

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Integrating Artistic Research Outputs within Academic Frameworks with special reference to Swamy Vipulananda Institute of Aesthetic Studies, Eastern University, Sri Lanka

G. F. Yasanthini

Library, Swamy Vipulananda Institute of Aesthetic Studies, Eastern University, Sri Lanka;  0000-0002-1621-2863

Abstract: Artistic research within the visual and performing arts has emerged as a crucial component of academic frameworks while continuing to face significant challenges in achieving recognition and integration within conventional academic infrastructure. This study aims to investigate the integration of artistic research outputs into academic frameworks. The study employed an explanatory mixed-method research design, incorporating a questionnaire survey followed by in-depth interviews. All fifty-seven faculty members were surveyed, and sixteen academics were interviewed. Collected data were analyzed using an Excel Spreadsheet, and the results were interpreted in narrative form. Findings reveal that artistic researchers employed a range of traditional and non-traditional formats for their research publications. Every researcher published at least one research output per year for sustained contribution to the field of interest. They preferred the native language and blended mode for their publications to reach diverse audiences. Further, 100% of researchers agreed that the purpose of publication is to share and disseminate new knowledge and use academic conferences as one of the publication channels. Peer review method (42.20%) is commonly practiced in artistic publications, and 47.83% of them trust the existing evaluation methods in the review process. More than 85% of researchers maintain at least one research profile to meet both artistic and academic goals, although these profiles were updated infrequently. The unavailability of indexed or reputable journals in local/native languages (91.3%) was a major challenge for integration. Study concludes that a collaborative framework involving researchers, policymakers, and librarians is essential to bridge the gap between artistic and academic research. It recommends adopting discipline-specific evaluation systems, interdisciplinary collaboration, inclusive publication practices, digital integration, institutional support, policy formulation, and innovative dissemination strategies.

CORRESPONDENCE

G. F. Yasanthini

Library, Swamy
Vipulananda Institute of
Aesthetic Studies, Eastern
University, Sri Lanka,
Kallady, Batticaloa
Email:
yasanthinig@esn.ac.lk

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received
28 October 2025

Accepted
08 December 2025

KEYWORDS

Academia, Artistic Research,
Digital Platforms, Institutional
Repositories, Research
Visibility

INTRODUCTION

Artistic research is a wide and diverse area of knowledge, grounded in experimental and explorative-based practices developed within the field of arts. The purpose of research is to discover new knowledge and make it accessible to a wider community. Though the research processes and their visibility differ between discipline to disciplines. The humanities and natural sciences do not have the same habits and norms within them. In a line, Schwab (2019) also stated that artistic research is radically different from all other fields of academia and science. There are distinct differences in publication types, evaluation metrics and models, terminology, review processes, traditions, and archival systems between subjects or fields that seem

closely related (Knorr-Cetina & Reichmann, 2015). Thus, this inequality of academic infrastructure negatively impacts the knowledge dissemination, especially in the publications of artistic research.

Artistic research publications differ significantly from traditional academic outputs by considering creative practice as the primary method of investigation. These research outputs may include a variety of formats, not only to include textual format but also to include visual arts, installations, music concerts, dance performances, dramatic art, films, digital media, literary forms of expression, and interactive experiences, etc., each with unique characteristics and protection requirements (Skains, 2018). Methodological approaches to conducting artistic research depart from conventional research evaluation metrics and for the development of contextual metrics that acknowledge the embodied, implicit, and experiential dimensions for the production of artistic knowledge (Springgay et al., 2005). Weinmayr (2020) also emphasized that when employing artistic research into academic concepts, its review process, reproducibility, and



Distributed under the Creative Commons
CC BY-NC-SA 4.0
Publisher: Eastern University, Sri Lanka

evaluation methods are still debatable. Peer review is crucial for any scholarly outputs, not only to assess the quality of research outputs but also to provide valuable feedback to the researcher for further improvement in their research field and practices.

Artistic research raises particular challenges between public cultural life and academia in terms of its status, publication, dissemination, recognition and sustainability. Notably, discipline-specific institutions, institutional cultures, professional artistic community, and its values and traditions also affect artistic research contexts. Wang et al., (2017) noted that the ephemeral nature of many artistic research outputs, especially those involving installation, performance, or digital media, poses challenges in assessing artistic research publications through conventional academic infrastructure that priorities written text and measurable metrics. Though Hovland (2023) argues that there is no sense in adopting conventional academic models and formats used in other disciplines in artistic research because of their irrelevance. In this context, universities face a significant challenge when developing a research evaluation system to accommodate practice-based academic fields in the evaluative metrics. Visual and Performing Arts is one of these fields that are difficult to assess by using traditional research criteria like publication type and citations because of its mode of communication and outcomes are different from another academic research fields (Lewandowska & Kulczycki, 2021).

The field of artistic research has lagged behind in the tradition of publishing formal, open-access journals. Even though the trend towards publishing open-access journals is slowly emerging, some journals do not meet all the requirements for academic research frameworks. In the digital era, the open digital platforms offer new ways to express and share the transmedia and media-specific features that characterize artistic research outputs. Publishing or depositing research outputs in an institutional repository is the way to increase the research visibility and to follow funders' expectations and research ethics (Meece et al., 2017). According to Lambaria (2020), the institutional repository is used by individual researchers as a place to store their artistic research results, as an archive, and to gain easy access for future reference and promotional purposes. The functionalities of these repositories may not be prioritized or the same for all the institutions (Francke et al., 2017). Nevertheless, artistic researchers need to work in double

frontiers as to adhere to the standards of the academic context and also to be relevant to the artistic community in terms of dissemination of their research outputs. Hence, they maintain their careers as academics and also as artists.

In recent years, structural changes and institutional priorities in higher education have contributed to increasing knowledge exchange for artistic research at the national and international levels (Swedish Research Council, 2023). Hence, these outputs are gradually gaining more recognition and commitment as an academic discipline, and it is expected that the results of this research will be published and made accessible in the same way as in other academic disciplines. Nevertheless, the practices of the publishing system and its visibility in this field are under-researched and unknown outside the artistic research community. As an academic librarian, my personal experience has shown that librarians at an academic library in higher education institutions where visual art and performing arts education are conducted have limited knowledge regarding artistic research, which is also a driving force in this study. Integrating artistic research publications within established academic structures presents diverse challenges, and it demands innovative approaches to enhance its visibility, ensure lasting access, and diligently ensure preservation.

Therefore, this study investigates current practices of artistic research publication in the field of visual art and performing arts, its availability and visibility, challenges to integrating within the academic frameworks and how it relates to current research infrastructure. The findings of this research will explore the strategies and guides to integrate the best institutional practices for the integration of artistic research outputs in academic frameworks.

Objectives

1. To examine the current publication practices of artistic research outputs within academic infrastructure
2. To identify the challenges in integrating artistic research publications within the academic framework
3. To explore the best practices for integrating artistic research publications within an academic framework to enhance the visibility and sustainability of artistic research outputs

RESEARCH METHODS

An explanatory sequential mixed method design was adapted for this study. In a quantitative phase, a structured questionnaire survey was administered through Google Form among all fifty-seven (57) permanent faculty members from all the disciplines at Swamy Vipulananda Institute of Aesthetic Studies, Eastern University, Sri Lanka. The data was analysed using an Excel spreadsheet. In a qualitative phase, to get an in-depth understanding of current artistic research publication practices and the challenges in integration, a one-to-one semi-structured interview was conducted for sixteen selected faculty members selected through purposive sampling techniques from all the disciplines in person. The qualitative data were thematically analysed by using manual coding. Both results were integrated to achieve the research objectives. The qualitative results were used to elucidate and contextualize the quantitative results. Finally, the findings were systematically interpreted in narrative form along with review of existing literature.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The response rate of this study was 80.70%. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The highest percentage of respondents was male (52.17%), and 47.83% of them were female. A significant percentage (60.87%) of respondents held

a Master's/MPhil degree, and the remaining 39.13% of them completed their PhD programme, indicating all the respondents had completed their second degree. Among the respondents, 63.04% were Senior Lecturers, 32.61% were lecturers, and only 4.35% of them were professors. In this study, 32.61% were from Music, 30.43% from Visual and Technological Arts, 19.57% from Dance, and 17.39% from Drama and Theatre.

Publication Practices

1. Type of Publications

Artistic research outputs are published and disseminated in different categories. A variety of artistic research publications were utilized in the survey to enhance the understanding of faculty publications. Therefore, the respondents were requested to select the listed publication types based on the relevance of their content to the presentations rather than considering the usefulness in the system. Based on data analysis, the expanded publications list include Journal Articles, Conference Papers (abstract/full paper presentations), Books/Book Chapters/Monographs, Theses/Dissertations, Lecture Recitals, Participating in Seminars/Dialog/Panel Discussion, Exhibitions (Solo/Group), Installations, Performances/Shows/Concerts, Music Albums, Portfolios/Physical Gallery, Media Art/Digital Artworks/Online Gallery, Art Catalogues/Artistic Research Platforms, Video Essays /Visual Essays, Blogs / Websites.

The above extended list of publication types reveals that the artistic researchers used a number of traditional and non-traditional research output formats to publish their research outcomes for disseminating the knowledge and creative skills by considering the way they presented their findings. The above publications are grouped into four categories for the easy understanding and interpretation of the researcher as follows:

Oral Presentation: Which includes Explanatory Conferences, Dialog/ Seminars/ Panel Discussion and Lectures because they all related to the direct verbal delivery of ideas and information to an audience, exchange of knowledge and facilitating real-time interaction

Textual Publications: Most of the traditional publications come under this category like Journal articles, Book Chapters, Monographs, Theses/ Dissertations, etc.

Table 1: Socio - Demographic Distribution of Respondents

Socio-demographic characters	Values	Percent
Gender	Male	52.17%
	Female	47.83%
Highest Educational Qualification	PhD	39.13%
	Master/MPhil	60.87%
Academic Designation	Professor	4.35%
	Senior Lecturer	63.04%
	Lecturer	32.61%
	Music	32.61%
Research Discipline	Dance	19.57%
	Drama and Theatre	17.39%
	Visual and Technological Arts	30.43%

Performative Publications: This category includes Lecture Recitals, Solo/ Group exhibitions, Installations, Shows, Music Albums, Concerts, Gallery, Video Essays / Visual Essays, which are specific to their respective field.

Other web and related Publications: These publications consist of materials available on the web or a related format that do not come under the other defined categories like Digital Archives, Media Art, Digital Artworks, Websites, Blog.

The categorization of the publication types is a useful and easy way when compare the artistic research practices with the other academic disciplines. For a better understanding of the respondents' artistic research outputs, Figure 1 depicts the distribution of respondents across major publication types.

The above chart reveals that 37.41% of the research outputs were oral presentations, while 31.29% represented textual publications. Performative publications accounted for 25.90%




Figure 1: Distribution of Respondents by Publication Types

and other web and related publications comprised 5.30%. Through the subsequent interview majority of the participants stated that a high proportion of their research outputs were disseminated as oral presentations and textual publications because of the requirements of academic promotion, whereas their performative publications reflected the practical nature of the artistic disciplines. Additionally, they mentioned that documentation challenges, copyright issues, and a lack of institutional recognition also contributed to comparatively lower performance and web-based publications. On a similar note, Hansson et al. (2021) emphasized the relatively high occurrence of conferences among publication outlets for humanist scholars, as they consider conferences a means to reach audiences beyond the academic sphere. In addition, they mentioned that conferences, being a major science communication arena, are used to reach popular audiences, meeting managerial demands of societal outreach and public knowledge sharing.

Even though Lüneburg (2023) pointed out that publishing research outputs in text form, as is important in the research tradition of Western

academia, not only supports research accessibility to a broad academic community, but also develops a deeper knowledge of artistic research within the wider community and creates as an artistic researcher through an easily traceable record.

2. Number of Publications

The results reveal (Table 2) that the majority of respondents produced 3–5 publications per year, accounting for 45.65%. Followed by 34.78% of them published 2 – 3 publications per year, while 6.52% of them produced more than five publications per year. The findings highlighted that every academic staff member published at least one artistic research output per year, which shows their sustained contribution to the field of interest. The total number of scholars producing research has increased due to increased research activity of the scholars during the entire period (Hansson et al., 2021). In this regard, Sovacool (2023) noted that publishing research outputs and the knowledge gained from them regularly can lead to personal growth.

3. Medium of Publications

Language plays a vital role in the dissemination and visibility of artistic research outputs. In this study, all the participants were requested to state the languages used for their artistic research publications and get to know the reason why they choose these mediums for their publications.

The distribution of publication mediums of the research outcomes among respondents is shown in Table 2, which shows the extent to which each medium is used to publish their scholarly outputs. The study revealed that Tamil (71.74%) was the predominant medium used by the respondents to publish their artistic research, followed by bilingual (23.91%) and multilingual (4.35%) used for their publications. The qualitative findings highlighted that artists use their native language, Tamil, for their publication because they desire to reach the local audience and to preserve the culture they live in. However, a substantial number of participants reported that for the visibility and academic recognition in national and international forums, they used English as a medium to produce their research outputs. English is the primary medium of academic publication even in those countries in which it is not an official language (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Notably, artistic researchers also used bilingual and multilingual mediums to publish research outputs. Visual Arts participants stated that *“Physical art exhibitions are held in Tamil for the institute community and the general public, however the feedback is published in English as a research paper or conference abstract to attract wider audiences”*. Nevertheless, Martín et al. (2014) stated in their studies that multilingual scholars have a greater need to publish in English-medium journals in order to make their research visible to a wider audience and gain international recognition.

Table 2: Publication frequency and medium

Publication characteristics	Values	Percent
Number of publications per year	1 year	13.04
	2-3 years	34.78
	3-5 years	45.65
	Above 5 years	6.52
Medium of publications	Tamil only	71.74
	Bilingual	23.91
	Multilingual	4.35

3. Mode of Publications

Identifying the modes of publication of the artistic research outcomes helps to understand publication behaviour and dissemination patterns of respondents. Figure 4 shows the distribution of respondents based on their preferred modes of publication, indicating whether online/digital, print/physical, or blended formats are used more commonly.

The survey revealed that all the respondents preferred blended publication modes for publishing artistic research outputs using traditional physical/printed and online/digital platforms. Follow-up interviews, a substantial number of respondents reported they prefer digital or online platforms to disseminate creative artwork for valuing the intangible documentation, and accessibility for diverse audiences like professionals, academics, and the general public, and using printed platforms for fulfilling institutional requirements.

Further, participants highlighted that they used online publications to reach wider audiences while maintaining professional recognition through print formats (Hansson et al., 2021). One respondent stated, *“I uploaded the performance video on online platforms while producing journal articles to reach diverse audiences”*. A combination of traditional and digital platforms enhances research dissemination by widening access to diverse and global audiences, increasing visibility, and enabling interactive and faster feedback, while publishing in peer-reviewed journals still creates significant influence for academic impact and reputation.

Motives for Publishing Artistic Research Outputs

Understanding the motives that lie beneath publishing artistic research outputs, which eventually drive artists and researchers to publish their creative work.

Table 3 shows the motives why the artistic academic researchers publish their artistic research outputs. As per the result, all the respondents reported that they published their artistic research outputs to share and disseminate the knowledge (100%) with wider community, that constitutes the basic needs for all publications of every academic staff member followed by they publish their creative research outputs for an inspiration for emerging artists (89.43%) and scholarly contributed to the field of interest (80.43%).

Further, 78.26% of the respondents reported that they publish their artistic outputs to enhance artistic visibility and to get academic recognition. At last, 45.65% of respondents show their motive to publish their work not only to share knowledge within the academic community but also to create social impact within the community.

The qualitative findings also revealed the same as found through surveys without any remarkable variation. Also, they elaborated on how their publications are interconnected with career advancement, cultural identity, and institutional obligations. Most respondents stated that artistic visibility and academic recognition are crucial for sustainability and credibility of career advancement, securing research grants, and the reputation of the institutions in the visual and performing art sectors. The respondents from drama and theatre arts stated that they could easily create an impact within society through their performances by addressing many current social issues using basic root-level languages. Visual and Technological Arts participants also highlighted that, without using any language, they can convey the message or create an impact on the community through their creative artworks. These findings align with Lambaria (2020) and Meece et al. (2017).

They mentioned that financial rewards, sharing discoveries, meeting demands from funding agencies, and developing collective knowledge on a subject were some possible reasons for publishing creative artworks by

creative artists. In addition, Sovacool (2023) also highlighted in his study that responsibility by acknowledging the privileged position, advancement through contributing to the advance and transmit knowledge, promoting own improvement and growth as a researcher, scholar, and writer, recognizing the uncertainty of future research needs and mentoring or guiding others to conduct research and publish its outputs are five key principles that support academic publishing.

Publication Channels for Artistic Research Outputs

The range of scholarly publication channels used by artistic researchers to publish and share their artistic research outputs for the wider community is illustrated in Figure 2.

The figure indicates that all respondents (100%) use academic conferences as one of the publication channels to publish artistic research outputs as an abstract or a full paper in conference proceedings. A significant number of them (82.61%) use journals for publishing their research outputs, followed by 63.04% of them using scholarly research platforms for publication purposes. Only 19.57% of them use physical or virtual exhibitions to share their research outputs. Interviews indicated that all the artistic researchers prefer to present the artistic research outputs at national and international conferences to receive feedback from peers and professionals at a time, gaining recognition

Table 3: Motives for Publishing Artistic Research Outputs

Motive/s	Frequency	Percentage (%)
To share and disseminate the knowledge	46	100.00%
Being an inspiration for emerging artists	41	89.13%
For scholarly contribution to the field of interest	37	80.43%
For artistic visibility and academic recognition	36	78.26%
To meet the institutional expectations	33	71.74%
To facilitate partnership with other artists or professional bodies or institutions	30	65.22%
To enhance research visibility engaging with wider audience	28	60.87%
To document and preserve research outputs for future references or teaching materials	26	56.52%
To fulfill funding requirements	26	56.52%
To get feedback for further development of their research outputs / research process	22	47.82%
To create social impact	21	45.65%




Figure 2. Distribution of Publication Channels for Artistic Research Outputs

within the communities, and building academic collaboration between participants when they meet them physically.

Similarly, most respondents stated that the journals act as a universal channel to share and disseminate their research outputs to get academic credibility and fulfill the institutional requirements for research. Notably, participants from the discipline of visual arts significantly use physical and virtual exhibitions to showcase the artifacts that they created. Also, the findings from the interview reveal that nine participants initially publish their research outputs in physical or printed formats, then they upload those particular works on institutional repositories and scholarly research platforms to enhance the visibility and accessibility.

Participants from the discipline of Visual Arts and Drama and Theatre Arts stated they use their own social media accounts, like Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, etc., to publish performative outputs. Even though they were not much aware or concerned about the illegal sharing, fraudulent use, and misuse of information before uploading artistic performative outputs without using any protective measures. One of the participants emphasized that *“I prefer publishing in open-access journals, even if they’re not high-ranked, because it means my work can be read by artists and curators worldwide”*.

According to Meece et.al., (2017) and Nadim and Randall (2013), when the research outputs are not published in open access scholarly journals, the institutional repository is a guaranteed way of achieving formal open access dissemination of research results. Nevertheless, Francke et al., (2017) stated that the long-term

preservation is not necessarily ensured within the institutional repository.

Review Process in Artistic Publications

Artistic publications follow review processes that are unique because artistic research is hybrid, blending creative practice with scholarly inquiry. This section explores the types of review processes in artistic publications, explaining how the creative works and artistic research outcomes are reviewed before dissemination.

The analysis (Table 4) shows that peer review was found to be the most common review type used for the evaluation of artistic research publications, followed by institutional review, editorial review, expert/practitioner review, and hybrid review. This high rate of peer review (42.20%) indicates the domination of traditional academic validation systems, highlighting academic rigour and credibility within the field (Wesseling, 2020). However, a relatively smaller

Table 4: Types of review process and perception about the review process

Characteristics of the review process	Values	Percent
Types of review	Hybrid Review	8.26
	Institutional Review	22.02
	Expert/ Practitioner Review	11.01
	Editorial review	16.51
	Peer Review	42.20
Perception about the review process	Biased	15.22
	Transparent	32.61
	Fair	47.83

proportion of expert and practitioner review (11.01%) indicates that artistic outputs are still less frequently evaluated through creative or discipline-specific criteria (Candy & Edmonds, 2018).

Even though hybrid reviews, which evaluated both academic and artistic merit in the context of artistic research they were reported in very less (8.26%) due to limited expertise in both contexts. Followed by the qualitative data, some of the respondents from the discipline of drama and theatre arts expressed that peer review was appreciated as a method to maintain academic rigor; many felt it frequently neglects the aesthetic, experiential, and performative aspects of artistic work.

In addition, respondents also emphasized that editorial reviews act as a mediating function, not only ensuring academic rigour but artistic authenticity (Bowman, 2020). Further, they noted that institutional reviews evaluated PhD and Master theses of postgraduate students in higher education institutions by the faculty members and it could not be adapted for any other publications.

Perception of the Review Process

The results (Table 4) shows that respondents had differing opinions about how artistic research publications are reviewed. Most participants (47.83%) thought the process was fair, suggesting that they generally trusted the existing evaluation methods. However, only a smaller percentage (32.61%) thought the process was transparent, indicating that although results are frequently accepted, many contributors are still unsure of the processes used to make decisions. However, a significant minority (15.22%) believed that the review process was biased, citing issues with subjectivity, partiality, or the absence of objective standards for assessing artistic research outputs.

The use of double-blind or hybrid review models, which were thought to lessen institutional and personal bias, was frequently associated with perceptions of fairness, according to the qualitative data, which further clarified these trends. On the other hand, the lack of clear evaluation standards for creative and practice-based works and the reviewers' scant comments were blamed for the perceived lack of transparency.

Reviewers with conventional academic backgrounds might not completely understand non-textual, performative, or artistic approaches,

according to respondents who acknowledged bias (Lewandowska & Kulczycki, 2021). The qualitative data received from the respondents further explained these trends in the review process by showing that perceptions of fairness were often linked to the use of double-blind peer review or hybrid review models, which were believed to reduce institutional and personal bias.

However, some of the respondents reported that the perceived lack of transparency was attributed to the reviewers' limited comments and the absence of explicit evaluation criteria for creative and practice-based works. Respondents who acknowledged bias suggested that reviewers with traditional academic backgrounds may not fully comprehend non-textual, performative, or artistic approaches. Hence, many scholars value the peer-review process for maintaining standards, enhancing reviewer knowledge, and feedback is essential for advancing fairness, inclusivity, and legitimacy in the evaluation of artistic research publications (Borgdorff, 2012; Candy & Edmonds, 2018; Wesseling, 2020).

Research and Scholarly Publication Platforms

1. Research and Scholarly Profiles

The quantitative and qualitative phases highlight the usage of research and scholarly platforms to meet both artistic and academic goals. As seen in Figure 3, the quantitative results revealed more than 85% of the respondents maintain at least one profile on research and scholarly platforms for the visibility of artistic research outputs. ResearchGate is most commonly used by the respondents (60.87%), followed by Google Scholar (30.43%) and 23.91% on Academia.edu. Only a smaller percentage (6.52%) maintained personal websites for publishing their research outputs, while 15.22% of them do not maintain any research and scholarly platforms for disseminating artistic research outputs.

Follow-up interviews explained the pattern of the use of these platforms. Most of the participants stated that they use multiple research and scholarly platforms for uploading their research outputs. One third of participants mentioned that they maintain their academic profiles in ResearchGate and Google Scholar for enhancing academic visibility and tracking citations. Notably, they pointed out that ResearchGate is one of, most commonly used by them for publishing their research outputs without the restriction of medium and publication mode. Also, they valued getting feedback and




Figure 3. Profile on Research and Scholarly Platforms

networking with the professionally related groups by maintaining their profile on ResearchGate rather than using Google Scholar, especially for artistic creations. The choice of these scholarly platforms' usage is highly influenced by their functional benefits, digital literacy, and the requirements of the institutions (Khechine & Augier, 2019).

Hence, the findings highlighted that to serve these platforms effectively for the artistic community it's need to accommodate non-traditional and creative research formats. In addition, Bornmann (2015) highlighted the role of digital research and scholarly platforms in facilitating alternative metrics that provide a wider view of research impact beyond traditional citation counts. Pawar (2025) suggests that faculty tend to prefer free and user-friendly platforms.

2. Frequency of Research and Scholarly Profile Updates

Table 5 presents the frequency distribution of updating researchers' scholarly profiles, in order to contextualize the regularity of maintaining an online academic presence and to describe implications for knowledge dissemination and research visibility.

It reveals that only 19.57% of respondents updated their profiles on research and scholarly platforms immediately after publishing. 39.13% of them updated twice a year, followed by 23.91% of them updated once a year, and 10.87% updated rarely, while 6.52% of respondents never updated their profile after the initial creation of the profile. This frequency pattern shows that the majority of them updating their profile

infrequently or occasionally that leads to limits the visibility of their publications (Pawar, 2025).

Follow-up interviews explained that the participants mentioned that, unaware about the benefits and functionalities of using these platforms or reliance on social media networks and other informal sites they rarely or never updated their profile. One participant stated that *"I have posted all my creative visual images on my Instagram page to get instant feedback from my colleagues and professional circle"*. The findings highlighted that a very few numbers of artistic researchers are highly engaged to frequently update their profile for maximizing their research visibility and creating its impact on the community. However, peer influences, regulatory bodies research mandates, and training initiatives significantly facilitate the interaction with digital research and scholarly profiles (Mukherjee, 2021).

Challenges Encountered in Integrating Artistic Research Outputs within Academic Framework

According to the Swedish Research Council (2023), the artistic research review report emphasized that there are many challenges

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Research and Scholarly

Frequency of Profile Updates	Frequency	Percent
Immediately after Publishing	9	19.57%
Twice a Year	18	39.13%
One a Year	11	23.91%
Rarely	5	10.87%
Never (No updates)	3	6.52%

Table 6: Challenges encountered in Integrating Artistic Research Outputs within Academic Framework

Challenge/s	Frequency	Percent
Unavailability of indexed or reputed journal in local/native languages	42	91.30%
Language barriers in expressing creative processes academically	37	80.43%
Funding agencies privileging conventional research outcomes	35	76.09%
Underrepresentation of artistic research in citation indexes	34	73.91%
Misalignment of artistic forms and academic publication standards	33	71.74%
Inadequate guidelines for evaluating outcomes of artistic research	32	69.57%
Time consuming to adapt artistic work for academic contexts	31	67.39%
Lack of suitable categorization of the publication types	29	63.04%
Dissemination and visibility of published artistic research is very low	28	60.87%
Not acknowledging artistic outcomes as valid research	27	58.70%
Inadequate documentation standards for non-textual / performative research outcomes	26	56.52%
Bias against interpretive or subjective forms of knowledge	26	56.52%
The quality of works representation and visual appearance of the interface is less	23	50.00%
Lack of technological and multimedia support for artistic research outputs	22	47.83%
Limited flexibility in the acceptance and representation of research outputs in the repository.	21	45.65%
Misunderstanding of peer review process	19	41.30%
Inconsistency in creating metadata for artistic research outputs	18	39.13%

encountered by the artistic research field over coming years. Notably research funding for foundation and prospects, research infrastructure specially for accessibility and participation and research ethics related with responsibility issues and research themes were identified as major challenges in its review. This study also aims to find the challenges encountered in the integration of artistic research outputs within academic framework.

Based on the quantitative data received from the respondents, there are many challenges identified and presented in Table 6. The findings indicated that the unavailability of indexed or reputable journals in local or native languages (91.3%) is the most significant challenge for artistic researchers to integrate their research outputs within academia, followed by language barriers in expressing creative processes academically (80.43%). Arenas-Castro et al. (2024) reported that, in late 2021, less than 7% of journals allowed authors to publish articles in languages other than English. The scholars in the field of humanities are pushed to use and publish

their research output in English rather than using their vernacular language (Hammarfelt & Haddow, 2018).

Furthermore, 76.09% of respondents reported that funding agencies tend to prioritize conventional research outcomes, 73.91% noted the underrepresentation of artistic research in citation indexes, while 19.13% indicated that inconsistency in creating metadata for artistic research outputs also presents a challenge to integrating artistic research within academic frameworks. Saisto and Tehdas (2019) in their study emphasized the complexity in creating descriptive, administrative, and technical metadata for performance art, as it is ephemeral and quite different from other media. The respondents from the visual and technological arts generally agreed that non-textual research outputs, such as image-based works, are difficult to validate within the academic framework (Schellini et al., 2023). The peer review's roles and practices in artistic research publications are not well established.

Followed by the interviews, the participants further explained artistic research often will not have measurable results, making it less likely to receive funds. This implies that institutional funding priorities are weighted towards conventional scientific approaches, where artistic research is not given equal value for its process-oriented and interpretative nature (Szyber, 2020). Moreover, unethical practices, partiality, and insufficient transparency an obstacle to the peer review process (Kadaifci et al., 2025).

Several participants are expressing concern that art like performances or installations are rarely archived or cataloged in academic research databases. These findings also reveal a systemic failure of identification and incorporation of artistic research in structures of academic knowledge. In addition, inconsistency in creating metadata for artistic research outcomes were noted by the participant as the challenge that hinder the standards, accessibility and the effective management of works in academic and archive environments (Meece et al., 2017). Further, Zibani et al. (2021) pointed out in his study that the higher education institutions exhibit limited flexibility in how research outputs are accepted and represented in repositories. Furthermore, they noted that most institutions do not include creative or non-traditional outputs. Francke et al, (2017) highlighted that attitudes, policies, and practices related to material preservation differ considerably across institutions, reflecting variations in the underlying purposes and functions of institutional repositories.

Best Practices for Integrating Artistic Research Outputs within Academic Framework

By integrating artistic research outputs within the academic framework, artistic researchers can engage collaboratively, innovatively, and creatively with their research questions. This approach provides a more inclusive pathway for exploring artistic experiences than relying solely on artistic methods. The best practices that can be adopted by artistic researchers and institutions for publishing research outputs should ensure meaningful integration within the academic infrastructure. Accordingly, based on the qualitative findings and a review of the existing literature, several strategies, technological solutions, and institutional approaches were explored to facilitate the integration of artistic research outputs into academic frameworks.

Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration between the artists, researchers, and technologists was identified as a best practice in integration by creating space in which scholars and artists do research collaboratively and facilitated the development of sustainable preservation techniques (Kyomugisha, 2024). These research collaborations that bridge the arts and sciences involve the integration of artists and artistic approaches within scientific and humanistic research contexts. Such collaborations foster a deeper understanding of human experiences, facilitate methodological distinction, encourage innovation in both approach and content, and create a collaborative ethics that crosses traditional disciplinary boundaries.

Standardized Academic Metrics and its Integration is found to be other strategies for artistic research integration. Developing new metrics for hybrid research evaluation system, citations and assessment of artistic research outputs that cover artistic research in equal standing with traditional scholarly works (Lewandowska & Kulczycki, 2021).

The artistic production is evaluated as ‘art’ rather than ‘research. Hence, artistic outputs and research have been employed as equivalent, yet at the same time disparate and incomparable forms of scholarly practices.

Open Access and Digital research Platforms are significantly impact on the visibility of artistic outputs within academia. The open access publishing of art and artistic research outputs within an academic context has received increased attention in the past few years. Encouraging the application of institutional digital repositories, video documentation, and multimedia archives to enhance its accessibility (Sundén & Lundén, 2015). Open Access, ensuring long-term preservation, systematic archiving and ready access to content, and visibility for institutional evaluation and funding allocation (Lambaria, 2020; Nadim & Randall, 2013).

Additionally, usage and familiarity with research digital profiles are influenced by a range of factors, including research experience, institutional policy, academic rank, institutional digital infrastructure availability, and others (Kumar & Sharma, 2022). Research mandates by regulatory bodies, peer influences, and training programs have also been shown to be important drivers of research profile engagement (Mukherjee, 2021).

Many participants discussed that Institutional Repositories is the best practice for accommodating their artistic research outputs in academic frameworks. Institutional repositories are being increasingly used by universities to save and disseminate artistic research productions, offering open access to creative works.

Support and advocacy by the library can also assist researchers in understanding that their institutional repository is a legitimate archiving option (Meece et al., 2017; Lambaria, 2020). Another requirement for consistent quality assessment of artistic outputs is consistent application of categories and labels so that uniform bibliometrics can be provided while accommodating the artistic production into repositories. Further, knowledgeable staff at the repositories would be a vital component in this process, to ascertain that publications are assigned the right metadata and labels during registration (Wahlström, 2021).

Supporting Stronger Funding Mechanisms and Research Structure also identified as one of the strategies for artistic research integration. The low priority of institutions' and funders' expectations can also be an indication of artistic autonomy as a reaction to repeated controversies regarding risks of academic limitations on artistic freedom (Szyber, 2020). Advocating for additional research funds to support artistic research and institutional funding of digital preservation, exhibition spaces, and research grants to enable artistic research (Wahlström, 2021).

Development or Enhancement of Institutional Research Policies is another way to bridging artistic research outcomes within academia. Institutions with clear policies or establishing guidelines on recognition of artistic research, structural support, funding, and archiving have proven to be more successful in preserving research outputs (Borgdorff, 2011). Well-structured and established policies define how creative and practice-based research output such as performances, installations, exhibitions, and design can be recognized as valid research outputs within institutional and national research infrastructure. Candy and Edmonds (2018) further added that policies recognizing the creative process as research in particular enable artists to be able to contribute more meaningfully to the system of academic knowledge.

Expanding the Publication Opportunities for Artistic Research production is essential for integrating creative and practice-based knowledge within the academic ecosystem. Comparatively limited opportunity for dissemination of non-textual, experiential and multimodal publications like digital works, installation and installations than the text-based research. Borgdorff (2011) argues that artistic research needs dissemination channels that can accommodate both artistic practice and critical reflection to document and share creative processes as scholarly contributions. Biggs and Karlsson (2011) stated that development of artistic research disciplinary journals, open-access platforms and digital repositories enhance accessibility and scholarly engagement. In addition, Schwab (2019) notes that hybrid digital journals foster interdisciplinary dialogue and methodological innovation by combining artistic and academic outputs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Artistic research plays a vital role in the academic setting, but its full realizable potential is reduced to having support mechanisms. Hence, the successful integration of artistic research outcomes into academia requires a comprehensive approach that integrates digital technologies, institutional support, interdisciplinary collaboration, policy formulation, and innovative dissemination strategies. The evidence confirms that artistic research can make significant contributions and creations to academic knowledge and social development, if appropriately supported. Future research must explore new methodologies and collaborative models that further integrate artistic inquiry within academic frameworks.

The study recommends that higher education institutions must implement policies that recognize artistic research on par with conventional research. Artistic research outcomes can be made more accessible through the development of dedicated digital platforms and repositories. In addition, interdisciplinarity collaboration can bridge the gap between art and science toward a more inclusive academic culture. Funding agencies and scholarly publishers must also make changes in assessment criteria to cover different types of research outputs, including exhibitions, performances, and multimedia products. Through the Research Support Services, academic libraries encourage the faculty members to publish their research

outputs in English or widely accepted languages. Provide one-to-one research consultation services for artistic researchers to design their research academically, facilitate them for reviewing existing literature, help them to find recognized or specialized journals and assist and aware the members to create scholarly research digital platforms and upload their publications and encourage them to update their profile frequently. Further, educate the faculty members on illegal digital sharing and ethical use of digital research outputs.

In addition, aware artistic researchers with the use of protective measures for the wider dissemination of their research outcomes. Furthermore, these results also suggest that targeted training and institutional incentives could encourage more consistent and strategic profile management, thereby improving the accessibility and visibility of artistic research

REFERENCES

- Adema, J. (2018). Performative Publications. *Media Practice and Education*, 19(1), 68–81. DOI: 10.1080/14682753.2017.1362174
- Arenas-Castro, H., Berdejo-Espinola, V., Chowdhury, S., Rodríguez-Contreras, A., James, A. R. M., Raja, N. B., Dunne, E. M., Bertolino, S., Emidio, N. B., Derez, C. M., Drobnik, S. M., Fulton, G. R., Henao-Diaz, L. F., Kaur, A., Kim, C. J. S., Lagisz, M., Medina, I., Mikula, P., Narayan, V. P., & Amano, T. (2024). Academic publishing requires linguistically inclusive policies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 291(2018), 20232840. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2023.2840
- Biggs, M., & Karlsson, H. (2011). *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Routledge. <https://clab.iat.sfu.ca/804/uploads/Site/RoutledgeCompanion.pdf>
- Borgdorff, H. (2011). The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research. In M. Biggs & H. Karlsson (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts* (pp. 45–63). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203841327
- Bornmann, L. (2015). Alternative metrics in scientometrics: a meta-analysis of research into three altmetrics. *Scientometrics*, 103(3), 1123–1144. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-015-1565-y
- Bowman, M. (2020). The work of art criticism: collaboration, communication, community. *Arts* 9 (4:101), 101. MDPI. DOI: 10.3390/arts9040101
- Candy, L., & Edmonds, E. (2018). *Practice-Based Research in the Creative Arts: Foundations and Futures from the Front Line*. Leonardo, 51(1), 63–69. DOI: 10.1162/LEON_a_01471
- Francke, H., Gamalielsson, J., & Lundell, B. (2017). Institutional repositories as infrastructures for long-term preservation. In *Information research*, 22(2), paper 757. Retrieved from <http://InformationR.net/ir/22-2/paper757.html>
- Frisk, H. (2017) Art Doc - An Experimental Archive and a Tool for Artistic Research. In M. Aramaki, M. Davies, R. Kronland-Martinet & S. Ystad (Eds.), *CMR 2017: Music Technology with Swing* (pp. 666-676). Springer, Cham. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-01692-0_44
- Hammarfelt, B., & Haddow, G. (2018). Conflicting measures and values: How humanities scholars in Australia and Sweden use and react to bibliometric indicators. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 69(7), 924–935. DOI: 10.1002/asi.24043
- Hansson, J., Tyrkkö, J., Golub, K., & Ahlström, I. (2021). Publication practices in the Humanities. *Nordic Journal of Library and Information Studies*, 2(2), 41–64. DOI: 10.7146/njlis.v2i2.125238
- Hovland, E. (2022). Artistic Research and the Need for a Paradigmatic Shift in Art Research, *JAR: Journal for Artistic Research*. Retrieved from www.jar-online.net/en/artistic-research-and-need-paradigmaticshift-art-research
- Kadaifci, C., Isikli, E., & Topcu, Y. I. (2025). Fundamental problems in the peer-review process and stakeholders' perceptions of potential suggestions for improvement. *Learned Publishing*, 38(1), e1637. DOI: 10.1002/leap.1637
- Khechine, H., & Augier, M. (2019). Adoption of a social learning platform in higher education: an extended UTAUT model implementation. *Proceedings of the . . . Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences/ Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. DOI: 10.24251/hicss.2019.008
- Knorr-Cetina, K., & Reichmann, W. (2015). Epistemic Cultures. In J. D. Wright (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 873–880). Elsevier Ltd. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.10454-4
- Kumar, V., & Sharma, R. (2022). Factors influencing the adoption of digital academic tools among college faculty in India. *International Journal of Education and Development using ICT*, 18(1), 89–102.
- Kyomugisha, A. (2024). Exploring the collaborations between Arts and Science in research initiatives. *Idosr Journal Of Communication And English*, 9(3), 27–32. DOI:10.59298/idosr/jce/93.2732.202400
- Lambaria, K. (2020). Considering Creative Activity in Institutional Repositories: An Exploration of Faculty Perceptions. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 8(1), paper 2312. DOI: 10.7710/2162-3309.2312
- Lewandowska, K., & Kulczycki, E. (2021). Academic research evaluation in Artistic disciplines: the case of Poland. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(2), 284–296. DOI:

- 10.1080/02602938.2021.1893651
- Lillis, T. M., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in global context*. London: Routledge
- Lüneburg, B. (2023). Knowledge Production in Artistic Research – Opportunities and Challenges, *MUSIC & PRACTICE*, In *Artistic Research*, 10 (2), 1-30. DOI: 10.32063/1009
- Martín, P., Rey-Rocha, J., Burgess, S., & Moreno, A. I. (2014). Publishing research in English-language journals: Attitudes, strategies and difficulties of multilingual scholars of medicine. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 16, 57–67. DOI: 10.1016/j.jeap.2014.08.001
- Meece, S., Robinson, A., & Gramstadt, M. (2017). Engaging researchers with the world's Orst scholarly Arts repositories: Ten years after the UK's Kultur Project. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 23(2–3), 209–232. DOI: 10.1080/13614533.2017.1320767
- Mukherjee, A. (2021). Academic profiling platforms and their role in research dissemination in India. *Library Herald*, 59(1), 65–74.
- Nadim, T., & Randall, R. (2013). *Defiant Objects research report*. Retrieved from <http://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/8731>
- Pawar, A. B. (2025). Awareness and Use of Research Profiles among Faculty Members in Non-Technical Colleges in Ahilyanagar District: A Survey. *International Journal of Research in Library Science*, 11(2), 198–203. httpsDOI: 10.26761/ijrls.11.2.2025.1888
- Saisto, A., & Tehdas, N. (2019). D-ark—A Shared Digital Performance Art Archive with a Modular Metadata Schema. *Heritage*, 2(1), 976–987. DOI: 10.3390/heritage2010064
- Schellini, M., BenGhida, S., Ghida, D. B., & Assumpção, F. R. (2023). Academic Philistinism? The Challenges of Contemporary Artistic Research Inside Academia. Semi-structured Interviews with Visual Art Students in Brazil. *Arte Individuo Y Sociedad*, 35(3), 1081–1099. DOI: 10.5209/aris.86280
- Schwab, M. (2019.). *The Exposition of Artistic Research: Publishing Art in Academia*, 92-104 Retrieved from <https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/60957/60958>
- Skains, R., L. (2018). Creative Practice as Research: *Discourse on Methodology*, Media Practice and Education, 19:1, 82-97, DOI: 10.1080/14682753.2017.1362175
- Sovacool, B. K. (2023). Reprint of: The privilege of learning and serendipity: My principles of publishing research for a new academic era. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 100, 103133. DOI: 10.1016/j.erss.2023.103133
- Springgay, S., Irwin, R. L., & Kind, S. W. (2005). A/r/tography as Living Inquiry Through Art and Text. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(6), 897–912. DOI: 10.1177/1077800405280696
- Sundén, K., Lundén, T. (2015). Art as Academic Output: Quality Assessment and Open Access publishing of Artistic Works at the University of Gothenburg. *Art Libraries Journal*, 40(4), 26-32. DOI: 10.1017/S0307472200020496
- Swedish Research Council (2023). *Research review 2023: Artistic research*. Swedish Research Council. Retrieved from <https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2023-01-26-research-review-2023-artistic-research.html>
- Szyber, B. (2020). *Fauxthentication. Art Academia and Authorship (or the site-specifics of the Academic Artist)*. Stockholm. Retrieved from <https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/819818/819819/0/0>
- Wahlström, A. (2021). When outputs of artistic research meet academic infrastructures: Antelopes in the horse pen (Dissertation). Retrieved from <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hb:diva-26460>
- Wang, Qingchun; Coemans, Sara; Siegesmund, Richard & Hannes, Karin (2017). Arts-based methods in socially engaged research practice: A classification framework. *Art/Research International: A Transdisciplinary Journal*, 2(2), 5-39. DOI: 10.18432/R26G8P
- Wesseling, J. (2020). *See it Again, Say it Again: The Artist as Researcher*. Valiz. Retrieved from <https://share.google/OXtuT9p4tslhFpTeb>
- Weinmayr, E. (2020). *Noun to Verb: an investigation into the micro-politics of publishing through artistic practice*. [Doctoral thesis, University of Gothenburg]. Göteborg: Art Monitor. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/66644>
- Zibani, P., Rajkoomar, M., & Naicker, N. (2021). A systematic review of faculty research repositories at higher education institutions. *Digital Library Perspectives*, 38(2), 237–248. DOI: 10.1108/dlp-04-2021-0035