

## Abstracts in the category 1: 'Organising the PhD: the structure of production'

### Plenary presentations

ABSTRACT ID: 44

Author: Emel Aközer

Title:

**DOCTORATES IN ARCHITECTURE: THE BOLOGNA PROCESS AND THE CRITICAL TRADITION**

On September 2003, four years after the Bologna Declaration, it was declared in the "Communiqué" of the Conference of Ministers responsible for higher education from 33 European countries in Berlin that, it is necessary to promote closer links between the "two pillars of knowledge society", European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and European Research Area (ERA). Ministers pointed out the need to complete the two cycles of higher education, which had been emphasized since the beginning of the Bologna Process, with the doctoral level as the third cycle, considering "the importance of research and research training and the promotion of interdisciplinarity in maintaining and improving the quality of higher education. . .". Earlier, the Sorbonne Declaration of 1998 on harmonisation of the architecture of the European higher education system had envisaged the creation not merely of a Europe of the Euro, of the banks and the economy, but a Europe of knowledge as well, a continent where "students and academics would freely circulate and rapidly disseminate knowledge", as it had been the case at those times when first universities were born. A system that would allow students "to enter the academic world at any time in their professional life and from diverse backgrounds" was among the objectives stated in the Sorbonne Declaration and its significance was reaffirmed in the main documents of the Bologna Process.

In this paper it is argued that the question "what might be a doctorate for architects who practice," which constitutes the focus of the colloquium "PhDesign in Architecture, The Unthinkable Doctorate", may be reformulated in light of this explicitly humanistic emphasis on knowledge in the European process: How might the third cycle of higher education in the professional fields, including architecture, be organized in such a way that practitioners can find the opportunities and necessary conditions to slow down the pace of the professional life for a time, and to reflect on their own experience from a critical distance, and to derive from it something objective and communicable, hence teachable, something that would be a contribution to knowledge? Can doctorates contribute to the conceptualization, critical evaluation and dissemination of practical knowledge that has been cultivated in local traditions, and of "personal knowledge" as well, to instigate better practice by informing and tuning the latter with the humanistic considerations of the Bologna Process, and to promote collaboration of practitioners with researchers in joint intellectual and practical pursuits?

These questions can be adequately dealt with only by retrieving the epistemological questions: what we can know, how we can know, and what constitutes a contribution to knowledge and what does not. The author acknowledges that a possible contribution to knowledge should not necessarily be in the form of a theoretical proposition. It is also possible to contribute to knowledge by means of a technical or technological innovation, through a work of art or architecture, a piece of music, poetry or literature, and even by acting in a particular way in a particular situation can enhance human knowledge. With reference to the critical tradition in architectural theory, history and criticism, however, she maintains that contribution to knowledge in the objective sense requires a philosophical / scientific attitude of mind, and hermeneutical skills.

#### *Selected Bibliography*

Stanford Anderson, "Architecture and Tradition", *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture*, AIA-ACSA Teacher Seminar, 1964, pp. 71-89.

Stanford Anderson, "Architectural Design as a System of Research Programs", *Design Studies* 5, no. 3 (July 1984), pp. 146-150.

Richard Foque, "Design Research: The Third Way", *Doctorates in Design and Architecture*, EAAE/AEEA Conference Proceedings, February 1996, pp. 125-129.

Karl R. Popper, *Objective Knowledge* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979).

**ABSTRACT ID: 2****Author: Javier Gimeno Martinez****Title:****Practice-based research in the creative and performing arts and design. The report "Inventarisatie internationaal onderzoek kunsten".**

The academisation of higher education in Belgium has originated the association between universities and *hogescholen*. The design-based PhDs (also called practice-based or studio-based PhDs) reveal as the main challenge not only for architecture but for other creative disciplines, too. In this framework the *Onderzoeksplatform Kunsten* from the *Associatie K.U.Leuven* commissioned a report which had to map the regulations on practice-based PhDs abroad in the fields of the fine arts, audiovisual arts, performing arts, music and design.

The lack of tradition at universities in practice-based research joined the lack of tradition at *hogescholen* in PhDs. The institutions had to find the right way of collaborating, evidencing the potential of this collaboration but respecting their specificity, at the same time. This research firstly mapped the most problematic local issues to later explore the solutions given abroad. The role of supervisors, the written component of the research, the evaluation criteria... configured the main objectives.

The research was finished in March 2004. It resulted in an overview of prestigious art schools and universities from three different countries (Finland, The Netherlands and United Kingdom). The report covered not only the way practice-based research took place abroad but also how it could be adapted in Flanders. Aspects as institutional regulations, examples of research projects, methodologies, codes of practice and ways of financing research were considered. After studying the foreign doctoral regulations, it was noticed that they were not that different to some already existing regulations in Flanders, which included practice-based elements in other disciplines, too.

This paper aims to give a complementary vision to design-based research in architecture by exploring the practice-based research in the creative and performing arts and design. Some finished projects will be provided in order to analyse the same problematic related to other creative disciplines. Therefore, the vision around the issue will be amplified and the conclusions enriched.

**ABSTRACT ID: 7****Author: Hajo Neis, Howard Davis and Christine Theodoropoulos****Title:****PROSPECTUS FOR A NEW PH.D. IN ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN**

Abstract Submission for The Fourth International NeTHCA Colloquium on Architecture and the City  
The Unthinkable Doctorate: PhDesign in Architecture?

The Department of Architecture at the University of Oregon is now in the preliminary stages of organizing a new Ph.D. program in Architecture. The purpose of this paper is to describe our proposal for a Ph.D. program focused on architectural design, with the intention of contributing to the dialogue at this conference, and obtaining other perspectives that will assist us as we refine our approach and establish strategies for future implementation.

The architecture program at the University of Oregon is 90 years old this year and has a solid reputation among American schools of architecture. We were the first U.S. school to abandon the Beaux-Arts system--in the 1920s--and have a reputation for experimentation within a comprehensive attitude toward architectural design. Although we have noted strengths in technical areas such as environmental systems, we pride ourselves in seeing architecture as a comprehensive, synthetic design discipline that incorporates many different frameworks. In other words, we tend to be "generalists" rather than "specialists." Our graduates are well respected among American firms, and also have a relatively high presence as teachers of architecture in other schools.

Graduate study at the University of Oregon currently focuses on the Master of Architecture Degree which serves both as a qualifying degree for graduates intending to enter professional practice and as a foundation for those pursuing academic careers in professional schools of architecture. At present our school, the only graduate program in the state, does not have a program in place that supports students who wish to pursue advanced studies in architectural design beyond the Master's level. This is at a time when design is expanding from a primarily professional field to one that supports scholarship and

research and at a time when doctoral degrees are rapidly becoming the preferred qualification for many university and professional positions.

Our intentions with respect to the new Ph.D. program are to build on our existing strengths, and create new opportunities to explore questions related to architectural design. We see this as different from many other programs with emphases on history, theory, behavioral studies, or technology. While such programs are of course valuable within the field, and have advanced architectural knowledge in important ways, our intention is to focus on design itself. This does not mean that other strengths of ours --such as environmental systems, housing, architecture in an urban context, or architectural theory--will not be included, but only that they will be incorporated within an overarching concern for the central activity of the architect, which is the synthetic activity of design.

Dissertation research will have a variety of contexts, including historical and contemporary studies of design within the profession, the ways architects and firms operate, the influence of new technologies on the design process, collaboration in the design process, the interaction of different professions, and many others. Such an emphasis will make our program relevant not only to those who will become academics, but also to practitioners for whom advanced work of this kind will result in innovations that can make practice more successful.

This paper will elaborate on this abstract by presenting a philosophical framework for a Ph.D. program in architectural design and an outline for its organization and areas of concentration.

**ABSTRACT ID: 58**

**Author: Alan Jones**

**Title:**

**Stop doing – start thinking**

*This new paper will build on the author's "The difference between know-how and know-that" published in the proceedings of the 2003 Four Faces conference and "Re-engage Research – research to survive" to be published in the proceedings of the 2004 La Question Doctorale conference in Marseilles. This last paper was used as a discussion paper for the newly formed Research Committee of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London.*

*For six years the author was a practising architect in London with Michael Hopkins RIBA Gold Medal 1993) and three years as an associate with David Morley Architects (Young Practice of the Year 1998) before returning to his native Northern Ireland as a lecturer at the School of Architecture Queens University Belfast. As one of the directors of Alan Jones Architects he also continues to practice, with his work being widely published and receiving awards and commendations. From 2001-2 he was honorary Vice President (Education) of the Royal Institute of British Architects, London – and re-introduced research as an issue in which the profession should take a deep interest. The author has just begun his PhD considering the relationship between architectural practice, teaching and research.*

Within Great Britain few practising architects engage with any form of post-graduate study. Those who do are normally towards the end of their careers or have had a role within a School of Architecture and are also practising – a foot in each camp. In the whole of Ireland with a population of six million there is a handful of architects undertaking design based postgraduate study within a school of architecture– with most having had a long-term involvement with their respective schools of architecture.

To the author this raises issues of the relationship between practice and academia – a scholarly approach to the activity of making architecture. In all cases, how will their research activities inform their design approach? How does their approach and goals for research differs from those who are purely academia based without the addition of a practice based perspective?

Many of the presentations and discussions at the three recent conferences at which the author attended - Four faces / Building the Link / La Question Doctorale - make reference to Michael Gibbon's research in the two types of research – type one and type two – with the emphasis very much now upon type two – collaborative cross disciplinary research. The author's Marseilles paper "Re-engage Research" considered the UK condition – suggesting this "soft" type two research is perceived as not being valued as highly by the Research Assessment Exercise as the more definable and assessable type one. The author suggests design is considered "soft" research. How has Gibbon's research been accepted by the UK research community and in particular the architectural community? How does this relate to the relationship between those in architectural practice and those in architectural education?

Since the last assessment of architectural research in the UK (2001) there has been much debate through correspondence within the journals as to the non-consideration of design based architectural research. UK schools of architecture are asking for design as research to be taken more seriously – though critics suggest that schools and architects cannot consider “what we do” as research – and that a change of approach, change of method and communication is necessary before “soft” design will be taken seriously as a form of “hard” research. On the surface it would appear that there is some movement towards acknowledging practice based research as valid and assessable but institutions are wary as immense financial implications ride upon the research assessment of schools of architecture. So why should UK schools of architecture permit design-based research, how is it best presented as being considered appropriate for research and why should and do practitioners embark upon PhD research?

This paper will consider these issues and explore how three practising Irish architects consider research in architecture relates to how they practice architecture.

## **Round – table presentations**

**ABSTRACT ID: 31**

**Author: Jenny Lowe**

**Title:**

**Reflections on a PhD by Project**

By way of contributing to the “PhDesign in Architecture: The Unthinkable Doctorate” colloquium I propose a presentation of an unpublished essay where I have critically reflected upon a PhD by Project that I completed in 2002 at RMIT in Australia. This programme insists that practice needs to be studied through the practice of practice (informed by and informing appropriate theory). This programme encourages reflection as an approach to research. Practitioners with an established body of work are asked to clarify an understanding of both how they work and that which is the essence of their concern. This is encouraged through introspection made explicit and through inquisition of projects. The process that is encouraged in this programme is the abstraction of themes at work in previous projects, the testing of these abstractions through speculative or live designs and the re-abstracting of these testings. The process is one of distillation. Whilst the reflective essay that I will reference focuses on the process of a PhD by Project I will also identify the architectural themes, issues and design methods that I was able to bring into language, through the PhD, that had previously been sublimated. These themes and issues have become the focus of my work since having completed the PhD by Project. In my experiences as a designer of architectural spaces and as a learning enabler in architectural education I have found the most open, courageous and honest architectural discourse in the design studios of architectural schools. My PhD experience at RMIT suggests to me that a similar level and language of discourse, albeit at a considerably more sophisticated level, becomes possible. As more work is produced at this level through such programmes and this work is disseminated through publication its effect on architectural discourse, and how architecture is perceived and discussed, should be considerable. I also propose a presentation of two PhD programmes at the University of Brighton, my home institution, that have the framework for PhDs by Practice/Project/Design already in place.

**ABSTRACT**

**Author: Kevin McCartney**

**Title:**

**Practice-Based Research for Architects: Is it Unthinkable?**

**Abstract**

*This paper raises issues about the nature of the work that might be submitted for examination for a doctoral award. It reviews recent practice in Britain concerning the growth of new doctoral awards, which can be seen as alternatives to the traditional PhD award. It identifies strengths and weaknesses in these new approaches, but argues for the benefits of working within the traditional frameworks, even if this might mean modifying existing regulations.*

## Introduction

In British Higher Education, the *PhD* (Doctor of Philosophy) degree is a generic award that is used in all, or nearly all, academic disciplines. It is the highest level of qualification, and is used not only in the natural sciences (*natural philosophy*), but also in the social sciences, and the humanities. It is even used in the creative arts, design and architecture. It may involve application of the classical scientific method, but this is no longer seen as an essential feature, even in the sciences.

The PhD functions as an academic gold standard. It has a universality that enables it to be awarded in recognition of excellence across a broad range of achievement. It continues to enjoy wide recognition across discipline boundaries, and a level of respect consistent with the recognition of exceptionally high standards in research in whatever subject area the work is carried out. A review of *Practice-Based Doctorates in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design* (Frayling et al, 1997) draws attention to the increased scope of typical PhD regulations for accommodating a very wide range of both processes and products.

## Professional Doctorates

Why do some academics argue against the existing arrangements? There clearly is some dissatisfaction with the relevance of the existing PhD regulations, particularly in professional discipline, and the creative arts. A recent report (University of Portsmouth, 1999) claimed that there are 34 different titles for doctorate degrees in British Institutions. This can be recognised as an indicator of dissatisfaction with reliance on the traditional PhD framework. But it might also be considered unfortunate, in the context of recommendations from the influential, and widely welcomed report from the National Committee of Enquiry into Higher Education chaired by Sir Ron Dearing. This recommended a Qualifications Framework, which placed doctorates, both taught and by research, at its zenith - level 8. Consistency in terminology was recommended and it was concluded that this would mean "placing a limit on the number of award titles" (Dearing et al, 1997, p149).

The growth of titles is mostly attributable to interest in professional doctorates, which are usually seen as subject specific, and hence refer to the discipline within the nomenclature of the awards. Hence we find Doctors of Music (D.Mus), Doctors of Engineering (Eng.D) and Doctors of Education (Ed.D).

## Professional Doctorates in the University of Portsmouth

Seven professional doctorates are recognised in the current University of Portsmouth (2003) regulations. None of these are in the fields of the creative arts, design and architecture. Almost all are based in disciplines related to medicine. Most are highly profession-specific. There is, for example, a DMedIm - Doctor of Medical Imaging. There is only one generic title: the DPP - Doctor of Professional Practice. But there is a generic set of regulations. The awards require that candidates complete the equivalent of at least three years of full time study including required taught components, and demonstrate:

"Through a substantial portfolio of work relating to an approved topic of professional research and development, provide evidence of: knowledge and understanding of the background literature and of research methods appropriate to the discipline; independent critical judgement; and an original contribution to the advancement of professional knowledge and practice." (University of Portsmouth, 2004)

These programmes have been demonstrably successful in terms of recruitment and completions. Having started as recently as 2000, there have been 7 graduates from the four-year, part-time programmes. From 20 registered candidates in the current year (2004-2005), there will be 70 professional doctorate students next year. There is clearly an economic impetus behind this rapid growth. It benefits from the support of a very large employer – the National Health Service, which is currently investing significant resources in its *Agenda for Change*, which supports professional training and development for staff.

A Masters degree is a pre-requisite for direct entry to the Professional Doctorate programmes, and employment in a relevant professional discipline is also required. Part of the programme is delivered by taught units. This element of taught delivery is considered significant to the course leaders. It enables individuals who have weighty professional responsibilities to take on doctoral studies, which they would not otherwise have started. The greater degree of supervision and guidance is considered crucial in reducing the "wastage" experienced in many PhD programmes, in which the competing non-academic responsibilities of mature students result in high drop-out rates.

## Taught Doctorates

The taught element has, however, caused others to raise doubts about the equivalence of the professional doctorate with the PhD. Frayling et al (1997), in describing their survey of doctoral regulations in British Higher Education Institutions, pointed out that "Most contributors ... agreed with the opinion of the Higher Education Business Enterprises: '*A substantially taught doctorate is of doctoral standard but is not the equivalent of a PhD*'".

## The PhD – An Inclusive Model

Frayling et al (1997) requested copies of doctoral regulations from 116 Higher Education Institutions in Britain. Only in the area of music did they find regulations that explicitly allowed doctoral submission to consist of a creative work without a text submission. There were a number of institutions that required "commentary" and "documentation" rather than explicitly requiring textual explanations. It is conceivable that a *commentary* could be in a graphic format, so long as this was acceptable to the examiners as constituting an unambiguous and critical exposition of the process by which the creative product were originated.

Their conclusions appear to favour the continued use of the PhD in the creative arts, making full use of the flexibility to be found in the PhD regulations of many institutions, which allow for an award based on "academically oriented practice-based study". (Frayling et al, 1997, p37). They argue for an "inclusive model" with nationally agreed, PhD Regulations, which are flexible enough to allow for the use of practice-based outputs as part of the evidence submitted as the doctoral artefact.

The guidance provided by the School of Creative Arts Film and Media in Portsmouth is typical of such an inclusive model:

"A PhD will typically involve around 80,000 – 100,000 words of written work (where the submission is entirely a written critical piece; ie: typically in critical Film Studies and Media Studies). Or around 20,000 – 50,000 words of written work and a creative piece involving video production, performance or similar in the Creative Arts area."  
(University of Portsmouth, 2005)

The inclusive model is questioned by Candlin (2000) who argues for greater recognition within academia of the value of art practice as a research method. This goal can of course be pursued within the traditional framework of the PhD as well as through special practice-based doctorates. Indeed the cross-disciplinary recognition of the research value of art (and design) practice might be more rapidly achieved if the case was established for incorporating such approaches within the traditional regulations. This requires clear arguments for the equivalence between practice-based work and more traditional research methods. It also means achieving clarity in identifying the distinctive nature of the doctoral qualification. This cause will also be greatly assisted by attempts to explain, define, exemplify and evaluate the methods of practice-based research. An excellent model for such efforts is the recent publication by De Jong and van der Voordt (2002), which aims to provide a comprehensive treatment of approaches to the study and research of not only architecture, but also urban and technical design.

Frayling et al, (1997) identify the following three distinctive attributes of a doctorate, which are unlikely to cause controversy:

- a) An original, independent piece of work which makes a recognisable contribution to knowledge and understanding. (Some might add a qualifier such as "significant" to indicate the high level of contribution that is expected.)
- b) Critical knowledge of appropriate research methods
- c) An oral examination by appropriate assessors of submitted work

It is probably clear that both (a) and (b) could be achieved solely with the submission of creative work. The demonstration of (c) a critical knowledge of methods solely through the creative work is more problematic, and this is why there is still an expectation in most cases for doctoral submissions in the creative arts to be accompanied by a text which documents and explains the process of originating the creative work, the methods used, the alternatives considered but rejected, the context and location of the work, and an explanation of the specific contribution it makes to knowledge and/or professional practice in the field.

The same authors also provide an expanded list of seven competences; all or most of which should be demonstrated in a submission for a doctoral award:

1. Systematic approach
2. Self-critical and rigorous use of method
3. Context awareness

4. Permanent and reproducible communication to peers of the origination process
5. Sustained and logical argument
6. Justification of actions and decisions
7. Production of a high-quality, valid and original work arising from the above

### **Do we need a different form of doctoral degree for architects?**

The intentions and motivation of the doctoral student is highly significant in determining the appropriateness of the nature of the submission and the award title, argue Frayling et al (1997). The PhD is universally recognised as an introduction to the academic life, and indeed, in some universities it is a condition of tenured employment. However, if the student considers that the research expertise and the independent, critical enquiry skills developed in the doctoral study is of relevance in the practice of architecture, as distinct from the study of the practice, then we might find good reason to consider the adoption of alternative titles, aimed at appraising and recognising outstanding ability in design, or innovation in professional practice.

If however this kind of work is to be recognised as being of equivalence to the PhD standard, there must either be an equivalence of the demonstration of a critical knowledge of context and method. Or there must be an alternative, compensating component in a practice-based submission. It is in the latter case that the alternative, profession-specific title, such as Doctor of Architecture, becomes of some value.

Perhaps the alternative compensating component might be a series of linked project work serving as a systematic method of exploring a well-defined area of interest, with the output from one project affecting the definition of the following project. This would satisfy those who distrust the taught component of many professional doctorates, whilst providing the systematic, iterative and guided development that appears to be necessary for many potential part-time, post-graduate students with significant external responsibilities.

### **Conclusion**

There is much to be gained in terms of universal recognition by working within the framework of traditional doctoral regulations. This might involve both testing and stretching the limits of these frameworks, and modifying the regulations. New award titles may be appropriate where there is an employer demand for qualifications that recognise professional skills and achievements of the highest order, without the academic emphasis on contribution to explicit knowledge and dissemination..

In all attempts, either to incorporate creative works within the traditional PhD framework, or to establish a more independent award such as a Doctorate of Architecture, the establishment of universal recognition for the award, and parity with the more traditional approaches, will depend on the extent to which it is possible to establish equivalence with the distinguishing doctoral characteristics identified above.

Of key importance in this regard, will be the documentation and evaluation of the rich variety of approaches to research in architecture.

### **References**

Candlin F (2000) Practice-based Doctorates and Questions of Academic Legitimacy  
International Journal of Art & Design Education, No. 1, p96-101

National Committee of Enquiry into Higher Education (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society: The Dearing Report*, HMSO, London

De Jong TM and van der Vooort DJM (eds) (2002) *Ways to Study and Research Urban Architectural and Technical Design*, DUP (Delft University Press) Science.

Frayling C, Stead V, Archer B, Cook N, Powell J, Scrivener S, Tovey M, (1997) *Practice-based Doctorates in the Creative and Performing Arts and Design*, UK Council for Graduate Education, Warwick.

Higher Education Business Enterprises, (1995) *Higher Education in the UK: Graduate Courses*, Higher Education Business Enterprises

University of Portsmouth (2005) School of Creative Arts, Film and Media Web site:  
<http://www.port.ac.uk/departments/academic/scafm/Postgraduatestudy/DoctoralStudy/>

University of Portsmouth (2004), *Awards of the University of Portsmouth*, vers. 2.5 October 2004, Academic Registry, University of Portsmouth <http://www.port.ac.uk/accesstoinformation/policies/academicregistry/filetodownload.10390.en.pdf>

University of Portsmouth (2003), *Academic Regulations: Professional Doctorates*, Release 1.2, Academic Registry, University of Portsmouth

University of Portsmouth (1999) *Professional Doctorates at the University of Portsmouth*, Final Report of Academic Policy Committee and Research Degrees Committee, University of Portsmouth

**ABSTRACT ID: 46**

**Author: Fernando Lara**

**Title:**

**Towards a design doctorate in Brazil: resistances and opportunities.**

In Brazil we perceived the occurrence, in the last two decades, of three phenomena possibly interrelated that reinforced the discipline of architectural design. The first is the boom in publications, mostly monographs or results from doctoral research. The second phenomenon involves a enormous expansion of B.Arch programs (from 50 in 1985 to 157 in 2004) and the consolidation of the MSc. in architecture (16 programs in 2004). A direct consequence of such expansion was the need for better teachers who rushed to MSc. programs searching for pedagogic tools and some systematization of their practical knowledge, but not necessarily looking for research. Finally, the third phenomenon is the proliferation of scientific events, or architectural events becoming scientific. One example would be the Brazilian Congress of Architects, traditionally a space for the political expression of the category, becoming more scientific with communications of research results and debates of academic format. One could think that are in the dawn of a new era, and those transformations would lead to a robust design-focused research or a better design education. It is probably not the case, but one way or another, the sum of these accomplishments reveals an increment of architectural criticism and a significant growth of spaces for discussion, be it congresses, dissertations and theses defenses or newspapers. However, if architectural discipline has been strengthened with the consolidation of the MSc. and the increase of publications, the studies on design do not follow such evolution. Indeed, design studies continue suffering from the professionals' resistance (both practitioners and academics) to systematize and to organize what they really do, what really teach or what their students really learn. As a result, we still design, discuss and teach architecture the same way we did 20 years ago. We would be happy to believe that, at least, the expansion of publications represents the end of a rotten although insistent tradition of Brazilian architectural culture, of being resistant to theory and method. Such resistance can be traced back 50 years ago when Brazilian Modernism was being celebrated world wide as a step ahead of functionalism and rationalism but hardly taking any step ahead of itself. The aim of this communication is to review the roots of this so-called resistance against theory and method in search of a better model for design doctorals in Brazil. The main question revolves around the opportunities for a design-focused research area and the resistances still encountered among old-guard practitioners and academics.

**ABSTRACT ID: 59**

**Author: Joaquin Ibáñez Montoya**

**Title:**

**KNOWING AND ACTING UNDER THE METHODOLOGICAL REVISION OF THE PROJECT**

This communication pretends to examine the contemporary divergences between the academic condition of the doctorate and the practical reason of the architectonic project. The question remits to a dysfunction between knowing and knowing how, placing the role of the Project in the core of research as a constitution of a specific knowledge. Scientific activity configures here knowledge from practice; its interest is in the cognitive itinerary with the objective of communicating under its practice or know how. The specific exercise of *intervention* over the exceptional space reverses its sense so as to participate in a wider architectonic reality. Its contemporary look over is research shows what practice is. Research and practice find in the doctorate a common place where disciplinary teaching can be deduced; a new sense is acquired in the research-action as a strictly architectural question.

The study is supported by a projective speech created over a *constructed heritage* wider in its field of action. Its not already a singular cultural fact but something that affects the general management of space. As well as its thinking. The objective, therefore, of communication is to illustrate how this contribution to research – as a new methodological

approximation -, improves the projective action. How, while thinking what already thought, this method of critical research contributes through the contest of advanced technologies of today's techno-industrial society.

The relation between the diverse activities in this process enables the student to orientate according to its different interests, but also to examine with new resources the essence of architecture. In the training centres, the doctoral plans can guarantee a deeper level, as they include the acquisition of the necessary knowledge on a enunciation on revision derived from production. To deepen in this study on behalf of the researcher, around its natural and physical environment means to reverse a historic itinerary in the accumulation of professional experience in relation with the natural, human and physical medium. The objective to verify will be an *oblique*, transversal and hybrid lecture, typical of today that permits to develop adequately a purely architectural research.

Under this perspective, understanding the methodological specificity of the *intervention project* as a revision of the Thesis, about its unthinkable condition, implies revising the disciplinary parameters attending both fields. It is to evaluate the techniques and technologies associated to the treatment of an information in total alignment with the exponential development of the new communication society. It is to advance the importance of the documental research applied to the process of thinking architecture, creating a lecture about itself in order to identify solutions in the real estate heritages of great extension and incidence that configure the territory of mankind. Doing it from a critical behaviour with its enunciation that understands the professional exercise as one with a temporary dimension, not only spatial.

Having evoked, somewhat briefly, the academic and professional challenges relative to the open action of today's architect in the scientific research typical of the doctorate, there are various questions that are anticipated so as to be evaluated as a conclusion. ¿Are we perhaps experiencing the emergence of a new type of professional? ¿Or is it that the architect is extending its field of competences appropriating new responsibilities? ¿Can the architect, an expert in an umbrella of specific actions, be widening towards another professional panorama?.

To make of professional experience and doctoral research a fluid dialogue in terms of project is, without doubt, a crucial problem with utmost interest in our department in Madrid.