

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

## NEW ARCHITECTURAL CRITICISM: HOW TO SEPARATE THE WHEAT FROM THE CHAFF IN INTERDISCIPLINARY DESIGN RESEARCH

**Igea Santina Troiani**

Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom

[troiani@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:troiani@brookes.ac.uk)

**Suzanne Ewing**

The University of Edinburgh, Scotland

[suzanne.ewing@ed.ac.uk](mailto:suzanne.ewing@ed.ac.uk)

### ABSTRACT

*As co-editors-in-chief of the interdisciplinary, international journal Architecture and Culture, we aim in this essay to examine the space of architectural criticism in the review process of architectural publication. Using our experience as editors, we examine how the assessment criteria for research – objectivity, reliability, validity – impact on our ambition to create a rigorous space that is not only interdisciplinary but also transdisciplinary and ‘undisciplinary’ (Marshall and Bleeker in Rodgers and Smyth eds., 2010: 219) in what constitutes writing about architecture and culture. Building upon the writings of Elizabeth Grosz (2001: xv) who argues for the production of a positive ‘third space’ between disciplines, and Julia Kristeva (in Coles and Defert eds., 1997: 1-22) who identifies a hesitation to embrace interdisciplinarity within institutions, we propose that in order to facilitate true interdisciplinary architectural research we need to re-evaluate our refereeing culture, assessment criteria, and author-reviewer-editor relations to challenge established methods of reviewing design research. We discuss our decision to modify standard referee forms in order to engender positive and more open assessment of design research that may expand the disciplinary confines. In light of the flagged decline of architectural criticism as public activity and in public discourse, we set out the formulations and evolutions of architectural criticism and its influence on architectural thought and practice. We propose the growth of a more consolidated, positive, but possibly hesitant, ‘third space’ (Grosz, 2001: xv) of history-theory-design-criticism inside architectural publishing, which may contribute to constructing and influencing new public ‘outsides’ of interdisciplinary design research.*

*Keywords: Architectural Design Research, New Architectural Criticism, Peer-review*

### 1 ‘OLD’ PEER-REVIEWING

“ [...] The business of a critic is to discriminate the better from the worse, or – if you like – the more beautiful from the uglier, the more valuable from the less. The word implies it. In ancient Greek, it pertains to winnowing or sieving: separating the wheat from the chaff” (Rykwert, 2014: 4).

The word “‘criticism’ derives from the Greek, *krinein*, meaning to separate, to sift, to make distinctions” (Attoe, 1978: 4). Whether writing in the academic or popular press, architectural critics are sifters and interpreters of architectural knowledge. They are attentive observers and narrators of better, beautiful, valuable architecture or architectural discourse. The critic’s project is to produce criticism – design review, reportage, journalism or academic scholarly argument – understood as the best publishable material that will enhance, for their audience, the understanding of the subject matter under consideration – for architecture, typically designed buildings and their inhabitation. The ‘instrumental purpose’ (Stead, 2003: 50) of criticism differs to that of review in that it requires the taking of a position – sometimes even partisan ‘for the public

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

*Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing*

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

good' (Forgey, 2003: 96) – on the subject matter. Consequently both Joseph Rykwert and David Leatherbarrow (2009: 19) posit criticism as an active rather than passive practice, seeing it as “‘a way of making’, even of world-making”. If architectural criticism is active, and a form of architectural production, it therefore can be understood as a project of interpretation and imagination (Leatherbarrow, 2009: 96 -97) that involves the production of a record of the work being examined as well as a new crafted work in itself. “Writing can’t be a reflection of building. If anything it should be a distortion. It takes something we think we know and presents it differently. It creates a new thing” (Colomina in Colomina, Mastrigli, Stadler and Rattenbury, 2005: 75).

In architecture, the making of distinctions through discrimination is exercised through the eye – keenness of observation, seeing things afresh etc. – and voice – the capacity to interpret, rearticulate and communicate to an audience – where both are based on knowledge of the field. After evaluation and judgement has been made, the conventional material of criticism’s craft is generally textual (Stadler in Colomina, Mastrigli, Stadler and Rattenbury, 2005: 78; Crosbie, 2009). While architecture remains an autonomous self-contained discipline, the objects of architecture (as building) and architectural writing (as conventional narrative) have been clearly defined and known. However because contemporary architectural design is transforming such that architecture might appear (safely) *as* architecture but also, as Mark Linder (2004: 14) suggests; “where, [...] architecture [might] make its appearance *other than as architecture*”, architectural criticism has become a more complex endeavour. Contemporary changes to the boundaries of architectural design and research production have loosened the definition of the discipline. Discourses and practices previously institutionalised within architecture have changed to traverse and converse with the knowledge and practices of other disciplines outside of, but related to, architecture. Faced with assessing and judging new kinds of exploratory and experimental work, the ‘old’ modes of peer-review used to assess what constitutes quality are now less effective. This demands the formation of a new architectural criticism to define what is unpublishable.

“[...] Journals] are defined as much by what [...] they] do not publish as what makes the page” (Bose in Kimmelman, McGuigan, Davidson, Goldberger, Stephens eds, 2013: 17). As co-editors-in-chief of the interdisciplinary, international journal *Architecture and Culture (A&C)* we aim to examine the space of architectural criticism in the review process of architectural publication in *A&C*, and the peer reviewer as an emergent new interdisciplinary critic. We examine how the assessment criteria for research – objectivity, reliability, validity – impact on our editorial ambition for more creative interdisciplinary publication. Building upon the writings of Elizabeth Grosz (2001) and Julia Kristeva (in Coles and Defert eds., 1997: 1-22) about operating outside disciplinary conventions, we propose that in order to facilitate true interdisciplinary architectural design research we need to re-evaluate our writing and refereeing culture – the space of production of criticism – in order to challenge established norms. The complexity of assessing submissions that are not conventional text-centred expositions, but also audio and visual evidenced architectural research, requires reconsideration of the standard academic refereeing process. The new space of criticism must be redefined to be more accommodating of other disciplinary tools, techniques and knowledge. To support the publication of cutting edge interdisciplinary academic architectural research, we seek the growth of a more positive, but possibly hesitant, ‘third

space' (Grosz, 2001: xv) of history-theory-design-criticism inside architectural publishing that may contribute to constructing and influencing new public 'outsides' of interdisciplinary design research.

We do this by asking firstly: what are the characteristics of the 'old' architectural critic/criticism? Secondly, how might new and relevant modes of architectural criticism make space for interdisciplinary research? Thirdly what are the expectations and qualities of a new peer-review process that might matter to the various disciplines participating in interdisciplinary research in architecture? How can new critical conversations emerge – where the author, critic and editor change their expectations of assessment – in order to sift and make distinctions of the wheat from the chaff, understood here as the publishable versus the unpublishable? Can criticism's purpose – "to feed the intellectual ecology of our field" (Lavin, 2009: 19) – transform to accommodate multiple disciplinary fields?

## 2 THE 'OLD' ARCHITECTURAL CRITIC: AUTONOMOUS DISCIPLINARY DISCOURSE

Andrew Leach and Anthony Moulis (2010) identify two types of architectural critic: the critic-historian, exemplified by Manfredo Tafuri, and the critic-activist, epitomized by Jane Jacobs. Leach and Moulis explore the mandate and motivation of both, where their authority to enter into the field of knowledge of architecture and urban design derives from the tone and purpose of their voices and where they see their limits. Leach and Moulis (2009: 307) assert; "Both [Tafuri and Jacobs] claim that it is the critic's task simply to make the complexities of the present clear, and to unmask the architect's or planner's motivations and their origins." These critics are active in the design process, interacting with architecture and designers, creating architectural criticism that is iterative and pedagogic. Through criticism the critic can 'equip' architects towards the best architecture (Leach and Moulis, 2010: 306). "A good critic can teach the architect things about their own building, things which they haven't realised, haven't noticed, and even, significantly, haven't intended" (Stead, 2003: 52).

Typically though, the architectural critic's prime responsibility was to the wider public. "A good critic is [...] able to write about architecture – and [...] the critical process itself – in an engaging, insightful, clear, and eloquent manner. They can open a project to a wider audience, as well as to a wider interpretation" (Stead, 2003: 52). In design reportage and journalism, readers can respond and dialogue through writing letters to the editor. Lavin (2009: 19) argues that architectural criticism should be a conversation. She recalls Tafuri's term, 'critique passionnée', which he used to denote the force exerted by the critical texts of the 1930s. These texts were by writers who were passionately moved by architectural subjects and who felt compelled to write about them so as to move others. Because of their impassioned position, Tafuri argues however that the critics lacked an adequate subjective distance.

In the last decade, academic debates around architectural discontentment with 'criticality' –following on from the consequences of pedagogically inheriting Tafuri's position on this (Baird, 2004) – have coincided with a more general sense of the inadequacies of contemporary architectural criticism. In "Three Complaints about Architectural Criticism" Stead (2003: 50) observes that the idea that "criticism is "not critical enough" and that it is characterised by mild, politely descriptive, aesthetic or formalist approaches" springs from a series of assumptions. They are: "that critics are not sufficiently objective, that they are biased by their own connections within the small and close-knit architectural

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

community, that they are complicit with the commercial bias of the journals, [and] that they are timid and afraid of litigation [...]" (Stead, 2003: 50). This relatively closed loop of an inner disciplinary conversation lacks a critical distance between critic and designer/architecture. A lack of frictional and outside accountability, the uncovering of some 'truth' about a subject, is relinquished for validation of particular practices and projects in a community of authors. Flattering or promotional criticism is at odds with a historically embedded pedagogical practice of negative criticism in architectural education and research review writing. Design review criticism in the British architectural academy has tended toward negative discourse, "frequently a playground for the display of intellectual superiority, arrogance and occasional bullying" (Parnell and Sara in El-Husseiny, 2009: 91). Stead (2003: 50) continues:

There is a pervasive belief abroad that criticism is only ever rigorous and true if it is negative. In fact, the etymological origins of the word "criticism" relate more to discernment, disinterested judgement, and the ability to make distinctions, than to actual fault-finding. Nevertheless, in its everyday usage the word has become synonymous with negativity, with pulling things apart; and there remains a common belief that even the most insightful and incisive criticism does not count as adequately "critical" if it comes to an ultimately positive conclusion. There is a curious masochism, or at least a deep sense of suspicion, to this sensibility that insists on recasting critical praise as obsequiousness. [...] But it is also rather sad that enthusiasm or praise is read as a sign of naivety or weakness on the part of the critic.

In "The Strange Death of Architectural Criticism", Martin Pawley (1998: 330) laments the demise of "take-no-prisoners" criticism in architectural journalism, something he himself was recognised for practicing (Rybczynski, 2008). Pawley compares the original wording of a piece of text about an architect with a revised version after 'factual errors' have been copy checked and altered in tone (presumably by his editor) to present a more tempered picture of the anonymous architect described. Pawley (1998: 330) contemplates the future of design criticism in relation to the critic's practice, in particular the delivery of direct and undiplomatic judgements, in a more litigious world. Like Pawley, many other predominantly "white, male and old" (Forgey: 2003: 95) architectural critics of his generation saw negative criticism as "good" for toughening up the designer, and ultimately for shaping better architecture. Whether delivering positive or negative criticism, Davies (2008: 94) points out that Pawley and his generation of critics aimed to discriminate for, or against, with the aim of presenting a reasonable and balanced overview.

There seems little contention that the 'old' architectural critic and public criticism has shifted. When the well-known architecture critic of *The New Yorker*, Paul Goldberger, resigned his post to become contributing editor of *Vanity Fair*, some even claimed the architectural critic to be dead (Quirk, 2012). As Vanessa Quirk (2012) writes: "I will add a cry to the din: "The Architecture Critic is Dead!" But you know what? Good riddance. Because criticism hasn't died the way you think. It's just been changed beyond recognition. And frankly, for the better." The changed landscape of criticism coincides with making space for interdisciplinary architectural practice and research.

### 3 THE NEW ARCHITECTURAL CRITIC: MAKING SPACE FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY DESIGN RESEARCH

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

*Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing*

Coincident with debates about the value of 'criticality' in architectural discourse in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, the discipline of architecture is undergoing change in design practice and research due to the embracing of interdisciplinarity (Troiani and Ewing; 2014).<sup>i</sup> In architectural criticism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, disciplinary shifts appeared in the variation of Huxtable's attention to high-art derived modernist monuments to Jacobs' broadening of architecture's territory to the social and urban. Critics from the 1970s began to prioritise architecture's connection with the world through a more geographical, sociological, systematic and technological lens. Nowadays, Jonathan Meades' cultural lens allows architecture and architectural criticism to be understood beyond aesthetics and technology as ecology, performance, economics and politics. These shifts create new "discursive formations" (Foucault, 1972/1969: 47-49) encompassing and consciously navigating other disciplinary realms (Troiani, Ewing and Periton, 2013). Creative, interdisciplinary research in architecture appears not only as quantitative data represented in comparative tables and charts. It can appear in a drawing, photograph, poetry, audio recording, film, installation, building etc. The assessment of these kinds of poetic, practice-based outputs needs to be understood, reviewed and validated within the interdisciplinary worlds in which the works are created and accepted for their challenge to what has until recently been a patriarchal, emotionally barren, argumentative landscape of knowledge transfer.

As architectural writers broaden their knowledge of other disciplines, it has become possible to reconsider what is better, beautiful, more valuable for architecture in relation to other disciplines, and as renewed interdisciplinary endeavour. Philosophers Grosz and Kristeva have presented architecture with explicit discourses about the positive potential of interdisciplinary research and practice. The celebration of difference – a second wave feminist agenda; the emergence of new terms and languages; transformations of tired disciplinary practices and tactics; and a questioning of the value of subjective and practice-based research has created a space of new criticism. Grosz (2001: xv) presents the argument that "to be outside (something) is to afford oneself the possibility of a perspective [...]." Grosz (2001: xv) acknowledges that this reflective distance comes at "a cost: to see what cannot be seen is to be unable to experience this inside in its own terms" and argues that "something is lost—the immediate intimacy of an inside position; and something is gained—the ability to critically evaluate that position and to possibly compare it with others. That non-hierarchical 'third space' is detached from the mainstreams of both disciplines but exists at the peripheries, boundaries or in-between of each. For Grosz (2001: xvii) to be outside is to be in a position of highly positive potentiality, where "the outside of one field is the inside of another." A 'third space' can exist in a designer's practice, the space of the author's writing or in new criticism.

The suggestion by Kristeva (in Coles and Defert eds, 1997) that experts in a discipline should not be hesitant to collaborate and converse with one another suggests that disciplinary boundaries need not be defended but instead understood, absorbed and danced across. This is challenging, and requires intellectual work, not just 'polite filtering' (Coyne in Murray ed., 2014: 201). The critic shifts from being an isolated individual authority to participating in broader knowledge teams and exchanges. Through a kind of open, less-guarded practice, the commonly understood "social norms" (Ellison, 2002: 994) in a field - which establish levels and thresholds of value and quality - will need to transform.

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

*Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing*

**11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE**

**APRIL 22-24 2015**

**PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**

**BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE**

**CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:**

**PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS**

In academic publishing examples such as 'Little Magazines' – with a collective editorial aimed at exposing differences and inclusive of multiple voices – *Utopie* and *Melp!* in 1960s France present alternative models of 'free-states' of publication (Petteeu, 2010: 290, 292). Lavin (2009:19) argues that "writing and design were once quite intimate and have both generally been at their best when most entangled". The active deployment of literary conversation will re-establish architectural criticism as "an issue of position, participation, passion" (Lavin, 2009: 19). This is not only a conversation between architect-author-designer and architect-critic but practitioners and reviewers outside of architecture. The prolific and lively unregulated production of multimedia journalistic blog output and other architectural 'publication' on digital and social media may also influence a renewed necessity to converse with the many outsiders of architecture. Already strategies of 'Open Review' for disciplinary criticism are emerging that allow many different disciplinary voices and individuals to participate in the production of criticism (Wager, 2002: 9). It is a space that not only transgresses academic disciplines but also culture at large.

A&C was established to create a new international academic journal space in which interdisciplinary architecture writing, textual to multi-media, can exist and evolve so as to provide more encompassing and pertinent commentary on architecture's relationship to culture. While its format (printed and digital) is not new, A&C establishes a space of new architectural discourse one that engages the editors and authors with designerly practice. We "take a strong editorial stance" with journal issues "created – curated, if you like" [as] artifacts with agendas and identities of their own" (Bose in Kimmelman, McGuigan, Davidson, Goldberger, Stephens eds, 2013: 17).<sup>ii</sup> A&C is the only academic architecture journal to our knowledge with all female editors-in-chief: Troiani, Ewing and Diana Periton. This has some bearing on our engagement with traditional academic writing and criticism, in that as historical 'outsiders' to architecture, in these academic publishing leadership roles, the deconstruction, feminisation and opening up of boundaries has become part of our publishing project. Our agendas include: recording and constructing new kinds of architectural criticism which is not only textual but also textual/audio-visual/ spatial. We aim to create a new discursive space in which interdisciplinary knowledge and practices can be comfortably housed. The decision to establish a multi-disciplinary Editorial Board and to source peer-reviewers from outside architecture has been one way to engender multiple disciplinary knowledge.<sup>iii</sup> For papers that cross two disciplines we invite a reviewer, one from architecture, the other from the other discipline to review it. The feedback (combined and not showing disciplinary differences) is returned to the author, aiming to present them with viewpoints about their submission from different disciplinary perspectives. How the author-research practitioner negotiates that terrain results in a 'third space' of literary and audio-visual production. When the journal was initially founded a scant number of non-architectural reviewers expressed their concern at not being experts in architecture and so therefore felt they were unable to give pertinent feedback outside their disciplines. Within their own disciplinary knowledge, a few reviewers adopted the 'masochist' negative tendency for which we are au fait in architecture deeming particularly experimental submissions unworthy of publication. As editors we felt that the opportunity to modify the review proforma might make it clearer to the peer-reviewer, within or outside architecture, of the permeable publication boundaries. In order to do this we had to reflect on what were the fundamental criteria of rigorous practice-based audio-visual research in architecture and articulate these to the reviewers so as to establish new-peer reviewing practice.

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

## 4 NEW PEER-REVIEWING

Peer-review is the main system used by the academic community. While there are many different types of peer review, such as masked, open and informal (Wager, 2002: 12) there is consensus that the current system has flaws. The histories and limitations of the conventional peer-review 'contract' and its process have been examined in relation to refereeing culture in different disciplines (Ellison, 2002; Wager, 2002; Ewing, 2010; Coyne in Murray ed, 2014). Nominated peer-reviewers are generally more favourable to a submission than non-nominated ones. Reviewers often disagree and very few submissions are accepted unconditionally (Wager, 2002: 28; Ellison, 2002: 995). Peer-review has an institutional and instrumental history. Ellison (2002) observes the tendency towards the lengthening and reshaping of refereed work in the field of economics since the 1960s. In the UK, the Research Assessment exercises of the past decades, directly related to institutional funding, have steered the mode and frequency of much academic architectural publication. Government related research project work drives disciplinary and interdisciplinary formations.

In "The Role and Use of Creative Practice in Research and its Contribution to Knowledge" Niedderer and Roworth-Stokes (2007: 11) demonstrate the normative categories of peer-reviewing or "essential criteria for the rigorous conduct and dissemination of research" in an academic scientific context – objectivity, reliability, validity – and how use of these is problematic for design research. We extend their conclusions to ask: how can criticism presented through blind peer-review of academic publications be delivered in the spirit of 'a productive and creative practice', as Stead (2003: 50) suggests, or passionate conversation (Lavin, 2009)? How does knowledge and limits of disciplinary non-disciplinary expertise impact on the questions asked of a reviewer? How does the 'authority' of the critic – status, specialisms, gender, age and personality – construct an epistemological "architectural intelligence" (Stadler in Colomina, Mastrigli, Stadler and Rattenbury, 2005: 78)?

The need to articulate and make explicit rigorous and relevant markers and thresholds of excellence is a challenge in the process of publishing interdisciplinary design research. Openness to the contemporary 'craft' of interdisciplinary criticism means working well with words: text, language and syntax; but also with other media such as visual commentary and critique, video/film, audio – spoken analysis and drawing; and with expertise in transdisciplinary understanding and communication. New architectural criticism may explore different media and this has significant consequences on the tools of judgement and the knowledge and open-mindedness of the reviewer-critic. Visual architectural criticism does exist (Wild, 2009: 12, 18, 20). There are specific tensions for architecture presented as, or through, research, where established assessment criteria for research – objectivity, reliability, validity – are directly at odds with creative, artistic research practice. The opposite of Niedderer and Roworth-Stokes' categories have negative connotations in an academic scientific context – subjectivity, unreliability and lack of validity.

We prefer to take from William Trochim's (2006) definitions in social research, such as his theory of validity, in which quality of research is considered in a process of accumulation and not as finite scientific entities. Research here is truthful approximation where quality of proposition, inference and conclusion can be conceived to be valid through operationalization: acts of translation between theory and observation. Close reading of the wider literature on peer-review standards reveals that while the need to present a 'truth' is explicit, there is also

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing

a need for the best research work to offer insight, opinion, 'belief' and 'care' (Wager, 2002: 15). The truth of fiction (Colomina in Colomina, Mastrigli, Stadler and Rattenbury, 2005: 75) is also in tension with the truth of non-fiction, the conventional essence of academic literature. Herbert Blumer's argument for "Symbolic Interaction" (1969) is founded on the inherent subjectivity of constructed worlds. If, as Blumer argues, the meaning of things is assumed to derive from social interaction, it can be in the space of interaction that meanings are defined, reconstructed, and communicated. This approach can therefore orient new peer reviewing. Researchers, and evaluators of research - including peer reviewer-critics - have an imperative to be aware of the positions and assumptions of their own social reality, to attend to their subject's subjective interpretation of reality, including disciplinary reality. New peer reviewing can be conceived of as 'symbolic interaction', where actors and explicit actions co-create meaning. The objects, or things involved are research submitted for publication. This leads us to adopt an editorial practice of micro-dialogue, rather than an application of disciplinary peer review method. Responsiveness to particular interpretations of other disciplines, and time afforded to accumulative construction towards valid interdisciplinary conclusions, are characteristics of this practice.

Creative, interdisciplinary research in architecture appears not only as quantitative data represented in comparative tables and charts. It can appear in a drawing, photograph, poetry, audio recording, film, installation, building etc. The assessment of these kinds of poetic, practice-based outputs needs to be understood, reviewed and validated within the interdisciplinary worlds in the works are created and accepted for their challenge to what has until recently been a patriarchal, emotionally barren, argumentative landscape of knowledge transfer.

The image of the aggressive 'old' architecture critic as "fighter" – positioned in an intellectual and cultural battle over architecture's worth (Rykwert, 2014: 4) refers to the French "*critique militante*, which we might translate more gently as "engaged criticism". Rykwert argues that the image of the critic as someone "detached above the fray, calmly formulating judgements and not engaging in jousts or disputes" is an "oxymoron". The new architectural critic writing in journals might be a more public figure participating in the forum for public "jousts or disputes". But in academic publication, the academy presents a far more polite, tempered and balanced image of the peer-reviewer. Not only that, the words of the critic are shared only between the author and the editor, and so the private nature of the critical exchange about the value and quality of the submission affects the type of criticism delivered by the peer-reviewer. The anonymous peer-reviewer could also be seen to create an alternative kind of criticism – less spectacular or bolshie, more learned – than the public architectural journalist, but this is not always the case. Like the author, editor and reader of this new kind of academic interdisciplinary work, the critic needs personal redefinition. As Attoe (1978: 4) points out in *Architecture and Critical Imagination* "when the critic sifts and makes distinctions he does so with equipment [...] limited by *his own particular conception of the role of the critic*". Using slippages in terminology between the disciplines of law and architecture, Peter Collins (1971: 154), claims discrimination is dependent on "judges and architects who have ideals believe simply that the possession of certain standards of excellence create a greater probability that they will bring justice or good architecture into the world than if they did not possess any standards at all". New architectural criticism relies on the new peer-reviewer challenging their 'own particular conception of the role of the critic' of interdisciplinary work.

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

Architectural criticism has flourished when entangled with practice, and is in close, if not consensual, conversation. Individual relations between participants in the 'third space' ecology of the production of A+C have potential to produce positive and open assessment of design research through new conversational discrimination, multi-disciplinary judgement, tactical, sometimes partisan selection and crafting. Authors, editors and peer-reviewers have a combined role which includes selection of work, setting thresholds and consideration of the conventional, alongside interdisciplinary and design research. In order to achieve this, we need to trust critics, be willing to be taught, embrace the passion and human drive of criticism, along with transparent evaluation criteria. We modified our standard A&C referee forms to be inclusive of interdisciplinary practices and knowledge. We select carefully and tacitly peer reviewers, encourage dialogue with reviewers, and are working towards a reflective process with a 'critical team'. This involves ungendering, unacculturating (in disciplinary terms) and hybridising the architectural writer, editor and reviewer. We need to question what we write as academics, as architects, as design researchers and how we support a creative research community. This can be achieved by changing our attitude to how we sift the wheat from the chaff.

## 5 REFERENCES

- Abrahams, Tim (2009 June) "The Decline of Print Journalism has Brought about a Spate of Self-published Architectural Criticism... Many of these Blogs are purely Indulgent Retrospection", *Blueprint* (London, England), no.279, p.48.
- ABRC (Advisory Board for the Research Councils) (1990) Peer review: *a Report to the Advisory Board for the Research Councils from the Working Group on Peer Review*.
- Attoe, Wayne (1978) *Architecture and Critical Imagination*, Chichester, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Baird, George, (2004 Fall-Winter) "'Criticality' and its Discontents", *Harvard design Magazine*, no.21, pp.16-21.
- Banham, Reyner "A Black Box: The Secret Profession of Architecture" in Banham, Reyner (1996) *A Critic Writes: Essays by Reyner Banham*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, pp. 292-299.
- Blumer Herbert (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism; Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bose, Shumi "Print Periodicals Represent an Establishment Validating What is Worth Recognition" in Kimmelman, Michael; McGuigan, Cathleen; Davidson, Justin; Goldberger, Paul; Stephens, Suzanne eds, *CLOG* issue titled "Unpublished" (2013): 16-17.
- Buchanan, Peter (1989 July) "What is Wrong with Architectural Criticism" in *Architectural Review*, vol.185, no.1109, pp. 24-26.
- Collins, Peter (1971) *Architectural Judgement*, London: Faber & Faber.
- Colomina, Beatriz; Mastrigli, Gabriele; Stadler, Matthew; Rattenbury, Kestrel (2005), "4 statements", *Volume* (Amsterdam, Netherlands), no.1, pp.74-79.
- Crosbie, Michael J. "Why Write?" *Journal of Architectural Education*, 2009 Feb, vol.62, no.3, p.10.

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing

- Coyne, Richard "Even more than Architecture" in Fraser, Murray ed. (2014) *Design Research in Architecture: An Overview*, Farnham: Ashgate Pub Co.
- Davies, Colin (2008 Mar.) "A Choice Critic's Choice: The Strange Death of Architectural Criticism: Martin Pawley Collected Writings, edited by David Jenkins", *Architectural Review*, vol.223, no.1333, p.94.
- Ellison, Glenn "Evolving Standards for Academic Publishing: A q-r Theory", *Journal of Political Economy*, 2002, vol.110, no.5, pp.994-1034.
- Ewing, Reid "Research you can Use. Peer Review Clarifies a lot of Things", *Planning*, 2010, vol.76. no.6, p.38
- Findley, Lisa "Reporter-journalist-critic", *Journal of Architectural Education*, 2009 Feb, vol.62, no.3, pp.12-13.
- Forgey, Benjamin (2003) "White, Male, Old", *Arkkitehti*, vol.100, no.3, pp.95-97.
- Foucault, Michel (1972/1969) *Archaeology of Knowledge*, London, Tavistock Publications.
- Grosz, Elizabeth (2001) *Architecture from the Outside. Essays on Virtual and Real Space*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Kimmelman, Michael; McGuigan, Cathleen; Davidson, Justin; Goldberger, Paul; Stephens, Suzanne, "Unpublished", *CLOG*, 2013, entire issue.
- Kelly, Peter (2010 Dec.) "The New Establishment [Architectural Criticism]", *Blueprint* (London, England), no.297, pp.60-62, 64.
- Kristeva, Julia (1997) 'Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: An interview' in Coles, Alex and Defert, Alexia eds. *De-, Dis-, Ex-*, vol.2, *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity*, Black Dog, London, pp.3-21.
- Lavin, Sylvia (2009 Feb.) "Critique Passionee" *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol.62, no.3, pp. 16-19
- Leach, Andrew and Moulis, Anthony (2010 Dec.) "History, Theory, Judgement, Project" *Architectural Theory Review*, vol.15, no.3, pp.298-311.
- Leatherbarrow, David (2009 Feb.) "The Craft of Criticism", *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol.62, no.3, pp.20-21, 96-99.
- Linder, Mark (2005) "TRANSdisciplinarity," *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report*, 9, pp.12-15.
- Marshall, John and Julian Bleeker, "Undisciplinarity" in Rodgers, Paul and Michael Smyth eds. (2010) *Digital Blur: Creative Practice at the Boundaries of Architecture, Design and Art*, Libri Publishing, Oxfordshire, pp.216-223.
- Niedderer, Kristina and Roworth-Stokes, Seymour (2007) "The Role and Use of Creative Practice in Research and its Contribution to Knowledge" in IASDR International Conference.
- Parnell, Rosie and Rachel Sara, "The Crit: An Architecture Student's Handbook" in Momen El-Husseiny (2009 Feb.): *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol.62, Issue 3, pp.90-92.

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE

APRIL 22-24 2015

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE

CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:

PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing

- Pawley, Martin (1998) "The Strange Death of Architectural Criticism" in Jenkins, David ed. (2007) *The Strange Death of Architectural Criticism: Martin Pawley Collected Writings*, London, Black Dog.
- Petteeuw, Véronique (2009 Feb.) "Architecture, Writing and Criticism in the 1960s and 1970s: The Little Magazine as Agent Provocateur", *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol.62, no.3, pp.281-297.
- Ponzini, Davide (2012 Sept.) "Photographers: Architecture Critics of Today?" *Domus*, no.961, pp.86-91.
- Quirk, Vanessa (06 April 2012) "The Architect Critic Is Dead (just not for the reason you think)" *Arch Daily*, ([www.archdaily.com/223714/the-architect-critic-is-dead-just-not-for-the-reason-you-think/](http://www.archdaily.com/223714/the-architect-critic-is-dead-just-not-for-the-reason-you-think/); accessed 11 June 2014)
- Russell, James S. (1998 Fall) "Fading Photographs", *Harvard Design Magazine*, pp.44-49.
- Rybczynski, Witold (2008 March 12) "Martin Pawley: A Critic who Pushed Architects into the Modern Technological World", [http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/obit/2008/03/martin\\_pawley.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/obit/2008/03/martin_pawley.html) ; Accessed 26 October 2014.
- Rykwert, Joseph, (2014 Apr) "Does Architecture Criticism Matter?" *Domus*, no. 979 pp.2-5.
- Sorkin, Michael (2013 June) "On the Legendary Doyenne of American Architectural Criticism", *Architectural Review*, vol.233, no.1396, p.25.
- Stead, Naomi (2003 Nov.-Dec.) "Three Complaints about Architectural Criticism", *Architecture Australia*, vol.92, no.6, pp.50, 52.
- Trochim, William M. "Introduction to Validity", *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*, 2nd Edition. Internet WWW page, at URL: <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/> (version current as of October 20, 2006)
- Troiani, Igea, Ewing, Suzanne and Diana Periton (2013 Nov) "Architecture and Culture: Architecture's Disciplinarity", in *Architecture and Culture*, vol.1, nos.1&2, pp.7-20.
- Troiani, Igea and Ewing, Suzanne (2014 July) "Inside Architecture from the Outside: Architecture's Disciplinary Practices", in *Architecture and Culture*, vol.2, no.2, pp.151-166.
- Wager, Elizabeth, Godlee, F, Jefferson, T. (2002) "How to Survive Peer Review", BMJ books.
- Wild, David (2009 Feb.) "Figures", in *Journal of Architectural Education*, vol 62, no 3, pp.12,18,20.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interdisciplinarity is understood here as the desire to widen architecture's relationship with other knowledge and practice cultures.

<sup>ii</sup> Vol. 1. Issues 1&2 of A&C are themed 'Discipline'. Vol. 2 Issue 1 is themed "Dissidence". Vol. 2 Issue 2 is an open issue loosely based on "Disciplinary Practices".

# THE VALUE OF DESIGN RESEARCH

*New Architectural Criticism: How to Separate the Wheat from the Chaff in Interdisciplinary Design Research*

*Igea Santina Troiani, Suzanne Ewing*

**11TH EUROPEAN ACADEMY OF  
DESIGN CONFERENCE**

**APRIL 22-24 2015**

**PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY**

**BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT  
FRANCE**

**CONFERENCE ORGANIZERS:**

**PARIS DESCARTES UNIVERSITY  
PARIS SORBONNE UNIVERSITY  
PARIS COLLEGE OF ART  
ISTEC PARIS**

---

<sup>iii</sup> The disciplines which the Editorial Board cover include: Anthropology, Sociology, Journalism, Architectural Historians/theorists, Art Historians and theorists, Artists, Architect- academic, Architect-urbanists, Interior Architectural theorists, Cultural Geography, Visual Culture, Film Studies, Fashion, Cultural and Media Studies, English Literature, Digital Culture [Studies of Information Visualisation (e.g. cartoons, graphic novels etc.), Scientist/Historian/Philosophy.