

Electroacoustic Performance Practice in Interdisciplinary Improvisation

James Andean

Centre for Music & Technology, Sibelius Academy,
University of the Arts Helsinki PL 30, 00097 Taideyliopisto, Finland

jamesandean@gmail.com

Abstract

Technological change over the past decades has seen electroacoustic music move increasingly out of the studios, onto the stage, and from there to broader, more varied, and more flexible performance contexts. This in turn has brought electroacoustic and electronic tools and methodologies into ever more intimate contact and collaboration with the full range of arts practices, from other musical forms, to the other performing arts, and beyond. While none of this is entirely new in and of itself – performance collaboration has been a part of electroacoustic practice since the earliest days of the form – we see today a level of integration that begins to dissolve boundaries between genres and between art forms. As a result, performer roles expand beyond previous limits and borders; practices shift and lines blur; and the notion of electroacoustic performance practice becomes less clearly outlined, dissolving instead into a more fluid pool of performance possibilities, opportunities, and affordances.

These developments pose a number of challenges, as electroacoustic performance practice is reconfigured, renegotiated, and reinterpreted as it evolves and dissolves into these fluid, malleable, and transitioning performance contexts. This paper will examine some of the consequences and issues this implies for electroacoustic performance practice, focusing specifically on the context of interdisciplinary improvisation, as this latter arguably represents a particularly clear case of both a fluid performance situation, and of the dissolution or renegotiation of boundaries between practices and art forms. Supporting references will be drawn from the Helsinki-based Research Group in Interdisciplinary Improvisation, as well as related performance and research groups, including Sound & Motion, the Liikutus project, and the Helsinki Meeting Point. We will also briefly discuss some of the methodological issues and approaches which may be particularly well-suited for research in these areas.

The projects mentioned above involve collaborative improvisation between performers from a range of fields, including sound, music, theatre, performance art, dance, studio arts, and film and video. While there are a number of fascinating research questions involved with such collaboration, we will focus on those which hold most relevance for electroacoustic practice.

The first of these involves the incorporation of technological means and media by a number of the practitioners and performers involved, for example musicians, sound artists, and video artists. How does the inclusion of digital and other technologies affect the ability of individual performers and the group as a whole to achieve ‘now-ness’, to be fully engaged with the moment, as is so critical in improvisation? Many of these tools rely on modes of use which involve forms of analysis and preparation – coding or patching, for instance – which most

commonly take place outside of the performance context. Can such acts be made performative, and if so, can they be sufficiently improvisatory? Or are the cognitive modes involved too far removed from those required for full presence and commitment to free and spontaneous improvisation? If, on the other hand, performance aspects of digital tools are prepared in advance, are they still fully suitable to the free improvisation context, or does this degree of preparation beforehand consist of a level of creative planning which is potentially antithetical to the freedom to follow where a freely improvised performance might lead? Are performers who rely on such tools fully able to integrate with others – performance artists, dancers, instrumentalists, studio artists – whose output does not rely on technological resources, or is there a noticeable difference in organic and spontaneous involvement?

Questions more specific to sonic performers involved with interdisciplinary improvisation can also be raised here. For instance, the use of electronics at times results in the potential lack of performance gesture – in the use of a laptop for instance. Is this problematic in communicating with other performers, or across art forms? Sonic performance gesture as a visual cue can be useful on a number of levels, from identifying a given sound source among a group of performers, to offering a preliminary level for engagement. Does its absence prevent the necessary level of fluid communication and interaction?

Perhaps most importantly, what transformations do electroacoustic performance practices undergo as a result of this meeting and melting of art forms? This occurs on two levels: first, how does the electroacoustic performer engage with performers from the other performance arts; second – and perhaps more relevantly – what happens to electroacoustic practice in a context in which the role of a given performer transcends boundaries, passing fluidly from sound, to movement, to more theatrical aspects, or to drawing, painting, or film? Or, more likely, in a performance act which combines aspects of any number of these into a single expression? Does electroacoustic practice dissolve in this multifaceted artistic pool? Or are there core elements which remain firm, and are retained across and throughout this transcendence of historical performance categories?

In tackling such questions in a performance research context, as with any research-oriented work, one must choose the methodological framework best suited for the project at hand, in terms of both research process and desired results. Specific methodological challenges faced here include those generally encountered when the object of research is process, rather than artistic outcomes or artefacts; as well as the acknowledged difficulty of improvisation as an object of research, due to its profoundly ephemeral and transitory nature, and the extremely broad interdisciplinarity which is at the core of the projects, calling for research strategies that take this into account, such as Gibbons' 'Mode 2' research (Gibbons et al. 1994) and Wasser & Bresler's 'interpretive zones' (Wasser & Bresler 1996; Hoel 1999).

For these reasons, among others, projects such as those discussed here tend to turn towards relatively recent methodologies of artistic research, beginning with practice-based research, or, further, practice as research, which perhaps better recognize some of the challenges which are particular to performance research (Barrett & Bolt 2007; Borgdorff 2012; Smith & Dean 2009). Further, these projects employ a methodology drawn from action research, in which the more traditional process of hypothesis – observation – conclusion is replaced by a cyclical model of planning – action – observation – reflection – repeat, or reflect – plan – act – observe – repeat (Carr & Kemmis 1986). A primary difference here is the emphasis on observation and reflection, with a corresponding lack of emphasis on conclusions; this is perhaps appropriate to the context under consideration, as it is difficult to claim definitive conclusions in a performance context which is under constant reinterpretation and renegotiation, as it is arguably impossible to establish an

epistemological framework sufficiently stable for the research results to be claimed as definitive, or to be rigorously transferable beyond the confines of a given research context.

Despite such drawbacks, the strength of such research processes – focused more on finding new or novel questions than answers, and on opening further avenues for development and exploration than conclusive determinations – is regularly demonstrated in research areas such as that being considered here, due to their flexibility, their ability to remain responsive to multiple disciplines and paradigms simultaneously, and their ability to approach organic or intuitive artistic processes as suitable research subjects. As employed here, they offer strong implications for electroacoustic performance practice as it continues to reinvent itself in the increasingly mobile, shifting, and multi-faceted performance contexts with which today's performers increasingly find themselves engaged.

Introduction

Over the past several years I've had the opportunity to participate in or observe a number of Helsinki-based research projects and performance groups focusing on interdisciplinary free improvisation, including the Research Group in Interdisciplinary Improvisation, the Liikutus project, Sound & Motion, El Hueso y La Cuerda, and the Helsinki Meeting Point. While none of these explicitly focuses on electroacoustic practices, all of them, in fact, include one or several electroacoustic performers; so while the core research focus for most of these groups lies elsewhere, there is nevertheless much that can be observed and considered here as electroacoustic performance practice confronts these wide, diffuse, and fluid performance contexts. The key words here are *interdisciplinary* improvisation, and *free* improvisation, primarily because each of these offers something of an extreme case study, doubly so when taken in combination, and therefore set particular challenges for the electroacoustic performer.

Free Improvisation

Let's start by clarifying each of these terms a bit, beginning with 'free improvisation'. We can claim a range for improvisation between 'maximum freedom' at one end, and 'maximum constraint' at the other. How realistic either of these extremes is, is clearly open to debate, as is how accurate it really is to polarize them in this manner; for one thing, 'free improvisation' as it is practiced in many communities today in fact involves quite a number of constraints, or at least conventions – if not for musical material, then at least for musical behaviour. Then of course there is the issue of 'freedom through constraint', of performers who find maximum freedom through maximum constraint.

Nevertheless, we can make some claim to the legitimacy of this range in improvisation, between freedom at one end – no pre-determined constraints, or at least none beyond those unspoken laws governing the community's general practice – through increasing degrees of constraint: from broad formal arcs, to rules of interaction, the specification of individual roles, the detailing of particular material, all the way to maximum constraint – possibly for example the use of a fully notated score, although this opens up a line of debate around the attempt to present improvisation and composition as polar opposites that is perhaps best avoided here.

The challenges to the electroacoustic performer change somewhat depending where you are in this spectrum. Today we will primarily be considering the 'entirely free' end of the spectrum, as it poses very particular challenges with regards to certain categories of

electroacoustic tools, which are sometimes of significantly reduced importance as one moves elsewhere in this range of improvisation practice.

While some of the projects mentioned involve only a couple of disciplines, some of them – most notably the Research Group in Interdisciplinary Improvisation – involve a fairly full spectrum of performance practices. This latter group, for example, includes performers from fields including sound, music, theatre, performance art, dance, lighting, film and video, and studio arts – in other words, a significant majority of the performing arts, and even some art forms that are not normally considered performative at all. Not surprisingly, there are a number of interesting challenges and issues that arise when trying to combine and communicate between such a broad range of practices, but a couple of these are of particular relevance to the electroacoustic practitioner, and again, particularly so in a context that combines this degree of interdisciplinarity with the free improvisation paradigm.

The first of these involves the incorporation of technological means and media by performers such as electroacoustic musicians, sound artists, and video artists. There are several aspects of such tools that are potentially problematic in multidisciplinary improvisation, but one in particular that stands out with regards to ‘free improvisation’.

Preparation: Coding, Mapping, Patching

To a significant extent, some categories of electroacoustic tools must be prepared or otherwise defined beforehand. A patch must be coded; an interface must be mapped; presets prepared; and so on. One finds, of course, a full range of flexibility in the instruments or tools that result; this is not a claim that such tools are a priori too inflexible for free improvisation. However, inevitably, they require the performer to imagine the potential needs of a future performance situation beforehand. This is problematic in free improvisation, firstly because the chances are significant that the performance will travel in directions that were not, or maybe could not have been, foreseen or imagined beforehand; indeed, the better the improvisation, the greater the chances that this will occur. While it is possible to design a very flexible tool, it is extremely probable that the design of any tool will make a number of assumptions about the contexts for its use; this is very likely to reduce its suitability in situations that lie outside those limits, at which point the chances increase that the tool will be abandoned in favour of others with more tempting affordances for that particular moment.

This is of course by no means limited only to electroacoustic tools; every tool of any kind makes significant assumptions regarding its use, whether we are talking about a piano, a paint brush, or Heidegger’s hammer. Unlike a piano or a paintbrush, however, electroacoustic tools risk limiting their adaptability to truly unforeseen circumstances by limiting their potential for bodily engagement; however, we will return to this in a moment.

There is another problem with the need to prepare electroacoustic tools for free improvisation in advance, and the resultant need to try to explicitly imagine the potential needs of a future performance beforehand, and this is a far more significant problem in free improvisation than in other improvisation contexts. Regardless of the relative flexibility of the tool itself, the performer has sat down and deliberately imagined and prepared a set range of performance actions and directions beforehand. I am not going to claim that this is an ethical betrayal of the principles of free improvisation; however, it creates some very practical difficulties for the performer, as these preparatory imaginings tend to very significantly guide the performer’s improvised output along lines predetermined prior to the performance, which is not ideal for truly ‘free’ improvisation. Not only do the performer’s expectations before the performance

guide the design of the code or the patch, the need to consciously act upon those expectations in the building of the tools tends to 'set the mold' as it were, greatly increasing the probability that in performance, the performer will follow these pre-imagined paths, thereby making the performer less fully sensitive and alert to the unforeseen potential of the moment, and reducing their flexibility and agility in responding to this potential. While a more experienced improviser is perhaps better able to tackle this difficulty, it tends to remain a tenacious and stubborn challenge.

Again, to some extent, this is almost always the case, regardless of the tool used. The second one walks into the performance space with any tool at all – be it electroacoustic, an acoustic instrument, or a theatrical prop – there is some degree of planning, some thought as to how this tool might be useful or why you might want it there in the first place, which risks significantly influencing improvised events. For this reason, one of the groups in question eventually made it a policy to arrive at performances with nothing at all, improvising only with what is afforded by that particular performance space and whatever it happens to contain, but this can be a very risky proposition. What's more, even if one arrives empty-handed, one is still guided by a vocabulary developed and established through the weight of prior performance experience, and, even in the freest of improvisation contexts, one often has imagined, however vaguely, some potential action or contribution beforehand. However, there is a key difference in how explicit such plans become when one is forced to deliberately code, patch, or otherwise design the tool oneself beforehand, thereby making clear and concrete what might otherwise have remained a vague notion in a larger pool of half-imagined possibilities.

Cognitive Shift and Delayed Response

Of course, another option is to design and implement one's tools 'on the fly', during the performance itself, thereby avoiding the need to define your tool beforehand, and allowing you to shape your tool according to the unfolding performance. This too, however, can be deeply problematic in free improvisation. Needless to say there are practical and feasibility issues in attempting this, but these can be significantly reduced with experience. What remains, however, is a twofold delay, caused on the one hand by the need to work momentarily 'offline', so to speak, before the desired sounding output is ready – be it live coding, synth patching, or simply loading a preset – exacerbated by the cognitive shift between this analysis mode, and performance mode; doubly so, yet again, in free improvisation, which is predicated on the complete attention and devotion to the subtlest vagaries of the unfolding moment. It is significantly less problematic in performance situations in which *all* performers involved are employing such tools, which tends either to simply impose a short collective delay on communication and collaborative construction, or else to shift performance focus onto those elements and parameters for which this delay is not a problem. It poses a much more significant problem when attempting to interface with performers who are operating without this delay, however short the delay might be.

So, on the one hand, these tools have a tendency to become primarily reactive, rather than immediate: the performer senses something, prepares the response, then presents the response, by which time the moment may have passed, or some of the potency of the gesture may have been lost. On the other hand, we have this cognitive shift, in and out of the moment, often repeatedly during a performance; not only does this take a small amount of time, but far more importantly, it can be mildly to severely disruptive to that performer's attention and presence. This has been commented on by a number of people, Sergi Jordà Puig for instance (Jordà

Puig 2005), as well as Newton Armstrong, who draws attention to a number of relevant dichotomies here, including ‘flow vs. computationalism’, ‘planning vs. agency’, Preston’s ‘representational vs. non-representational intentionality’ (Preston 1988), ‘functional vs. realizational’, and ‘essentialist vs. constructivist’ (Feenberg 1999). Armstrong contrasts tools that require shifts in and out of “mental abstraction” and “symbolic representation” with embodied or “enactive” tools that allow for “an unconscious, unreflective mode of behaviour”, “a merging of action and awareness”, “a seamless continuity between perceiving and acting”, and the collapse of “the boundaries between perception, reasoning and action” (Armstrong 2009).

Prioritizing Communication

However, there is a serious and often unquestioned assumption being made when bemoaning such challenges, which is that the first and foremost priority and requirement for strong and effective free improvisation is the immediate, unhindered, and unfettered communication and interaction between performers. In fact, this doesn’t automatically need to be the case, or at least not the single priority that trumps all others; there are many performance paradigms, even improvisation paradigms, where this kind of communication is not terribly critical, for example groups or collaborations that highlight parallel play rather than collaborative play, or even collaborative situations in which inter-performer communication is not required to be quite so immediate or hyper-detailed. The moment this level of communication drops in priority, many of the problems described so far either vanish, or reduce dramatically in urgency.

One might take this one step further, to ask if this incredibly focused communication between free improvisors is not occasionally at the expense of communication between performers and audience. Inter-performer communication seems critical because the performers work together to enact the evolving work, but this ignores the audience’s role in the ecological triad (Andean 2011), and therefore risks becoming insular and introverted. Guy Harries (2011) points to the two feedback loops in performance described by Eskelinen & Transtad (2003: 200): “an interactive one between the actors”, and “a transactional one between the audience and the actors”. There is the possibility here that we are too heavily weighting the interactive loop over the transactional loop. In part, this may be due to an assumption that the source of pleasure in being a free improvisation audience member lies primarily in witnessing the quality, sophistication, and finesse of the interaction and communication between performers, which seems to downplay the importance of the aesthetic qualities of the results. This may be very similar to the assumption often made by the electroacoustic composer that the listener’s listening priorities will be the same as the composer’s poetic priorities, something addressed by Simon Emmerson (2013), and equated here with the performer’s assumption that, since their own focus in performance is on this detailed communication with their fellow performers, that this is also where the audience will centre their attention. In contrast with one of Emmerson’s suggestions, however, I propose that simply witnessing empathy between performers onstage does not in and of itself guarantee empathy between performers and audience, and that in fact the latter may at times even feel resentment at being left out of the loop.

Interdisciplinarity

We will now turn to the interdisciplinary question, especially with reference to the Research Group in Interdisciplinary Improvisation. When the project was initially proposed, the approach to ‘inter-disciplinarity’ that was envisioned centred on the communication between artists and performers from different disciplines. How does a musician interact with an actor? How does a dancer interact with a painter? Predicted points of research included differences in perspective between mobile and non-mobile performers, or challenges in integrating time-based performers – dancers, musicians, actors, etc. – with the arts that more typically take place ‘outside’ of time, or which are typically non-performative, such as painting, drawing, and so on.

We very quickly found, however, that the group’s practice was pulling in a very different direction. Instead of remaining within the confines of our own disciplines and attempting to communicate across the borders, the group instead very quickly gravitated towards a central point, where the various practices met, mingled, and combined, creating a single performance practice, clearly drawing on aspects of theatre, sound, visual art, and so on, but that was somehow either none of these, or all at once. Group members found themselves performing a combined practice, with individual performers shifting emphasis somewhat, from moment to moment, in the direction of a particular art form or another, without ever – or only rarely – taking a clear position within a single discipline. What results is thus less a matter of ‘communication between disciplines’, and more of a ‘disciplinary melting pot’; as a result, the group’s activity might better be described, not so much as ‘interdisciplinary’, but rather as ‘non-disciplinary’.

Technological Tools

What does this imply for the electroacoustic elements? Once again, there is the issue of tools. In a situation where performers are fluidly and freely exchanging and combining roles, the use of expert tools risks segregating that performer, or at least preventing other performers from absorbing that performance aspect into their own practice. The tools or props brought in from a number of the other art forms pose no barrier whatsoever: theatre or performance art props are accessible to all; studio art tools are very familiar to pretty much anybody; even musical instruments can be fairly readily engaged with even by someone with no prior experience with that particular instrument, or even by those with no prior experience on any instrument. Often, however, this is not the case with technological tools, which primarily means electroacoustic tools, film, and video, although enough of us have enough experience with a camera or a projector to be able to incorporate these reasonably quickly as well, leaving electroacoustic tools as the primary challenge. The primary factor here appears once again to be the degree to which a given tool is open to “embodied modes of interaction”, as discussed in detail by Armstrong (2009); not only does this determine the ease or difficulty of use for a non-expert practitioner, it also determines the extent to which the tools can be incorporated into another performance mode – the degree to which it can be co-opted and appropriated as a theatrical or performance art prop, or to which a dancer is able to grab it and engage with it.

There are a number of characteristics of electroacoustic tools that have a significant impact on the extent to which the tool is available to be incorporated by other performers. The first is whether it is spatially locked or not. A portable device immediately affords a much broader

range of performance possibilities than anything that is limited to a specific performance 'station', as a more portable device invites engagement with and through spatially mobile performance practices, such as dance or theatre. This is closely linked to a question of 'flexibility of identity', referring to the ease with which a tool can be co-opted and redefined through a completely different performative act. A cable, a microphone, a handheld synth, even a loudspeaker, offer some opportunities for a dancer or actor to reinterpret the object by picking it up, turning it around, walking away with it, dragging it across the floor, etc., redefining the object in the process, all of which is made dramatically more feasible through the mobility and portability of the object in question. Some objects, however, are semiotically very stubborn indeed, resisting or refusing attempts to hijack or derail their identity, a laptop being perhaps the clearest example: run with it, stroke it, talk to it, do what you will – a laptop very stubbornly insists on remaining a laptop.

Mobility and Localization

It is also very important, however, that not only the tool, but also the *sound*, be mobile, and importantly that the sound consistently localizes to the performer. This is primarily a question of communication with the other performers. To some extent, musicians and sonic performers are quite capable of closing their eyes and engaging purely aurally, although often this is less a question of performer-to-performer communication and more a question of engaging with the collective sounding output. This is not, however, a common characteristic of other performance arts, in practically all of which a given performer's output is intimately tied to that performer's location, movement, and gesture, and cannot be meaningfully abstracted or unmoored. It is not uncommon for a musician's individual identity to melt away into the collective pool, but this is much more difficult for other performers, for whom it can be quite disconcerting and alienating.

This problem is significantly exacerbated when the sound of a performer's actions is spatially removed from that performer, the obvious example being, of course, the 'voice of god' effect of having sound come from loudspeakers above and at one end of the performance space. In this case, not only does it hinder inter-performer communication by dislocating the sound source from the human agent that produced it, forcing other performers to schizophrenically split their engagement between either the agent or their output, but it also places that performer's output on a very different plane from the output of other performers, and in fact often imposes a hierarchical differentiation, with loudspeaker sound, if not taking on a dominant and defining role, then at least serving to frame and contain those performances that are more spatially restricted, and effectively to limit those performances. (There can be very similar issues involved in the use of cameras and live video projection, with some interesting parallels and differences, but that is perhaps outside the scope of our discussion here.)

However, once again we come up against this question of performance priorities: is the unfettered communication between performers really our first, or only, priority? While the segregation of performer output between those coming from loudspeakers, and those that remain locked to the performers' bodies and locations, is disruptive to communication between performers, it is not automatically a problem for the audience, and in fact offers certain potential for expanding the audience experience, as Harries (2011) has also pointed out. For example, it offers the possibility to expand the performance frame to include both a local level and a field level, as described by Emmerson (2007: 98), which is often readily

recognized and accepted by the audience, who are perhaps less concerned by the precise localization of the performer responsible, and which can serve to extend the performance and the performance space, both literally and metaphorically, in a manner that can bring diversity and variety to a particular performance event. It also offers a whole range of extended performance affordances, such as, again with reference to Harries (2011), phantoms, doubles, evoked absence, the uncanny, parallel worlds, etc., each of which, again, may make moment-to-moment communication between performers more challenging, but can make for a more satisfying or rewarding experience for the audience.

Conclusion

There are a number of other avenues for exploration regarding the interdisciplinary improvisation context. Likely candidates include: spatial and temporal shifts, performances with the virtual self, audience response, performance-as-research, and other methodological questions. Hopefully, however, what has been offered here has served as an overview of some of the central issues encountered to date, while leaving space for future work on these and other aspects of the field.

References

- ANDEAN James, "Ecological Psychology and the Electroacoustic Concert Context", *Organised Sound*, 16(2), 2011, pp. 125-133.
- ANDEAN James and Marianne DECOSTER-TAIVALKOSKI, "Working Methods of the Sound & Motion Improvisation Research Group, Helsinki", *Reflections on Process in Sound*, 1, 2012, pp. 11-18.
- ARMSTRONG Newton, *An Enactive Approach to Digital Musical Instrument Design: Theory, Models, Techniques*, Saarbrücken, VDM Verlag, 2009.
- BARRETT Estelle and Barbara BOLT (eds.), *Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry*, London, I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 2007.
- BORGdorff Henk, *The Conflict of the Faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research*, Leiden, Leiden University Press, 2012.
- BOWERS John, *Improvising Machines: Ethnographically Informed Design For Improvised Electro-Acoustic Music*, Masters dissertation, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK, 2002.
- CARR Wilfred & Stephen KEMMIS, *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*, London, Falmer, 1986.
- EMMERSON Simon, *Living Electronic Music*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2007.
- EMMERSON Simon, *Rebalancing the discussion on interactivity*, paper presented at the *EMS13 Conference*, Lisbon, Portugal, 17-21 June 2013.
- ESKELINEN Markku & Ragnhild TRONSTAD, "Video Games and Configurative Performances", in Mark Wolf & Bernard Perron (eds.), *The Video Game Theory Reader*, New York and London, Routledge, 2003.
- FEENBERG Andrew, *Questioning Technology*, London, Routledge, 1999.

GIBBONS Michael, LIMOGES Camille, NOWOTNY Helga, SCHWARTZMAN Simon, SCOTT Peter, & TROW Martin, *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London, Sage, 1994.

HARRIES Guy, *The Electroacoustic and its Double: Duality and Dramaturgy in Live Performance*, Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City University, London, 2011.

HEIDEGGER Martin, *Being and Time*, London, SCM Press, 1927.

HOEL Torlaug L., "Students Cooperating in Writing: Teaching, Learning, and Research Based on Theories from Vygotsky and Bakhtin", paper presented at the *European Conference on Educational Research*, Lahti, Finland, 22-25 September 1999.

JORDA PUIG Sergi, *Digital Lutherie: Crafting musical computers for new musics' performance and improvisation*, Doctoral thesis, Departament de Tecnologia de la Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2005.

PAKES Anna, "Art as action or art as object? The embodiment of knowledge in practice as research", *Working Papers in Art and Design* 3, 2004. Retrieved 3.07.2014 from URL: https://www.herts.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0015/12363/WPIAAD_vol3_pakes.pdf, n. d.

PRESTON Elizabeth F., *Representational and non-representational intentionality: Husserl, Heidegger, and artificial intelligence*, Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, 1988.

SMITH Hazel and Roger DEAN (eds.), *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

WASSER Judith and Liora BRESLER, "Working in the Interpretive Zone: Conceptualizing Collaboration in Qualitative Research Teams", *Educational Researcher*, 25(5), 1996, pp. 5-15.