez Royo

Over the past ten years, a paradigm shift within performing arts education has occurred, namely a twist towards the researcher-creator profile, which is particularly manifest in postgraduate programmes.

We could consider two previous education models in the performing arts, like the two poles of an opposition (Smith-Autard, 2002). On the one side there is the educative model: artistic training was mainly understood as a process of transformation and global spiritual development of the student; inherited both from philosophy and from the principles that led modern dance, education was based upon an equally distributed emphasis on the improvement of the physical, emotional, and social dimensions of personality. The learning process should be meaningful as such, and not be directed towards the attainment of any kind of further end; it was a matter of forming a personality, which would entail necessarily positive results in the artistic practice.

On the opposite side, there is the professional model that is still to be found in art academies: it consists in producing professional performers and dancers with great abilities. On the opposite side of the process, the emphasis is put on the outcome, on the creation of definite products theatrically ready to be presented to the audience. The dancer or performer is a professional with high-level skills in her field, a virtuous expert in her area.

Smith Autard states that these two models suppose the previous steps (the first covers the forties and extends until the seventies of the twentieth century, whereas the second prevails in the eighties) in a chronological and dialectical development, according to which it is a synthesis of both periods that currently defines the educative paradigm: the in-between model, consisting in the integration of the virtues of the previous two, and that – from her point of view – inaugurates a new stage of education.

The paradigm shift in artistic education that we have observed during the elaboration of this report shows, indeed, that some of the elements of those systems persist, but it could never be reduced to an integration of some of their characteristics. It is rather a qualitative transformation defined by a turn towards research, an emphasis on knowledge production and on the integration of theory and practice.

As a matter of fact, in the researcher-creator model there is a greater emphasis on the process than on the outcome; it is not about the spiritual or emotional process of the student, but most of all about a path in which new knowledge is produced.

Yet, to dismiss the imposition of a series of techniques and knowledge that the student should learn according to a predefined structure doesn't mean leaving everything up to her intuition



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

and spontaneous creativity. Instead, the new paradigm is based on the exploration of unknown domains that are not predetermined, and on the acquisition of knowledge in an autonomous way, though in permanent dialogue with fellow students, tutors and advisors that assure a pondered and conscious research.

So, knowledge is not to be understood as a particular route that is known in advance, that the student follows and others have explored before her; rather, it is better understood as a heterogeneous field in which the student moves forward creating an individual path where (s)he acquires a knowledge which does not apply to her from the outside, but that (s)he actively embodies. Instead of a transmission then, we speak in terms of knowledge production.

As a consequence, in this paradigm special relevance goes to self-learning technologies, as well as to the integration of theory and practice, with special emphasis on reflexive practice. The student situates herself between the spheres of critique and creation.

## **Researcher-creator profile in master programmes**

The aforementioned tendency is present, to a greater or lesser extent, in the study plans of postgraduate programmes in the performing arts that have been studied in the frame of this report. Obviously, their actualisations will take specific forms according to constraints determined by their respective contexts<sup>1</sup>. Below, a series of characteristics common to these studies are analysed item per item, providing a first approach to the researcher-creator paradigm.

### 1. Selection criteria

Amongst the criteria to select the candidates to access the studies, only a minority of centres refers to artistic talent, which means that the presumption of the born genius artist, of an individual innate artistic skill is abandoned. At its place, as a fundamental criterion that is practically omnipresent, there is the reference to the capacity to reflect and contextualise one's own artistic work or that of others, which will allow the development of an artistic investigation of interest for the community.

Within the studies specifically dedicated to dance, the selection of well-proportioned and flexible bodies – the kind of requirements that allowed the dancer's movement to be satisfying at a

---

<sup>1</sup> This study has covered a wide range of studies on the performing arts at postgraduate and PhD levels; the new paradigm could be specifically observed in traditionally avantgardist programmes and in the ones that have been reformed in recent years. The study also includes reports about centres that offer an excellent professional education, but where this paradigm shift cannot be observed, since the study plans of previous decades are still in use. At the same time, we decided to include collectives and centres in which a coherent and constant research effectively takes place, even if they are not subject to the regulations of the academia, since they are not official education programmes. These initiatives provide very original modes of the researcher-creator paradigm.



mechanical level – disappears. Instead of physical abilities, the relevant criterion is once again the capacity to articulate one’s own practice.

## 2. Professional goals

There is a clear difference between the postgraduate studies that appeared at the university and have a more theoretic profile and those which are more directed to practice. In university programmes, which are usually more directed to the training of researchers that can go on working in the framework of the academia, there is the reference to a series of mixed forms of praxis and theory in the professional exercise, as well as to different professions in collaboration with creators.

In the professional goals of practical programmes, we still find the training of performers and dancers; the difference provided by the researcher-creator paradigm lies in the fact that parallel to them, a series of figures that are becoming more relevant have emerged: instead of dancers, there is more insistence in the training of choreographers; at the same time, the profession of performer has been supplanted by the one of autonomous stage creator, with the capacity to develop an artistic research in an independent way. In the same way, a series of hybrid figures have emerged, situated in the territory of the integration of the artistic activity and the reflection about it, like the figure of the dramaturge.

On the other hand, more than a professional training there is a series of programmes that are no longer conceived as an education, but as a moment of reflection and revision of one’s own praxis within an already established career; in such programmes, the creator can dedicate herself to the exploration of the artistic questions that concern her, during a larger period of time than the residency system can usually provide, and without the pressure to produce which prevails in the market context.

## 3. Academic curriculum

### 3.1. Individual trajectory

The most obvious aspect of this shift of educative paradigm can be observed in the curricular importance awarded to the individual trajectory. According to the kind of programme (more practice-directed or more academic), autonomous research will assume a bigger or smaller credits amount, in many cases constituting its totality. More than learning previously determined contents that can be transmitted in a one-way mode to a community of students, what is fundamental is the individual exploration of a subject. Quite often, at the beginning of these programmes the student presents a research project that (s)he will develop throughout the master.



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

In a complementary way, and in order to assure a deep and high-quality research, dialogue is given great relevance. To make sure that this process is not only the outcome of individual inspiration, the work is constantly questioned through dialogue and discussion. This generates a series of transformations both in the curriculum and in the figures of the professor and student.

The first of them is the new relevance acquired by the tutor. Even if this figure has always existed, in some cases it has come to supplant the figure of the professor. Instead of an authoritarian and exemplary figure that prescribes the areas of knowledge and the way to access them, the professor becomes a tutor or advisor; her new role does not consist so much in transmitting the student a certain amount of knowledge, but rather in guiding the autonomous work of the student. This does not mean that the professor loses relevance, but only that her task shifts to another scope. In fact, in all the programmes where the individual trajectory occupies an important place, a considerable amount of credits is attributed to tutorial activities. Since the areas to which the activities of the students belong are necessarily very diverse, it is also necessary to count on the advice of tutors who are external to the centre, on professionals and experts capable of understanding the original research of the student and accompany her in her trajectory. In many of the programmes that are organised around the student's research, it is the student herself that elects the tutors (s)he finds better suited.

Of course these transformations result as well in a modification of the student's role. (S)he is a responsible individual who creates and follows her own research path and who is in constant exchange relationships with others. The shift is particularly visible in the terminology that has developed in different programmes, to make their new focus manifest: some have chosen "participant" (so as to avoid hierarchic distinctions between professor-participants and student-participants), while others have decided to adopt "creator-student". At the same time, the student becomes a consultant and a critic of the others' work, namely through the implication in the reflection about the research activity of her fellow students. In this plan of studies, critique and creation are closely related to one another in the collaborations among fellows: the validity of their practices is negotiated collectively.

Still, there is a problem linked with this anti-hierarchic educative practice, for which several postgraduate programmes have gradually found solutions: the very frame of freedom that enables a responsible practice also allows that the participant decides neither to question her practice nor to go through a learning process, that (s)he determines neither to question her activity nor its limits. The strategies to avoid this possible conflict have essentially been two: to introduce, as a criterion of selection, the will to question one's practice, the need to redirect the artistic practice or interests



towards the exploration of new stages within the own work. At the same time, a responsible practice is to be assured by means of discussion, justification, and legitimization of one's own decisions throughout the research, and which can take multiple forms.

### 3.2. Dialogal practice.

In this framework, debate and dialogue are essential; on the one hand, in order to assure the responsibility for the own work in a frame of freedom; on the other hand, in order to integrate a reflexive and meta-practical dimension in the very artistic activity, which constitutes a fundamental aspect of the researcher-creator paradigm.

Artistic research is not conceived according to the already outdated model of the creator genius, that can only generate masterpieces from the solitude of her studio, her talent and inspiration; it is conceived as a process of exchange and group work collaboration, in dialogue with others, not only with the audience, but first and foremost immersed in a community of research in which the creator is able to question and contextualize her own practice. The relevance of discussion and debate for this researcher-creator paradigm is obvious in the multiplicity of forms in which it has been integrated in postgraduate studies:

a) Tutorials. In the abovementioned tutorials, which are assigned an important amount of credits and that contribute to the constant guidance of the research, there is a constant dialogue between mentor and student.

b) Seminars. The format of theoretical classes of master class, in which the transmission of knowledge is one-way, is replaced by the seminar; in this case, the professor proposes a subject around which an exchange is generated, that can develop in multiple directions, which are not previously established. In many cases, seminars lack a subject prescribed beforehand, so that they are exclusively based upon the presentation of the research processes (be they theoretical, practical or a mixture of both), as well as on the subsequent group discussions about them. In this case, the seminar has likewise become the fundamental tool for the integration of theory and practice, in the frame of the analysis and judgement of the individual work, another of the keys that define the researcher-creator paradigm. This work of reflection on the own practice also allows overcoming the subjectivity associated to the artist; as Jeroen Fabius points out, the possibility to know the research work from inside, in process, of getting into the decisions and the reasons that motivated them, allows the participants (professors and students) to overcome an aesthetics that could, in some cases, limit the reading of the exposed processes.



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

c) *Mentor-student*. In this situation, in which the student is a participant with equal rights and responsibilities in a collective learning process, (s)he assumes the responsibility of a guide, tutor and critic of the work of her fellows. With this activity, the parameters that most interest the programmes of the new paradigm are reinforced: integration of theory and praxis; absence of absolute truths, which are replaced by a collective management of the principles of understanding, seeing, judging, and creating; democratic debate; information offer, which the individual reorganises in accordance with her research criteria. This figure of the mentor-student appears in several contexts: in seminars, in critical round tables after the presentations of the work at the theatre, or in the different forms of collaboration among students. In this last case, for evaluation, the students sometimes have to hand in the critiques and comments they have written analysing the works of their fellows, on top of the works they have accomplished throughout the course.

d) *Chaotic encounters*. Another of the dialogal formats consists in submerging the student in a non-hierarchic scientific and artistic community, from where to bombard her with information, networks, and contacts. It is a matter of introducing her in a community of distinct artists, creators and theoreticians of several contexts and with different trainings, which offer a wide range of approaches to the particular subject of the course. The contacts are not programmed, they are neither pedagogically nor formally decided in advance, for it is the student who develops her own methods to make her way among that community of persons and the information they provide. The aim of this strategy that has been displayed in several programmes, mostly at the beginning of the master or at the beginning of each year or semester, is to facilitate from the start the questioning of the own practice and the openness towards other possibilities; to generate a shock effect that largely contributes to widen the spectre of personal parameters and criteria. In some occasions, these encounters have had the effect of disorienting the students; to avoid this problem, there is often been decided that the student starts with a process of self-diagnosis of the own work, in order to establish a clear position from where to stretch out bridges towards the new sources of information.

e) *Plenary meeting*. Finally, a dialogue including further levels – other than the guiding, the contextualisation, and the critique of the students’ work – is favoured, which turns around the self-management and revision of the very postgraduate programme. In a large part of the analysed postgraduate studies, different frames are offered within which the student herself, in democratic dialogue with all the people involved in the programme (teaching staff, organisation, and administration staff), collectively decide about the immediate future organisation of the programme, a procedure that allows to quickly identify and solve possible problems.

### 3.3. Subjects



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

As already mentioned, the elaboration of an individual trajectory is essential in the new paradigm. Instead of a standardised path for all the students, the student is offered the possibility to draw her path herself, according to her specific research interests. This tendency has developed in several forms: in some cases, especially in programmes which are more practice-directed and less subject to academic regulation, the curriculum is articulated around that research; the students decide which professors and artists they want to invite, for them to direct workshops or seminars. This means that instead of a repertory of subjects that all the students have to attend and pass, there is a system that is reinvented each semester, that adapts to the specific needs of each singular research, created from and around each personal work. In this case, the participants are not interchangeable individuals inside a predefined structure, but agents that configure the programme in which they are involved. This decision brings about some drawbacks: the most common lies in the difficulty to find a consensus among the students concerning the classes, seminars or laboratories, in which they would be interested to participate. To avoid this situation, a series of measures have been proposed: on the one hand, to diversify and widen the teaching offer; for instance, by dividing the students into small groups, in order to reach a consensus more easily; on the other hand, and in a complementary way, the amount of compulsory activities is reduced, so that the students participate only in the subjects that correspond to their interests. In the centres where there is a predetermined teaching offer, it has been decided to provide a wide range of optional subjects that can be freely chosen and attended at the departments, faculties, and centres with which there are agreements, with the aim of enabling the design of a trajectory that is adequate to individual needs.

Within the provided subjects, it is possible to identify a series of similarities between the different programmes:

a) Methodological guidance and introduction to research.

All the programmes give relevance to those activities intended to help the student acquiring the methodological tools needed to direct her investigation. The subjects sharing this intent usually take place at the beginning of the programme or of the several learning unities. They are mainly directed to the research of modalities that can productively link the practical activity with the theoretical part that usually goes it, to the search for materials and sources, as well as to familiarising the student with the particularities of presenting academic written works.

b) Technique.

In postgraduate programmes, the classes of technique are practically inexistent; they are more common at undergraduate levels instead. In many cases, if the student considers (s)he may need them and the programme is organised at an institution that offers both levels, (s)he can attend them in the inferior courses. When classes of technique are actually part of postgraduate



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



programmes, they are individual and focused on the use of a technique (video, for example). At the same time, if the course deals with a movement discipline, the tasks seldom consist in accurately reconstituting or reproducing the models presented by the teacher by imitating them, but much more in understanding the parameters and grounds on which the discipline is based, in questioning and experimenting with them. In fact, more than techniques, it is more common to resort to methods that favour the development of an accurate physical awareness and to the work with movement principles such as Body Mind Centering. This is a way of fostering the student's research approach to materials that (s)he knows, while motivating her critical and reflexive awareness in each learning situation provided by the educative programmes.

c) Strictly theoretical subjects.

The formats of these classes vary between master class and seminar, this latter being the most common: it consists of a collective work around a subject proposed by the professor; the system is usually based on the individual research of one of the aspects related with the proposed subject, and on its presentation in the class, followed by a group discussion. The most common subjects are history and performing arts theory (theatre, dance, performance, aesthetics, contemporary art, and cultural studies); this knowledge should facilitate the localisation of the student's practice within a series of contexts: the historical context, the one of contemporary practices, and in relation to the culture and society in which it is produced.

### 3.4. Integration of theory and practice.

The integration between practice and theory is one of the fundamental aspects of this paradigm, and it is present in multiple forms and in very distinct levels in the analysed programmes.

a) In the very classes, and favoured by hybrid formats. Especially in the courses of project development, the integration of the theoretical and practical approaches in the object of research is fostered. The course starts approaching a certain subject based on readings and debates, to then gradually integrate the presentations of the students, which will be appreciated and examined according to the theoretical knowledge dealt with at the beginning, and in the frame of continuous discussions.

b) Analysis work. The analysis of the pieces in class is consciously treated as theatre or dance applied sciences: with this activity, the idea is to show the close relation between language and reflection that is at the basis of any dance and theatre training, to reveal the several body ideas, the hierarchies and aesthetic principles inherent in each performing language. Likewise, the





comparative analysis between disciplines is considered to be a valuable tool to discover the conceptual networks and the hierarchies underlying each discipline.

c) The contextualisation of the own practice is considered as a work that necessarily combines theoretical and practical knowledge, to the extent that it implies knowledge or research on the contemporary situation of the arts and aesthetics, as well as the analysis of the own production with the aim of finding one's place in that context.

d) The work of critique and revision of the fellows' work is capital in the studied programmes, and it happens in all the forms of dialogue commented above. In this activity, there is a perfect union between practice and theory, since each particular analysis is based on a series of implicit or explicit knowledge from other realms (facilitated within the programme or not), such as theory of the theatre and dance, cultural studies or contemporary aesthetics.

### 3.5. Professional guidance and connection with the professional context.

This aspect of continuous training also assumes a relevant role within the researcher-creator paradigm. As in the previous professional model, a form of accessing it are the theoretical-practical courses about the functioning of cultural institutions, the practices (compulsory or optional, in cultural or artistic institutions) and the professional dedication of the teaching staff (invited or permanent) to an artistic practice or to curatorship, parallel to their teaching activity, in which they may, to a greater or lesser extent, involve the students. Finally, what happens in many programmes is that the students are themselves established artists that keep doing their professional work throughout their participation in the master.

The connection with the professional sphere does not only aim at helping the student finding a better access to the working world in the future, and at training her in a series of concrete techniques that (s)he might need, but also – and above all – at giving her the opportunity to contrast her own ideas with a wide range of perspectives.

### 3.6. Final projects

The master's final work varies considerably depending on whether the programme is practical research-directed, or on its situation within the academic frame. It is not worthwhile analysing the format, the guidelines, and the evaluation criteria of the written final works, since they amount, in general, to the current master final works at the university.

As for the programmes in which a practical final work is submitted, they offer a series of permanent features:



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

On the one hand, they defend a great creative freedom of the student and a wide interpretation of the performing arts, in which the theatrical text is essentially conceived as performing *text* that does not have to be faithful to any hypothetical previous dramatic piece. On the other hand, there are neither limits nor guidelines that determine the work of the student, so that a wide range of contemporary artistic practices are admitted that encompass theatre, choreography, performance, but also installation, work with digital technologies, site specific work, collaborative art and many other formats, as long as it is possible to read those pieces from a performative point of view. There is visibly an emphasis on the interdisciplinarity that characterises the majority of the programmes, especially in the tolerance regarding the format of the final work, as well as in the motivation to research and explore both artistically and theoretically the respective limits of the performing languages.

Yet, there is in all the programmes a formal requirement that consists in adding a written complement to the practical final work; the relations between the two parts (practical / artistic and theoretical) are nevertheless quite free, so that the student can choose the way in which they complete each other. The written text can be a mere comment on the own praxis or a written reflection on it, but it can also assume many other different functions, as for example: analytical examination/inquiry into practices related to the artistic work; creation and verification of the role of hypotheses which have arisen in the studio; approaching a subject that looks at the practical work from a philosophical, anthropological, aesthetic, sociological, historical perspective, etc.; experimenting with the creation of a *performative text*, among many other possibilities that are kept open to the creativity of the student.

The written complement does not always have to fulfil the requirements of quotation, bibliography, language and structuring; it can be a sort of journal enhancing or documenting the processes the student has been through during her research. This assemblage of materials can sometimes be composed of the most varied ones, so that the written part may not be predominant, but only another language among the possibilities provided by photography, sketches, outlines, the student's notes throughout her research; these additional pieces of work should facilitate the access to the creation process, to the decisions that have been taken during the creation of the final product, the art works that have worked as reference, the sources that have supplied valuable information. Its elaboration can constitute a creative process as such.

### 3.7. Examination and evaluation

In the studied programmes, the model of examination is practically abandoned in favour of a process of evaluation during the seminars and courses, based on individual works, documentation,



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

discussion and a final interview (public or private). Sometimes it is not each course in a singular form that is evaluated, but rather the semester in general – at the end of which practical works and their documentation are submitted, as well as the outcome of the research attended during that time. In any of these cases, more than proving the acquisition of some knowledge, it is a matter of giving the student the possibility to reflect about her praxis, to expose the principles that have led her research, and articulate her position.

### **Researcher-creator profile in doctoral programmes**

Doctoral programmes do not differ much from one another; they all are based upon an original research carried out in an autonomous way by a PhD student; what matters is not that the student acquires a professional competence, but that (s)he produces knowledge. All the programmes we know about currently demand a written additional work, apart from the final work or works resulting from the process of artistic research. Around this issue lies the most inflamed debate on artistic research at doctoral level. Likewise, another aspect of disagreement is related to the criteria of access to the studies.

Some programmes, like for instance Het Platform in Brussels, sustain that the doctorate is a way of disseminating and sharing with a wider community the knowledge acquired throughout a whole life dedicated to artistic research. The function of the academy, and specifically the function of the doctoral programmes, would be to provide the adequate tools to disseminate and make this practice accessible to a wider community. In this way, the artists that would have the right to a doctorate in performing arts would be the ones already consecrated by the artistic community, whereas the students coming directly from postgraduate studies could not apply. This limitation responds, at the same time, to the fear of certain domains regarding the possibility that a student having already obtained her PhD but without practical artistic experience outside the academy could attain the qualifications demanded to direct the research of other young students. For these reasons, and as an intermediate solution, the possibility of establishing a distinction between junior and senior doctorate has even been considered.

However, the positions which defend the access to doctorate studies without restrictions depending on the previous artistic experience of the candidates, are based upon the need to achieve an environment where artistic research can develop having enough time to do so – and without the short-term production pressures it is usually subject to –, especially for those artists that need it more, i.e. the ones starting a professional career. There is also a political will to favour public funding for research projects in the frame of the arts, which until now had only been attributed to science.



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

The other fundamental debate that has arisen around the doctorate in the arts is centred in the need to present a written work in addition to practical work. For some, this is an essential requirement that should be kept, while for others it means the acceptance of the external regulations that the academy imposes upon the arts. Marijke Hoogenboom or Dieter Lesage, who stand for this second position, sustain that the artist should not be imposed the legitimisation of her research in a language that is not proper to it and according to a standardised procedure, since it implies limiting the possibilities of creativity in artistic research. Lesage gives an example to portray the absurdity of the position he criticises: a novel as doctorate work, which was accompanied by an additional written work explaining it. These authors assert that the need of a written appendix lies either in the lack of trust that the academy has in the arts' autonomous critical capacity, or in its incapacity to take a language as complex as the artistic one into account. This line of argumentation defends the elaboration of new forms of evaluating artistic research (in which the humanities could form an alliance with the arts), instead of imposing a form of expression on the artist, since they could make place for alternatives to the current systems of evaluating the quality of research in the humanities, which are so controversial as the publication in peer reviewed scientific journals. Some intermediate positions in this conflict have chosen to keep the obligation to present a written document; in this case, the concession made to the researcher artist lies in letting her decide about the relations that bind the two works in a creative way.

## Recapitulation

The figures that participate in the postgraduate learning process within the profile of researcher-creator, move towards a democratic cohabitation with shared responsibility: on the one side, the figure of the professor is completed by tutorial tasks and guidance of the student's work. The professor's function is not so much about defining the contents of what the student has to learn, but rather about facilitating a framework in which the learning process can take place. On her side, the student assumes the responsibility of creating her own trajectory, throughout which the learning process is not guided but determined in a more or less autonomous way. The followed model does not amount to a hierarchy and to a previous structuring of the knowledge that should be attained, or to the method that would allow the student to gradually access them, but rather to a rhizomatic model: it is about confronting the student with several sources, which (s)he will access by integrating them in her own research, to the extent that they are useful for the research to go further. In this process, both figures are surrounded by a multidirectional exchange, so that not only the professors, but also the students assume the role of tutors, critics, and dialogue partners of her fellows, favouring the processes of reflection, critique, and contextualisation of their artistic research.



This text is under [license of Creative Commons](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

In this framework, the process of learning and of knowledge creation acquires more relevance than the very artistic outcome to which the research might have led. Although it is true that in all the programmes the submission of a final work is required, it is not considered as an artistic end to be attained, but as the means to experiment and explore all the research processes that lead to it. The final piece is not really evaluated according to its artistic quality, but to the knowledge that has been generated during the creation process. This is why the documentation of the process is important, for it allows the evaluators and tutors to have an access to all that reality that otherwise remains invisible.

Indeed, it is about the personal experience and development, as in the educative model mentioned at the beginning, but it is also and most of all about the knowledge produced within that very process, as well as about generating forms of sharing it with the artistic community; for this to happen, a series of techniques have been developed in the different programmes, that have been referred to throughout this text. In this process, there is an integration of theory and practice at many levels, in which the first is understood as a necessary tool to identify and situate the own practice, both regarding historical lines of development and the whole of contemporary artistic practices, providing the possibility to reflect critically about one's own practice and that of others; in this way, it crucially contributes to a complete, multidimensional and complex approach of the object of study; lastly, the integration of theory and practice in the processes of artistic research increases the awareness of the social and political dimensions of the practices, in relation to the environment where they take place.

This integration gives the final blow to the confidence in the artist's intuition, to instead confront the artist's research processes and the knowledge they produce with an artistic-scientific community that collectively negotiates the parameters and criteria to appreciate the productions they generate.

