Abstract

Over the past decades, there has been an increase in discourses around the comparative appropriateness of various research methodologies for benefitting the real life problems of society, including interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary methodological considerations; fragmentation of knowledge domains in ever-expanding fields; practice-as-research and the creative practitioner; big, co-owned and open data; and non-linear collaborative methods for producing knowledge.

Due to ever-expanding subject domains, it has been pointed out (Sperber 2005) that “current disciplinary system may be becoming brittle” and that we are in need of a new postmodern acceptance of fragmented but self-organising areas of knowledge (see Moran 2010). Curation of new knowledge thus becomes an important part within the impact debate, as it becomes increasingly difficult for a public outside of academia to make sense of deep but fragmented areas of knowledge after they have been created. There is a renewed call for public/academia interaction where the engagement with innovation is designed into the research process, knowledge co-produced and co-owned, impact built into research processes right from the start. Quadruple helix systems (Carayannis 2012) and Open Innovation 2.0 have arrived with its concepts of ecosystems, mash-ups, quadruple helixes partnerships, orchestration, curation, and value constellations (Curley, Salmelin 2015).

In the UK, these discourses and their related methodologies have been given a new momentum with the impact agendas of the last REF (Research Excellence Framework). Simultaneously, the last REF could be seen as a collection of quality assessment methods that, collectively, have an inbuilt tension between, on the one hand, a more traditional, linear knowledge production culture – a mode 1 knowledge production model - and on the other, an impact driven, non-linear mode that values socially-distributed knowledge more than discovery – a mode 2 knowledge production model (Gibbons 1994).

Simultaneously and specifically within the arts, there has been an increasing momentum in and a public appetite for process (rather than product), and the 20th century saw the increase in meta-discourses. But one might say that the 21st century has seen a new phenomenological arrival with what Pierre Luigi Sacco (2015) has labeled as Culture 3.0, characterized as using
open platforms, often being democratic, using value creation, ubiquitously available production tools and individuals constantly shifting and renegotiating their roles between producing and consuming content. Sacco furthermore suggests that Europe is hung up on Culture 1.0, characterized by a distinction of high-brow vs low-brow, arts patronage, gatekeepers and value absorption.

This presentation will attempt to contextualize these concepts (Open Innovation 2.0, Culture 3.0, Quadruple Helix Systems) as part of the need by society to create curated interfaces between new knowledge and society. These interfaces are often perceived as mash-ups, with various boundaries being constantly in flux, be it disciplinary boundaries, boundaries between a public and academia, multi-professional working practices, production and creation, or process and product. The intentional act of curation can be a sense-making creative act that allows the fog to clear. What will hopefully be left is a deeper understanding of the cultural relativity of arts-related practices and the roles that universities play to facilitate various cultural co-produced interfaces between arts and society.
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