

PARtake: The Journal of Performance as Research
Volume 3, Issue 1 – Spring 2020
ISSN: 2472-0860



***Knowledge Catcher: On the Performative Agency
of Scholarly Forms***

Connie Svabo, MSc, PhD – Roskilde University
Julie Bønnelycke, MA, PhD – Roskilde University

Preface

This article explores performative reading and writing as ways to expand and innovate scholarly forms of communication. Such hybrid knowledge performances break with dominant scriptocentric epistemologies and legitimize emotional, poetic, and co-experienced knowledge creation. Deeply rooted, static views of academic research give way to performing knowledge as fusions of performance and research as flows of transformation, process, and experiment.

Drawing on science and technology studies in order to understand the agency of academic formats in relation to two conventional forms of knowledge communication—writing and reading—the article explores the performative aesthetic aspects of these forms of communication. Knowledge is co-constituted by the forms in which it is developed and communicated. The form of the article, as well as its content, builds on performative experimentations and explorations, and the transgression of traditional academic form. *Being a performance piece*, rather than merely the recount of performance, the article requests the cooperation and engagement of the reader-participant in order to transverse time and space in a continuous co-production of knowledge. The piece subverts the medium-message and sender-receiver relations by asking that the reader contribute actively to the articulation of knowledge. There is a certain choreography offered by the article and a specific set of activities required for this to work. Please read on.

Introduction-Instruction

Dear reader. We suggest the following approach to reading this article:

Please make sure that you have a piece of paper, a pen, and a pair of scissors close at hand.

Print the knowledge-catcher₁ provided on the following page and fold it according to the instructions provided on the template.

Select the mood that comes closest to your current state and switch the sides according to the number provided.

Choose from the available themes and switch according to the number provided. Then choose a flap to open. Follow directions provided under the flap. This will provide you with a course of action for reading.

When you have had enough, feel satisfied or have been through all options, please proceed to Conclusion.

Knowledge Catcher

Emotional Choreography

Go to section 2 read until told otherwise

Go to section 3 and read until told otherwise

Go to section 4 and read until told otherwise

Go to section 5 and read until the writing tells you to do something else

Go to section 6 follow the instructions

Go to section 7 read until told otherwise

Go to section 8

Go to section 9

Go to section 10

Go to section 11

Go to section 12

Return here section 6 written, go to section 7

Find audience Read your haiku aloud If not yet written, go to section 6

Go to section 1 read until told otherwise

Go to section 2 read until told otherwise

Go to section 3 and read until told otherwise

Go to section 4 and read until told otherwise

Go to section 5 and read until the writing tells you to do something else

Go to section 6 follow the instructions

Go to section 7 read until told otherwise

Go to section 8

Go to section 9

Go to section 10

Go to section 11

Go to section 12

1. Print and cut around outside of knowledge catcher
2. Fold in half and in half again
3. Open out, turn over so top is blank and fold each corner into the middle
4. Turn over and repeat
5. Turn over so you can see the printed emotions. Fold in half and in half again
6. Slide your thumb and your finger behind two of the emotion sides and press together so they bend round and touch
7. Turn over and repeat with the thumb and finger of the other hand for the other two emotion sides
8. All the printed emotions should now be at the front with centres touching and you are ready to use your knowledge catcher

1. Hybrid Forms of Knowledge

In a still relevant critique of academia, performance studies scholar, ethnographer Dwight Conquergood writes about the scriptocentricism of the scholarly world. According to Conquergood, dominant epistemologies link *knowing* with *text*. Knowledge is fabricated, cut into written forms that are characterized by distance.² Conquergood points out that such dominant epistemologies squeeze out “meaning that is embodied, tacit, intoned, gestured, improvised, co-experienced, [and] covert.” With reference to de Certeau, Conquergood states, “Posted above the gates of modernity, this sign: Here only what is written is understood.”³

Conquergood argues that Performance Studies has a special role to play in academia, by breaking with dominant epistemologies and legitimizing embodied, tacit, gestured, personal, poetic, emotional, improvised, covert and co-experienced forms of knowledge. Conquergood suggests that *performance* is a relevant counter-model to dominant epistemologies. Blurring the boundaries between performance and research is a way of radically intervening in the conventional forms of scholarly knowledge and considerably expanding academic formats.

In the words of Performance Studies scholar and performative writer Ronald Pelias:

Despite the fact that many have declared the logical positivist house in ruins, scholars continue to reside there. Despite the fact that many have shown how building structures with the mind only is flawed architecture, scholars continue to do so. The performative writing fracture may help academic houses settle into greater alignment with human experience.⁴

Given the significance of writing in scholarly research, it is perhaps surprising that we do not explicitly reflect on and discuss its practice more, whether in terms of our own writing strategies or those of others. Yet it is now widely accepted that writing is never simply reporting, and that choice of words, metaphors and textual forms have performative effects: They do not just depict but enact realities. There is much current interest in creative forms of writing within cultural theory, architecture, geography, anthropology, sociology, and related fields, following longer histories of experimentation, for example, as in performative writing.

This article takes its cue from Performance Studies in an exploration of the *mediation*, which is carried out by *aesthetic forms* in academia. The article contributes to expanding scholarly forms through fusions of performance and research. It suggests

alternative modes of engaging with academic formats, modes that take into consideration the selves, emotions, preferences and situatedness of the people *present and actively participating* in the making of knowledge. This makes it possible to perform knowledge in new ways, thereby creating new hybrid forms of knowledge. Examples of such hybrid forms of knowledge are *performative writing* and *performance lectures*.

Performative writing is scholarly writing, which is conscious of the aesthetic form of the written text as co-productive in knowledge creation. In general, performative writing is a method used to engage with and evoke human experiences. Performative writing does this by invoking poetic and personal rhetorical and compositional forms in scholarly works across the human and social sciences. Performative writing expands the aesthetic and literary forms of academic scholarship.

Performative writing pushes our understanding of what constitutes scholarly knowledge and makes it possible to include poetic, personal, emotional, embodied, gestured, improvised and co-experienced forms of knowledge in scholarly texts. Performative writing makes it possible to use text as a medium for conveying these forms of insight, knowledge, and experience. Ronald Pelias explains, "...performative writing features lived experience, telling iconic moments that call forth the complexities of human life. With lived experience, there is no separation between mind and body, objective and subjective, cognitive and affective."⁵

Performative writing makes it possible for us to say: We are puzzled by the apparently overlooked co-agency of the forms in which knowledge is presented in academia—by the overlooked interrelations of knowledge, form and content. In academia we often tend to pretend that aesthetic forms—for example the form of a journal article or the lecture—are transparent, see-through media, that they don't *do* anything. In much academic practice, scholarly forms of knowledge communication are often treated as if they are transparent, passive intermediaries, mere transporters of meaning. This is a mediation-aesthetic misconception, which science and technology studies can help shed light on.

Works within science and technology studies (STS) have, throughout the past many decades, shown how tools and technologies co-constitute knowledge—including how methodologies act as "thinking technologies."⁶ Science and technology studies helps us to see the agency of our thinking technologies, our instruments and inscription

devices. In this article, we transpose the STS sensibility to the performative agency of thinking technologies, using this STS informed understanding of the agency of mediators in relation to two conventional forms of knowledge communication: Writing and reading. In this article we engage with these forms of communication, not by delivering an explicit critique of existing practices, but by exploring performative aesthetic aspects of these forms of communication. Knowledge is co-constituted by the forms in which it is developed and communicated. According to science and technology scholar Bruno Latour: “Everything changes if the word mediation fills out a little in order to designate the action of mediators. Then the meaning is no longer simply transported by the medium but in part constituted, moved, recreated, modified, in short expressed and betrayed.”⁷

The journal article can be seen as such a medium. It links otherwise separate entities—it links researchers with their research and makes it possible to create statements of knowledge. We can also think of the performed presentation as a medium, linking researchers with audiences of peers and the public. The interesting aspect about the concept of mediation, as viewed from science and technology studies, is that attention is drawn not only to how these media establish connections, but also how they act as mediators, making connections, yet simultaneously transforming the linked. Paying attention to the forms by which knowledge is communicated is like holding up a magnifying glass to our performances of knowledge.

In the creation and communication of knowledge, the form cannot be separated from the content. Very simply put: If you pour different materials into the same mold, the mold will shape the material. According to this understanding of mediation, the forms through which we communicate knowledge co-constitute the knowledge that is communicated. The content is co-shaped; it is formed by the mediator. Knowledge forms have performative agency. They enact the world and us as co-producers with it. This applies to knowledge technologies such as microscopes and telescopes, scanners and seismographs. It also applies to inscription devices and enactments, and to texts and performances.

This relates to what, in science and technology studies, is called the ontological politics of research.⁸ It is the politics of world-creation through research. Which worlds are created with particular knowledge practices? Through specific knowledge forms? What is enacted into existence? What is left out?

The technologies used, enact *what* can be known and *how*.

STS scholar Steven Shapin describes Robert Boyle's writing techniques for establishing scientific validity (i.e. consensus) in his pneumatic experiments in the mid 17th century.⁹ The importance of his work comes as much from the technical results, as from the crafting of indisputable matters of fact through linguistic practices. Through the written form, Boyle demarcated credible knowledge from uncertain and unscientific knowledge, crafting reliable researcher-narrator positions by enabling virtual witnessing of his experiments. He thereby made sure that, through his texts, the established public was enabled to see what he saw, creating consensus about his scientific results.¹⁰ The virtual witnessing served as an exact representation of his work, enabling the endorsement of colleagues and laypersons.

What if, instead, *we do not wish for you to see what we see, but to create a co-experience?* One that involves the active mediation made visible and tangible through devices that are foregrounded as agents in our knowledge-making process. We do not wish to involve you, dear reader, as a witness/audience to our scientific theatre, but to co-perform with you, through the mediation of our article and "knowledge-catcher." The mere fact that you are still here with us suggests that you are interested in taking part. Thank you.

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

2. Folding Worm Holes - Mediation as Mode of Knowledge Production

By creating an academic paper that probes the performativity of the academic format and encourages the active contribution of the reader as co-producer of meaning, explore the intermingling of selves, positions and emotions in *scholartist* knowledge production are explored.¹¹ We turn our attention to the mediating agency of the format of the academic paper, thereby seeking to *intra-vene* by destabilizing, ever so slightly, its hegemony.¹² As a mediating agent, this article does not serve to convey a message through the translation of a performance (a pre-performed research piece) into text, but in accordance with the work of John Law: to transform through translation, to distort, transform, and make something new.¹³ Alongside the passing of the message comes noise and disturbing signals (whether this be through any kind of technical device, as is the original context for the notion, or any kind of socio-technical assemblage to stay

with the science and technology terminology). These are not merely distractions, but as Serres puts it: a productive part of information transmission.¹⁴ We mobilize the productivity of disturbance by emphasizing the mediation as a form of co-creation.

Building on the work of philosopher Michel Serres, science and technology scholar John Law and the notion of *translation*, we seek to create wormholes between the different temporalities that are the co-presence of this paper. Wormholes are considered theoretical, traversable spherical tunnels that, according to the relativity theory, create shortcuts between the foldings in space-time.¹⁵ Understanding translation as the process of making connections, establishing communication, or as forging a passage between domains,¹⁶ we create folds that touch upon each other's presence and actively communicate between them – here manifested in the folds and the putting-in-motion of folds in the knowledge catcher.

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

3. Performance Pieces

Integrating performance and research is a way of providing productive “tension” in new ontological choreographies. Creating performance pieces that relate to the topic or theme of research may provide productive tension by bringing together playful and intellectual ways of knowing. This may make it possible to enact new dimensions of the research theme and provide strong counterpoints to a written text, in terms of how the topic is addressed and argued. Creating performance pieces may also facilitate dealing with subjugated voices, hidden perspectives or positionalities, sentiments, or emotions in relation to the research. Such performance work may make it possible to fuse or intertwine forms of knowledge, which are otherwise commonly kept apart—braiding imaginative-creative and critical-analytical modes of engagement.

Creative performance pieces may contribute innovation to the academic paper, providing dynamic, participatory and engaging forms, as well as making it possible for researchers (and audiences) to engage with emotional, sensory, and aesthetic aspects of research and knowing, in situ and in action. Enacted through such forms, performing knowledge becomes collectively co-created, potentially polyphonous, playful, processual, relational, as well as more aesthetically engaging—for presenters and audiences!

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

4. Process, Selves, and Science

STS scholar Charis Cussins describes how medical procedures—through a carefully coordinated set of processes, positions, and technologies—perform an ontological choreography that enacts bodies, selves, patients, and persons to produce scientific knowledge.¹⁷ Subjects must become objects to be researched upon; selves must be “parked,” put aside to render purified results.¹⁸ Scientific processes weed out soft, crooked, unruly outcomes: Are the graphs statistically significant? If not, they must go.

One aspect of crafting reliable researcher-narrator positions (still) involves the convention that the researcher does not include herself in what she writes. In the writing process, an ontological choreography is self-imposed. Methodological and epistemological choreographies determine which knowledge performance sequences are correct, which positions can follow each other, and which steps can evolve into another combination. As researchers, we are schooled to know and line out what we want to write before we start. The results are there, already produced, waiting now as data to be reported.

As science and technology scholar Bruno Latour has famously described it, scientific knowledge is based on procedures of inscription.¹⁹ Where uncertainties are wetted away, and scientifically sound accounts are fixated to enter into circulation amongst the scientific community and to the public. And, crucially, these publics and communities are created through this process.

Performance as a contrasting model for research, for *knowing*, enacts research as dynamic, relational, responsive, processual, and emergent. Working with performance-based models for research is related to how the world is seen. Proponents argue for performance-based models because this relates appropriately to how the world is performed – processual, in action. Is there a stable reality out there that might be uncovered through sound scientific investigation? Is reality perhaps instead ambiguous, polyvalent, multiple, as suggested by central figures within performative approaches to science?²⁰ Is the world itself in flux, a series of emergent and unpredictable happenings and events, enactments, and performances?

“What I am offering to be sounded and perhaps fathomed in the following pages is a new object for philosophy.”²¹ This is how Michel Serres introduces the book

“Genesis,” first published in 1982 in French and translated into English in 1995. The text proceeds:

A flight of screaming birds, a school of herring tearing through the water like a silken sheet, a cloud of chirping crickets, a booming whirlwind of mosquitos... crowds, packs, hordes on the move, and filling with their clamor space; Leibniz called them aggregates, these objects, sets. He brought them to people’s attention at least [...].²²

From this perspective, reality emerges in its continuous, multiple enactments, as described by philosopher Annemarie Mol in her accounts of the multiple, co-existing enactments of phenomena such as disease and health. ²³ Reality is enacted through performances of knowing and doing, and different performances of knowledge enact different realities.

Research not only describes what it studies, it also *makes it*, performs it. Research is performative. This brings with it the need to develop fluid and decentered models for knowing. Modeling knowledge on performance means that temporality is an integral part of knowledge, of knowing: That the ever-changing here-and-now and situatedness of knowledge is foregrounded as an integral part of how knowledge is continuously performed and re-performed. Thinking about knowledge in this way makes it possible to recast knowledge performances. It becomes possible – indeed necessary – to devise knowledge performances as staging patterns of interaction, choreographing circumstances and planning processes of engagement. This makes explicit the performativity of knowledge production and circulation, thus un-blackboxing knowledge, exploring the relationality and the emotional and deeply personal dimensions of knowledge. This may include knowing the world through sensuous, poetic, metaphorical, and allegorical forms, as suggested by sociologists John Law and John Urry.²⁴

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH THE ARTICLE]

5. Emotional and Sensuous Engagement

One possible implication of unfolding knowledge performances from a process paradigm is that the process of knowledge creation might be included in the assessments of its qualities, including the experiences of creating knowledge. What was it like to write that journal article? Experiences of creating knowledge may consider

cognitive dimensions, for example, in terms of content learning: Did I learn something new? Experiences of creating knowledge may also be described in relation to sensory-aesthetic and emotional dimensions. Was the knowledge creation process aesthetically appealing? How did it feel to do that conference presentation? How do I feel about my research?

Design research is a discipline focusing on research in and through design practices, and within this field, an interesting idea has emerged: In the process of design, conceptualized as a situated practice, personal experience, emotions, and values inevitably become embedded in the design. Therefore, the designer's emotions in design processes should be included thereby suggesting that how designers feel while designing might be something to include in the design process. The creative production both projects the designers' scripts for use and users, as well as being a materialization of the designers' emotions; the production is a mediating device between designers and users.²⁵ The design thus represents value beyond the intended purpose: its value as creative, emotional practice.

What if researchers take inspiration from this idea and transfer it to research? Can this aspect of the value assessment of research include how researchers *feel* about the work they are doing? To include the perspectives of the producer her/himself in an assessment of the work, or assessment of the work's value, might contribute significant new insights to an understanding of academic knowledge creation. What if passion and personal relevance were valid assessment criteria? If scholars are writing articles that they find horrendously boring, it is not surprising if their readers do so too!

Convention has it that the scholarly form is a passionless form, a form that seeks to enact objectivity and distance. In a call for engaged scholarship, Conquergood invokes Gramsci: "The intellectual's error consists in believing that one can know without understanding and even more without feeling and being impassioned [...] that is, without feeling the elementary passions of the people."²⁶

Aesthetic performances and artifacts constitute the ways people relate to the world, as well as research. At the core of the issue is the question of legitimacy: What are legitimate knowledge forms? What is knowledge?

There is a rich array of literature to draw on when engaging with these questions. The *writing culture* debate within ethnography in the 1980s on the "*poetics and politics of ethnography*,"²⁷ has pointed toward situated knowing, positionality,

standpoint epistemologies. Within performance studies, the argumentation has been for performative writing,²⁸ personal and poetic writing,²⁹ and critical performance ethnographies.³⁰ If the circle is drawn just a tiny bit wider, the edges of scholarly forms are ruffled by research-creation,³¹ arts-based research,³² autoethnography,³³ narrative,³⁴ mess,³⁵ invention,³⁶ non-representationality,³⁷ theatre-archaeology³⁸ and scholartistry.³⁹

Aesthetic forms mediate knowledge, and throughout the past half-century, there has been substantial interest in disrupting the dominant epistemologies, as mentioned by Dwight Conquergood. Nevertheless, as Ronald Pelias points out, the flawed architectures of the logical positivist house still have a strong hold on the spatial design in the academic sphere, and performative writing is a mere crack in the wall.⁴⁰

Perhaps the positionality of rupture is not the worst place to be. Latour and Yaneva, arguing against what they call “a desperately static” view of architecture, suggest that architecture should be seen as “a series of transformations” — as both process and movement:

Everybody knows—and especially architects, of course—that a building is not a static object but a moving project, and that even once it has been built, it ages, it is transformed by its users, modified by all of what happens inside and outside, and that it will pass or be renovated, adulterated and transformed beyond recognition.’⁴¹

Latour’s alternative to the “desperately static views of architecture” is to produce research that enacts processes, research that traces pluralities and generates accounts regarding flows of transformation.

Understanding what such plural and fluid knowledge performances might look like can be unfolded further with help from situational aesthetics. In Yuriko Saito’s situational aesthetics:

sensitivity is centered on circumstance and interaction. It is a description of something appealing which occurs relationally and in process. It refers to what we might describe as entities coming together in a passing moment. Part of this aesthetic is the sensuous engagement; the exploration of the senses and emotions that spark in this moment.⁴²

This conceptualization captures the highly ephemeral coming-togetherness and uniqueness that characterize research-as-flows and as moments of touching that, however brief, nevertheless create ripples of effect through affective encounters.

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

6. Haiku

This paper draws on Japanese situational aesthetics, building on the work of philosopher Yuriko Saito. It builds on an aesthetic of circumstance and interaction, of process and relation. Saito writes that the Japanese aesthetic tradition aspires to acknowledge and express the quintessential character of an object, material or subject matter.⁴³ This characteristic is expressed through the haiku poem, the famous 5-7-5 syllable verse originating from the 17th century. The aim of haiku is to “capture the essence of nature and identifying oneself with it.”⁴⁴ When the poet’s labor is object-centered rather than subject-governed “the poet’s efforts will ‘grow into’ (naru) a verse rather than ‘doing’ (suru) a verse.”⁴⁵

The ideal of the haiku poem is impersonality; to put oneself aside in order to grasp the subject of the poem for what it is—to make oneself available for the coming into being of something else. Again, we encounter the inevitable tension between subjectivity and objectivity, and this is encapsulated in the haiku poem as the requirement to become one with one’s subject. The fusion requires a split: Putting oneself aside in order to become the subject. The self-subjection to an exercise in ontological choreography in the name of art instead of science. We, the authors, would argue that articulating— or writing out—the situatedness would be necessary in order to perform that putting aside. This is not putting aside in order to result in oblivion but as the other dimension of the artistic/scientific practice.

So, dear reader, here we suggest a different mode of engagement with this paper. We ask you to conduct your own ontological choreography through an exercise in Japanese poetry. We invite you to contribute to the intermingled becoming of aesthetic and scientific forms by creating your own translational work: Translate the scientific into poetry. Translate emotions into words.

We suggest you write two poems in the haiku form.

It goes like this:

Line 1 = 5 syllables

Line 2 = 7 syllables

Line 3 = 5 syllables

They do not have to rhyme.

The first poem should be about your scientific work.

The second one about your own emotions regarding your scientific work. How do you feel about what you do? How are you part of it or how does it reflect you?

When you have written them, read them aloud. Feel the rhythm. Taste the words. Feel the truths they express. Become one with them.

Through the process of writing, otherwise separate genres are brought together: The scholarly and the poetic. This process is not only a metaphor for knowledge creation but suggestive of processes for embodied, sensorial, aesthetic engagement, translated and transformed by the fixed form and traditional prescriptions of the haiku poem – a poetization of scientific knowledge. The poems enact hybridity and transformation through situated, sensuous engagement.

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

7. Dwelling in Potentiality

There are poetry and art in origami; there is also knowledge-making. Expressing research through haiku or using a knowledge-catcher as reading guide highlights ambiguity, relationality, orchestrated serendipity and process-aspects of knowledge performance.

Creative performance is promoted by scholars across the human and social sciences as a key model for thinking about research.⁴⁶ Understanding research as performance, as choreography and dance, provides access to the *processual aspects of knowledge creation*. Knowledge is process. A paper is process. A presentation is process. Research is process. Knowledge-making is always situated, contingent, dependent on and entangled with ideological, economic, historical, cultural, and other patterns. Knowledge is always negotiated, emergent, provisional, and incomplete.

Performing knowledge can be an experiment. Residing in the cracks of walls. Suspending the moment of uncertainty, cultivating it, reveling at the intersection of multiple realities, not yet choosing a path, but exploring that non-place where they might intermingle and investigate what kinds of sense-making might take place here. Un-inscribed, present through vague senses of relevance, of personal connection, of something that touches the researcher/artist, makes something emerge. This nexus may be the space where one can make oneself available for new forms of knowing, exploring

processes rather than products. This may be a site of exploring processes of becoming, of articulating modes of knowing; this knowing might be understood more as perceiving and recognizing from personal and situated positions, rather than as establishing truths that are knowable in only one certain way.

This approach to knowledge production entails a measure of openness. Performing knowledge on the basis of process philosophy means that one does not know in advance what might be found. Performing knowledge is a process of *coming to know*. Ronald Pelias accounts for this in relation to writing, through the distinction between writing *into* and writing *about*. Pelias describes how, when you write *into*, you do not in advance know what you will find — writing is a process of coming to know.⁴⁷ When you write *about* something, the result and direction are often predetermined. The researcher knows where she is going and the writing typically follows a preplanned program: Research questions, hypotheses, dispositions, and synopses all indicate a sense of direction, of steps towards reaching a specific goal. New discoveries might emerge, but they are usually secondary outcomes. Sometimes writing can be dynamic, relational, responsive, processual, and emergent. Sometimes writing can be modeled on performance—cultivating flows, shifts, and movements. Writing can involve dwelling in the moment, listening to the silences and the unspoken in open-ended inquiry and in the site of not-yet-knowing, as described by performative writer Lynn Fels.⁴⁸ Such writing can also include caring engagement that entails experimenting with mutual becomings and attentiveness toward possibilities presenting themselves. Writing with care. With joy. Writing with the paper, not just on it.

[PLEASE RETURN TO THE KNOWLEDGE-CATCHER TO PROCEED WITH
THE ARTICLE]

Conclusion

This article contributes to an understanding of research as performance, by directing attention to the mediation carried out in and by scholarly forms, such as the journal article or presented paper. Knowledge, in part, is constituted by the characteristics of the medium with which we communicate that knowledge. Informed by science and technology studies, this concept can be understood as the performative agency of thinking technologies. By introducing the knowledge-catcher as a mediating device, the agency of the format through which knowledge is created, is brought to the fore. The knowledge-catcher serves to foreground the performativity and relationality

of knowledge creation. It creates links in time and space, connecting readers, writers, and paper in a collaborative performance of alternative knowledge forms, mobilizing emotional and aesthetic elements and bringing into play the situatedness of the reader as well as the writers. It is furthermore a device for performative reading; it choreographs a non-linear reading practice and lets the interests and emotions of the reader guide the experience.⁴⁹

Integrating performance and research makes it possible to develop new hybrid knowledge forms. This implies integrating and working with multiple forms of knowing: papers *and* performances, written scholarship *and* creative work, practice *and* theory, artistry *and* analytics. Hybrid forms such as performative writing and reading expand the knowledge performances of academia. Fusing the scholarly and the artistic makes it possible to redefine scholarly form: performing knowledge in new ways and creating new forms of knowledge. Basing an understanding and development of hybrid knowledge performances on *process* may yield new ways of evaluating research, for example, by including aesthetic sensibilities and emotions in assessments of the value of scholarly work.

With and by this paper, the authors have staged patterns of interaction; we have choreographed the circumstances and modes of engagement offered to the reader, who then becomes co-creator of the performance. To overcome the stasis of the academic paper, which closes in on itself in a one-dimensional temporality, we have asked for the contribution of the reader to re-activate the staging of actions, to re-create a transient, sensuous engagement with situational aesthetics. A point of this re-creation is its non-repetitive character. Each re-creation is a new enactment, mediation, and translation—betrayal is inherent. Did you cheat and lift all the flaps at once? Or, did you resist the script and read the article chronologically?

We have foregrounded not only ourselves but also the article itself, as actors *co-present* alongside readers in the co-creation of knowledge through performance.

¹ “Cootiecatchers”, <https://www.downloadablecootiecatchers.wordpress.com>, accessed Nov. 14, 2019.

² Dwight Conquergood, “Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research”, *TDR: The MIT Press*. 46(2) (2002): 146.

³ *Ibid.*, 147.

⁴ Ronald J. Pelias, *Performance, An Alphabet of Performative Writing* Oxfordshire: Taylor and Francis, 2014: 11.

- 5 Ibid., 12.
- 6 Nina Lykke, Randi Markussen and Finn Olesen, "There are always more things going on than you thought! Methodologies as thinking technologies: Interview with Donna Haraway," *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning*, 9, no. 4 (2000): 55.
- 7 Bruno Latour, "The Berlin Key or How to Do Words with Things", *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture*, edited by P.M. Graves-Brown, London: Routledge, 1991:10-21.
- 8 Annemarie Mol, "Ontological Politics: A Word and Some Questions", in *Actor Network Theory and After*, Blackwell and the Sociological Review edited by John Law and John Hassard, Oxford and Keele: Blackwell, 1999: 74–89.
- 9 Steven Shapin, "Pump and Circumstance: Robert Boyle's Literary Technology" *Social Studies of Science*, 14, (1984): 481-520.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Connie Svabo, "Performative Schizoid Method: Performance as Research" *PARtake: The Journal of Performance as Research*, 1 no. 1 (2016):7.
- 12 Karen Barad, 'Intra-actions': an interview with Karen Barad by Adam Kleinman. *Mousse*, 34, (2012): 76–81, and Julie Bønnelycke. *Have Fun Living Healthily! An ethnological study of museums promoting health*. University & Steno Diabetes Center Copenhagen, 2018.
- 13 John Law, *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, London: Routledge, 2004., and John Law 'Traduction/Trahison: Notes on ANT', published by the Centre for Science. Studies, Lancaster University, Lancaster, 2003.
- 14 Steven Brown, "Michel Serres: Science, translation and the logic of the parasite". *Theory. Culture & Society*. 19:(2002) 1-27.
- 15 Francisco S. N. Lobo, "Wormhole Basics" in *Wormholes, Warp Drives and Energy Conditions*, Fundamental Theories of Physics, vol 189, edited by Francisco S. N. Lobo, Cham: Springer, 2017: 11-33.
- 16 Steven Brown, "Michel Serres: Science, translation and the logic of the parasite." *Theory. Culture & Society*. (2002) 1-27.
- 17 Charis Cussins, "Ontological Choreography: Agency through Objectification in Infertility Clinics". *Social Studies of Science*, 26(3) (1996): 575-610.
- 18 Astrid Jespersen, Julie Bønnelycke and Hanne Hellerup Eriksen. "Careful science? Bodywork and care practices in randomised clinical trials". *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 36 (5)(2014): 655–669.
- 19 Bruno Latour, "Technology is Society made Durable" In *A Sociology of Monsters Essays on Power, Technology and Domination*, edited by J. Law, London: Sociological Review Monograph No 38: (1991), 103-132. and Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar. *Laboratory Life. The Construction of Scientific Facts*. New York: Sage Publications, 1976.
- 20 Annemarie Mol, "Ontological Politics: A Word and Some Questions" *The Sociological Review* 47 no.1: 74–89 and Annemarie Mol and John Law. "Complexities: An Introduction" in *Complexities. Social studies of knowledge practices*, edited by Mol, Annemarie and John Law, 1-22, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.
- 21 Michel Serres, *Genesis*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995/1982:2.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Annemarie Mol, "Ontological Politics: A Word and Some Questions" *The Sociological Review* 47 no.1: 74–89.

- 24 John Law, and John Urry, "Enacting the Social." *Economy and Society*. 33(3) (2004): 390-410.
- 25 Amic G. Ho & Kin Wai Michael G. Siu) "Emotion Design, Emotional Design, Emotionalize Design: A Review on Their Relationships from a New Perspective," *The Design Journal*, 15:1 (2012): 15
- 26 Gramsci (1971) 418, quoted in Dwight Conquergood, "Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research" *TDR: The MIT Press*. 46(2), (2002): 145-156.
- 27 James Clifford and George E. Marcus. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography: a School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. University of California Press, 1986.
- 28 Della Pollock. "Performing Writing". In: Phelan, Peggy & Lane, Jill (eds.). *The ends of performance*, (New York University Press, 1998), 73-103.
- 29 Ronald J. Pelias, Ronald J. "Writing into position: Strategies for composition and evaluation." *Writing Performance, Identity, and Everyday Life*. (Routledge, 2018), 73-91.
- 30 D. Soyini Madison. "It's Time to Write: Writing as Performance". In: *Critical Ethnography: Method, Ethics, and Performance*. (SAGE publications, Thousand Oaks, 2005).
- 31 Owen B. Chapman, and Kim Sawchuk. "Research-creation: Intervention, analysis and family resemblances". *Canadian Journal of Communication* 37.1 (2012).
- 32 Patricia Leavy. *Method Meets Art: Arts-based Research Practice*. (Guilford Publications, 2009).
- 33 Carolyn Ellis and Arthur Bochner. *Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity: Researcher as Subject*. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (2000).
- 34 Czarniawska, Barbara. *Narratives in Social Science Research*. (2004).
- 35 John Law, *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004).
- 36 Celia Lury and Nina Wakeford, *Inventive Methods: The Happening of the Social* (Oxon: Routledge, 2012).
- 37 Nigel Thrift, *Non-representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect* (London: Routledge, 2008), 2. Phillip Vannini, "Non-representational Research Methodologies: An Introduction," in *Non-representational Methodologies: Re-envisioning Research*, ed. Phillip Vannini (New York and London: Routledge, 2015), 5.
- 38 Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks, *Theatre/Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 2001).
- 39 Connie Svabo. "Performative Schizoid Method: Performance as Research." In *PARtake: The Journal of Performance as Research*, 1(1), 1-21. (2016) and Michael Shanks and Connie Svabo, "Scholartistry: Incorporating Scholarship and Art." in *Journal of Problem Based Learning in Higher Education*, 6(1). (2018). <https://doi.org/10.5278/ojs.jpblhe.v6i1.1957>
- 40 Conquergood, "Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research" 145-156. & Pelias, *Performance, An Alphabet of Performative Writing*.
- 41 Bruno Latour and Alben Yaneva. "Give Me a Gun and I Will Make All Buildings Move: An ANT's View of Architecture." Essay, 2008. Accessible online at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237749787_Give_me_a_gun_and_I_will_make_all_buildings_move_an_ANT's_view_of_architecture

- 42 Connie Svabo. *Does it spark joy?* Paper presented at NORDES Conference, Espoo: Aalto University, 2019: 1-18.
<https://archive.nordes.org/index.php/n13/article/view/464/435>
- 43 Yuriko Saito 2007. "The moral dimension of Japanese aesthetics" In *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 65(1): Vol. 65, No. 1, Special Issue: Global Theories of the Arts and Aesthetics (Winter, 2007): 85-97, 85
- 44 Saito, "The moral dimension of Japanese aesthetics": 85.
- 45 Saito, 86.
- 46 Karen Barad. Meeting the universe halfway : quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. (Duke University Press, 2007). Andrew Pickering. *The Cybernetic Brain: Sketches of Another Future*. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 2010). Jon McKenzie, *Perform or Else: From Discipline to Performance*, (New York: Routledge, 2001). Mary M. Gergen and Kenneth J. Gergen, *Playing with Purpose: Adventures in Performative Social Science* (California: Left Coast Press, 2012).
- 47 Pelias, "Performance, An Alphabet of Performative Writing".
- 48 Fels, Lynn. "Catching my breath: In full flight over the prairies". *Emotion, Space and Society*, 11,(2014): 52-60.
- 49 Norman K Denzin: *Performance Ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture*. Sage Publications, 2003:94