

Cartography as a method for Artistic Research: a theoretical and conceptual proposition

Bibiana Bragagnolo
Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso (UFMT)

Abstract

The main goal of this article is to expose cartography as a potential method for Artistic Research and in confluence with the concept of declassification, based on a reflection on the methods currently used in the field and their implications. Based on the criticisms made to the most frequently used methodologies, we detected a need for methodological proposals that contemplate the primordial characteristics of Artistic Research. Thus, three questions are shown to be potentially relevant when proposing cartography as a possible method for Artistic Research: 1) Its procedural and non-representational characteristic; 2) The dissolution between the hard lines that separate subject and object, objectivity and subjectivity and theory and practice; and 3) Understanding research as an intervention in reality. Based on these three key points, the cartography method is presented as a possible path to Artistic Research.

Keywords: method; artistic research; research through art; declassification; cartography.

1. Methods and Artistic Research

In any type of scientific research, the method holds substantial importance. The term, arising from the combination of “1: *metá* (reflection, reasoning, truth) + *hódos* (path, direction)” (Passos; Barros, 2009, p. 17), shows that method is understood as a type of reasoning or reflection that leads to a certain path or direction. Thus, depending on “how” something is done, the results, materials, and the object of study itself will change, raising different types of questions and yielding different types of answers. In the case of a recent branch of research such as Artistic Research (AR), the question of method becomes even more determinant, mainly under two aspects. Firstly, there should be methodologies that enable a given research intent to be conducted—a field of research that arises as possibility but cannot demonstrate by itself how its questions shall be addressed can easily become unfruitful. Secondly, the type of method chosen defines the positioning of the research area and may cause it to align with different epistemic and ideological fields.

The reflections of this article will focus on the theoretical proposition of cartography as a possible method for AR¹, a type of research in art that can still be considered recent and lacking in-depth methodological discussions and scrutiny. Aiming to contribute to such discussions, this theoretical-conceptual article is based on the research and study of the selected theoretical framework, followed by a conceptual development. The research stage presented in this article is the theoretical basis for the proposition of the cartography method in alignment with the field of AR and the concept of declassification by Gutiérrez (2018).

Artistic Research arises from the intention to fill a gap in scientific knowledge in art: the absence of the artist's own voice as a creator. In it, the researcher and the artist come together as the artist-researcher character, in a process in which artistic practice as a creative process becomes the center of research questions and artistic production is taken as a constituent part of research and as production of intrinsic knowledge. Currently, Artistic Research involves many understandings, often contradictory; however, the artist-researcher character is a consensus regarding different understandings about what AR is and what characterizes it as a field (cf. Gil, 2022; Lopez-Cano; San Cristóbal, 2020; Correia; Dalagna, 2020 and 2019; Cook, 2018; Assis, 2018; Correia; Dalagna; Benetti; Monteiro, 2018; Dogantan-Dack, 2015a; Lopez-Cano; Opazo, 2014; Borgdorff, 2012; Coessens; Douglas; Crispim, 2009; Cobussen, 2002). AR is also identified by the inseparability between theory and practice and, consequently, by the relationship created between the artistic and academic results, which are products of such research.

From this brief explanation of what AR consists of, one can see that, as subject and in this context, method is a potentially touchy topic. The very notion of AR is something that challenges our scientific culture, accustomed to defining research by results that can be confidently transferred to other contexts (Coessens et al., 2009). Moreover, the combination of the roles of researcher and artist as an agent who investigates the artistic process itself questions the traditional dichotomous notions of subject and object, and objectivity and subjectivity. However, AR is justified insofar as it is the only possibility to truly investigate artistic creative processes and to enable a totally process-oriented approach. Thus, inherent in its very existence, "artistic research involves a deterritorialization of a research culture in the arts that is currently dominated by scientific, epistemic approaches" (Coessens et al., 2009, p. 99).

At the present time, approximately two decades after what is understood as the beginnings of AR, there is already a panorama to be observed. In a 2020 article, López-Cano

¹Although the focus of the discussion is Artistic Research, especially with emphasis and examples in the field of music, these reflections and propositions about the method can be applied to the more general field of performance research (and even more specifically in research through performance) or research in art (through art) and other artistic languages.

provides an analysis on the production and existence of Artistic Research in Latin America, but points out some common points to AR around the world. According to this author, among the topics most addressed in what he calls “formative artistic research,” which would be that produced in the graduate environment, those related to gesture and corporeality in instrumental interpretation, the systematic study of expressiveness in interpretation and reflection on collaborative work between composers and performers, professional preparation for recitals and concerts, and some aspects of identity and situated knowledge-creation stand out. Among the most used methodologies, similar to the rest of the world, experimentation and autoethnography are noteworthy (López-Cano, 2020, p. 155), and the experimental processes in this type of research are also commonly related to autoethnography.

A previous research effort mapped the AR production in Brazil in the last 10 years (Bragagnolo; Sanchez, 2022) and found that, among the 45 articles identified, the most mentioned research methodology was also autoethnography. These autoethnographic studies are directly connected with what is understood as “research through practice” or “practice-based research” (Dogantan-Dack, 2015a), in which some theoretical framework is applied to the practical performance situation, with the ultimate purpose of producing and/or improving the execution of certain work(s). Among the texts found in this categorization, research options are quite different, but all share the adoption of a method of observation of personal practice to verify the application of some protocol in instrumental practice, with varied purposes, but which converge, above all, for the technical and expressive improvement of instrumental execution. Corroborating the information brought from the analysis of the mapped materials, in July 2021, the first edition of the Autoetnografia Brasil² (Autoethnography Brazil) congress took place in Brazil, which brought together researchers from various areas, including the arts and, more specifically, musical performance, with interest in this method.

Coming from anthropology, the autoethnography method consists of a study of personal introspection, written in first person, which aims to shed light on the culture to which the subject belongs by cultural descriptions mediated through language, history and ethnographic explanation (Ellis; Bochner, 2000). One of the first uses of the term autoethnography dates back to 1975 and is owed to the anthropologist Karl Heider, who used it to designate the descriptions he made of his own culture, the Dani of New Guinea, a human group on which his studies were focused. In the current sense, it refers to research strategies that aim to systematically describe and analyze the researcher’s personal experience to understand some aspects of the culture, phenomenon, or event that belongs to them or in which they participate (Ellis; Bochner, 2000).

² More information at: <https://autoetnografia.weebly.com/>.

However, one should point out there is some difference between the use of autoethnographic practices in AR: in the artistic field, it focuses on the universe of meanings the researcher bears, which means that autoethnography in AR does not consider the researcher exclusively as a representative of a culture or phenomenon of which they are a part of, but focuses on themselves, on their personal motivations, artistic impulses, desires and, in a very special way, on their own task (Lopez-Cano; Opazo, 2014). It is nonetheless evident that, due to the artist being culturally and socially situated, these two spheres will be reflected in their autoethnographic practice.

The use of the autoethnography method can bring interesting results and be adapted to the assumptions of AR, however, Chiantore (2020a) and López-Cano (2020), when talking about the centrality of the autoethnographic method in AR in European and Latin American contexts present some points of criticism. The first author states that autoethnography “has become the fetish word of artistic research, in name of which the most diverse texts began to flourish (as, in fact, the definitions of the concept and its proposals for application to the framework of artistic research were diverse)” (Chiantore, 2020a, p. 75). This author also notes that the use of autoethnography in AR is often sterile. López-Cano, likewise, criticizes the use of autoethnography, which, in many cases, is nothing more than “a mere transcription of work diaries that do not even construct defined questions or artistic research problems” (López-Cano, 2020, p. 142).

Assis, in an interview with López-Cano (2020), complements with a very critical position in view of the wide use of autoethnography and states that:

I think this is one of the big misunderstandings about artistic research, the idea that self-observation, self-analysis, or (even worst) self-evaluation of one’s artistic work can lead to valuable research results. I do not doubt that self-observation, self-reflection, and self-analysis might be useful for some individuals’ inner lives in some specific circumstances. What I profoundly doubt is that such self-referential exercises carry any form of universal knowledge that could contribute to further developments of artistic practices. Additionally, in autoethnographic research, we often see uncritical self-celebrations of the working methods of those doing them. [...] There are also doctoral programs that accept dissertations of composers writing about their own musical works for their own sake. This not only confuses the object and subject of research but implies the assumption that those works are “good” and deserve being the object of a doctoral reflection, a shameless assumption, to say the least. Completely different is to situate one’s artistic work critically, within a broader context or problem that the own practice tries to address. In such cases, the compositions might contribute to a wider discourse, providing processes or solutions that might have some more universal interest. And in such—more interesting—cases one moves away from autoethnography. Thus, autoethnography is something that artistic research should avoid at any cost. (Assis; López-Cano, 2020, p. 177).

Thus, it is perceived that the use of autoethnography in AR, especially its frivolous use, can end up masking research without clear objectives (whether academic or artistic) and potentially self-centered studies, contributing to a wrong understanding of the area and its weakening.

One must mention that, among the autoethnographic works found in the mapping of production in Brazil (Bragagnolo; Sanchez, 2022), some studies configure analyses for performance. In these cases, some analytical procedure is applied in a given piece and, from that, interpretive decisions are made. Chiantore (2020a) also mentions, in the European context, the existence of studies understood as AR and that carry out what the author calls “performative analysis.” However, the author postulates that, from the chosen theoretical framework, such analyses of performance can have quite different meanings and can often be reduced “to a simple umbrella for a verbal description of our interpretive decisions” (Chiantore, 2020a, p. 75), going against the very assumptions of Artistic Research.

Regarding the works that clearly propose to reflect on the AR methods, we have as main reference the book “Investigación artística en música: Problemas, métodos, experiencias y modelos” (Artistic investigation in music: Problems, methods, experiences and models) (López-Cano; Opazo, 2014). This book, written in a clear and didactic way, brings 3 chapters dedicated to methodological strategies to find and exemplify ways to perform AR, having an entire section dedicated to autoethnography. As it is an easily readable material and written in Spanish, López-Cano and Opazo’s book appears as one of the most used references in AR research found in Brazil in the last ten years (Bragagnolo; Sanchez, 2022). However, the whole book refers to examples of research that, in Brazil, correspond to undergraduate thesis, which are often the first contact of the student/artist with the scientific universe. Thus, despite the positive and didactic aspect of this material, it does not present itself as an in-depth reflection on the alignment between the method and the AR assumptions themselves.

Given this panorama about AR and the methods it uses, the need for investigations that address the subject in this type of research comes to light, especially beyond the autoethnographic perspective. The confluence between the roles of researcher and artist, as well as the entrenchment between theory and practice, make AR a field that requires methodologies that meet its own particularities so that the uniqueness of the type of knowledge it provides can really be perceived, at the same time that it is constituted under solid bases that position it as academic research. Thus, the very existence of AR, as previously mentioned, challenges the traditional methods of modern science, making it necessary to reflect on the theme.

2. Artistic Research as a Critical Practice

Complementing the discussion above, some branches consider that the artist must adopt a critical position that characterizes AR, such as the studies of Dogantan-Dack (2015b), Assis (2018), Gil (2022) and Nogueira (2022). This means the performer actively and creatively confronts their artistic objects. In the case of music, this means that the musical work itself ceases to exist as an ideal object and becomes understood as an event, moving from an essentialist and metaphysical sphere to a concrete existence. This theme adds more layers to

the question of the method in AR since it becomes, in this case, a practice that presupposes intervention.

In this type of AR, in which there is a positioning where the performer appears beyond the creator of their musical and instrumental activities, but as a reflective being in constant questioning of the epistemological dimensions of their practice and role in the world, different authors have used different types of theoretical references to build their understandings and direct their practices. However, many of them refer to post-structuralist philosophical conceptions, such as Assis (2018), who uses the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari as a basis, Chiantore (2017), who relies on the reference of the declassification of Gutiérrez and Cobussen (2002), which aligns with Derrida.

In previous articles (Bragagnolo, 2021a and 2021b), a conception of AR was aligned to this aspect through the use of the theoretical framework of declassification (Gutiérrez, 2009, 2018, 2020). The more in-depth reflection derived from these previous works will guide the next section, which succinctly resumes the basic concepts of declassification to then position it as a guiding perspective for reflections on the use of the cartography method in AR.

2.1 On declassification (and Artistic Research)

Classification is an act inherent to human beings, since it is the way in which we know ourselves and the world around us. By organizing the universe that surrounds us, we create categories and classifications to grasp the complexity of reality. Conceptually, Gutiérrez states that “we will understand classification as a general and simultaneously specialized logical operation that consists of dismembering and representing a supposed external world in universal concepts, hierarchizing them according to the established logic and returning a result to the same external world from which, in reality, they never came” (Gutiérrez, 2018, p. 33). Thus, the relationship of classification with categorization procedures is exposed, which always occur from a dominant logic.

When we enter the field of music, especially that of Western classical music, we notice the presence of classificatory processes that organize it. According to Chiantore, the very fact that we speak of a classical or erudite music, for example, is already a product of an “immutable classificatory trinity” (2020b, p. 14) that consists of defining, dividing and hierarchizing, since “if there is a classical music it is because others are not, and such a distribution is not limited to talking about possible differences, but of a precise hierarchy: this label was conceived from a principle to identify a music that was considered superior to others” (Chiantore, 2020b, p. 14). This organized music is disciplined to maintain its *status quo*.

The hegemonic musical knowledge of the so-called classical music is often caught reproducing as universal knowledge what is, in fact, situated. Such knowledge is reproduced in the gears of musical teaching and also in the production of knowledge, through institutions

such as conservatories, music schools and universities, in which classical music is predominantly found and the basis for musical teaching (Penna; Sobreira, 2020; Monteiro; Soares, 2020; Chiantore, 2017; Leech-Wilkinson, 2016). This also highlights the presence of colonial/colonizing elements in the musical universe (involving educational institutions, pedagogical and artistic practices), which have even been sources of many debates in recent years (cf. Cohon; Sanchez; Del Pino, 2020).

Within this musical universe, through traditional classification, several types of knowledge become absent due to the existence of metonymic logic, which confuses the part with the whole (Santos, 2002). Exemplifying this logic in this context, one can cite the understanding that the history of Western music is taken as the history of official music, leaving a world of other pieces of knowledge absent and invisible. One may also mention the absence of Black and female composers among the canonical repertoire, reflecting the existence of the classificatory processes put forward by Gutiérrez (cf. Bragagnolo, 2021a) and demonstrating that the very existence of a canon reproduces in itself the aforementioned metonymic logic.

Just as knowledge goes through this process of classification, our own identities are also shaped by it. This identity, fruit of the classificatory process, domesticates the individual, especially his external behavior, and it is in relation to it that we must remain attentive and vigilant. The capitalist mode of production maintains a direct relationship with this understanding of identity, as it “sponsored individualism distinguished between subjects who, no matter how much they consume, will never cease to be mass and meek” (Gutiérrez, 2009, p. 28). Under the false perspective of individuality, this excessive identity (fruit of the process of knowledge classification) maintains the illusion of choice, while perpetuating hegemonic and dominant patterns. Thus, Gutiérrez proposes the rebuttal to this type of identity,

which proceeds from the authoritarian and unquestionable discourses that are generated around individuals already at the moment they open their eyes to life and is inoculated through family, school, group, community, social, national, state, global education processes, without remnant or space for individual development and divergence. (Gutiérrez, 2009, p. 13).

In the 2021 research (Bragagnolo, 2021b), one may see in more detail how such classification processes act directly in the identity of musical performers and, therefore, in their artistic practices.

After briefly denouncing the problems arising from the classification and understanding the risk of increasing classification by all its branches until creative dissection (Gutiérrez, 2020, p. 33), we present declassification, consisting of an epistemological strategy of reflection and action on the classification. Starting from the critique of the elements of classified thought, measures are proposed that glimpse logical pluralism and aim to combat dogmatic thinking installed in the imperceptible structures of everyday normality.

One must emphasize that the concepts of classification and declassification do not maintain an antagonistic, dichotomous relationship. The opposite of classifying would consist of not classifying, albeit declassification always implies reclassifying with other logics and objectives: “The condition of the new declassified series would be the integration of logical pluralism and revisability in their configurations, including incorporating the traditional hierarchies of classification in an explicitly subaltern and secondary way (Gutiérrez, 2018, p. 22). While classifying divides and separates, declassifying aggregates and gathers, revealing knowledge rather than hiding it.

In addition to the applicability of declassification in knowledge itself, Gutiérrez proposes that it would be possible to elaborate an emancipatory thought about our own identities, suggesting that we can “liberate ourselves from some processes of belonging and embrace others [...] The escape from identity begins with planning the escape” (Gutiérrez, 2009, p. 39). In this sense, the very awareness of the marks that delimit our identities by itself already functions as a tool of possible liberation. The musical performer, from the moment they perceive themselves in the middle of an ultra-classified system, combined with a knowledge that is Eurocentric, elitist, sexist and temporally situated, can make choices. The simple perception of oneself as being socially and historically situated is an opening to declassification processes.

Declassified thinking does not consist of the extinction of identity, but of the reflection on its presuppositions. In Mendes' words, he “intends to make the ‘I’ a vector of solidarity, so that, when projected on the world, it does not imply violence and oppression towards the ‘other’” (Mendes, 2016, p. 59). To declassify is, therefore, to admit the possibility of exchange, building more sensitive relationships. Difference would thus constitute an essential part of identity and, instead of valuing ideas of homogenization and adequacy, heterogeneity and pluralism would emerge as central values which, in artistic practice, could allow new worlds and artistic possibilities to emerge.

The use of declassifying apparatuses in AR were the subject of the previous works already mentioned (Bragagnolo, 2021a, 2021b), which proposed some declassification strategies to be applied. As a subsequent step to these previous works, and given the criticisms brought to the methods currently used in AR, one should reflect on this last theme in a more in-depth way and in the light of the concepts presented here. Considering the very nature of the AR, in connection with this specific conception related the concept of declassification, the perspective of it emerges as a practice with deep alignments with cartography, especially considering three fundamental aspects of AR: 1) Its procedural and non-representational characteristic; 2) The dissolution between the hard lines that separate subject and object, objectivity and subjectivity, and theory and practice; and 3) The understanding of research as an intervention in reality.

From these three focal points, in the following section the method of cartography is presented, always in dialogue with the declassification, and developed as a possibility of path to Artistic Research.

3. Some cartography clues for/in Artistic Research

The method of cartography is described broadly in two central books on the subject: “Pistas do método da cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade” (Clues to the method of cartography: research intervention and production of subjectivity) (Passos; Kastrup; Escóssia, 2009) and “Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum” (Clues to the method of cartography: the experience of research and the common plan) (Passos; Kastrup; Tedesco, 2014), in which the authors present it from eight “clues” in each of the two volumes. The focus of the look and application of the method, despite being psychology, makes clear the openness and possibility of using it in other areas of knowledge and in different research practices.

The initial questions that led the authors to the “why” of the proposition of cartography as a method start from concerns such as: “How to name the strategies employed in research, when they do not fit well into the model of modern science, which recommends methods of representation of pre-existing objects? How to find a method of investigation that is in tune with the procedural character of the investigation?” (Passos; Kastrup; Escóssia, 2009, p. 9). With these first questions raised, it is clear they are also pertinent to the universe of AR, which arises from the focus on an artistic process.

Originally formulated by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, the cartography method was understood as a path that helps us in the study of subjectivity, given some of its characteristics (Kastrup; Barros, 2009). The principle of cartography (presented together with decalcomania) comes from the introduction of “A Thousand Plateaus” and consists of the fact that “a rhizome cannot be justified by any structural or generative model” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 20), which puts it in direct connection with the authors’ concept of rhizome and positions it contrary to any essentialist notion.

Cartography does not appear as a ready-made method, nor as a set of rules to be applied. It is proposed as a research-intervention method, which presupposes a non-prescriptive orientation of the researcher’s work, without ready rules nor previously established objectives. The great challenge of the method is precisely to reverse the traditional sense of method: “no longer a walk to achieve prefixed goals (methods), but the primacy of walking that traces, along the way, its goals” (Passos; Barros, 2009, p. 17).

The cartography clues proposed by the authors serve to guide the cartographer and are references that contribute to the maintenance of an attitude of openness to what is being produced and calibration of walking in the very course of research. Thus, mapping

presupposes dealing with goals in constant variation, or, in other words, “entering the field without knowing the target to be pursued” (Kastrup, 2009, p. 40), considering that the most important for the cartographer are the signs of processuality.

The natural movement of science itself, which makes and remakes its utterances and creates new research problems, makes the reformulation of traditional research methods necessary from time to time, as in the already addressed case of AR. The proposal of the cartography method also emerges in this context as capable of making the research encompass more than what is encompassed through the traditional methods of positivist science. Thus, unlike the method of modern science, cartography does not seek to “isolate the object from its historical articulations or its connections with the world. On the contrary, the objective of cartography is precisely to draw the network of forces to which the object or phenomenon in question is connected, accounting for its modulations and its permanent movement” (Barros; Kastrup, 2009, p. 57).

Having carried out this brief introduction and contextualization on the cartography method, in the next topics we will focus on the three issues previously raised (the procedural and non-representational characteristic of AR; the dissolution between the hard lines that separate subject and object, objectivity and subjectivity, and theory and practice; and the understanding of research as an intervention in reality), aiming to propose cartography as a possible method for AR and in alignment with the concept of declassification.

3.1 Monitoring the processes

Artistic Research is a type of investigation in art that does not simply analyze objects or artistic practices, but that assumes the state of being of the work of art not as an object, but rather as an experience (Coessens et al., 2009). In the musical sphere, disciplines such as musicology, musical analysis, aesthetics and even some research in interpretive practices mainly contemplate the representational aspect, in which the object of study is a practice or artistic object in its crystallized form (through a score or a recording, for example). Differently, AR focuses on the understanding of work as a process, and it is itself that directs both the research question and the practices and possible artistic and textual results.

Cartography, in turn, also proposes the monitoring of processes, and not the representation of objects. “Understanding, for the cartographer, has nothing to do with explaining, let alone revealing. For them, there is nothing above—heavens or transcendence—nor below—mists of essence. What is above, below and on all sides are intensities seeking expression” (Rolnik, 2007, p. 66). This quote from Rolnik indicates the passage from an essentialist positioning and worldview to a procedural one.

In the same vein, declassification assumes an openly anti-essentialist and non-representational role. Gutiérrez criticizes the invention of the essence, through which

“classification systems based on exclusion, in the greater or lesser degree of analogy and approximation with the ontological canon, in the selection and location in an increasing or decreasing sense, according to the degree of ownership of things and beings, are developed, to a multitude of ridiculous and particular patterns with universal ambition” (Gutiérrez, 2020, p. 74).

The same criticism is made by Deleuze, when he states that “the poisoned present of Platonism was the introduction of transcendence into philosophy” (1997, p. 137), alluding to essence as an ideal category. As the division of categories is an arbitrary logic, the existing materials in the world would need to fit together, often forcing definitions to ensure that the “exception” or discrepancy is conformed/absorbed by the rule of totality, creating an environment of adjustments.

Hegemonic views, which encompass consensus and common sense, are thus understood as not, in fact, being so common, since they are made from a point of view that operates by annulling and excluding differences (or only including them through a comparative operation that deprives them of their uniqueness) (Passos; Eirado, 2009). Gutiérrez thus brings that, as a result of this process of hegemonization, we live oblivious to the rich reserves of differences and plurality made invisible by classification (2018). In this way, it seems to common sense that what it excludes simply does not exist, forming a whole universe of absent knowledge and practices.

Thus, it is worth mentioning that the researcher’s view focused exclusively on the plan of the instituted forms ends up revealing an insufficiency, since it leaves out of the research an integral part of the object investigated. Things and states of affairs, which are present on the plane of forms, are not fixed realities, but rather temporal cutouts, or freezes, of a process and thus correspond to certain specific moments or phases. Consequently, this type of investigation takes certain moments of the process, characterized by a certain slowness, as stoppages and interprets them as universal constancy that which would correspond only to a phase of a larger process (Kastrup; Tedesco; Passos, 2008).

Traditional methods usually work with purified objects through controlled practices in a laboratory situation, which leads to the investigation of these objects regardless of their history and their numerous connections to the world. However, when we move away from this model of knowledge, the objects of the world, without having a fixed nature or bearing invariance, open themselves to variation and are in a constant transformation.

Restricted to the dimension of forms, traditional research methodologies fail to grasp the most genuine mark of reality, its continuous process of creation. The challenge of cartography is precisely the investigation of these forms, however, inseparable from their procedural dimension, that is, “from the collective plane of the moving forces” (Escóssia; Tedesco, 2009, p. 99). Thus, classifications, hierarchies, dichotomies, forms and figures need to disappear,

even for a moment, for bodies to be exposed in their most intensive state of variation, that is, as pure qualities not yet reduced to the categories of representation.

In the specific case of musical practices, the traditional concept of musical work refers to an understanding that is essentialist and that locates the work prior to its own existence, leading to representational study perspectives. In this regard, Assis states that:

The way one defines what counts as a work establishes profound constraints on what is considered as acceptable and unacceptable, as possible and impossible, what is allowed and what is forbidden, thus providing the musical market with precise instruments of survey and control. Therefore, ontological judgements, which are a priori judgements, do have empirical consequences—at least in the empirical world of music performance. (Assis, 2018, p. 45).

This highlights the idea that the adoption of a conception focused on the representational world also has relevant consequences on artistic practices, restricting their possibilities, as has been deeply discussed in previous research (Bragagnolo, 2021a).

In an attempt to fit the research into a general classification, there seems to be, from the beginning, a world ready to be investigated, which is supposed to be substantial and ideally isolated. The research activity becomes the measurement (interpretation) of the correspondence and reliability of the research products to the researcher's expectation: "objects and subjects are torn from their procedurality" (César; Silva; Bicalho, 2014, p. 171). In the case of art research, or more specifically AR, this adaptation to a classified and ready universe ends up significantly restricting the possibilities of artistic expansion and, thus, the artistic results themselves.

The cartographic method involves an expanded conception of knowledge, which is no longer restricted to the description and/or classification of the formal contours of the objects of the classified world. It is about including the multiple lines or vectors of the rhizome (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995), so that the understanding of a complex and plural reality can emerge. What is privileged is the monitoring of the lines of force that make up the experience, privileging not a state of affairs, but mainly what is in the process of being (Passos; Barros, 2009). This conception connects directly with what Gutiérrez understands and names declassification, which would precisely aim to build a new place of enunciation, which would be critical (and self-critical), metacognitive, self-vigilant, de-stereotyped, beyond the dichotomous, dehierarchized, transverse, plural, decolonized, flexible, revisable and, in short, declassified (Gutiérrez, 2018).

Regarding AR, its very nature leads to a type of research in which the analysis of pre-existing objects is insufficient. Considering that AR is focused on the process, the path is as or more relevant than the final object, connecting it directly with the assumptions of the cartography method. The attention of the artist-researcher, the cartographer, or the subject attentive to the declassification processes necessarily accesses elements of the process itself,

leading to the composition of cartographies in which “the knowledge that is produced does not result from the representation of a preexisting reality” (Kastrup, 2009, p. 49), but arises as a composition.

In short, knowledge is understood as the production of reality and research as a plunge into the plane of experience in which the self and the world emerge, the one who knows and the one which is known. And in this way, two important statements arise about the work processes in cartographic research (Barros; Silva, 2014), which lead to the questioning of some dichotomies that emerge with traditional methods. The first statement poses that cartography takes procedural activity as a phenomenon to be investigated, leading to the questioning of the separation between theory and practice in the research process. The second postulates that the activity of the cartographer themselves must be analyzed in the process, since the research activity produces the researcher and the field, indicating a questioning of the oppositions between subject and object and subjectivity and objectivity. These points lead us to the next topic of the explanation.

3.2 Dichotomies

An important criticism within the context addressed in the previous topic consists of that already made to metonymic reason (Santos, 2002), which denounces the problems caused by the need to classify reality into parts subordinated to totalities. Gutiérrez (2013) identifies the metonymic reason as the logic that rationally confuses the part with the whole, the genus with the species, and that makes us believe that observable objects and their systems of description are totalities that represent not our own world in a situated way, but the world itself and reality itself, which culminates in the homogenization of the whole.

At the heart of the metonymic reasoning are the dichotomies, which consist of the partition of a whole into two parts. However, this division into parts is never neutral and all dichotomies created by metonymic reason contain a hierarchy, as in scientific culture/literary culture; scientific knowledge/traditional knowledge; man/woman; culture/nature; civilized/primitive; capital/labor; white/black; North/South; West/East; and so on (Santos, 2002). According to Gutiérrez, thinking about the world in dichotomies does not produce knowledge, but produces, more specifically, dichotomous knowledge (2018) that, in addition to classifying, hierarchizes.

With regard to AR, positioned as an investigation of experience and process, there is no way to maintain the dichotomous attitude typical of traditional science towards objects, based on the belief that they exist regardless of our relationship with them. Thus, AR ends up questioning some of the traditional dichotomies of positivist science, such as: subject *versus* object, objectivity *versus* subjectivity, and theory *versus* practice. The look at experience modulates the entire research procedure, because it makes a participatory dimension appear in the constitution of objects (Barros; Barros, 2014).

Regarding the relationship between subject and object, in traditional third- and first-person methodologies there is always the imposition of a point of view capable of representing or signifying the object studied. They consist of discursive practices of talking about reality, which include the protagonism of the object, whether human or not, but which appears only as an “informant” or “data source” (Kastrup; Passos, 2014, p. 31). In a clearly classificatory process, it would be up to the researcher to separate, in the explanation, the agent and the environment, and then, in an abstract attitude, to reconstruct the connections. In the classical approach to science, it is assumed that science is that which can be reproduced with the same results and guaranteed by an observer exempt from the object of study. In this perspective, the researcher’s experience is excluded, and the knowledge produced is always about things and, never with them. However, the cognitive structures that allow us to know are concrete, embodied and alive, making it necessary to assume that these structures have a history and are situated temporally, socially and culturally (Varela, 2003).

Still in relation to the subject/object dichotomy, but now bringing up the issue of objectivity *versus* subjectivity, in traditional science anonymity appears as a tool that aims to guarantee the integrity of the participant and the legitimacy of their participation. By deleting the name, the participant is placed under the “no matter who” registry, placing abstract and generic subjects on the scene. According to Vinciane Despret (2011 *apud* Sade; Ferraz; Rocha, 2014), the anonymity of the object paradoxically creates an identity, since erasing the name creates the position of “subject” of the research as a passive target of the researcher’s actions.

These procedures that seek neutrality and anonymity allude to bureaucratic procedures, which Gutiérrez identifies as belonging to the ideology of regulation: “an ideology without apparent ideology” and which, therefore, ends up being taken in the classification process as transversal, neutral and objective, hiding its situated face (Gutiérrez, 2018, p. 38). In addition, the practices that guarantee a supposed objectivity end up putting on the scene alienated and disinterested subjects. This repression prevents, at the same time, that the anonymous subject of the research becomes, in fact, a participant, and that the disinterested researcher becomes someone involved in the process, interested in its effects (Sade; Ferraz; Rocha, 2014).

Cartography questions the naturalness of objects, subjects, knowledge, and the research process itself, as well as the relations that constitute a territory and its alleged homogeneity (Barros; Barros, 2014). Thus, it breaks with the logic of neutrality in research, and the object of a research is no longer taken as something that stands as an obstacle and that must therefore be dominated, controlled. The object of cartographic research, whether human or non-human, must be taken in its vicinity: to be next to the object and to be interested in its surroundings is the attitude of the cartographer. The object assumes its protagonism and loses its anonymity.

The cartographer throws themselves into the experience. Not being immune to it, they accompany the emergency processes, so that mapping is always composing with the existential territory, engaging in it, inhabiting the territory and cultivating an availability to experience (Alvarez; Passos, 2009). In this position of the cartographer there is a contraction that makes inseparable terms that are usually distinguished: “subject and object, researcher and field of research, theory and practice connect to the composition of the problematic field” (Alvarez; Passos, 2009, p. 137), which brings to the method a declassified aspect, while bringing to it a non-dichotomous conception.

Thus, cartography research is the cultivation of an existential territory in which the researcher and the researched meet, which confluences and encompasses the understanding of AR as the cultivation of an artistic territory, in which artist and artistic object relate, create frictions and transform each other from their various other connections with the world. The places that artistic research aims to investigate and illuminate are those of artistic practices and their inherent knowledge, understanding that places always imply a point of view and, here, the point of view is that of the artist (Coessens *et al.*, 2009).

In this sense, the experience of research or research as experience makes the subject and object of knowledge, researcher and researched, co-emerge. The assumption of the inseparable relationship between elements previously positioned as dichotomous leads us to an understanding of research as intervention, since the method of cartography does not oppose theory and practice, research and intervention, production of knowledge and production of reality (Alvarez; Passos, 2009). This imbrication between theory and practice in a consciously situated way leads us to the third topic of conceptual development.

3.3 Research as an intervention

From the moment that a research focus is assumed in the procedural scope and the suspension of unproductive dichotomies, as subject and object, objectivity and subjectivity, and theory and practice, we move to a research understanding that actually pays attention to maps, connected with rhizomes, which form a territory in which researcher and object are involved. At this moment, one must recognize and assume the research as an intervention.

Maturana and Varela state that “all doing is knowing, all knowing is doing” (1990). Knowing is not only representing the object or processing information about a supposedly already constituted world, but it presupposes involving oneself with the world, committing oneself to its production (Alvarez; Passos, 2009). Being in the field causes a mutual change between observer and observed, between artist-researcher and artistic object. The field of analysis is distinguished, but it does not separate itself from the field of intervention, always embodied in a concrete social situation. The analysis here is done without distancing, since

it is immersed in the collective experience in which everything and everyone is involved (Passos; Barros, 2009).

To intervene, then, is to make this plunge on the implicational plane in which the positions of those who know and what is known, of those who analyze and what is analyzed, are dissolved. Defending that all research is intervention requires the cartographer to dive into the plane of experience, “where knowing and doing become inseparable, preventing any claim to neutrality or even assumption of a subject and a knowing object prior to the relationship that binds them” (Passos; Barros, 2009, p. 30).

Understanding that knowing is doing, creating a reality of oneself and the world, one assumes that knowing then has political consequences. When we are no longer content with the mere representation of the object, “when we bet that all knowledge is a transformation of reality, the research process gains a complexity that makes us force the limits of our methodological procedures” (Passos; Barros, 2009, p. 30) and of our own classifications of the world.

It is true that other research methods presuppose a certain type of interference in the field, such as action research (Tripp, 2005), to name just one example. However, it is worth mentioning that assuming research as an intervention in the context of cartography provides for an increase in the coefficient of transversality, which means the connection of minority becomings, going beyond the hegemonic axes of organization. Thinking about AR, and aiming at a declassification process, the focus of research as an intervention requires a type of interference that proposes to escape the reproduction of canonical and uncritically reproduced artistic practices by the classification system.

In this perspective, all production of knowledge takes place from a position that implies us politically, understanding that politics is the form of human activity that, linked to power, puts subjects in relation, articulates them according to rules or norms and is also done in local arrangements, by microrelations (Passos; Barros, 2009). Then, we would acquire and transmit a consciousness of self-critical militancy, renouncing any attempt at neutrality and explicitly adopting positions of political, ecological and social commitment (Gutiérrez, 2018).

In this sense, in the understanding of Coessens *et al.*, the artist-researcher is neither a passive receiver who simply rearranges what already exists, nor a lonely and isolated creator who brings something totally new into existence (Coessens *et al.*, 2009). They act as an element inserted into a whole, this being the whole inner world and also the outer world, from which they cannot escape. Thus, in AR, in which the inseparability between theory and practice is a key point, a position of interference is assumed almost naturally, at least in view of the artistic objects that are created during the research processes. However, aligning it with the concepts of Gutiérrez, we assume the artist-researcher acts towards an intervention in favor of a declassified thought, oriented to logical pluralism, positioned as a critique of classificatory logic, whether in music, or in the world.

Taking cartography as a methodological direction, therefore, commits us to the production of cognitive politics. The concept of cognitive politics seeks to show that knowledge is not limited to the adoption of a theoretical-methodological model, but involves a position in relation to the world and to oneself, an attitude, an *ethos*. Thus, we note that cognitivism, and with it the assumptions of the representation model, is not only a theoretical problem, but a political problem (Passos; Kastrup; Escóssia, 2009).

By understanding art, artistic making, and the artist themselves as historically, socially and culturally situated elements, knowledge and our own research and performance practices can be transformed, revealing what we believe and seek in the world and assuming a commitment to disqualified thinking. In the words of Gutiérrez, “it is organizational innovation, and not merely technological innovation, that could generate an authentic democratization of the knowledge society” (2007, p. 114). Only through a change in the organization of knowledge, assuming it as a guiding principle of research as an intervention, is a social and political change towards full democratization possible.

The principle of research cartography as an intervention enables the artist-researcher to assume the work of art and the artistic making as a critical interface to reality (Betts, 2007), expanding, dissolving and creating fissures in the territorial margins that surround the artistic and creative processes. Thus, through a declassified intervention, many other maps can be drawn.

4. (Declassified) Artistic Research: using cartography as a method

After presenting the discussions listed in the previous item, which revealed the alignments and conceptual approximations between AR, declassification and cartography in some central points, the latter is evidenced as a potentially fruitful methodological possibility for AR, especially from the perspective adopted here. The positioning and commitment to declassification emerge as elements that can be associated with the cartographic method and that would act in the AR by paving the way for the exploration and development of marginal, border, and possibly decolonial artistic and research practices.

From the theoretical path taken, one can predict that there would be no sense in describing the method of cartography from a series of rules or as a set of predetermined procedures and protocols. The philosophical conception that supports cartography keeps it at a distance from the method as a booklet to be followed and established beforehand. The very use of the cartographic method is in fact in the process, more as a practice of self-surveillance and philosophical positioning before the research, the researcher, the investigated object, and the inhabited territory.

Therefore, traditional research tools (whether qualitative or quantitative) can be used from a cartographic perspective, considering that cartographic research, including the assembly of its instruments, is committed to access to experience, and not to description and

measurement (César; Silva; Bicalho, 2014). It presupposes, then, an overcoming of the dichotomous perspective between qualitative and quantitative methods. To put it another way, it is about distinguishing without separating the intensive plane of experience and the plane of forms. The quantitative and qualitative aspects in cartography make sense in the articulation with experience, in which the very intertwining of the two planes takes place. Cartography is in research what goes through access to experience, regardless of whether it is located in the traditional qualitative or quantitative dimension (César; Silva; Bicalho, 2014).

Therefore, autoethnography itself, for example, may be used within the cartographic method, or elements of this practice that serve the purposes of the research, as well as its combination with other methods that are considered relevant for the constitution of the map. However, its use would be conditioned to a cartographic, self-vigilant and self-critical application of itself and that would respond affirmatively to the validation questions that must be posted for a research that has the intention of constituting a cartography.

The validation of a cartographic research consists of evaluating its evaluations, that is, confirming or corroborating both the procedures and their effects as well as the guidelines with which the research is oriented. Validation, in this case, is to make a critical evaluation of the guidelines, asking about their origin and their interests, as well as making an evaluation of the research process (Passos; Kastrup, 2014). For this, some questions are essential: “Does research go beyond the forms constituted? Has the collective plan of moving forces been accessed?” (Passos; Kastrup, 2014, p. 205). Other questions are also proposed to be asked to the texts that accompany the research, in order to guarantee its cartographic aspect: “Does the narrative access the plan of forces of composition of the investigated “objects”? Is there any mention of open points? Riddles? Ambiguities? Do the different actors appear with their own perceptions and narratives? Is the text polyphonic in the sense of incorporating multiple voices and perspectives? Does the narrative express the disassembly of the identity form of the “object”? (Passos; Kastrup, 2014, p. 205). These questions aim at a careful observation in relation to the application of the cartography method itself.

In view of the declassifying position that is assumed in this conception of AR, cartography shows the possibility of a method capable of containing the habitation processes of an artistic territory, encompassing the singularities of artistic making and maintaining solid research bases, without limiting the inhabited territory.

5. Starting a map

This article had as main objective to expose the theoretical bases of the proposition of cartography as a potential method for AR. In view of the need and urgency to think about AR methodologies, perceived through the lack of texts on the subject and the criticisms brought to the use of autoethnography, which consists of the most commonly applied methodology, the

proposition of cartography as a method brings two main aspects. First, it includes the inherent characteristics of AR that are not compatible with the methods of traditional science, namely: its procedural aspect; the dissolution that AR predicts of the barriers between subject and object, subjectivity and objectivity, and theory and practice; and its character of intervention in reality. Secondly, cartography aligns with the assumptions of declassification brought by Gutiérrez, and may even be a possible method for any research that thinks of itself as declassified in these terms and, in the case of AR, allows it to act as an intervention practice to think about the world without being determined by conventional logic.

The conjunction between the method of cartography and the concept of declassification, for opposing the scientific method of positivist bias and the hegemonic classificatory universe, respectively, are also positioned as a possibility for decolonial developments. Since often artistic practices, especially in the academic environment, are part of this Eurocentric epistemic framework, the alignment between cartography and declassification has generative potential for new research practices, performance, and relations between them, in a more plural way and linked to decolonial thinking, a subject that will be deepened in future works.

The application of the cartography method has already been carried out in the artistic research project entitled “Aos olhos da areia”, which aims to investigate the ideas of order and disorder through the concept of declassification, applied in canonical works of the pianistic repertoire, with the purpose of expanding the territorial limits of these works and amplifying the interferences and the performer’s own role. In the experiments already carried out, the performer poses as a creative and critical agent, historically and socially situated, capable of proposing and defending artistic practices beyond the Eurocentric ones. The use of cartography in this project has been supported by some declassification strategies proposed by Gutiérrez (2018) and that, in line with the very assumptions of cartography, collaborate in the direction of research, artistic results and self-monitoring in relation to the application of the method, helping to answer the question “what classification does my thinking necessarily obey?” (Gutiérrez, 2020, p. 82) within the artistic scope. This use of the cartography method is ongoing and will be the subject of a subsequent article, which will act as a kind of practical application of the theoretical-conceptual path initiated and proposed here.

The path of cartography, presented in this article as an appropriate method for AR, primarily thought from music (which is the author’s main artistic language), also has wide possibilities of use in other areas of research in arts that propose to think in a post-structuralist way and away from traditional essentialist and generative views. In addition to AR, recent discussions on new ontological understandings of the musical work (cf. Assis, 2018; Costa, 2016), for example, have brought to light the need to think about methods that accompany such paradigm shifts in musicology and other branches and, in this sense, cartography also appears as a possibility to be explored in future research.

It is important to emphasize that the proposition presented here, as well as the change in perspective that it foresees, is not intended in any way to annul or replace the existence of traditional research methodologies that are constituted from a representational view of reality. The proposal is precisely the opposite, to enable the emergence of other understandings and, with this, to expand the plurality of possible methods and epistemes, opening room for the territories of art practices and research to be expanded.

In an attempt to propose a conclusive image, I bring a phrase by Gutiérrez that, speaking about the impossibility of a universal, static and timeless truth, conflates in itself meanings that allude to both declassification and cartography and AR, uniting these three spheres under the idea of the map that is built in progress and in process: “The only certainty is the way” (2018, p. 58). Thus, it is expected that this proposition of a theoretical-conceptual nature instigates walking and inspires the proliferation of different paths.

References

ALVAREZ, Johnny; PASSOS, Eduardo. Cartografa é habitar um território existencial. *In*: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.

ASSIS, Paulo de. *Logic of experimentation: Rethinking Music Performance through Artistic Research*. Ghent: Orpheus Institute, 2018.

ASSIS, Paulo de.; LÓPEZ-CANO, Rúben. Ruben López Cano interviews Paulo de Assis. *Resonancias*, v. 24, n. 46, p. 173-181, 2020.

BARROS, Laura Pozzana de; KASTRUP, Virgínia. Cartografar é acompanhar processos. *In*: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.

BARROS, Letícia Maria Renault de; BARROS, Maria Elizabeth Barros de. O problema da análise em pesquisa cartográfica. *In*: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; TEDESCO, S. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.

BARROS, Maria Elizabeth Barros de; SILVA, Fábio Hebert da. O trabalho do cartógrafo do ponto de vista da atividade. *In*: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; TEDESCO, S. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.

BETTS, Nancy. A Obra de Arte como Interface Crítica. *In*: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DA ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PESQUISADORES DE ARTES PLÁSTICAS, 16, 2007, Florianópolis. *Anais [...]*. Florianópolis: ANPAP, 2007. p 424-443.

BORGdorff, Henk. *The conflict of the faculties: Perspectives on Artistic Research and Academia*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2012.

BRAGAGNOLO, Bibiana. A identidade do performer musical: marcas e possibilidades de desclassificação. *Percursos*, Florianópolis, v. 22, p. 95-123, 2021b.

BRAGAGNOLO, BIBIANA. Práticas de desclassificação na performance musical: perspectivas emancipatórias para a Pesquisa Artística. *Revista Vórtex*, v. 9, p. 1-24, 2021a.

BRAGAGNOLO, Bibiana; SANCHEZ, Leonardo P. Pesquisa artística no Brasil: mapas, caminhos e trajetórias. *Orfeu*, Florianópolis, v. 7, n. 2, 2022.

- CÉSAR, Janaína Mariano; SILVA, Fábio Hebert da; BICALHO, Pedro Paulo Gastalho de. O lugar do quantitativo na pesquisa cartográfica. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; TEDESCO, S. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.
- CHIANTORE, Luca. Prólogo: La música de la desclasificación. In: GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. *A ojos de la arena: Ejercicios de desclasificación*. Madrid: ACCI ediciones, 2020b. p. 11-22.
- CHIANTORE, Luca. Retos y oportunidades en la investigación artística en música clásica. *Quodlibet*, Rioja, n. 74, p. 55-86, 2020a.
- CHIANTORE, Luca. Undisciplining music: Artistic research and historiographic activism. *Ímpar*, v. 1, n. 17, p. 3-21, 2017.
- COBUSSEN, Marcel. *Deconstruction in Music*. Tese de Doutorado, Department of Art and Culture Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands. 2002. Available at: <http://www.deconstruction-in-music.com/navbar/index.html>. Accessed: 15 set. 2018.
- COESSENS, Kathleen; CRISPIN, Darla; DOUGLAS, Anne. *The artistic turn: a manifesto*. Ghent, Leuven University Press, 2009.
- COHON, João Casimiro Kahil; SANCHEZ, Leonardo Pellegrim; DEL PINO, Ramón. (eds.). Dossiê: Música enquanto prática decolonial. *Proa*, v. 1, n. 10, 2020.
- COOK, Nicholas. *Music as creative practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- CORREIA, Jorge; DALAGNA, Gilvano. *Premises for Artistic Research*. Aveiro: UA Editora, 2019. (Cahiers of Artistic Research 2).
- CORREIA, Jorge; DALAGNA, Gilvano. *Premises for Artistic Research*. Aveiro: UA Editora, 2020. (Cahiers of Artistic Research 3).
- CORREIA, Jorge; DALAGNA, Gilvano; BENETTI, Alfonso; FRANCISCO, MONTEIRO. *When is research Artistic Research?* Aveiro: UA Editora, 2018. (Cahiers of Artistic Research 1).
- COSTA, Valério Fiel da. *Morfologia da obra aberta*. Curitiba, Prismas, 2016.
- DELEUZE, Gilles. Platão, os gregos. In: *Crítica e clínica*. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1997. p. 154-155.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. *Mil Platôs: Capitalismo e esquizofrenia*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1995.
- DOGANTAN-DACK, Mine (ed.). *Artistic Practice as Research in Music: Theory, Criticism, Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015a.
- DOGANTAN-DACK, Mine. Artistic Research in Classical Music Performance: Truth and Politics. *Parse Journal*, n. 1, p. 27-40, 2015b.
- ELLIS, Carolyn; BOCHNER, Arthur. Autoethnography, Personal Narrative and Personal Reflexivity. In: DEZIN, N.; LINCOLN, Y. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2000.
- ESCÓSSIA, Liliana da. TEDESCO, Sílvia. O coletivo de forças como plano de experiência cartográfica. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- GIL, Susana Castro. Transcrição, uma opção para a Pesquisa Artística e a reconfiguração ontológica de agências e entidades. In: BRAGAGNOLO, B.; DALTRO, E.; SANCHEZ, L. P. (org.). *Pesquisa artística: Performance, criação e cultura contemporânea*. Rio Branco: Stricto Sensu, 2022.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. *A ojos de la arena: Ejercicios de desclasificación*. Madrid: ACCI ediciones, 2020.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. *Desclasificados: pluralismo lógico y violencia de la clasificación*. Barcelona: Anthropos, 2007.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. *En pedazos: El sentido de la desclasificación*. Madrid: ACCI, 2018.
- GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. *La identidad excesiva*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2009.

- GUTIÉRREZ, Antonio García. La organización del conocimiento desde la perspectiva poscolonial. itinerarios de la paraconsistencia. *Perspectivas em Ciência da Informação*. v. 18, n. 4, 2013.
- KASTRUP, Virgínia. O funcionamento da atenção no trabalho do cartógrafo. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- KASTRUP, Virgínia; BARROS, Regina Benevides de. Movimentos-funções do dispositivo na prática da cartografia. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- KASTRUP, Virgínia; PASSOS, Eduardo. Cartografar é traçar um plano comum. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; TEDESCO, S. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.
- KASTRUP, Virgínia; TEDESCO, Silvia; PASSOS, Eduardo. *Políticas da cognição*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2008.
- LEECH-WILKINSON, Daniel. Classical music as enforced Utopia. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education*, v. 15, 2016.
- LÓPEZ-CANO, Rubén. La investigación artística en música en Latinoamérica. *Quodlibet*, n. 74, 2020.
- LÓPEZ-CANO, Rubén; OPAZO, Úrsula San Cristóbal. *Investigación artística en música: Problemas, métodos, experiencias y modelos*. Barcelona: Fondo para la Cultura y las Artes de México; Escola Superior de Música de Catalunya, 2014.
- LÓPEZ-CANO, Rubén; SAN CRISTÓBAL, Úrsula. Investigación artística en música: cuatro escenas y un modelo para la investigación formativa. *Quodlibet*, n. 74, 2020.
- MATURANA, Humberto.; VARELA, Francisco. *El árbol del conocimiento: las bases biológicas del conocimiento humano*. Madrid: Debate, 1990.
- MENDES, Miguel Soares Braz. *Jazz desclassificado: reflexões para a construção de narrativas musicais emancipatórias*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Música) – Departamento de Comunicação e Arte, Universidade de Aveiro, 2016.
- NOGUEIRA, Isabel. Criando mundos, tecendo encantamentos: reflexões sobre uma metodologia feminista para a pesquisa artística. In: BRAGAGNOLO, B.; DALTRO, E.; SANCHEZ, L. P. (org.). *Pesquisa artística: Performance, criação e cultura contemporânea*. Rio Branco: Stricto Sensu, 2022.
- MONTEIRO, Glauco Luis Flores; SOARES, Teresinha Rodrigues Prada. Reflexões acerca da relevância e necessidade da decolonialidade no ensino de música em uma universidade fronteiriça contemporânea. *Raído*, v. 14, n. 34, 2020.
- PASSOS, Eduardo; BARROS, Regina Benevides de. Por uma política da narratividade. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (org.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- PASSOS, Eduardo; EIRADO, André do. Cartografia como dissolução do ponto de vista do observador. In: PASSOS, E.; KASTRUP, V.; ESCÓSSIA, L. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Liliana da. *Pistas do método da cartografia: Pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; TEDESCO, Silvia. *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.
- PENNA, Maura; SOBREIRA, Silvia. A formação universitária do músico: a persistência do modelo de ensino conservatorial. *Opus*, v. 26 n. 3, p. 1-25, set./dez. 2020.
- ROLNIK, Sueli. *Cartografia Sentimental*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2007.
- SADE, Christian; FERRAZ, Gustavo Cruz; ROCHA, Jerusa Machado. O ethos da confiança na pesquisa cartográfica: experiência compartilhada e aumento da potência de agir. In: PASSOS, E.;

KASTRUP, V.; TEDESCO, S. (orgs.). *Pistas do método da cartografia: a experiência da pesquisa e o plano comum*. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2014.

SANTOS, Boaventura de Sousa. Para uma sociologia das ausências e uma sociologia das emergências. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, n. 63, 2002.

TRIPP, David. Pesquisa-ação: uma introdução metodológica. *Educação e Pesquisa*, v. 31, n. 3, 2005.

VARELA, Francisco. O reencantamento do concreto. *Cadernos de Subjetividade*, São Paulo, v. 1, n. 1, 2003.