Trusting the Mapmaker
validity and presentational knowing, part one

Beneath the poetry of the texts,
there is the actual poetry,
without form and without text
Antonin Artaud, 1958[130]

Arts-informed research is based on a different frame, a different set of assumptions
from traditional, qualitative inquiry processes. It is not highly structured or
prescriptive, it is organic and emergent. It is about alternative ways of coming to
know and of dispersing or sharing that knowledge.
Knowles and Cole (2002: 210)

In this chapter, I am seeking to carve out another step towards legitimising richer
pictures, richer accounts, and the richer connection between ourselves and our planet
that lies behind such accounts, whilst realising at the same time that this is an
impossibly naïve and fanciful dream. I explore three related questioning areas: first,
what is it to trust the mapmaker? (where I question how presentational knowing
might be a valid representation of experience or an intrinsic part of the experience in
itself); second, *why pay attention to and value presentational knowing at all?* (which I
regard from both the perspective of our species-level disconnection from the planet
and from that of the processes of working with adult learners); and third, *what is it to*
do presentational knowing in inquiry well? (which I look at from my own experience,
from that of other inquirers working specifically with presentational knowing and
from the experience of the field of art therapy). This is a field in the making, and as
such, drawing together these different materials, questions and experiences helps
cohere the field - I am not presuming to offer definitive statements and answers.

What is it to trust the mapmaker?

Is the map *about* the territory or is the map *with* the territory?
Is presentational knowing *about* the inquiry, or is it *an intrinsic part of* the inquiry?

In French, the phrase "the map is not the territory" translates into "the menu isn't the
meal"[131]. At some level, I would contend that, the map, the mapmaker, the map
printer and so on are all an intrinsic part of the territory (or, using the French version,
the menu, the chef, the typographer who designed the menu and so on are all part of

---

[130] Translated by MC Richards.
[131] I like "la carte n'est pas le repas" instead of "the map is not the territory," as for me the menu *is* part of the meal
experience, you just need to draw the boundary of relevance wider…

the experience of the meal). It all depends on where I choose to draw the boundaries of systemic relevance. The map might well in-form the territory just as action inquiry would have it that the researcher and the researched are mutually changed through the research process (and, for that matter, the contention in Goethean science that experimental research is reciprocal, as well as my own view that I am simultaneously formed and informed through my engagements in presentational knowing).

Theorist Ken Wilber suggests that for knowing in the realm of the first person: "a statement is valid not if it represents an objective state of affairs but if it authentically expresses a subjective reality. The validity criterion here is not just truth but truthfulness or sincerity - not 'Does the map match the territory?' but 'Can the mapmaker be trusted?' I must trust you to report your interior status truthfully[132], because there is no other way for me to get to know your interior, and thus no other way for me to investigate your subjective consciousness" (Wilber, 1997: 71-92).

When anthropologist Clifford Geertz picked up on Gilbert Ryle's notion of the "thick description" (Ryle, 1968), an enriched account which blends sensory detail with contextual meaning. Geertz said that "the distinction, relative in any case, that appears in the experimental or observational sciences between 'description' and 'explanation' appears here as one" (Geertz, 1973: 27). Perhaps this is what artists have always done – described and explained in a single gesture. Similarly, Goethe suggests that "Let us not seek for something beyond the phenomena – they themselves are the theory" (Goethe, quoted in Shotter, 2000), and Lather suggests that "the challenge becomes to generate a polyvalent database that is used to *vivify* interpretation as opposed to 'support' or 'prove'" (Lather, 1991: 157). The idea of vivifying – bringing to life – the interpretation seems like a literally lively way of describing what rigorous, engaged presentational knowing offers to action inquiry. Again, I see connections between this and the processes of Goethean science, which invite researchers to "become one with" (or animate) the phenomenon they are researching.

Why pay attention to and value presentational knowing at all?

By enriching inquiry through more integrated and thorough explorations using presentational knowing, my growing sense is that we stand less of a chance of remaining disconnected from (and more of a chance of reconnecting with) the other

---

[132] This depends on the truth that one lives by. For example, one colleague I work with is always, always late for informal (not client) meetings. When she says "I'll be there at 10am" I know from the experience of our relationship together that this is not "true" and so I plan for, maybe, a 10.30 to 11am arrival. What she reports to me is not so much "true", then, as "consistent" and so this is not a problem. Echoing Wilber's own words, I *have* got to know her "interior" (at least in this respect), but not though "true" statements being reported linguistically. There is another truth I am working with here. Unlike Wilber, I would claim that there is another way, which is getting to know (back to the French familiar "connaître" sense) someone else's patterns – the *shape* of their interior - over time. The gesture of truth and consistency may come in an embodied, not linguistically-mediated way. The body doesn't tell lies so easily...

human and more than human worlds… less in an individualistic world of our own, (which of course, isn't of us, we are of it). Bringing presentational knowing more fully into inquiry becomes a valid activity when the processes of coming to know through presentation reconnect us more deeply back into the world of which we are a part. My working assumption is that forging deeper and more direct connection is a worthwhile activity if we are to come back to being "in tune" with the rhythms and capacities of our planetary home[133].

I agree with Stephen Nachmanovitch's sentiments when he comments that Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead, in both their very different careers: "were consistently concerned with transmitting the clearest possible picture of the data, pointing at the experience itself, rather than statistical clumpings of experience or inductive projections from experience" (Nachmanovitch, 1981: 9).

When considering the relationship between presentational knowing and our current socio-ecological situation for a moment, art historian, Hildegard Kurt suggests that from a sustainability perspective the art world has work to do too, in order to become more connected: "a significant number of people involved in sustainability expect art simply to demonstrate ecological shortcomings visually and illustrate moral appeals. Or it should provide the decoration, the 'cream topping' for design measures that have been signed off in every other respect… In the art world, lively dialogue is often hindered by the error of seeing sustainability only as an 'environmental subject' and not a genuinely cultural challenge. And of course artists are rightly resistant when they suspect that sustainability-related co-operation offers are ultimately just another attempt to instrumentalize art… as a mere communication strategy for non-artistic purposes… All in all, a constructive dialogue beneficial both to art and to sustainability can take place only when it is accepted that art has, ever since the start of Modernism, increasingly become a form of knowledge. Far from restricting itself to designing surfaces, art is involved in designing values, and increasingly becoming a medium for exploration, cognition and for changing the world." (Kurt, 2004: 239)

Nature writer Richard Mabey, in discussion with the originator of Gaia theory, James Lovelock, outlined to him the biologist Lewis Thomas' metaphor that humankind is "the handyman for the earth". Mabey said that Lovelock gave the metaphor "a neat Gaian tweak: 'Employed by the earth; yes, I like that!'" (Mabey, 2006: 108). If I take the view that I am employed by the earth as its *organs of perception*[134] (rather than

---

[133] I would also argue that bringing many ways of knowing explicitly to research – and to life – has an intrinsic value at all levels, not just with the "big picture" in mind. In amongst the different ways this is articulated, Clinchy deliciously calls for a "polygamous epistemology" (Clinchy, in Goldberger et al, 1996: 240).

[134] Goethe uses this phrase, not to claim some human species superiority, but to recognise the particular sensory and expressive gifts which the human species brings. My understanding is that, as the planet's "organs of perception" we have a particular ability and responsibility (or ability to respond) in uniquely rich ways. Goethe says: "The human being knows [herself] only insofar as [she] knows the world; [she] perceives the world only in [herself], and [herself] only in the world. Every new object, clearly seen, opens up a new organ of perception in us" (in Robbins, 2005: 113, *my choice of gender*). Henri Bortoft says that a phenomenon "is perceived through the

continuing to claim outdated notions of dominion over the earth due to these self-same unique capabilities), then I would also need to state that I am not nearly making as good use of my unique abilities as I might (and my guess is that I'm not the only one).

Coenraad van Houten, from the anthroposophy-based Centre for Social Development in Forest Row, East Sussex, is concerned with the forms through which adult learning can be meaningfully structured. He places particular emphasis on the need to heal the split between "unworldly" artistic creativity and "head-bound" scientific research, suggesting that this is "not so that [the adult learners] become artists, but to find the creative source within themselves" (van Houten, 1995: 66). He suggests that art holds the potential for developing specific faculties in adult learners (to counterbalance, but not replace an over-reliance on academic linguistic forms), such as:

- Widened and deepened ability to perceive;
- Empathy;
- Courage to make judgements from the whole situation, instead of from just one side;
- Courage to enter into an open process;
- Decisiveness.

(van Houten, 1995: 173).

Educationalist Eliot Eisner makes similar claims in his "Ten Lessons the Arts Teach"[135]:

1. **The arts teach learners to make good judgments about qualitative relationships.** Unlike much of the curriculum in which correct answers and rules prevail, in the arts it is judgment rather than rules that prevail.
2. **The arts teach learners that problems can have more than one solution** and that questions can have more than one answer.
3. **The arts celebrate multiple perspectives.** One of their large lessons is that there are many ways to see and interpret the world.
4. **The arts teach learners that in complex forms of problem solving** purposes are seldom fixed, but change with circumstance and opportunity. Learning in the arts requires the ability and a willingness to surrender to the unanticipated possibilities of the work as it unfolds.
5. **The arts make vivid the fact that neither words in their literal form nor number exhaust what we can know.** The limits of our language do not define the limits of our cognition.

---

mind, when the mind functions as an organ of perception instead of the medium of logical thought" (Bortoft, 1996: 21).

[135] I have adapted Eisner's wording slightly to include "learners" rather then "children" or "the young", "the academy" rather then "schools" and "society" rather than "adults".

6. **The arts teach students that small differences can have large effects.**
   The arts traffic in subtleties.
7. **The arts teach students to think through and within a material.**
   All art forms employ some means through which images become real.
8. **The arts help learners learn to say what cannot be said.** When learners are invited to disclose what a work of art helps them feel, they must reach into their poetic capacities to find the words that will do the job.
9. **The arts enable us to have experience we can have from no other source**
   and through such experience to discover the range and variety of what we are capable of feeling.
10. **The arts' position in the academy's curriculum symbolizes to learners**
    what society believes is important.

(Eisner, 2002: 70-92)

What is my own experience of the value of presentational knowing? I have learned more about leading, following, enabling, power, agency and communion from my embodied clowning practices than text books alone can offer. Is this valid? I have connected with the more than human world in a more deeply sustained way through the expressive practices of Goethean science than I have been able to do in my head with the (attractive) ideas of deep ecology. Is this valid? I have been able to accept the lived experience of emergence (and not-knowing what might happen next) through the processes of presentational knowing in more concrete ways than the idea of emergence as it is articulated through propositional knowing. Is this valid? And, in spite of this living evidence to myself, the influence of the dominant paradigm still leads me to over-value propositional knowing in the mix of my life. I find it difficult to justify and carve out time for presentational knowing. I do not resources my presentational knowing practice well on a day to day basis, and nor do my clients. My espoused theory and theory-in-use gape apart, joined by a frustrated thread of yearning.

In conventional non-"Art" academia, I would suggest that presentational knowing is minimally attended to. Considering the extent to which Westernised living is dominated by visual material, sounds, messages, advertising, communication, typography and moving images, I am amazed that academia does not seem to overtly value (or even know how to value) visual literacy or the aesthetic qualities of the work it produces. This lack of valuing may serve a tacit denial of sensuality and experiential knowing in favour of privileging the abstracted, disconnected intellectual and propositional knowing over which the academic machine can exert control. I am not surprised that the quality criteria for evaluating presentational knowing are also nascent[136].

---

[136] Even in the rather radical MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice of which I am a part at the University of Bath.

What is it to do presentational knowing in inquiry well?

One participant on the MSc at Bath submitted a book of quotes and photography she'd made as part of her first year portfolio of work. As the tutor team that year looked at it, one tutor expressed delight at her use of presentational knowing at all, whilst I, looking though my graphic design and typography lens, was disappointed at is poor aesthetic qualities. What constitutes useful feedback on this work? I am now tending to find that more recent participants still tend to consign important pieces of presentational knowing to the appendices of their papers, or worse, hide them away altogether, rather than fully integrate them into their work. Reason and Marshall say that students sometimes "worry that they cannot tell the full story of the research because it is too personal or too challenging of mainstream ideas – 'I can't write <u>that</u>!'" (Reason and Marshall, 2001: 417). It seems to me that, in spite of invitations to MSc participants to the contrary, presentational knowing can still be viewed by students as an add-on, the icing on the cake, too personal, too revealing, too self-indulgent (too much fun to do), or too challenging of what makes "proper" work[137].

Some fields of professional practice (such as educational inquiry, art therapy and ethnography) have pockets of activity where using and evaluating presentational knowing is better developed. But before I explore and become influenced by these fields in more detail, I will start with my own practice by asking myself: *what am I looking for in terms of the processes and "end products" (or "formation"[138]) of presentational knowing when I work with MSc learners at the University of Bath?*

Reflecting back over working with the hundred or so MSc participants whose work I have assessed, the following criteria have emerged in my practice and through discussion and debate with my co-marking tutors. I notice that, through these criteria, I seek to affirm participants' experiments and explorations, whilst also offering some (often gentle) challenge.

MSc learners' presentational knowing in inquiry:
- tells them something that they didn't already overtly know;
- helps them articulate something that they know in their heart and their guts;
- allows them to get to know the direct experience, the phenomena, more intimately;
- evokes full sensory and emotional memories of and resonance with their direct experience;
- surprises and provokes the learner, me and maybe others;
- has a large element of spontaneity, accidents and imperfection;
- is crafted with a sense of full-bodied and whole-hearted engagement (if not always finely crafted skill);

---

[137] This is also true in this thesis – take note that I have framed the interludes as "experiments" in order to protect their presentational form from allegations of propositional inadequacy.

[138] Apparently, the German word "Bildung", which means "formation" describes both what is the end product and the process of its production as well.

- has qualities of immediacy and forges close links to the experience in itself– not superficially recreated for "show", or to try and please me as their tutor;
- delights and interests them;
- is something they are more curious than precious about;
- rings true, has trustworthiness and relevance beyond the individual, blends trustworthy "subjectivity" (the particular) which corresponds in its representation to a resonant, relevant "objectivity" or "intersubjectivity" (the universal), (Polanyi, 1974);
- has a crafting of form which enhances and is congruent with the content of the learning.

Now, where to go for others' consideration of these issues, in order to enrich the ground of my own understanding (prior to part two of this chapter, which includes the validity of presentational knowing as a subset nested within wider considerations of validity in action research)? The first source I discovered was through educators Robyn Ewing and David Smith from the Education Faculty at the University of Sydney, who made this contribution to the debate around the validity of arts-informed research for a publication edited by the Center for Arts-informed Research at the University of Toronto. Through these questions, they seek to open a wider discourse than my own criteria-in-use listed above:

- What are the requirements of arts-informed inquiry and by what criteria do we judge effective inquiry?
- Who should be the judges? Who should develop the criteria to assess the artwork? Who are or should be the connoisseurs of arts-informed inquiry?
- What should be the balance of emphasis on "art" and "inquiry"? How do the process and product(s) of arts-informed inquiry differ from the production of an artwork?
- Is this kind of work just a sophisticated form of navel gazing? Is research based on "navel-gazing" legitimate and appropriate?
- Should those who use the arts in inquiries be permitted to have the same access to funding, resources and academic power bases as those undertaking more traditional quantitative and qualitative methodologies?

(Ewing and Smith, in Cole et al, 2004: 147-158)

Knowles and Cole from the Center for Arts-informed Research also present some "defining elements about making judgements on the 'goodness' of transformative, arts-informed research" (Knowles and Cole, 2002: 210-212), which I summarised to add to this exploration:

- **Intentionality** – with clear intellectual and moral purposes;
- **Researcher presence** – in terms of the explicit (and perhaps subtle) revealing of the intersection of a researcher's life with that or those of the researched;

- **Methodological commitment** – evidence of a deep reflexiveness about processes grounded in a set of coherent ideological principles;
- **Holistic quality** – a coherent and seamless quality to the truthfulness and sincerity of the research relationship, the process of inquiry, interpretation, and representational form;
- **Communicability** – the work is accessible, evocative and resonant for its audience;
- **Aesthetic form** – aesthetic quality and aesthetic appeal;
- **Knowledge claims** – made with sufficient ambiguity and humility to allow for multiple interpretations and reader response;
- **Contributions** – to both theoretical and transformative potentials.

Next, I consulted a small book I had been recommended by American art therapy practitioner, Greg Furth on the Jungian interpretation of drawings, remembering that it had something to say on the subject of validity and reliability[139] of image-based work (Furth 1988). Furth says: "the picture must be accepted as a valid method of communicating with the unconscious and as conveying its meaning reliably. Reliability in a picture specifically means that the content is trustworthy, it keeps working time after time, more or less for all people at all times. It is dependable, and the therapist can use it as a reliable analytic aid in helping the patient grow and develop. Validity in a picture means that it shows (or tests) what it purports to show (or test) e.g. repressed or undeveloped psychological contents, which are rich and relevant. In brief, the content of a picture is always supported by and is well grounded in, actual fact…" but he then goes on to point out that "writing does convey, to most educated persons, more reliable and valid messages than pictures…" (Furth, 1988: 21). It seems to me that the scope for the interpretation of the forms of presentational knowing is wider, more elastic and demands a more active audience than the narrower scope from conventional written forms of expression (which are narrowed and focused further through the use of clear framing statements).

Furth's book led me to explore what the field of art therapy had to offer on the issue of its own validity, which I see as being closely related to first person inquiry practice. Art therapy educator, Shaun McNiff writes extensively on the validity, and in his book, Art-Based Research (McNiff, 1998), he says "assessments of the quality of expression have been a provocative subject in the history of art therapy. Values of free expression for every person have been a unifying focus for all sectors of the field. This egalitarian spirit has also been accompanied by a 'commandment' against making judgements about the quality of art produced in therapy. It is felt that if people are subjected to criticism of any kind, they will be discouraged from expressing

---

[139] "Reliability" is a term I am familiar with through conventional market research, where it has a similar meaning to that which Furth is suggesting, that is, if conducted in the same way again, would the research methodology be likely to yield similar results? If so, then the methodology is considered to be reliable. In this thesis, my inquiries are highly contextually and time-specific, and conducting the research in the same way again wouldn't be possible. Does this make my research unreliable? I think not. It just means that this conventional notion of reliability is not one of my guiding ideals.

themselves… I do not advocate judging… however… aesthetic reactions are inevitable. I am intrigued with the issue of aesthetic quality because it is so controversial in art therapy" (McNiff, 1998: 171-176). Here we see McNiff introducing the kinds of issue which I was questioning when working with the MSc participant outlined at the start of this section. McNiff goes on to outline a number of questions around quality and quality criteria, summarised and annotated below[140]:

Questions to ask of the field of work
- How successful is the expression (against its intended purposes)?
- Is quality a purely personal (or cultural) interpretation?
- Is aesthetic measurement a contradiction?
- Can a 'failed' picture generate significant [inquiry] benefits?
- Are authentic and expressive images more likely to deepen my engagement with the [inquiry] process?
- Do superficial and stereotypical[141] images limit my involvement in [presentational knowing and inquiry]?
- Is it possible to find significance in any kind of expression within the [presentational knowing and inquiry] experience?"

Questions of the particular project
- Does the project connect to your experience?
- Does it evoke something from the creator of the work?
- Does the project stand out from others and does it initiate a new dimension to practice?
- Does the project convey a feeling of psychological depth?
- Does it have aesthetic significance?
- Is it memorable?
- Is the project appealing to others?
- Is it helpful to someone?
- Does it provoke, inspire, arouse interest?
- Is the expression appealing (or shocking, or emotionally moving in some other way) to the person perceiving it?

Tom Romano has a similar set of criteria when he suggests ways in which young learners can self-evaluate their multi-genre papers (Romano, 2000: 169):

- What surprised you?
- What did you learn about writing in different genres as a way of inquiring into your topic and communicating what you know?
- What did the multigenre format enable you to do with your topic?

---

[140] I have replaced references to "art therapy" or "art-based research" with "inquiry" or "presentational knowing and inquiry" for consistency.
[141] I would suggest that stereotypical imagery can also be revealing of cultural, social and individual ways of knowing.

- What was hard about writing your multigenre paper?
- What could have made writing this paper easier?
- What did you learn about content and/or form?

And, finally, qualitative research theorist Laurel Richardson has developed the following validity criteria for her creative analytic practices (CAP) ethnography[142] (Richardson, 2000). She says "science-writing prose is not held sacrosanct. The ethnographic genre has been blurred, enlarged, altered to include poetry, drama, conversations, readers' theatre and so on… How does the ease of manipulating page formats and typographical style contribute to – or distract from – the evocativeness of the text?[143]… I believe in holding CAP ethnography to high and difficult standards; mere novelty does not suffice. Here are five of the criteria I use when reviewing papers or monographs submitted for social scientific publication:

1. **Substance contributions:** Does this piece contribute to our understanding of social life? Does the writer demonstrate a deeply grounded (if embedded) social scientific perspective? How has this perspective informed the construction of the text?

2. **Aesthetic merit:** Rather than reducing standards, CAP ethnography adds another standard. Does this piece succeed aesthetically[144]? Does the use of creative analytic practices open up the text, invite interpretative responses? Is the text artistically shaped, satisfying, complex, not boring?

3. **Reflexivity:** Is the author cognizant of the epistemology of the post-modern? How did the author come to write this text? How was the information gathered? Are there ethical issues? How has the author's subjectivity been both a producer and product of this text? Is there adequate self-awareness and self-exposure for the reader to make judgements about the point of view? Does the author hold him- or herself accountable to the standards of knowing and telling of the people he or she has studied?

4. **Impact:** Does this affect me? Emotionally? Intellectually? Does it generate new questions? Move me to write? Move me to try new research practices? Move me to action?

5. **Expression of reality:** Does the text embody a fleshed out, embodied sense of lived experience? Does it seem 'true' – a credible account of a cultural, social, individual, or communal sense of the 'real'?" (Richardson, 2000: 929-32).

---

[142] *Ethnography*: (from the Greek *ethnos* = nation and *graphein* = writing) refers to the qualitative description of human social phenomena, based on fieldwork. Ethnography is a holistic research method founded in the idea that a system's properties cannot necessarily be accurately understood independently of each other. The genre has both formal and historical connections to travel writing and colonial office reports. Several academic traditions, in particular the constructivist and relativist paradigms, claim ethnography as a valid research method (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethnography).

[143] As a some-time assessor for and long standing member of the International Society of Typographic designers, I would say that it has the potential (or even duty) to illuminate the meaning of the text… and that the visual literacy level in understanding and using such design forms is pathetically low, given the thousand of visual messages and symbols that we are exposed to on a daily basis.

[144] I include both "beauty" and "ugliness" within my consideration of aesthetic.

Bringing together McNiff, Ewing and Smith, Knowles and Cole, and Richardson's three basic viewpoints from arts-informed research, art therapy and ethnography shows a set of strongly congruent ideas which seem relevant to each other, and three clusters of overlapping themes which all of the disciplines considered to be important:

1. **Reflexivity, researcher presence and being connected to experience;**
2. **Aesthetic form, aesthetic merit and aesthetic significance;**
3. **Impact, offering the chance of being emotionally moved, communicability.**

I will return to these three themes for validity later in this thesis (see *Trusting the Mapmaker – validity and presentational knowing, part 2*) and test them (and me) out to self-assess my own work.

How does my own work stack up against a set of validity criteria that extend beyond ticking a box that says "this work has done something that looks like presentational knowing. Well done. ✔ ." Resourcing the formation of aesthetically pleasing, meaningful and sophisticated expressions and interpretations of experience is problematic in a cultural and economic context which does not value such activity very highly (or reifies it beyond the grasp of "non-artists"). Doing presentational knowing well takes time and focused engagement, which are at odds with introjected societal expectations and demands for ever greater speed, "value for money" and the intensely packed lives needed (just) to make a living. I become irritated and angry at the fear-driven inner- and social conditioning that holds these rushed, striving patterns of behaviour tightly in place… and yet I am fully in, of and acting into perpetuating those patterns myself.

In an article called "Creative Space for a Creative Life," Stephen Nachmanovitch (a former student of Bateson) says that "we often talk about creativity as a set of psychological qualities: a supple imagination, ability to put things together in new and different ways. But there is another necessary condition before we can speak of creativity. You can have all the wonderful things you want, but the creative act is incomplete unless those imaginings get down on paper, canvas or magnetic tape, or out an instrument, or danced or spoken, and finally out to the appropriate audience, whether large or small, who need to receive the gift. The meal has to be cooked, the store opened, the machine built and tested, the business plan brought to its first year in the black. There has to be that sacramental kiss between the sacred and secular worlds so that the result of you being out <u>there</u>, on the mountain under the moonlight, then comes <u>here</u>, into our shared world, as an actual object people can hold and touch, or an actual event people can experience and remember" (Nachmanovitch, 1999: 12).

Who is to judge? who are the conoisseurs?

ethnography

Expression of reality

EWING + SMITH

Balance between art & inquiry?

RICHARDSON

Reflexivity
Researcher presence
Connected to experience

Substance contributions

Methodological commitment

Aesthetic merit
Aesthetic form
Aesthetic significance

Holistic quality

Impact
Communicability
Emotionally moving

KNOWLES + COLE

Intentionality

Sophisticated naval-gazing?

arts-informed research

Psychological depth

Helpful to someone

Access to resources

art therapy

McNIFF

DO SUPERFICIAL IMAGES LIMIT MY INVOLVEMENT?

Adds new dimensions to practice

IS AESTHETIC MEASUREMENT A CONTRADICTION?

ARE AUTHENTIC AND EXPRESSIVE IMAGES MORE LIKELY TO DEEPEN MY ENGAGEMENT?

criteria to judge effective inquiry?