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Abstract
This article explores the cultures and learning practices of four academic schools with an expressed wish to bridge the gap between traditional academic and arts or journalistic practices. Pierre Bourdieu, the French sociologist, termed them allodoxic, in that they challenge the traditional academic way of thinking and doing. Results from two research projects, spanning over 5 years, employing a multitude of methods, have been used in this article. The results show that these challenging bridging attempts create conflictual cultures. First, faculties with different backgrounds are employed and they bring with them their respective habitus and doxa (Bourdieu), which is manifested in their different epistemologies, doxas. Despite a strong will to work interdisciplinarily, conflicts (destructive) arise particularly around epistemological and pedagogic issues. Second, I show that students at these schools have had double-perspective learning, through theoretical and practice-based methods, despite little help from their lecturers who have high ideals but little actual knowledge themselves of working in/through a double perspective. In many cases, through trial-and-error processes, students have appropriated embodied knowledge of a double perspective, which has given them surplus value when compared with learning through only traditional academic learning practices. It gives reflexive insights and understandings as well as transferrable skills highly useful in professional life. I finally argue that allodoxic conflictual cultures actually construct new ways of knowing through continuous discussions and meetings between faculties with different competences.
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The art world and the academic world have existed side by side for centuries (but with a few exceptions). We are now at a point in time where these two worlds have converged: where arts and art forms are found in academic institutions and scholarly methods of knowledge production are used in art schools. These are not easy processes, and there are traditionalists on all sides claiming their own particular ways of knowing and doing to be the most suitable, which have resulted in discernable power play among, and between, academic institutions.¹

There are, however, examples all over the world where academic institutions have been created based on the fundamental idea that the convergence of different competences, creating new and exciting possibilities, and thereby bridging the distinction between art/s and academia will create new knowledge and new truths. Having worked in one of those academic schools, I have personal experiences of what excitement and increased knowledge contribution this brings, and also of the difficulties these meetings entail. This made me curious of the usefulness of a double perspective, which led me to carry out two projects on this topic.

The overall aim of this article is to discuss the results of four field studies at academic arts or media schools with the outspoken aim to work interdisciplinarily and bridge the gap between arts theory and practice. However, the research material that these studies provided is vast and only a fraction is discussed in this article. The article thus focuses on two main issues: (1) What happens at these four schools that try to work interdisciplinarily through a double perspective? and (2) Is it at all possible for students to learn academically in/through a double perspective?

There is also a normative aim. Having researched the how and why of working multimodally with a double perspective for 7 years, I myself have seen the surplus value this brings to students' learning processes and to research. I will thus in this article argue for the benefit working and learning academically in-between and through a double perspective.

This article, however, starts off with a contextualisation, where my theoretical standpoint as well as theoretical concepts used are highlighted, followed by a brief methodological discussion.

**CLARIFYING CONCEPTS**

Clarifying the stance of the article, and that of myself, it is situated in the theoretical world of Pierre Bourdieu, albeit appropriated to fit my feminist perspective. To understand the academic cultural knowledge construction, academia needs to be seen as a hierarchically constructed field, generated by power and structured by rules that the players of the field (academics, students, and staff) need to master.² The prize of the game is the right to define doxa, which in a Bourdieuan sense is more than thought-patterns of a world view. Doxa is also the ways of acting, dressing, and being. It is so self-evident that we see it as common sense. There are, however, those who see through this and try to implement an alternative way of seeing and being, an allodoxa.³

The particular part of the academic field I am studying is that which is outspokenly allodoxic. In the more traditional academia, the (scientific) doxa embraces distance, objectivity, and the written, while distancing itself from the artistic/professional/practical.⁴ However, artistic, academic knowledge creation and practice-based research are making headway into the academic field⁵ and claiming new forms of knowledge creation processes than traditional academic practices.⁶ These fairly new academic practices create demand for new research practices as well as educational models, which open up a plethora of interesting concepts as well as debatable issues. A review of these cannot be presented in this article for want of space, and thus clarification of only those concepts used in this text will suffice.

**Arts-based research** can be seen as research in and through artistic practices. It differs from humanistic research on the arts by not just being the subject of research but by being the product, the method as well as the context.⁷ Thus, it entails learning through one's own practice, which could involve arts, as in scenic art,⁸ and also design⁹ or teaching.¹⁰

**Practice-based research** is both parallel to, and overlapping, arts-based research, and it is wider. It encompasses other practices, such as journalism and pedagogy. Thus, for this article, practice-based research is a more suitable concept. Practice-based research is carried out in the in-between spaces of the rational and the intuitive.¹¹ These thoughts are not new, and many refer to
John Dewey’s educational philosophy on learning by doing, Donald Schön’s idea of the reflexive practitioner, or Rudolf Arnheim’s work on visual thinking and intelligence, and building on the idea of combining the academic and the practical. Twenty years ago, discussions on the so-called *Mode 2 knowledge* was fervent. Based on new needs to understand contemporary complexities (and to build a national educational politics), new interdisciplinary universities were built around the world with the aim to bridge disciplines, as opposed to traditional discipline-based universities (and knowledge creation).\(^\text{15}\)

In the particular field of arts and media that I have studied, there have been epistemological discussions of the visual as a knowledge-creating base (as opposed to reading-and-writing), and methods of drawing and photographing, for example traditionally used in social anthropology or botany, are now used in modern subjects. The term *visual ethnography* is in vogue and much debated. My more education-oriented colleagues refer to aesthetic learning processes and visual pedagogy. \(^\text{18}\) It is *seeing* as a way of knowing and understanding, which is emphasised. The visual has furthermore been used both in fashion studies as well as in cultural studies as material for identity creation. \(^\text{19}\) However, the visual is not the only sense and Pink is now talking of sensory ethnography, Polanyi of the tacit dimension and in pedagogy, and Selander and Kress discuss the importance of multimodal ways of learning.

All these concepts are woven into each other, and as a German-speaking Swede, I would naturally use the concept *Gestaltung* as an all-embracing term for the practice where an idea is given form, which could be visual, written, multimodal, etc. \(^\text{23}\) There is, however, no useful English translation, and thus the Bauhaus idea of integrating *Theorie-und-Gestaltung* is untranslatable. Thus, Göthlund and Lind developed the concept *double perspective* for those pedagogic forms where both traditional academic and theoretical practices together with arts- and practice-based practices are used. To me, this is by far both the most graphic (compare *Mode 2*) and also that which best explains the need to bridge gaps, and that which embodies several traditions and ways of seeing. In this article *double perspective* is the term I use.

**Methodological design**

Two research projects serve as the methodological basis of this article. *Performing Knowledge*, (2008–2010), aimed at studying and developing university pedagogic practices with a double perspective, where both theory and arts-based practice were used as forms of knowledge in learning processes, particularly in degree-work projects. A plethora of methods was used to observe and interview three cohorts of media studies/art-teacher students, and analyse their work, at five universities. \(^\text{25}\)

*In-between Spaces of Knowledge*, (2011–2013), aimed at studying the border-crossing meeting between theory and practice. And from cultural-sociological and feminist power perspectives, to analyse and problematise the discourses, cultures, and structures that arise in this border crossing, when situated in a higher education institution. The project was based on five field studies. In this I have a Bourdieuian perspective. \(^\text{26}\) The *field* that I studied was academia, and specifically that part of the field which attempts to widen the academic field and find a bridging gate to the neighbouring field of art/s and journalism.

Doing the actual field studies meant employing several different methods: *observations* of organisational structures and cultures and *interviews* with members of staff, the head of the department, and a selection of students. Inspired by the work of Gillian Rose, Sarah Pink, and Jennifer New, I also employed *visual ethnography*. Of particular interest to my project are Pink’s discussion of knowledge production through photography and Rose’s discussions of interpretations of visual empirical material. Furthermore, in the interviews, I used an associative visualisation exercise that I developed during the *Performing Knowledge* project. \(^\text{30}\) Thus, my camera was my tool, and thousands of photographs and drawings became field notes as well as empirical research material. By using these visual methods, I argue that I have been able to cut through words and thereby achieve a deeper understanding.

The research funding I had received stipulated that my home institution The School of Arts and Communication (K3) at Malmö University, Sweden, should be my main focus and to which I should provide feedback on the pedagogic results of the project. My choice of other academic...
institutions with which to do the field studies fell thus on institutions with similar allodoxic ideological standpoints as K3. They all want to cross the border between traditional academic theoretical studies and arts-/practice-based learning. They all also have degree projects that are constituted by a double perspective having both a traditional theoretical (dissertation) and a practice-based part. The others are the arts and design school Fakultät des Gestaltung, Bauhaus University, Weimar, Germany; the media and design school Department of Culture, Society and Medial Gestaltung (KSM), Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden; and the School of Journalism and Mass Communication (SJMC), University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Field studies were done during 2012.

**FINDING FRICTIONS AND CULTURAL CONFLICTS**

As a side result of the *Performing Knowledge* project, we also found that in those academic institutions working outspokenly with knowledge production and learning processes based on a double perspective, and to which faculty has applied for this very reason, there were interdisciplinary conflicts between practical/arts and academic staff. K3, the school where I have my tenure was amongst them, and I have been participating in the cultural construction for some years. Through the research project, with the help of my fellow researchers, I started, however, to observe.

What I found at K3 was indeed an interdisciplinary “meeting place” as stated in K3’s ideological manifesto, but they often turned into places of conflict. This was particularly so during almost every school-away-day, when definitions of “theory and gestaltung/practice-based learning” was discussed. What were intended to be cooperative discussions became heated, often aggressive, argumentations. Watching the research film from one of those discussions, it was obvious that faculties with similar background grouped together and used academic argumentation skills as well as invectives and gestures to both distance oneself from, and diminish, the other side.

In one section of K3, the conflicts were specifically tense over issues concerning epistemology and pedagogy. At several section staff meetings that I attended, fierce fights arose over whether aesthetic learning was as effective, or indeed as appropriate as traditional learning (lectures, seminars, and written notes), and whether multimodal examinations were at all academically valid and whether they could replace written examinations. Although all agreed on the basic idea of working with a double perspective, what that entailed differed. More traditional academic staff saw traditional academic texts as superior and argued that multimodal work should be used as illustrations of theoretical thoughts to spice up the text. Practical/arts lecturers saw the practical as the main subject and the theoretical as an aid to create better practical/visual products. Everything from put-off gestures to derogatory name-calling and loud aggressive verbal fights were used to defend one’s position. This also happened in classes in front of students. In everyday work, things were not always heated, but subtle distinctions of who had coffee with who to back talk was common.

It was therefore with curiosity and eagerness that I went to the Bauhaus university in Weimar—the famous place of the origin of the Bauhaus manifesto that K3 was modelled on, and where I thought I would find answers to how one could work in the in-between space of *Theorie-und-Gestaltung*—without destructive conflicts. Instead, I found more conflicts than I had experienced in any other place of learning. I have ever visited. This article is the result of that disappointment I felt and a wish to understand these conflicts.

Arriving at Bauhaus I thought I was in heaven, walking around in spacious studios where arts-based PhD students and professors worked with students, making them reflect on their doing. I soon realised, however, there were decisive distinctions in every part of the university. A couple of years prior to my study the school had been divided, because of a long-standing conflict between two senior professors and their respective teams. As a consequence, the more academic subjects and staff had moved out and created a Faculty of Media. Interviews with staff from both faculties showed that the split was a necessity, resulting from a fundamental split in views on issues such as how to do research and on what, the most appropriate methods and object of learning. Even at the remaining Faculty of Gestaltung (based on the original Bauhaus ideas of *Theorie-und-Gestaltung*—as well as physically placed in the old Bauhaus building), I experienced
deep-lying conflicts, running along several demarcation lines, though mostly between academics and artists. The Faculty of Gestaltung was strictly hierarchically organised with traditional academic staff having the higher posts, better work conditions, and higher salaries than staff with an art background. In the interviews, this was a subject often brought up by the latter as an issue of frustration, but taken for granted by the former as the natural order of things. The artistic–academic conflict went as far as two professors—sitting in offices next to each other—having their academic argumentation out in the local newspaper. The issue was the examining product of the, then, newly started arts-based PhD-program. One professor wanted the PhD products to be an equal part art and dissertation as the “dissertation is the essence of a PhD,” whereas the other wanted most emphasis put on the art part, followed by a 15-page report, as “arts students do not write well.”

Spatial doxa

“Culture sits in the walls” is an everyday Swedish expression meaning that an organisational culture is ingrained in the very building. Bourdieu writes of geography as a reflection of the socially constructed space. The media researcher Zaman argues that the geography of the workplace can be used as a strategy to keep women in their place. Gendered or not, walking around, observing, I indeed experienced physical manifestations of the dichotomised doxa I talked of above. It showed itself, not only in ways of thinking and acting but also in the planning of university buildings: who sits where, modes of dress, who takes coffee breaks with whom, etc.

Despite ideas of open meeting places, I found closed corridors where everyone sat in their offices with little interaction with others. These were spaces for researchers/senior lecturers. At the same time, arts-based/journalistic lecturers shared rooms or were placed amongst students in open studios.

At KSM in Norrköping and SJMC in Dar es Salaam, I found the least obvious distinctions and conflicts. Lecturers worked together and had similar educational ideas. Particularly at KSM, I was told of a conflict-free teaching department, and it was difficult to cut through the very positive stories told about their lived ideology. Towards the end of interviews, however, tales of hierarchy and unfairness were told—often when the tape recorder was turned off. KSM lecturers, whether with arts/practical background or with PhDs, expressed frustration that they were seen as “only teachers” and given no time to research, whereas researchers at the adjoining research institute had very little lecturing to do. In most departments, teaching and research staff are the same, or at least overlapping. In Norrköping, the organisational choice has been to separate the two into two different institutions, thus avoiding more common internal cultural conflicts within the teaching school. To emphasise this, research and teaching were situated in different geographical spaces. One lecturer wanted to explain his frustration and did so by abruptly standing up, taking me by my arm and saying:

I’ll show you the differences. We are literally seen as below the researchers. Here we are [he showed around the corridor] and there are the others [he pointed towards the ceiling].

The research seminar was another tangible area where hierarchic doxa was spatially reflected, and which was brought up in interviews at K3 and
KSM as an example of hierarchical staff differences. Research seminars were perceived by practical/arts lecturers to be exclusively for researchers, that is, excluding anyone with a practical/arts background, whereas lecturers with PhDs and PhD students perceived practical/arts lecturers’ absence from these seminars as lack of interest. At SJMC, the prominent position of researchers was overwhelmingly visible at the research seminars I attended. From a raised platform, protected from the sun, researchers loudly read out written words whilst the rest of the staff was seated in the blazing sun, listening.

**Common conflicts**

Anyone reading this article, from whatever subject, will reflect that academic conflicts are universal in most universities. And indeed, the historian Anita Göransson shows commonplace cultural conflicts in academia, which she argues, referring to Pierre Bourdieu, arise from powered conflicts of how to define academia and its traditions. In discussions of arts-based and practice-based research, it is shown that these practices create conflicts when being introduced into academic institutions with traditional (social) scientific or humanistic doxa or for that matter when scientific methods are perceived as being forced into art schools. But how can this be explained?

Pierre Bourdieu argues that at the root of any social conflict lies the fight over the right to define social space and what is construed as important. In the academic field, there is a power dimension in defining what is academia, power of deciding what university courses should contain, of what is academic and useful knowledge, and what is unnecessary knowledge. These are at the core of the doxa, and that is why any conflicts over these are so sensitive, and so common. There are long traditions of such powered conflicts between different academic disciplines, for example, social science–humanities, psychology–psychiatry, art–technology, art–art history. Bourdieu elegantly explains these as the natural way of controlling the social world, where the winner takes it all, in this case the opportunity of defining doxa, what is academic research, what is mumbo-jumbo (or art, or journalism), what is interesting course literature, what is important curriculum, what is proper pedagogy. Bearing this in mind, the result I found...
in the different schools is not surprising at all. Thus, interdisciplinary meetings meant that different staff with the wished-for different competencies as a consequence had different meanings of what academia is and should be, or what a particular course should be about. All safely based on their own academic tradition and culture, with their different theories of knowledge, teaching practices, meeting tradition, dress codes, etc.\(^44\) Thus, all the architects, interaction designers, artists, filmmaker, photographers, writers, journalists, philosophers, typographers, and media studies scholars came prepared with their own version of academic culture. In Bourdieuian terms,\(^45\) they all had their own habitus, which decides their entire outlook on life, and life in academia, as well as bringing with them doxa from their respective field. This was the intended situation. The problem was not the differences nor the conflicts. Meetings were, however, destructive, not creative, and differences swept under the ideological carpet of all-inclusiveness, whilst lecturers used their different habitus and cultural capital to define their power positions, which in turn was used when fighting over positions, curriculum, pedagogy, course literature, and marking criteria. This is what Bourdieu\(^46\) terms symbolic violence, and thus shows the powerful nature of small things in life.

One could argue that this is the natural order of things in academia. My point is, however, that this takes place even in allodoxic academic schools that are deliberately striving to bridge gaps, to expand academic doxa, indeed to deconstruct the dichotomy so that arts/journalism \textit{is} academic. These schools have high reputations for doing exactly this, and their faculty has pursued positions because they want to work in this kind of in-between-space, and interviews showed indeed an overwhelming wish to embrace a double perspective. The doxa (from whatever field originally) is, however, so ingrained in all of us after decades of studying and practicing, that it is hard to discard.\(^47\) We cannot simply take off the doxa as we take off a coat.

This doxic strength became visible when juxtaposed. At the Bauhaus university of Weimar, all teaching was either theoretical or artistic, held by theoretical and artistic professors/assistants, respectively. No overlap was possible. And this was the usual order of things, which became visible to those involved by a big faux pas that
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\caption{Gestaltung-students at Bauhaus during my “theoretical” lecture}
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I made. As a “theoretical” visiting professor, I was to give a “theoretical lecture” on cultural theory. I started this, however, by introducing a drawing exercise\(^48\) where students were asked to draw specific words (such as culture, theory, power, woman, and man). As if using drawing material in a theoretical lecture was not enough, I made an even bigger faux pas when theorising these drawings. The assistant lecturer, and one of the professors, was bewildered and shocked at this visual way of teaching, but also intrigued. They discussed this “strangeness” in a departmental meeting, as an issue of whether this way of working could be used in the future.

\textbf{Ideology turns political economy}

In my world, there are always political and economic reasons behind most conflicts, albeit doxic. Seeing the four schools from a political–economic perspective, they were not only created from deep ideological conviction but also from political ambitions on both national and university level. This follows a global trend of democratising and broadening tertiary education.\(^49\)

From this perspective, I observed that at all four schools, conflicts arose or were particularly fierce, in difficult times. At K3 the conflicts escalated after having had six deans in 4 years, being forced to move into a new building, and integrated into a new faculty, with decreasing funding as a result. At Weimar, the spark was the fight over the new PhD course, with angry post-graduate students pressing on, and the German government eagerly awaiting the result. At KSM there was frustration over lack of recourses and research funding for lecturers and in Tanzania lecturers, with no
economic possibility of getting a PhD, felt threatened when the university board—to raise the school to higher international standard—pressured them to do a PhD.

LEARNING IN/THROUGH A DOUBLE PERSPECTIVE

Is there only gloom and doom, cultural conflicts, and constructed dichotomies in these schools that actually attempt to bridge across disciplinary differences? And are we doomed to a dichotomised doxic academic life, where borders are upheld by our colleagues—and ourselves? Pierre Bourdieu would have answered yes, that it is very difficult to break these patterns, as the academic tradition is built into the walls of every department, every lecture hall, every art school studio, every syllabus. Then, is it at all possible for students, or staff, to work in/through a double perspective? I do not share Bourdieu’s pessimism and I argue that it is indeed possible to find in-between meeting places. Although cultural conflicts became a substantial part of my findings, I found students and staff learning and researching in/through a double perspective.

One tangible thread that ran through all interviews was the expressed difficulties in understanding what is meant by “double perspective.” The big difference was that most faculty members came up with theories of what this could mean, whereas all students I spoke to expressed frustration over not really understanding something they were inclined to do. This frustration is understandable. Having lecturers and professors who fight—even openly—and who have no actual knowledge of the double perspective students are supposed to learn and perform, made the learning situation for students difficult. The solution for these students—at all four schools—was to try and do it anyway. Students worked for years trying out professors’ theories of this double perspective. Failing. Trying again. Failing. Trying again. Through this trial-and-error learning process, they learnt by doing.

With all these conflicts, all this frustration, is it worth the price? My immediate answer is yes, and this has several reasons. First, the trial-and-error process of learning through the double-perspective maze might be frustrating, but it paid off. Many of the students I interviewed emphasised the joy they felt when they worked things out. They might not get answers from their lecturers, but they worked together and learnt together. Second, working outside the box of the specific course traditions gave a surplus value. Media studies students emphasised how learning became not only fun and inspiring through working practice based but they also understood theories better. German and Swedish arts students talked of how their whole world opened up through theoretical readings. One concrete example of this is a KSM master student, with a previous art degree. She told me how she started to understand the artwork she had previously done by the way she had theoretically reflected on her doing during the master course. In her final degree work, she investigated the gap between scientific and artistic knowing, and commented visually on the learning process she had gone through.

Thoughts are in our bodies and theories are embodied. So everything I have learnt about Sarah Ahmeds theories about bodies are in those bodies I have made, and now I understand. Really. (KSM master student)

Third, learning in/through a double perspective gives transferrable knowledge and skills that are most useful in professional life. Throughout the two research projects that were conducted at K3, alumni students were interviewed alongside students. That means that some students that were part of the Performing Knowledge project as students were interviewed as alumni in the later project. They all told how the combination of practice-based and theoretical teaching gave deeper knowledge of the subject area they had studied. Even
if they were frustrated by this while taking the courses, they now realised the value of this process. Learning through a double perspective also gave something above that. They all stated that they had in fact got the positions they had because they had this “double knowledge” [sic].

Fourth, there are democratic aspects of learning in/through a double perspective. At K3, I was able to follow three cohorts of students, observing their learning processes, compiling statistics of their results, and analysing their degree work. This shows that weaker students have difficulties in understanding and doing a double perspective and their degree work was relatively mediocre. The opposite were students with generally high results, and with high academic and cultural habitus. They also showed understanding for problematised double perspectives and could argue for how they would use it in their future careers. The reader will hardly be surprised by this result. More interesting is, however, that this academically strong group, who master the academically written practices, also performed well in the practice-based subjects, creating impressive multimodal work—even if they had never practiced any arts prior to entering K3. Arguably even more interesting is that students with prior arts or practical training produced really good degree work, both the dissertation and the multimodal work. Put in Bourdieuan terms: the habitus and capital you carry with you have bearings on your results.53 My point here is that it is interesting to see that academic knowledge is not the only prior knowledge that matters, and different kinds of capital makes a difference to the learning process. It shows the possibilities of practice-based learning processes, which together with theoretical work, could create both deeper and broader knowledge and understanding within a subject area.54 Furthermore, this has democratic aspects. Students with little prior academic capital could be given possibilities both to learn and excel through a combination of traditional academic and practice-based learning forms.55

Another democratic aspect of visual/multimodal learning is lack of resources. SJMC was the place where most value was put on traditional academic knowledge and the education was mostly theoretical. One reason was that the previously practical journalism school had been incorporated into the University of Dar es Salaam, which created demands for academisation. This process took place in several African countries striving towards more international university systems.56 Another reason was that the technological equipment was about to break, with little possibilities of renewal. So instead of learning to film by going out and filming, students learnt to film by being lectured on how it worked, and taking turns at using the one film camera available.

Given the result from the other schools, this ought to make the Tanzanian students the most frustrated. Instead, I found students happy because they were told what was expected of them by lecturers, who knew what they were talking about. Salaries are low and resources few, which means that everyone needs a second job. Thus, those with PhDs also worked as filmmakers, journalists, photographers, or artists. And professional filmmakers, journalists, photographers, or artists also worked at the university, teaching theoretical modules. The latter might not have a formal theoretical or research background, but took what opportunities there were to read academic books. In a sense this is the upside-down world to the European schools. At SJMC, it is the lecturers that have an embodied knowledge of in-between spaces, whereas their students do not have the same opportunity to learn in/through a double perspective.

But of course there is a but. It takes time to learn both academic and practical skills. A K3 student pointed to these opportunities and difficulties:

The integration [of theory and practice] has shown a complexity within the field and shown a gap that often exists between theory and practice. When this gap is discovered it is
also possible to investigate it. But this takes time! Therefore integration must be prepared and understood prior to the degree-work, in order for the student to get time to get all the way through the research. (K3 Media Studies Student, 2010)

Time is what it took this student, who did both a degree in photography and one in media studies and he argued this was necessary in order to investigate this gap properly. His media studies degree project is interesting in several ways and has become a focus for dispute. He attempted to disclaim the idea of objectivity in photography by showing how one can get completely different truths by using different lenses, different types of cameras and taking photos at different times, all from the same point in town. He backed his theses up with heavy theoretical discussions. Both the practice-based research (photographs) and the theoretical analysis of these was shown and discussed in the same academic dissertation. What made this dissertation special is that his analysis consisted only of images, not a single word.

So, back to cultural differences. Colleagues with an arts background thought the work was brilliant and wanted to reward it with an A. The more research-oriented colleagues (with PhDs) wanted the student to fail. One of the latter stood up at a staff conference, when degree works were discussed, looked through the dissertation of the student above with large gestures, and then tossed it behind his back with an exclamation “I don’t recognise any of the references. And there are only pictures. So it can’t pass.”

POSSIBILITIES OF A DOUBLE PERSPECTIVE

The question that has led me through two large research projects, and which is the starting point of this article, was the search for in-between spaces of knowledge, and knowledge creating through a double perspective. To summarise the findings presented here, even in institutions that outspokenly worked to overcome the borders between academic and practice-based learning and research, there were cultural conflicts along these lines. This created problems for students’ learning processes, particularly lecturers’ lack of personal knowledge of working in/through a double perspective caused students frustration. Also, working doubly sometimes takes double the time, time not always available within the framework of a bachelor course. I am, however, left with an overwhelming amount of research results pointing to the surplus value of learning in/through a double perspective.

I argue that students learn more by working in/through a double perspective. First, seeing a subject from different perspectives means students learn to see more of a subject than had they only used one learning-model. More importantly, they learn to see different sides of the subject. By using words like seeing and perspective, these conclusions are fairly obvious. I argue, however, that working in/through a double perspective gives knowledge above that of the subject matter. In students’ work where multimodal forms of knowledge are intertwined with theoretical forms of knowledge, the research processes are approached in different ways, thereby becoming more visible. As a result methodological issues are easier to encompass in their learning processes. On top of that, it increases students’ ability to communicate complex phenomena through a multitude of modes.

The allodoxic position of working in/through a double perspective, doing and reflecting at the same time has a critical potential. In many ways. To follow the allegory of perspective, it allows students to see things differently and to understand that there are many forms of knowledge, many forms of doing, and many forms of truths. It thus gives students an inclusive and democratic way of seeing knowledge. Henk Borgdorff argues that artistic research invites both the researcher and the audience to reflection and provides not only an “explanatory grip” of traditional (scientific) research but also insight and understanding. A reflexive standpoint.

Artistic research is therefore not just embedded in artistic and academic contexts, and it focuses not just on what is enacted in creative processes and embodied in arts products, but also engages with who we are and where we stand.

Appropriating Bergdorff’s argument and applying it to research and learning in/through a double perspective, I, as a feminist researcher, see this reflexive standpoint as the most valuable of the surplus values. It means that by working—in Aristotelian terms—with both theoretical and practical knowledge, the third, ethical wisdom will evolve. I do not believe that one becomes more ethical
through working in/through a double perspective, but possibly wiser. And a double perspective as facilitating learning processes, I argue, is more democratic. It gives different kinds of students, with different kinds of prior knowledge, different opportunities to learn the same thing. But differently. Having a high degree of educational, cultural, and academic capital, knowing the academic codes, having the right class background have long been keys to successful academic studies. The results I presented here show, however, that other kinds of capital, cultural codes, and social background are also given weight and become useful in courses with double perspective and where students learn through varied learning processes and are given varied assessments and examinations, for example, visual, multimodal, performative work, traditional academic essays, group work, and oral examinations. This also applies to students with some kind of perceived handicap (such as dyslexia, blindness, deafness, and psychological illness).

Furthermore, students (and some staff) show that it is indeed possible to research and to work in-between and to embody a double perspective. It influences their entire way of doing and seeing their subject area. Whereas most lecturers at the four schools I studied fumble around their own practices to find an answer to what this double perspective is, these students and staff with deep knowledge of both arts/journalism and academia got on with the business of doing. To them the issue of in/through a double perspective is easy; they have an embodied knowledge. And they produce new exciting knowledge. Furthermore, this “double knowledge” is transferable which students can bring into professional life. So, with Søren Kjørup, I argue for plurality in academia. This is, however, not easily achieved. It takes time to accomplish multi-skills from different subject areas. Introducing new ways doing and thinking, allodoxic practices, into academia stirs up conflicts as I have shown.

Finally, I found support for my standpoint, as well as answers to my main question, in the place I least suspected: the school where I work. The intense conflicts that were found at K3 in the Performing Knowledge project, were not evident 5 years later. One reason is said to be the decade of continuous discussions and conflicts around theory-and-gestaltung, that is, that conflicts were brought out into the open, taken seriously and discussed in earnest. Another reason could arguably be the three new full professors with double competence, and the fact that several K3 PhD students who have graduated on dissertations that are both traditionally academic and arts based, are now members of the faculty. Furthermore, there have been attempts to raise the research-competence of arts-based lectures. Thus, as in Dar es Salaam, there are now faculty members who embody a double perspective.

My final argument is political–economical in nature. There is very obviously no shortage of will-power and ideology involved in establishing interdisciplinary academic schools that aim to create meeting places of learning in/through a double perspective. However, what is also needed is an awareness that this does create conflicts, and a willingness to deal with these, to make them creative processes and not destructive. It is furthermore important to work with the competencies of faculty, not only students. This could mean changing research policies so as to encourage “practical” lecturers to partake in research activities, encourage “theoretical” lecturers to learn practical skills, and encourage teamwork in teaching and in research in/through a double perspective. This way a “double knowledge” will become embodied also amongst faculty.
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