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ABSTRACT

Due to the complexity of understanding art itself, it is not surprising to see no existing research conducted in the field of developing models in ‘content making’ compared to models in art criticism. Hence, this research which is still in its early development will be outlining the key principles in the context of content making, which play a major element in structuring the way of developing fundamental understanding and ideas for fine art students when they are conducting their individual studio research. Since there are no examples of written models in teaching content, the methodology of this research will be looking into and making interpretation from two art criticism models; one will be from Lucy Lippard’s model and the second will be from Terry Barret’s model. In this early development this research will be outlining key principles for future framework development.

Field of Research: Content making, form & content, art teaching model, art-as-research, art-based research, phenomenological, theme, studio practice

1. Introduction

Over the last two decades, there has been an ongoing debate concerning the role of art and design practices in the field of academic research (Makela & Routarinne, 2006, p. 12). These discussions have in turn created an opening in the academic world where these roles and position as ‘knowledge’ is question and develop. The questioning and development has targeted not only on the question of art’s own epistemological situation but also concerning its pedagogical position i.e. how it is being taught and how it is being learn. This is true within the undergraduate level and especially within the postgraduate level. In one of the primer concerns in fine art studio practice other than the making of the ‘art object’ or the ‘work of art’ (form) is the significant concern on starting and developing the ‘content’. (The ‘form’ and content’ dynamic) It is well known that the teaching of fine art student on starting and developing their own art content has always been an open-ended and exclusive situation amongst the fine art lectures or instructors. Every fine art lecturer has his own way of teaching the students on how to develop their own artistic content. But throughout the researcher’s own experience in teaching undergraduate fine art student, most students still end up struggling in making sense of how to start and develop their own artistic content in their studio research. Because of the complexity of understanding art itself, it is of no surprising there seem to be no exiting research conducted in the field of developing models in ‘content making’ compare to models in art criticism.

Thus this research which is in its early development will be outlining key principles in the context of content making which play a major element in structuring a way of developing fundamental
understanding and ideas for fine art students when they are conducting their individual studio research. Because there are no examples of written models in teaching content, the methodology of this research will be looking into and making interpretation from two art criticism models. One will be from Lucy Lippard’s model and the second will be from Terry Barret’s model. In this early development this research will be outlining key principles for future framework development.

2. Reviews on related literature

With the ever global push of methodologies in the social sciences and scientific research, empirical, cognitive, rationalist or instrumentalist approaches to knowledge formulation seem to dominate ways of knowing. This domination is evident in institutions of higher learning with their input-output accountabilities attached to calculable measures of funding and investment. Yet it is clear that vested concentration to pragmatic and instrumentalised approaches to research may not be suiting the best interests of those in the creative and artistic practice such as music, theatre, fine art i.e. painting, sculpture, installation etc. Bolt (2011) explain that unlike science, which has set in progress an objectsphere particular to its discipline and distinct its systematic methods and approach of analysis, the approaches taken in art-based research, such as in painting - studio enquiry, often contradict what is commonly projected of research (p. 150). Art proceeds on the assumption that we can never know the outcome in advance and that knowledge is emergent rather prescribed (ibid). In Grierson & Brearley (2009) they suggested that there is a growing need for articulated research methodologies appropriate to creative arts practice and diverse cultural knowledge systems (p. 4). In Hannula, Suoranta and Vaden (2005) they stated that the discussion about artistic research should be carried out specifically in the field of artistic research and on its own terms (p. 14). Daichendt (2012) emphasised that the writing component (content) is a valuable aspect of art education and in many ways the only form of research recognized by contemporary universities (p. 6).

3. Research Questions

There are no examples of (academically) written model in content making for the usage of undergraduate fine art student in starting and developing their own art content. Before the research was conducted the researchers have come out with two main questions. The first question is, ‘What are the possible key principles in making a structured model for content making?’ While the second is, ‘How can these principles be made into a model (framework) for content making?’

4. Methodology

Qualitatively the research requires gathering relevant data from the specified documents – art criticism model – compiling and comparing literature in order to analyze the material and arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of key principles for content making in Fine Art Studio practice within the undergraduate learning. It is imperative to understand that some qualitative researchers are not ‘concerned about validity’ as it is commonly understood, preferring to aim for 'understanding', which might be achieved by what Harry Wolcott (1994) calls 'rigorous subjectivity' (p. 366-7) The quest is not so much with 'getting it right' as getting it 'differently contoured and nuanced' (Richardson, 1994, p. 521). To some, there are many overlapping truths operating at different levels and constantly subject to
change. Thus interpretivism is a way to attain insights through discovering meanings by improving our comprehension of the whole. Qualitative research explores the richness, depth, and complexity of phenomena. Qualitative research, broadly defined, means ‘any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 17).

4.1 Secondary data

Secondary data will be a major part of the research. It will be based on two major models from critical art theory. One will be from Lucy Lippard’s model and the second will be from Terry Barret’s model. These models will then be interpretatively reform to structure a new model in content making.

5. Findings & Discussion

As stated the researcher pinpointed several key an important framework from critical art theory, one is from Lucy Lippard’s model and the other is Terry Barret’s model, in the effort to establish key principles in developing a propose model in ‘content making’. As this research is still in its early development the finding is more gear towards such establishment and not as a finish model or scheme. Within this research the division is as stated below in three working and one establish diagrams.
As indicated in the two models there are similar concepts that can be formulated into a single framework. Other concepts are not within the parameter of content making which are more inclined to be indicated within the context of ‘form’. As a result the final framework is established in ‘Figure 4’.

Figure 2: Terry Barret’s model framework

Figure 3: Similar key principles from both models – ‘Form & Content’: ‘Form’ indicated in blue color & ‘Content’ indicated in yellow color
6. Conclusion and Future Recommendation

As the stage of this research is still in its early development, this paper is more incline towards presenting a finished – establish – framework that will further be develop and elaborated in the coming research and future papers. But as a conclusion there are two main concepts that deal directly with content making, one is ‘context’ and the second is ‘content & meaning’. Both are dealing with conceptual development and research and not in (the process) making the ‘form’ which is more hands-on experience with the artwork materials and technical handling. But as an initial ‘mover’ context is put as the first priority when fine students wants to start their research journey in towards them forming their own artistic ‘content’ and individual ‘idea’ which is situated in the ‘content & meaning’. This is back by Barret (2011, p. 15) himself when he explained, “Meanings of artworks depend on context, the circumstances that form their setting. These circumstances in turn vary, from where and how an object is placed, to the way the parts of the object relate, to the history and experience of the artist and conditions in the outside world.” As mention elaborations of this division will further be refine and elaborate in future stages of this on-going research which the particulars and content will be looking into Heartney’s (2008) distinction on art themes, and also from Robertson & McDaniel’s ART21 short-format documentary series in which they have divided modern art into several major themes.
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