Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

The Interconnectivity Between the Arts and the Social Sciences

Michael IKIBE

mj.ikibe@kingsuniversity.edu.ng

Kings University, Osun State, Nigeria

Article

Keywords: Arts, social sciences, interdisciplinarity, cultural production, representation, arts-based research

Posted Date: November 16th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11186092/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

The relationship between the arts and the social sciences is often described as interdisciplinary, yet the term can conceal the different ways in which the two areas of knowledge meet. This article examines that relationship through documentary research and critical reading of scholarly literature on cultural production, representation, social inquiry, arts-based methods and participatory practice. It argues that the connection is reciprocal but not seamless: artistic works can make social experience visible, preserve memory and communicate meanings that are difficult to capture through conventional measures, while social-scientific concepts and methods help explain the institutions, inequalities, audiences and historical circumstances through which art is produced and received. The discussion draws on cultural sociology, representation theory, the debate about the "two cultures," arts-based research and community arts. It also considers the limits of interdisciplinary work, including the risk of treating artworks as transparent evidence, reducing artistic value to measurable social outcomes, or using creative methods without adequate ethical and interpretive care. The article's contribution is a practical account of the conditions under which collaboration between the arts and social sciences can improve inquiry without erasing the distinct purposes of either field. It concludes that productive collaboration requires methodological clarity, attention to power and context, and respect for both artistic form and empirical accountability.

1. Introduction

The arts and the social sciences address overlapping questions about people, relationships, institutions, memory, identity and change. They do not, however, ask those questions in exactly the same way. A novel may explore the experience of social exclusion through character, plot, voice and ambiguity; sociology may investigate exclusion through concepts, comparative evidence and analysis of institutions. A film may make the consequences of displacement emotionally immediate, while political science may examine the policies and power relations that produce displacement. These approaches can illuminate one another, but they should not be treated as interchangeable. The central concern of this article is therefore not simply that art and social science are connected, but how their relationship works, what each can contribute to the other, and where their differences need to be maintained.

The manuscript submitted for review approached this relationship through a broad overview of historical development, interdependence, research methods, the role of the arts in social inquiry and the influence of social-scientific thinking on artistic practice. Those themes remain relevant. The present revision develops them through a clearer documentary method, a more explicit theoretical discussion and a critical assessment of both the benefits and limitations of interdisciplinary work. Rather than presenting the relationship as automatically beneficial, the article asks what makes collaboration intellectually productive and ethically responsible.

The term "arts" is used here broadly to include literary writing, visual arts, music, theatre, dance, film and related creative practices. The term "social sciences" refers principally to sociology, anthropology,

psychology, economics, political science, human geography and communication research. History, philosophy and cultural studies frequently cross these boundaries. Their institutional classification differs between countries and universities; consequently, this article does not assume that every discipline listed under the arts or humanities belongs to one fixed administrative category. It focuses instead on forms of inquiry and the questions they pursue.

A useful starting point is C. P. Snow's account of the "two cultures," which identified a damaging separation between literary intellectuals and scientists and called attention to the cost of intellectual division (Snow 1959). Snow's argument was framed around the sciences more broadly, rather than the social sciences alone, but it remains relevant to debates about disciplinary boundaries. The issue is not that every scholar should become competent in every field. It is that disciplinary specialisation can make scholars overlook evidence, concepts and forms of expression that would improve their understanding of a problem. At the same time, calls for integration can become superficial if they treat different methods as interchangeable or assume that interdisciplinary work is inherently superior.

Cultural sociology offers another starting point. Bourdieu's analysis of cultural production places artistic works within fields shaped by institutions, professional authority, competition, economic resources and symbolic power (Bourdieu 1993). Hall's work on representation similarly directs attention to the processes through which meaning is produced and circulated rather than treating images and texts as neutral reflections of a pre-existing reality (Hall 1997). These perspectives make it possible to examine art both as a creative form and as a social practice. Art is made under particular conditions, interpreted by situated audiences, circulated through institutions and sometimes used to challenge the same social arrangements that support it.

Despite extensive work on cultural sociology, arts-based research and participatory art, a general account of arts–social science relations can still become a list of benefits rather than an explanation of the processes involved. The article addresses this problem by bringing together four questions: how historical and institutional boundaries developed; how artistic forms can contribute to social inquiry; how social-scientific concepts shape the production and interpretation of art; and what methodological, ethical and political difficulties arise when the fields work together.

The article makes three connected arguments. First, the relationship is reciprocal but asymmetrical in particular settings: the influence of social science on an artistic project, for example, may differ from the use of a poem or film as research material. Second, the value of integration depends on the question being asked and the quality of the methods used, not on the mere presence of more than one discipline. Third, collaboration should preserve the specific strengths of artistic and social-scientific practice while making their assumptions open to scrutiny. This position avoids both a rigid division between the fields and an uncritical claim that combining them necessarily produces better knowledge.

The article is a documentary and interpretive study, not a report of interviews, experiments or a newly collected human-participant dataset. Its claims are analytical and illustrative; they should not be read as statistical estimates of the effects of art or as a systematic measurement of interdisciplinary outcomes.

2. Research approach and method

This article uses a documentary research approach based on the critical reading of published scholarship and publicly accessible materials relevant to the relationship between the arts and the social sciences. The materials include books on cultural production and representation, methodological texts on arts-based inquiry, work on participatory and community arts, and foundational discussions of disciplinary boundaries. The original manuscript also drew on online publications and general reference materials. In revising the article, greater weight is given to identifiable scholarly books and publications whose bibliographic details can be checked. General web pages are not treated as equivalent to peer-reviewed research, and claims that require empirical support are not inferred from an illustrative example alone.

The approach is best described as a critical documentary review rather than a systematic review. The research process was not originally designed around a preregistered protocol, exhaustive database searches, a formal screening flow diagram or a quantitative synthesis. It would therefore be inaccurate to claim that the article systematically identified every publication in the field. Instead, the study brings together relevant works that help explain the conceptual, methodological and practical dimensions of the subject. This clarification is important because the strength of a review depends not only on its conclusions but also on the transparency of the process through which sources were chosen and interpreted.

The materials were read with attention to four recurring themes: (1) the social conditions under which artistic production takes place; (2) the use of artistic forms and practices in social research; (3) the influence of social-scientific concepts on the interpretation and creation of art; and (4) the ethical and practical problems associated with interdisciplinary collaboration. These themes were used as an organising framework rather than as a formal coding scheme applied to a complete dataset. The discussion compares the arguments of the selected sources, identifies areas of agreement and tension, and considers what their implications are for interdisciplinary research.

A documentary approach is appropriate for the article's broad conceptual question because the main object of analysis is the existing body of ideas and methods, rather than the behaviour of a defined group of participants. It allows the article to compare arguments across disciplines and to consider how different authors define representation, cultural production, social evidence and artistic participation. It also has limits. The sources selected for discussion cannot be assumed to represent the whole field; publication and language biases may shape which arguments are visible; and the review does not independently test claims about the social effects of particular art programmes. Examples are therefore used to clarify analytical points, not to establish causal effects.

The review also distinguishes between primary artistic works and scholarly writing about those works. A painting, novel, performance or film may be a primary cultural artefact for a study of representation or historical memory. It does not, by itself, establish the prevalence of a social condition or the causal explanation for that condition. Such claims require additional contextual and empirical evidence.

Conversely, a social-scientific study of audiences or institutions may explain patterns of reception but may not exhaust the formal, aesthetic or interpretive significance of a work. The two types of material answer different questions and should be related carefully.

No new interviews, surveys, experiments or observations involving human participants were conducted for this article. The analysis is based on published and publicly accessible documents. Accordingly, the paper does not report a new participant dataset or statistical analysis. The data availability statement at the end of the manuscript identifies the nature of the documentary materials and the means by which the underlying published sources can be located. The reference list is intended to provide a traceable starting point for checking the literature discussed. This is not a claim that a separate coded database or a contemporaneous search log exists; no such record is asserted where it was not created.

This method has two consequences for the interpretation of the article. First, the conclusions are conceptual and methodological. They suggest how interdisciplinary work can be organised and assessed, rather than claiming that all arts-based projects have demonstrated the same outcomes. Second, the article's value rests on the clarity of its synthesis and the usefulness of the distinctions it develops. A future systematic review could build on this work by defining databases, search terms, inclusion criteria, publication dates and a transparent screening procedure. A separate empirical study could then examine how particular collaborations operate in universities, cultural institutions or communities.

During preparation of this revised manuscript, a generative AI language model was used to assist with restructuring and drafting portions of the text. The author reviewed the resulting material, remains responsible for the interpretation and final wording, and must verify all factual claims and references before submission.

3. Defining the arts, the social sciences and interdisciplinarity

The boundaries between the arts and social sciences are historically contingent rather than natural divisions. Universities organise knowledge into departments, faculties, curricula and professional pathways, but the categories do not always correspond neatly to the work scholars perform. Literature can be analysed through sociology; political movements can be studied through theatre and performance; music can serve as a subject for anthropology; and visual methods can form part of public-health or community research. History, philosophy, communication and cultural studies are especially likely to cross conventional boundaries. A useful account of interconnectivity must therefore distinguish institutional labels from intellectual practice.

For the purposes of this article, the arts are understood as practices that create, interpret or perform expressive forms, including literature, music, visual representation, drama, dance, film and related media. The social sciences are understood as disciplines that investigate social relations, institutions, collective behaviour, political organisation, economic life and cultural practice through explicit conceptual and methodological approaches. These are working definitions, not claims that all institutions use the terms

in the same way. The humanities also contribute important interpretive traditions, especially close reading, historical contextualisation and philosophical analysis. In practice, an interdisciplinary project may draw on the arts, humanities and social sciences at the same time.

The degree of integration should be proportionate to the research question. A study of the social history of a theatre company may need historical records, interviews, institutional analysis and attention to performance. A study of the formal structure of a poem may require close literary analysis, with social context used to clarify rather than replace the reading. A study of public responses to a film may require audience research and analysis of circulation. Each project involves a different relationship between creative form and social evidence. No single formula can determine the right balance in advance.

The arts and social sciences also differ in their standards of evaluation. An artistic work may be assessed through formal innovation, craft, expressive power, historical significance or its relation to an artistic tradition. Social-scientific research is commonly evaluated through the clarity of its question, the suitability of its methods, the quality of evidence, the transparency of analysis and the plausibility of its conclusions. These standards can overlap, but they are not identical. A moving performance is not automatically a reliable representation of every member of a community; a statistically robust study does not necessarily capture the full emotional or symbolic meaning of an experience. Interdisciplinary work needs to explain how different standards are being used and why.

The reverse relationship is also important. Social-scientific concepts can help artists understand the conditions under which works are produced and received. Concepts such as class, gender, race, identity, socialisation, power, migration and collective memory may inform the themes or forms of a work. Yet such concepts should not become rigid templates that predetermine artistic meaning. An artist may deliberately resist a familiar social explanation, create ambiguity or present a perspective that unsettles established categories. The analytical contribution of social science is strongest when it expands the questions available to artists rather than prescribing what art should say.

4. Historical and theoretical foundations

The relationship between artistic expression and social understanding predates the modern university. Communities have used songs, stories, ritual, monuments, images and performance to transmit memory, mark social relationships and interpret events. These practices were not always separated into “art” and “social science” as contemporary academic institutions classify them. Their social functions can be examined alongside their expressive forms, rather than being forced into a modern disciplinary division (Geertz 1973). They often formed part of religious life, political authority, education, healing, trade, commemoration and community organisation. Any historical account should therefore avoid projecting current disciplinary divisions too far into the past.

In many societies, oral poetry, music and performance have served as repositories of collective memory. They can preserve accounts of migration, conflict, lineage, political legitimacy and moral obligation. But oral and artistic forms are not neutral containers of facts. They are performed for particular audiences,

shaped by conventions and sometimes revised to meet changing needs. A song of praise may preserve details about a ruler while also legitimising authority; a lament may express grief and establish a community's moral claim; a dramatic retelling may bring old events into conversation with contemporary disputes. Historical analysis can clarify the context and circulation of these forms, while artistic analysis can attend to rhythm, narrative, symbolism and performance.

The emergence of modern academic disciplines introduced new institutional boundaries. During the nineteenth century, universities and professional associations increasingly defined specialised fields, developed disciplinary methods and established standards of expertise. Sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics and political science took distinct forms, although they continued to draw on philosophy, history and literary writing. The arts likewise developed specialised institutions, professional roles and critical traditions. This process made sustained inquiry possible, but it could also encourage scholars to treat aesthetic expression and social explanation as separate domains.

Snow's "two cultures" argument is one influential statement of the problem created by intellectual separation (Snow 1959). Becker's account of "art worlds" also shows that artistic production depends on cooperative networks, conventions and resources, not only on individual inspiration (Becker 1982). His concern was that specialists could lose the ability to communicate across disciplinary cultures and therefore fail to address important public problems. The argument has limitations: it can make the humanities and sciences appear more internally uniform than they are, and it does not fully capture the diversity of the social sciences. Nevertheless, it raises a question that remains relevant to arts–social science relations: what kinds of knowledge become unavailable when scholars regard the methods of another field as irrelevant or unintelligible?

Bourdieu's theory of cultural production provides a way to understand artistic activity as both creative and social. In his account, cultural works emerge within fields structured by relations among artists, critics, publishers, galleries, educational institutions, funders and audiences. These actors compete over resources and recognition, and their positions affect what can be produced, circulated and valued (Bourdieu 1993). The theory does not reduce a work to its economic conditions. Rather, it shows that artistic autonomy, reputation and aesthetic judgement are themselves formed through social relationships. A work can possess distinctive formal qualities while also being shaped by institutions and struggles over legitimacy.

Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital is useful here because cultural competence is not distributed evenly (Bourdieu 1986). Familiarity with particular genres, styles, languages or institutions can affect access to education and cultural participation. The ability to recognise a reference in a novel or understand the conventions of a musical form may be treated as personal taste, yet it is often connected to family experience, schooling and social position. This perspective enables researchers to ask whose cultural knowledge is recognised, which practices are labelled prestigious, and how institutions reproduce or challenge distinctions between legitimate and popular culture.

Hall's account of representation adds a related but distinct emphasis. Representation does not simply reproduce a reality that already has a fixed meaning; it participates in the production of meaning through language, images, classification and shared cultural codes (Hall 1997). This approach is especially useful for examining how groups are depicted in literature, news, film, museums and public campaigns. It directs attention to who has the authority to represent whom, what stereotypes are repeated, and which experiences are rendered visible or invisible. However, representation analysis should not assume that audiences receive messages passively. People interpret cultural works from different social positions and may accept, negotiate or resist the meanings offered to them.

The relationship between art and society can also be considered through the idea of dialogue. Bakhtin's work on language and the novel emphasises the interaction of voices, social languages and competing perspectives (Bakhtin 1981). Although his work is not a general theory of every art form, it offers a way to think about artistic works as spaces in which social meanings encounter one another. A novel may place official language alongside everyday speech, expose the assumptions of an authoritative narrator or allow conflicting viewpoints to remain unresolved. Social analysis can examine the historical and institutional conditions of these voices; literary analysis can show how the work constructs their interaction.

5. How the arts contribute to social-scientific inquiry

The arts can contribute to social-scientific inquiry in at least five connected ways: they provide cultural materials for analysis; make experience communicable; enable forms of participation; support the presentation of research; and invite reflection on aspects of social life that may be difficult to express through conventional research instruments. These contributions should be assessed in relation to the question being asked. The presence of an artistic element does not automatically make a study more inclusive or more accurate, but artistic practices can widen the range of evidence and forms of communication available to researchers.

5.1 Art as a source for understanding social life

Novels, songs, films, paintings, photographs and performances can serve as cultural materials for the study of social values and historical change. A literary text may reveal the language through which a society imagines class, gender, authority or belonging. A popular song may offer evidence about political mood, religious commitment, consumer aspiration or local identity. A film can show how a particular period represents family life, urban space or national history. Such materials can be especially valuable when researchers investigate cultural ideals, public narratives or the ways communities imagine themselves.

The evidentiary value of an artwork depends on the question. If the question concerns the representation of poverty in a novel, close analysis of the novel is central. If the question concerns the actual prevalence of poverty in a population, the novel cannot substitute for demographic or economic evidence. It may

show how poverty is imagined, narrated or morally evaluated, but it cannot establish the frequency of a condition. Similarly, a film about migration may provide material for analysing public narratives of displacement without proving that every migrant shares the experiences portrayed. The distinction between representation and prevalence is fundamental to sound interdisciplinary work.

5.2 Making lived experience visible and communicable

Social-scientific research often depends on categories, tables, survey responses and analytical concepts. These are necessary tools, but they can compress complex experience. Artistic forms may make aspects of lived experience more accessible by giving them narrative, image, sound, movement or spatial form. A poem can communicate the temporal texture of grief; a photograph can draw attention to the material conditions of a place; a performance can stage the conflict between public expectations and private feeling. Such forms can help researchers and audiences engage with experiences that are difficult to communicate through abstract description alone.

5.3 Arts-based and participatory methods

Arts-based research uses artistic processes in the development, analysis or communication of research. The precise meaning of the term varies, but the central point is that art is more than an illustration added after the analysis has been completed. Creative practice can shape the research question, generate material, support interpretation or provide a form in which findings are presented. A researcher might use drawing to explore how participants map a neighbourhood, theatre to examine institutional relationships, or collaborative photography to investigate the meaning of public space. The method should be selected because it fits the research problem, not because it appears innovative.

Participatory visual methods, including photovoice, illustrate both the promise and the demands of such work. In photovoice projects, participants use photographs and discussion to document aspects of their lives and communicate concerns to audiences or decision-makers. Wang and Burris (1997) describe photovoice as a process that connects images, critical dialogue and community action. More broadly, visual research requires attention to how images are made, interpreted and placed within relations of power (Rose 2016). The method can give participants greater control over what they wish to show and discuss, although that control is never complete: researchers still influence recruitment, framing, analysis and dissemination. Images may also reveal identities or locations unintentionally. Ethical planning must therefore consider consent, ownership, privacy and the possible consequences of public circulation.

Participatory theatre and community arts provide related possibilities. A group may use performance to explore a conflict, rehearse alternative responses or communicate an experience to a wider audience. Helguera (2011) examines socially engaged art as a practice that involves relationships, participation and social contexts rather than treating the finished object as the only relevant outcome. Matarasso's account of participatory art also emphasises the diversity of practices and the need to examine both their strengths and their difficulties (Matarasso 2019). These perspectives caution against assuming that participation is automatically empowering. The process may reproduce unequal authority if

professional facilitators control the agenda, if participants are invited only to validate a predetermined message, or if the work is used to claim community endorsement without meaningful consent.

5.4 Communication of research findings

Art can help researchers communicate complex findings to audiences outside the academy. A short film, illustrated report, exhibition, podcast or staged reading may make a project accessible to people who would not read a technical article. Creative communication can also support public discussion by giving an audience a concrete point of entry into an issue. Yet accessibility should not be confused with simplification at any cost. A compelling narrative can omit uncertainty, overstate causation or privilege one participant's experience over others. Researchers must make clear what the creative output shows, what it leaves out and how it relates to the underlying evidence.

A documentary film, for example, depends on choices about whom to record, what footage to retain, how to arrange events and what sound or narration to use. These choices shape the audience's understanding. A film can be factually grounded and still construct a particular interpretation. The appropriate response is not to abandon creative presentation but to make its construction transparent. Researchers should preserve a record of relevant methodological decisions, explain the basis for claims, and avoid presenting edited scenes as if they were unmediated reality.

5.5 Memory, heritage and historical interpretation

Artistic forms can preserve and reinterpret cultural memory. Songs, monuments, photographs, theatre and oral performance may provide material for examining how communities remember events and how public narratives change. Their value lies not only in recording information but also in showing how events acquire emotional and symbolic significance. A commemorative monument, for instance, tells a story through its location, design, inscriptions and omissions. The social scientist may ask who commissioned it, whose memory it represents and how people use the site. The art historian or cultural critic may examine its visual conventions, material choices and aesthetic language. Historical inquiry can compare the claims of the monument with other records.

Memory is not identical to a complete or uncontested account of the past. Communities may preserve conflicting versions of an event, and public art may silence some groups while honouring others. The use of artistic material as historical evidence therefore requires comparison, contextualisation and attention to the circumstances of preservation. A song or oral narrative should not be dismissed because it is not a written archive, but neither should it be treated as self-verifying. Its meaning and evidentiary limits must be established in relation to the research question.

These contributions show why the arts can be valuable to social-scientific inquiry. They extend the range of cultural materials available for analysis, create forms of participation and communication, and make questions of representation and memory more visible. Their value is strongest when researchers specify what the artistic material can establish and combine it with other evidence where the question demands it.

6. How the social sciences inform artistic production and interpretation

The influence also moves in the other direction. Social-scientific ideas can inform artistic practice by helping artists and cultural institutions understand the settings in which works are created, funded, distributed and interpreted. This influence may be explicit, as when an artist works with a sociologist or uses research on migration to develop a project. It may also be indirect, through public debate, education, institutional policy or the everyday concepts through which people understand social life. The relationship should not be described as a one-way transfer of expert knowledge from social science to art. Artists may question, transform or reject the assumptions embedded in social-scientific explanations.

6.1 Understanding audiences and cultural institutions

Research on audiences can help cultural organisations understand who attends events, who does not, and what barriers shape participation. Surveys, interviews, observation and administrative data may reveal differences related to cost, transport, language, disability access, scheduling, education or perceptions of belonging. Such findings can inform programming and outreach. However, audience research should not reduce cultural participation to attendance figures alone. A person may attend an exhibition without finding it meaningful; another may engage with a work online or through informal discussion without appearing in institutional records. Quantitative indicators can show patterns, while qualitative inquiry can help explain how people interpret their experiences.

The study of cultural institutions also draws attention to gatekeeping. Becker's analysis of cooperative activity in art worlds helps explain how conventions, professional networks and supporting institutions shape what becomes visible as art (Becker 1982). Publishers, galleries, theatres, museums, festivals and funding bodies influence which works reach audiences and which artists receive recognition. Bourdieu's account of cultural production is useful because it treats artistic value and legitimacy as matters shaped by fields of relationships rather than as outcomes of individual talent alone (Bourdieu 1993). This does not mean that aesthetic judgement is merely a disguise for power. It means that judgements take place within institutional settings, and that access to those settings is uneven. Artists and cultural managers can use social-scientific analysis to examine whose work is promoted, whose expertise is recognised and how resources are distributed.

6.2 Social identity, inequality and representation

Sociology, anthropology, psychology and political science provide concepts for examining how identities are formed and represented. Research on gender, class, ethnicity, disability, migration and national belonging can help artists identify the social assumptions embedded in familiar stories or visual conventions. Hall's work is especially relevant because it treats representation as a process through which meanings and identities are constructed, circulated and contested (Hall 1997). A work of art may

reproduce a stereotype, complicate it or expose how the stereotype is maintained. The interpretation depends on form, context and reception, not merely on the presence of a particular character or image.

Social-scientific concepts can also help artists think about the distribution of voice. Who speaks in a narrative? Who is described by others but does not speak for themselves? Which accents, languages or bodily expressions are treated as authoritative? These questions have implications for both artistic choices and institutional practice. Goffman's account of everyday self-presentation, for example, offers concepts for examining how identity is performed and interpreted in social settings (Goffman 1959). They do not require every work to represent every group equally, nor do they imply that a character must be a direct representative of a social category. Rather, they encourage reflection on the assumptions through which audiences are invited to understand social difference.

6.3 Social research and creative decision-making

Research can inform choices about setting, character, narrative structure, material and audience. An artist developing a work about urban poverty may draw on research into housing, labour and public policy to avoid relying solely on familiar images of deprivation. A playwright exploring migration may examine the legal, economic and family relationships that shape the experience. A musician working with historical material may study the social contexts in which a genre developed and the changes that occur when it moves between communities or media. In these cases, social science supplies context and questions, not a template for the finished work.

The relationship becomes less productive when research is used as a guarantee of authenticity. No single interview, report or dataset can provide an artist with complete access to another person's experience. A character built from research remains a creative construction. Artists should avoid claiming that a work represents an entire community simply because some members were consulted. Similarly, social scientists should not treat artistic collaboration as a shortcut to ethical legitimacy. Consultation must be meaningful, and the project should make clear what role participants played in shaping the work.

The appropriate approach is to align evaluation with the stated aims of the project and to use more than one source of evidence when necessary. Attendance data may be combined with participant accounts, observation, analysis of the work and longer-term follow-up. Researchers should distinguish between outputs (such as events held), outcomes (such as reported changes in knowledge or participation) and broader impacts (such as sustained changes in institutions or communities). A causal claim requires a design capable of supporting it; positive feedback from participants alone cannot establish that a programme caused a wider social change.

The social sciences can therefore strengthen artistic practice by supplying context, methods for understanding audiences and tools for evaluating programmes. But their contribution should remain open to challenge. Artistic practice is not simply an application of social-scientific findings, and social

science cannot determine the meaning or value of a work by measurement alone. A productive relationship allows each field to question the assumptions of the other.

7. Areas of application and illustrative cases

The preceding discussion can be made clearer by considering areas in which artistic and social-scientific approaches may be brought together. The examples in this section are illustrative rather than reports of new fieldwork conducted for this article. They show how a researcher might combine methods and what kinds of evidence each method could contribute.

7.1 Community development and public participation

Community development projects often involve questions of place, access, local identity and the distribution of resources. Artistic activity can provide a means for residents to describe how they experience a neighbourhood, what they value about it and what they want to change. A community mural, local exhibition, oral-history performance or participatory photography project can create a shared object around which people discuss the past and future of a place. Social-scientific methods can then examine who participated, whose concerns were represented, how decisions were made and whether the process influenced planning or public debate.

7.2 Cultural heritage and historical memory

Museums, archives, memorials and performance traditions provide settings for collaboration between artists, historians, anthropologists and sociologists. A museum exhibition can be studied as a form of historical interpretation and as an institutional arrangement that decides what is collected, displayed and explained. A performance based on oral history can bring past experiences to contemporary audiences, while historical comparison can identify discrepancies between memory and documentary records. Anthropological research can examine the meanings attached to objects and rituals; sociology can investigate how heritage is linked to identity, tourism, status and public policy. Geertz's interpretive approach is useful here because it treats cultural practices as meaningful actions that require contextual interpretation rather than description alone (Geertz 1973).

The relationship between art and political communication is not necessarily democratic. Creative forms can challenge authority, but they can also support propaganda, exclusion or the personalisation of political power. A moving image or memorable slogan can make a political claim persuasive without making it accurate. Social-scientific analysis can help separate emotional appeal from evidence and investigate how media systems, resources and institutional access shape circulation. The aim is not to strip political art of its emotional force, but to understand how that force operates.

7.4 Health, well-being and social relationships

Arts participation is sometimes linked to mental health, social connection and well-being. Music, drama, visual art and movement may provide opportunities for expression, social contact and reflection. Social-

scientific and health research can examine whether particular programmes are associated with changes in reported well-being, participation or other outcomes. However, broad claims that “art improves health” are too general unless the type of activity, population, comparison and outcome are specified. Different activities may have different effects, and a programme that benefits some participants may not be appropriate for everyone.

Research in this area should distinguish between arts participation as a social or cultural experience and a clinical intervention. Where a project makes health claims, its methods should be suitable to the claim and should account for relevant ethical and professional standards. Participants’ accounts can explain what they found meaningful, while quantitative measures may help identify patterns. Neither form of evidence should be made to answer questions it cannot support. Artistic value should not be judged solely by whether it produces a measurable health outcome, and health outcomes should not be inferred from the fact that participants enjoyed an activity.

Interdisciplinary teaching is most effective when learning objectives are explicit. If a course uses drama to teach political institutions, students should learn both the relevant political concepts and how performance shapes interpretation. If visual art is used to examine historical memory, students should consider the source, date, audience and context of the image. Creative activity should not be treated as a substitute for disciplinary knowledge; rather, it can provide another way to question, apply and communicate that knowledge.

7.6 Nigerian and African contexts

The relationship between arts and social sciences should not be discussed only through European and North American examples. Across African societies, music, oral narrative, performance, visual forms and material culture have been central to political authority, religious practice, community memory and social criticism. These practices can be studied as art forms in their own right and as sources for understanding social life. Yet they should not be treated as uniform expressions of a single “African culture.” Artistic forms differ across languages, regions, generations, religious traditions and political histories.

In Nigeria, literary writing, popular music, theatre, film and visual art have provided ways to address colonial experience, national identity, urban life, corruption, inequality, religious change and environmental concerns. Such works can be analysed through their aesthetic choices and through the social settings in which they are produced and received. Research on Nigerian university arts institutions, cultural policy and creative industries can also examine how education, funding, infrastructure and markets shape opportunities for artists. A careful account would draw on verifiable local scholarship and specific cases rather than relying on broad generalisations about Nigerian society.

The Nigerian context also demonstrates why interdisciplinary work needs local knowledge. A song, performance or visual symbol may carry meanings that are not obvious to an outside observer. Translation can preserve some meanings while losing others; public reception may differ between local

audiences and national or international markets. Researchers should therefore work with relevant languages, historical sources and community knowledge where possible, and be cautious about interpreting a cultural form solely through imported theoretical categories. Banks (2007) and Pink (2013) similarly stress that visual and sensory materials need to be interpreted in relation to their production, circulation and social use. Concepts from Bourdieu, Hall or Snow can be useful, but they should be tested against the evidence and adapted where local histories require it.

Taken together, these areas show that arts–social science collaboration can contribute to public communication, historical interpretation, education, cultural policy and community engagement. The examples do not prove that every interdisciplinary project succeeds. They instead identify the questions that must be asked when assessing a project: what problem is being addressed, whose knowledge is included, what each method contributes, how claims are supported, and what consequences may follow from the work.

8. Tensions, limitations and conditions for responsible collaboration

The benefits of interconnectivity should not obscure its difficulties. Collaboration between arts and social sciences may encounter differences in language, timescale, evaluation, institutional reward and control over outputs. Researchers may expect a clear account of methods and findings, while artists may need room for experimentation, ambiguity and revision. A funding body may demand measurable outcomes, whereas participants may value the process for reasons that cannot be reduced to indicators. These tensions do not mean that collaboration is impossible. They mean that expectations should be negotiated rather than assumed to be shared.

8.1 The risk of instrumentalising art

One difficulty arises when art is valued only for its usefulness to an external objective. A programme may be funded because it is expected to reduce crime, improve health, increase tourism or promote social cohesion. Such aims can be legitimate, but they may narrow the space for artistic exploration and lead institutions to privilege projects whose outcomes are easy to count. Art can have social consequences without being designed as an instrument of policy. It can also be challenging, unsettling or critical in ways that do not produce immediate agreement or measurable benefit.

Evaluation should therefore distinguish the artistic aims of a project from its social aims and explain how each will be assessed. If a theatre project seeks to develop a new performance and also to encourage public discussion, the artistic quality of the performance and the nature of public discussion are related but distinct outcomes. Neither should be used as a substitute for the other. This distinction protects artistic autonomy while allowing claims about social impact to be examined carefully.

8.2 The risk of treating art as transparent evidence

A second difficulty is the assumption that artistic works reveal social reality directly. An artwork is constructed through selection, style, genre, technique and point of view. It may document, exaggerate, idealise, parody or deliberately distort. These qualities are part of its meaning, not defects to be removed. A social scientist who uses art as evidence must ask what kind of claim the work can support. A novel can illuminate cultural assumptions and imagined possibilities, but it cannot alone establish how widely those assumptions are held. A film can preserve an event and still shape its interpretation through editing and narration.

This limitation is not a reason to exclude artistic material from research. Written records, surveys and administrative datasets are also produced within institutions and can contain omissions or biases. The relevant requirement is critical comparison. Researchers should consider provenance, intended audience, context, mode of production and relation to other sources. They should distinguish what is directly visible in the work from what they infer about the society in which it circulated.

8.3 Unequal power and representation

Interdisciplinary projects may reproduce inequalities even when they aim to address them. Academic researchers often control funding, publication and the language used to describe results. Artists may control the final form of a work, while participants provide stories or images without having meaningful influence over how these materials are used. Community partners may be asked to contribute time and knowledge but receive little recognition or benefit. The language of participation can hide these differences if it does not specify who makes decisions.

Responsible collaboration requires clear agreements about roles, attribution, ownership, consent, payment where appropriate and the right to withdraw when feasible. Researchers should explain the likely audiences and uses of the material, especially where images, performances or personal narratives could expose participants to stigma or unwanted attention. The broader qualitative-research tradition also stresses reflexivity: researchers should examine how their position and choices shape the evidence and interpretation they present (Denzin and Lincoln 2018). Consent is not a single administrative step that resolves every ethical question. It is part of an ongoing relationship that may need to be revisited as the project develops.

8.4 Standards of evidence and interpretation

A further challenge concerns the different standards through which artistic and social-scientific work is evaluated. Creative research may produce an artwork, performance or exhibition as a central output. Social-scientific reviewers may ask for a conventional methods section, while artistic collaborators may regard the creative process itself as a form of inquiry. The solution is not to abandon standards but to make them explicit. A project should explain the role of the artwork, the evidence used, the decisions made during production and the basis for the conclusions drawn.

Where a project makes empirical claims, it should provide enough information for readers to assess those claims. Where it makes an interpretive or artistic argument, it should explain the relevant context

and demonstrate how its reading follows from the material. Some outputs may require more than one form of documentation. A film can be accompanied by a written account of selection and editing decisions; an exhibition can include curatorial notes; a participatory project can explain recruitment, facilitation and analysis. These materials help audiences understand the relationship between creative choices and research claims.

Institutions can support collaboration by recognising different forms of scholarly and creative output, providing time for joint planning, and establishing clear procedures for authorship, intellectual property and evaluation. Training can help students and researchers understand methods outside their home discipline. But institutional support should not be reduced to creating a new centre or adding an interdisciplinary label to an existing programme. The substance of collaboration lies in the way research questions, methods and interpretations are brought together.

8.6 Limitations of this article

This article has limitations that follow from its documentary and interpretive design. It does not report a systematic review with exhaustive database searches, formal screening criteria or a quantitative synthesis. The selection of literature is therefore not comprehensive, and the discussion may omit relevant work published in languages or venues not represented in the sources examined. The article does not present new fieldwork, interviews, surveys or experiments, and it does not independently test the outcomes of arts programmes. Its illustrative cases clarify possible relationships between methods but do not establish that a particular intervention produces a specific social effect.

These limitations define the appropriate scope of the conclusions. The article offers a conceptual synthesis and a set of methodological considerations for interdisciplinary work; it does not claim to provide a complete history of all relations between the arts and social sciences, nor does it rank the effectiveness of different methods. Further research could test the arguments in defined settings, compare collaborative projects over time, or conduct a systematic review of arts-based methods in a particular discipline. Such work would require a more explicit search protocol and a clearly delimited evidence base.

Acknowledging these limitations strengthens rather than weakens the article. It makes clear what the analysis can reasonably support and identifies ways future work could extend it. Interconnectivity is best treated as a practical and intellectual achievement that must be demonstrated in each project, not as a benefit that follows automatically from bringing different disciplines together.

9. Implications and recommendations

Several implications follow from the analysis. First, researchers should begin with a clearly defined question and then decide which artistic and social-scientific methods are needed. Interdisciplinary work should not be organised around the assumption that every project requires a creative output or that

every artwork needs to be evaluated through social-scientific measures. The method should fit the question, the available evidence and the purpose of the research.

Second, interdisciplinary curricula should teach students to recognise both shared concerns and differences in disciplinary standards. Courses that combine arts and social sciences can ask students to analyse a cultural work, identify the social context in which it was produced, and evaluate the limits of the evidence it provides. Students should also learn how surveys, interviews, archives, observation and creative practice produce different kinds of knowledge. This approach is more useful than simply placing unrelated courses side by side.

Third, universities and cultural institutions should provide practical support for collaboration. Joint seminars, shared supervision, artist–researcher partnerships and community-based projects can help participants understand each other's methods. Institutions should also clarify expectations about authorship, attribution, intellectual property, data management and the evaluation of outputs. Where community members contribute knowledge or creative labour, their role should be recognised fairly.

Fourth, projects that make claims about social impact should develop an evaluation plan proportionate to those claims. This may involve a combination of attendance records, participant accounts, observation, analysis of the artistic work and follow-up research. The distinction between outputs, outcomes and longer-term impacts should be maintained, and causal claims should be made only where the research design supports them. At the same time, artistic value should not be reduced to the achievement of policy targets.

Fifth, researchers should treat ethics as part of the design of interdisciplinary work. Images, performances and personal narratives can identify people or places even when names are removed. Researchers should consider consent, ownership, audience, circulation and potential harm before collecting or publishing material. In participatory projects, they should also be clear about how decisions are made and how participants can influence the final output.

Finally, scholars should continue to develop context-sensitive approaches, including work grounded in Nigerian and other African histories and cultural practices. Freire's emphasis on dialogue and critical pedagogy also provides a useful reminder that participation should involve critical agency rather than one-way delivery of expert messages (Freire 1970). Concepts developed in one intellectual setting can be valuable elsewhere, but their relevance should be argued rather than assumed. Local languages, artistic traditions, institutional histories and community interpretations can reveal dimensions that are missed when research relies only on generalised frameworks. This does not require rejecting international scholarship; it requires putting different forms of knowledge into a critical relationship.

10. Conclusion

The arts and the social sciences are connected by their shared concern with human experience, but their relationship is more complex than a simple claim that each enriches the other. Artistic forms can

preserve memory, represent social relationships, communicate lived experience and provide material for the study of culture. Social-scientific inquiry can clarify the institutions, inequalities, audiences and historical circumstances that shape artistic production and reception. The connection is reciprocal, but it does not erase differences between creative expression and empirical explanation.

The theoretical discussion has shown how the debate about the “two cultures,” Bourdieu’s account of cultural production and Hall’s theory of representation can help explain the relationship. The methodological discussion has shown that arts-based and participatory approaches can extend research practice, provided that their role is clearly defined and their claims are supported by appropriate evidence. Illustrative applications in community development, heritage, political communication, well-being, education and Nigerian cultural life demonstrate the range of questions that can benefit from collaboration.

The article has also emphasised that interdisciplinarity is not automatically successful. Art can be instrumentalised when judged only by policy outcomes; artistic works can be misread when treated as transparent records of society; and participatory projects can reproduce unequal power when decisions and benefits are not shared. Researchers must therefore be explicit about methods, evidence, interpretation and ethics. They should respect artistic form without abandoning critical scrutiny, and use social-scientific analysis without reducing creative work to a set of measurable effects.

The central conclusion is that productive interconnectivity depends on a disciplined openness to other ways of knowing. It requires collaboration that is grounded in clear questions, transparent methods, contextual understanding and respect for the distinct contributions of the arts and social sciences. When these conditions are met, interdisciplinary work can provide a fuller account of cultural production and social life than either field is likely to achieve in isolation.

Declarations

Competing Interests

The author declares no competing interests.

Ethical Approval

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Informed Consent

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

Author Contribution

M.J.I. conceived the study, conducted the literature review and critical analysis, structured the historical and theoretical frameworks, and wrote and reviewed the final manuscript text.

Data Availability

This article is based on published scholarship and publicly accessible documentary materials cited in the reference list. The cited books and article are the principal sources supporting the analysis and can be located through their publishers, library catalogues or journal platforms. No new participant dataset, survey dataset or experimental dataset was generated for this article. No separate coded dataset or formal search log was created as part of the original research process. The source list in the manuscript identifies the materials used in the revised discussion; the authors can provide clarification about the cited sources upon reasonable request.

References

1. Bakhtin MM (1981) In: Holquist M, Emerson C, Holquist M (eds) The dialogic imagination: Four essays. University of Texas, Trans
2. Banks M (2007) Using visual data in qualitative research. Sage
3. Barone T, Eisner EW (2012) Arts based research. Sage
4. Becker HS (1982) Art worlds. University of California Press
5. Bourdieu P (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson JG (ed) Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Greenwood, pp 241–258
6. Bourdieu P (1993) In: Johnson R (ed) The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature. Columbia University
7. Denzin NK, Lincoln YS (eds) (2018) The Sage handbook of qualitative research, 5th edn. Sage
8. Eisner EW (2002) The arts and the creation of mind. Yale University Press
9. Freire P (1970) Pedagogy of the oppressed. Herder and Herder
10. Geertz C (1973) The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. Basic Books
11. Goffman E (1959) The presentation of self in everyday life. Doubleday
12. Hall S (ed) (1997) Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. Sage
13. Helguera P (2011) Education for socially engaged art: A materials and techniques handbook. Jorge Pinto Books
14. Leavy P (2020) Method meets art: Arts-based research practice, 3rd edn. Guilford Press
15. Matarasso F (2019) A restless art: How participation won, and why it matters. Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation

16. Pink S (2013) Doing visual ethnography, 3rd edn. Sage
17. Rose G (2016) Visual methodologies: An introduction to researching with visual materials, 4th edn. Sage
18. Snow CP (1959) The two cultures and the scientific revolution. Cambridge University Press
19. Wang C, Burris MA (1997) Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. Health Educ Behav 24(3):369–387. https://doi.org/10.1177/109019819702400309

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- SupplementaryDocumentarySourceInventory.pdf