Halina Dunin-Woyseth & Fredrik Nilsson

Doctorateness in Design Disciplines.
Negotiating Connoisseurship and Criticism in Practice-related Fields

Abstract

Discussions on the concept of 'doctorateness' have been growing during last years in traditional academic disciplines as well as in creative fields. This paper is a brief report from the first stage of a research project which studies how the concept of 'doctorateness' could be considered in the field of architecture, design and arts. The project builds upon a series of doctoral courses for architects and designers, and includes the study and evaluation of already accepted doctoral theses. In analyses of assessment assignments, the 'connoisseurship model' of Elliot W. Eisner was found to be useful. Eisner's model of Connoisseurship & Criticism has served as the main tool for the analyses of empirical data, and as a framework for developing the concept of 'doctorateness' further. From the first phase of studies in the research project, the importance of particular kinds of awareness can be stressed as crucial for 'doctorateness', and here the model of connoisseurship and criticism has been operative. A more elaborate definition of 'doctorateness' is presumed to be of use as a pedagogical tool in research education in design fields as well as in dialogues between professionals of design practice and research.

Introduction

Issues of research criteria and quality levels have in several ways been on the international agenda and widely discussed, and there are continually higher expectations with regard to quality of research in the fields of Architecture, Design and Arts (the ADA fields). In organised research education, academic standards of 'designerly' research are being taught, discussed and negotiated. During the years of doctoral apprenticeship, the PhD students learn to master the research craft, and the final trial is the assessment of the doctoral thesis, where a committee decides whether an expected level of 'doctorateness' has been achieved.

During the last years a discussion on the concept of 'doctorateness' has been growing, both in traditional academic disciplines as well as in creative fields. The debate is partly about how to define the concept of 'doctorateness' in a contemporary situation, not least in relation to the increasing number of different types of doctoral programmes and awards with different stakeholders and agendas, including professional and artistic doctorates (Denicolo & Park, 2010; Philips, Stock, & Vincs, 2009; Stock, 2011). Even though there might be some disagreement on whether the concept of 'doctorateness' is appropriate to use, we find it relatively well established in the current discussions on criteria for doctoral work. Trafford and Leshem (2009) describe 'doctorateness' as 'a precondition scholarly attribute of theses that examiners look for when judging their academic worth'. They also argue that when doctoral candidates understand the nature of 'doctorateness' they are usually able to provide the quality of thesis that examiners expect, and that 'doctorateness' can be seen as a 'threshold concept' hitherto underemphasised by examiners, supervisors and candidates (Trafford & Leshem, 2009, p. 315).

This paper is a brief report from a research project that studies how the concept of 'doctorateness' could be considered in our own field of architecture, design and arts. The aim

of the project is to provide a more operative definition of 'doctorateness', which we hope to become a pedagogical tool to be used in research education in the ADA fields.

The concept of 'doctorateness' has been central in doctoral courses offered in Belgium, Norway and Sweden for several years. One of these courses introduced studying and evaluating doctoral theses as an assignment in research education on the theme of 'scholarly craft and criticism' (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2011a, pp. 47–48). In 2011, together with a group of international doctoral candidates, we started a more thorough investigation to study the 'doctorateness' of several recent Scandinavian practice-related doctoral theses in architecture and design as a research project itself. The project is now being developed as a Scandinavian project with senior researchers together with one post-doc and one doctoral student. It is pursued in the context of the strong research environment 'Architecture in the Making. Architecture as a Making Discipline and Material Practice' funded by the Swedish research council Formas, that in a national collaboration between the four schools of architecture in Sweden has the aim to develop theories and methods from the perspective of architectural practice to strengthen architectural research.

The project consists of several phases, where the first is an analysis of the three assessment assignments carried out by doctoral students at universities in three different countries. All of them studied the same set of doctoral theses. In its next phase the project will include analyses of written assessments by the adjudication committees for the doctoral theses at the universities where they were defended. The following phase will build on a comparison of the results of assessments by the different groups of assessors. While we can regard the group of informants from the first phase as novices in research practice, the other group is the experts in the practice of assessing research at the doctoral level.

In elaborating the concept of 'doctorateness' we found the 'connoisseurship model' of Elliot W. Eisner to be useful and operative, and to open up for developments in relation to research in practice-related fields. Connoisseurship is about informed perception and appreciation of nuances in a particular field of practice; criticism is about disclosure and communication of characteristics to a broader audience (Eisner, 1975, pp. 2–4). This represents two aspects of what could be regarded as important in 'doctorateness'. The following phases of the project will further develop and refine the conceptual framework, and as a point of departure we have chosen Eisner's model of Connoisseurship & Criticism to serve as the main tool for the analyses of our empirical data at this stage. In doing so, we sought guidelines in our approach to the traditions of Evaluation Research as proposed by Borg and Gall (Borg & Gall, 1989, pp. 739–780). This paper reports from the first stage of the project.

The concept of 'doctorateness'. A brief review
The concept of a doctor's degree was historically a licence to teach in a university as a faculty member. The universities were initially places mainly for teaching and learning of knowledge, and have during time transformed into places also for research and production of new knowledge. This has led to focus not only on teaching of knowledge but also on teaching of methodology and training in research skills, and today a doctor is more about certain abilities and capacities in relation to research as well as position in a certain community. The doctoral degree proclaims that the recipient 'is worthy of being listened to *as an equal* by the appropriate university faculty' and to be a doctor means 'to be an authority, in full command of the subject right up to the boundaries of current knowledge, and able to extend them' (Phillips & Pugh, 2005, pp. 20–21). Someone with a doctorate is recognised as an authority by the faculty and other academics and scholars outside the university, and doctoral education is today about becoming a professional researcher in your field and acquiring what can be called research competence. This mostly concerns the learning of skills, rather than certain

knowledge. 'You have to be able to carve out a researchable topic, to master the techniques required and put them to appropriate use, and to cogently communicate your findings. So there are craft skills involved in becoming a full professional, which, like any skills, have to be learned by doing the task in practice situations under supervision.' (Phillips & Pugh, 2005, pp. 20–22) But not least important for a professional is to have the ability to extend the knowledge in the field, to 'push the limits' of what we already know or do especially when confronted with new conditions and circumstances, and in creative ways question established notions and solutions. This is important for both the practice professional and the research professional.

To achieve a doctoral award and to demonstrate 'doctorateness' are closely related, but not necessarily the same thing. Denicolo and Park (2010) state that the difficulty of articulating the meaning of 'doctorateness' is a reflection of the mix of qualities required of someone who has 'doctorateness', including intellectual quality and confidence, independence of thinking, enthusiasm and commitment, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances and opportunities. The criteria of doctoral assessment have traditionally focused on the output, normally a thesis, and not primarily the 'doctorateness' from which the thesis was produced, the research competence. The contemporary challenges Denicolo and Park point at are mainly two-fold: on the one hand to have a form of assessment that makes it possible to evaluate whether a candidate has a sufficient level of 'doctorateness', and on the other, to achieve consistency in the assessment of work on a doctoral level so it is transferable within and between disciplines, so that it is used consistently between institutions and is enduring through time. 'The current challenge is to reform doctoral assessment to meet contemporary situations whilst maintaining continuity and congruence with the past.' (Denicolo & Park, 2010, pp. 2–3)

Already in 1997, the UK Council for Graduate Education published a report on quality of doctoral work in the ADA fields, in which the term 'doctorateness' appeared in the following context: 'The essence of "doctorateness" is about an informed peer consensus on mastery of the subject; mastery of analytical breadth (where methods, techniques, contexts and data are concerned) and mastery of depth (the contribution itself, judged to be competent and original and of high quality)' (Frayling et al., 1997, p. 11).

In 2005, the European Ministers adopted the Framework for Qualifications from the so-called 'Dublin Descriptors' (EHEA, 2005), which on the doctoral level can be summarised as *a systematic understanding of a field of study* including mastery of the skills and methods of research; *the ability to conceive and pursue a substantial process of research* with scholarly integrity; *a contribution* through original research; *capacity of critical analysis* and evaluation; and *an ability to communicate* with peers, the larger scholarly community and with society in general.

We regard these two definitions, coming from different time periods, as important contributions to the development of the third level of higher education in Europe. While the first set of criteria addresses in a more pronounced way, the final product of the doctoral work, the second concerns the doctoral competences to be achieved during the process of doctoral studies. Combining these two sets of criteria of doctoral standards is how we tentatively interpret the concept of 'doctorateness'.

PhD students assessing doctoral dissertations. Preparing an empirical base
The first phase of the research project, which this paper reports on and which was mentioned in the introductory part of this article, builds upon a series of doctoral courses which we have implemented in research education for architects and designers in Belgium, Norway and Sweden in the years 2008-2011 (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2009, 2010, 2011b, 2011c). These courses were an attempt to train the doctoral students in the art of scholarly assessment

as a mode of developing research competences and, thus, preparing these students to be creative and competent in producing the final product of their doctoral studies – a thesis. The courses included the study and evaluation of already accepted doctoral theses in the design fields, and the PhD students were guided by a set of criteria formulated by us as the teachers. With regard to these guidelines, which include our interpretation of how the competences are embedded in the final product of doctoral work, the students were asked to discuss and evaluate: *the research problem* of the thesis; *the knowledge status* in the field; the *research design* of the doctoral project (the relations between the object of study, the theoretical frameworks used, the traditional or the 'by design' approach to the research); the description and *self-evaluation of the route mapping*, i.e. the research method applied and the arguments for the chosen approach; *the scholarly craftsmanship* materialised in the thesis (*akribi*); *the communicability* of the thesis; *the importance of the project* to the knowledge building in the field, and if it has brought about new original knowledge; *the potential for further development* of the results of the thesis; and *the value of the thesis outside* the scholarly and designer community.

At the end of each assessment seminar, we requested the PhD students to estimate the value of such a kind of research training, as well as how they, after having submitted a written evaluation as well as presented and discussed the thesis they assessed during the seminar, interpret the concept of 'doctorateness'. Four groups working on three theses, as examples of our empirical material for the research project, elucidated the intentions of the project.

A group of doctoral students from the Ardhi University, Dar-es-Salam, who studied a traditional thesis (Syversen, 2007), wrote: 'The assignment on the doctoral thesis review was useful in self-reflection on our own research projects in addition to imparting knowledge on how we can assess other scholarly works.' Their understanding of the concept of 'doctorateness' emphasised its dependence on the academic context of where a thesis was written: '"doctorateness" is a demanding scholarly endeavour that largely relies on the prevailing traditions in a specific university / institution.'[1]

A Swedish architect, working part time in practice and part time doing an industrial PhD, who studied a thesis based on 'research by design' (von Busch, 2008) reported that it created problems for him to study it. He browsed it many times, not in a sequential way, and then discussed its contents and form with his co-partner in this assignment. He was not sure whether he understood the thesis as it was intended by the author, but in spite of that he found studying the thesis interesting and fruitful. The PhD student highly appreciated the assignment, as he thought his course colleagues did too. He found it also of value that the course participants had the opportunity to learn about more than one thesis during the seminar where all the theses studied were presented and discussed. He felt a kind of uncertainty with regard to the concept of 'doctorateness'. He believes that the 'degree of doctorateness' can be measured by the degree of the author's awareness of what research generally deals with in an academic and cultural context and how the author understands the specificity of one's own research field and with relation to other fields. In this respect, the course has highly improved this awareness in the participants, according to the PhD student.[2]

A group of doctoral students at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design (AHO) studied an early example of a thesis close to research-by-design (Redström, 2001). They comment that it is possible to argue that the epistemological position of the author in retrospect might be viewed as in a by-design or performative paradigm, but that there is an uneasy connection between practical experimental design and theory in the thesis. Even though it is argued that theories, arguments and the design philosophy are based around the outcomes and the processes of the practical experimentation in designing and building the artefacts, there is little evidence of how the practical work has influenced and formed the theory throughout the thesis. 'The artefacts then act more as illustrations, starting points for

discussions by the authors and the presentation of ideas rather than experimental design efforts that in themselves seek to explore, investigate and probe certain topics.' In their reflections on 'doctorateness', they emphasise the importance of the aspects of having knowledge of the research landscape; understanding of traditions of research structures, cultures and languages; ability to communicate across disciplinary and professional borders; and to demonstrate criticality, rigour and appropriateness of structure of the presentation.[3]

Another group at AHO, which also studied the thesis by Otto von Busch (von Busch, 2008), highlighted 'doctorateness' as something that distinguishes or makes the link between research and the professional practice of the research field. 'To us, the analytical breadth is crucial in deciphering the essence of "doctorateness" as it is this that separates the practice from the research.' They argue that even though we as individuals may only work with one method, the understanding of the breadth of methodology and your positioning within this mesh of theories is critical in order for one to properly be a master of your own craft of research. And 'In the future we may be confronted with work that may demand a different methodological approach.'[4]

During the seminars, we as teachers put emphasis on the research design of the doctoral theses both written in a traditional academic manner as well as on how such a research design differed in cases of doctoral theses based on research by design. We found it important that especially those PhD students who approached design research in new ways have to be aware of what the traditional approaches are. This awareness we regard as necessary for building generic and field-specific research competences among doctoral students. It is not least important for being able to communicate research and new knowledge within the field of architecture and design as well as with other fields, in order to gain recognition for the field-specific knowledge and approaches.

Eisner's Connoisseurship & Criticism model of assessment

When analysing the outcome of the first stage of this research project with a focus on the concept of 'doctorateness' in the practice-based fields of architecture and design, we tentatively used the 'connoisseurship model' based on the work by the professor of art and education at Stanford University Elliot W. Eisner. His use of the concepts 'connoisseurship' and 'criticism' in the study of educational practice seems to be also of great relevance to clarifying and elaborating the meaning of 'doctorateness' close to architectural and design practice.

Eisner defines connoisseurship as the art of perception that makes appreciation of complexity possible, it is the ability to make fine-grained discriminations among complex qualities. To be a connoisseur in a field is to be informed about the qualities of the particular material or topic of the field; it means being able to discriminate the subtleties by drawing upon often sensory and perceptual memory against which the particulars of the present may be compared and contrasted. Connoisseurship is an appreciative art. Connoisseurs – in any field – *appreciate* what they encounter in the proper meaning of that word. Appreciation in this context means not necessarily a liking of what one has encountered, but rather an awareness of its characteristics and qualities. Such awareness provides the basis for the judgement. Knowing what to look for, being able to recognize skill, form, and imagination are some of the distinguishing traits of connoisseurship (Eisner, 1975, pp. 2–3, 1976, p. 140).

If connoisseurship is the art of appreciation, criticism is the art of disclosure. Eisner argues that what the critic aims at is not only to describe the character and qualities of the object or event, he or she also strives to articulate or render ineffable qualities in a language that makes them vivid. The task of the critic is to help us see, and to provide 'a rendering in linguistic terms of what it is that he or she has encountered so that others not possessing his level of connoisseurship can also enter into the work' (Eisner, 1975, p. 4).

In this sense, criticism requires connoisseurship but connoisseurship does not require the skills of criticism. It is connoisseurship that provides criticism with its subject matter, and one can be a connoisseur without uttering a word about what has been experienced. Connoisseurship is private, but criticism is public. Connoisseurs simply need to appreciate what they encounter. Critics, however, must render those qualities vivid by the artful use of critical disclosure (Eisner, 1975, p. 5). Criticism is the connoisseur's disclosure of perceptions, and it is done through description, interpretation, evaluation, and 'thematics' (identifying dominant features or pervasive qualities). Through criticism, the connoisseur reveals the complexities of the particular field and its objects, and re-educates others' perception of it (Vars, 2002, p. 70). Judgement and evaluation of qualities are present in both connoisseurship and criticism, but the critic needs to have the abilities and skills to make the qualities and arguments for judgement explicit and communicable.

With reference to studies of academic program reviews, Gordon Vars states that 'connoisseurship' may function as the 'catalyst' for evaluation and the primary instrument of measurement, guiding data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Although connoisseurs or evaluators may be expected to consider guidelines and criteria, the standards used in reaching their judgements primarily come from their experience as professionals and upon the collective experience of the profession (Vars, 2002, pp. 70–71).

The Connoisseurship & Criticism model with regards to 'doctorateness'
An elaborate interpretation of the concepts of 'connoisseurship' and 'criticism' in relation to practice-based research fields seemed to be appropriate to study 'doctorateness' in the fields of architecture, arts and design. The connoisseur could be said to be embedded in practice and here the experience and perception of the qualities and competences of that particular practice is crucial. The critic builds upon those experiential and perceptual components and competences, but also has to be able to step outside, take a somewhat critical distance and be able to articulate and communicate with others not possessing the connoisseurship or not being in the field.

These characteristics of both being embedded in practice and being able to reach outside can be related to how Michael Biggs describes practice-based research. Biggs defines practice-based research as research that prioritizes some property of experience arising through practice over cognitive content arising from reflection on practice. But he also emphasises that research that can be communicated or disseminated is more desirable than research that cannot be communicated, because it will have greater impact in its field. So he concludes that practice-based research of interest has an experiential component and should be communicable to others (Biggs, 2004, p. 7).

The issue of communication is important in all research, but crucial in relation to architectural and design research, and one can relate this to Nigel Cross' arguments on design abilities fundamentally relying on non-verbal media of thought and communication. Cross argues that designerly ways of knowing are embodied in people and not least embodied in the processes of designing and the products of designing. Knowledge resides in objects and artefacts, and designers are immersed in this material culture, and have the ability to understand what messages objects communicate; designers both 'read' and 'write' in 'object languages' (Cross, 2007, pp. 26–29). To be immersed in the field and have the ability to think and communicate with non-verbal codes is part of connoisseurship. Cross also argues that we would be foolish to disregard or overlook the informal knowledge embedded in products and people simply because it has not been made explicit yet, and to articulate and make this knowledge explicit is a task for design research. But he also states that there is a need to draw a distinction between works of practice and works of research, and he does not see how normal works of practice can be regarded as works of research. 'The whole point of doing

research is to extract reliable knowledge from either the natural or artificial world, and to make that knowledge available to others in re-usable form. This does not mean that works of design practice must be wholly excluded from research, but it does mean that, to qualify as research, there must be reflection by the practitioner on the work, and the communication of some re-usable results from that reflection' (Cross, 2007, p. 126).

So to do research we could say that the competence of the connoisseur – the ability to perceive and appreciate nuances in a particular field of practice – has to be combined with the competence of the critic – the ability to disclose and communicate characteristics and qualities to a broader audience. And this communication can of course be made in different media. Especially design practitioners use a range of various media to investigate, evaluate and communicate qualities when developing a design, where discernment, judgement and argumentation are implicit but in several instances also made explicit. Design practice and the designers' abilities for non-verbal thought and communication form a rich and interesting base for further development in research and communication of knowledge.

Eisner has in a more recent text in an anthology on the role of arts in social science research written that it has become increasingly clear since the latter half of the 20th century that knowledge or understanding is not always reducible to language. The deliteralization of knowledge and the liberation of the term knowledge from dominance by the propositional have opened the door for multiple forms of knowing (Eisner, 2008, p. 5). But Eisner also points out that to use different media to effectively disclose what one has experienced requires the skills, knowledge of techniques and familiarity with the materials also taking into detailed account how they behave when employed. The material and media must be converted into something that gives form to and clearly mediates the researcher's observations and gained knowledge (Eisner, 2008, p. 7). Even though he states that 'we should try telling what we know with anything that will carry the message forward', he also says that doing it on new as well as old media is no simple task, and what are needed are skills and techniques to treat a material so it becomes a medium of expression. One of the biggest obstacles to this kind of research is 'the paucity of highly skilled, artistically grounded practitioners', people who know how to use images, materials and the different media in refined and effective ways to represent what one has learned.

One way to address this situation, is according to Eisner, to create teams of researchers that work closely with practitioners in the arts. This would also require a new approach not only to the education of researchers but to the kinds of dissertation projects that would be encouraged and supported. Eisner even suggests the possibility of dissertations being prepared by groups of three or four individuals each of whom having major responsibility for some aspect of the work. Such projects should, according to Eisner, have both a theoretical or conceptual basis and should manifest sophistication in the arts. 'The vision I am describing is considerably more collaborative, cooperative, multidisciplinary, and multimodal in character. Knowledge creation is a social affair. The solo producer will no longer be salient, particularly in the context for those wishing to do arts-informed research' (Eisner, 2008, p. 10). Even if we do not go as far as Eisner and argue for collaborative doctoral projects by several individuals with different competences, which would probably be difficult to fit into the framework of the 'Dublin Descriptors' (EHEA, 2005), we certainly see the need to assess doctoral projects in practice-related fields from different perspectives needing different competences. The composition of assessment committees is then crucial.

Looking at the criteria for doctoral research competence from the 'Dublin Descriptors', one can see that both the competences of a connoisseur and of a critic are needed. The required 'systematic understanding of a field of study including mastery of the skills and methods of research' as well as the 'ability to conceive and pursue a substantial process of research with scholarly integrity' and the needed 'contribution through original

research' could be seen as the competences of a connoisseur. The required 'capacity of critical analysis and evaluation' and 'ability to communicate with peers, the larger scholarly community and with society in general' are competences of a critic.

The description by Phillips and Pugh of what constitutes a professional researcher shows the similar characteristics of both a connoisseur and critic. The skills that make one 'able to carve out a researchable topic, to master the techniques required and put them to appropriate use' belong to the connoisseur, while the ability 'to cogently communicate your findings' belongs to the critic. What they also point at is that these craft skills involved in becoming a full professional have to be learned by doing the task in practice situations. One could say that to become a professional means to become to some degree a connoisseur. To be a critic means that you are involved in articulating and communicating the qualities in certain practices to a broader audience both inside and outside a particular field of practice.

Both connoisseurship and criticism are based on practices. The particular challenge in practice-related research assessment within 'making disciplines' is that the connoisseur/critic has to comply with the demands of both the world of academia and the world of professional practice (Dunin-Woyseth & Michl, 2001, p. 2). The evaluators or the assessment committees do many times have to be both connoisseurs and master the skills in the field of research as well as in the field of practice. The bridge between the scholarly and professional practice fields can be the aspect of criticism, which is central in the forming of and already present in both professions and scholarly disciplines. The most important people for the development of a field of inquiry close to practice are the ones that are both 'connoisseurs/critics of design research' and 'connoisseurs/critics of design practice'.

When looking at our own guidelines for the PhD students in assessing the doctoral theses, we see that both these aspects are partly covered. The aspects of the research problem of the thesis, the knowledge status in the field, the research design of the doctoral project and the scholarly craftsmanship materialised in the thesis belong to the 'design research connoisseur'. The aspect of description and self-evaluation of the 'route mapping' and the arguments for the chosen approach belong to the 'design research critic', while the communicability of the thesis belongs to both the design research critic and design practice critic. The importance of the project to the knowledge building in the field, and if it has brought about new original knowledge, the potential for further development of the results and the value of the thesis outside the scholarly and designer community belong primarily to the design practice critic.

Preliminary conclusions
Within the first phase of the project, we have clarified the reasons for doing the evaluation project as embedded in the growing importance of the third cycle of higher education, the doctoral studies, and the need to develop suitable 'tools' for promoting high quality of these studies. 'Doctorateness' is understood both as a product (doctoral theses) and a process (research competent doctorate holders). We identified the stakeholders of the development of doctoral studies in the creative fields of architecture, design and arts as these fields are practiced for broader social public and academia. The objects of our evaluation have been the PhD students' written evaluations of a series of already accepted doctoral theses, regarded from the point of view of what constituted their 'doctorateness', i.e. both the final product, the thesis itself, and the process as described and argued for by the authors of the doctoral theses examined. Our evaluation design consisted of providing an empirical base for the assessment and constituting an analysis tool: Eisner's Connoisseurship & Criticism model of assessment. We collected the data during our doctoral courses, in the form of the PhD students' group assignments and their individual comments on 'doctorateness'. We analysed the evaluation

data, applying Eisner's Connoisseurship & Criticism model of evaluation. The preliminary evaluation results can be summarized as follows.

In the preliminary analysis of the study of the doctoral students' assessments, we found Eisner's 'connoisseurship model' and its concepts to be fruitful. The group of doctoral students from the Arhdi University studying a more traditional thesis stressed 'doctorateness' as largely relying on prevailing traditions in a specific university context. To know the tradition and the context is part of the competence of the connoisseur. The Swedish architect studying a thesis based on research-by-design said that the degree of 'doctorateness' can be measured by the degree of awareness of the academic and cultural context of the particular research, which is the competence of the connoisseur, and also how the author understands the specificity of one's own research field and its relation to other fields, which is the competence of the critic. The group from AHO studying the thesis by Redström pointed at the danger that artefacts are only being used or read as presentation of ideas or mere illustrations rather than means of research (which could be the position when only being a connoisseur). In their reflections on 'doctorateness', they emphasised the importance of having knowledge of the research landscape and understanding of research traditions, cultures and languages – the competence of the connoisseur – as well as demonstrating criticality and the ability to communicate across disciplinary and professional borders – the competence of the critic.

The group at AHO that studied the thesis by von Busch argued for the need to understand the breadth of methodology (a connoisseur) and to be able to make positionings within the mesh of theories (a critic). They also made an interesting remark on 'doctorateness' as something that both distinguishes and makes the link between research and professional practice of the research field. To create these links and negotiate understandings between research and practice is certainly the task of the connoisseur/critic. Of special interest is not least to create linkages between 'design research connoisseurs/critics' and 'design practice connoisseurs/critics'. The development of the field of practice-related design disciplines makes it more and more possible that there will be an increasing number of people being both.

From the first phase of the studies in our research project we can see that the importance of a particular kind of awareness can be stressed as crucial for 'doctorateness'. Here the model of connoisseurship and criticism has been operative, but we also see the need and possibilities for further development of the model and the concepts in relation to discernment and judgement of qualities in both design practice and research. Eisner has emphasised the awareness of experienced characteristics and qualities in the specific material of the connoisseur and critic, and we would also highlight the awareness of the knowledge landscape one as a professional researcher has to navigate in. This is important for being able to position oneself and to be able to extend the knowledge in the field. But it is just as important for having the increasingly needed ability to communicate and get into dialogue with peers, professionals and other knowledge producers in one's own as well as other disciplines and fields. We presume that a more elaborate definition of 'doctorateness' stressing the specific awareness and competences being negotiated will be operative and useful as a pedagogical tool in research education in the design fields as well as in dialogues between research professionals and practice professionals.

Halina Dunin-Woyseth
Professor, Dr., Architect
Oslo School of Architecture and Design /
Telemark University College, Norway
dunin@online.no

Fredrik Nilsson
Professor, Dr., Architect SAR/MSA
Department of Architecture
Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden
fredrik.nilsson@chalmers.se

References

Biggs, M. (2004). Learning from Experience: approaches to the experiential component of practice-based research. In H. Karlsson (Ed.), *Forskning, Reflektion, Utveckling*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational Research: An Introduction*. New York: Longman.

Cross, N. (2007). *Designerly Ways of Knowing*. Basel: Birkhäuser.

Denicolo, P., & Park, C. (2010). *Doctorateness - an elusive concept?* Gloucester: The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Publications/InformationAndGuidance/Documents/doctorateness.pdf

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Michl, J. (2001). Towards a disciplinary identity of the making professions: an introduction. In *Towards a Disciplinary Identity of the Making Professions*. Oslo: AHO.

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nilsson, F. (2009). Visual Thinking as Bridge Building. Testing a Pedagogical Concept, Drawing Some New Insights. In S. Martens, A. Jakimowicz, & J. Verbeke (Eds.), *Reflections +9*. Brussels: Sint-Lucas Architectuur.

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nilsson, F. (2010). An Emerging Research Culture - Building Doctoral Scholarship in Architecture and Design at Sint-Lucas. In A. Jakimowicz, S. Martens, & J. Verbeke (Eds.), *Reflections +13*. Brussels: Sint-Lucas Architectuur.

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nilsson, F. (2011a). Building a culture of doctoral scholarship in architecture and design. A Belgian-Scandinavian case. *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research*, *23*(1), 41–55.

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nilsson, F. (2011b). Research by Design: Progress in establishing field-specific research in architecture and design - an update on four national scenes. In G. De Maeyer (Ed.), *Reflections +15*. Brussels: Sint-Lucas Architectuur.

Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nilsson, F. (2011c). Building (Trans)Disciplinary Architectural Research - Introducing Mode 1 and Mode 2 to Design Practitioners. In I. Doucet & N. Janssens (Eds.), *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism*. Dordrecht: Springer.

EHEA. (2005). A Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved January 20, 2012, from http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/QF-EHEA-May2005.pdf

Eisner, E. (1975). The Perceptive Eye: Toward the Reformation of Educational Evaluation. In *Occasional Papers*. Stanford: Stanford Evaluation Consortium. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED128408

Eisner, E. (1976). Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism: Their Form and Function in Educational Evaluation. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *10*(3/4), 135–150.

Eisner, E. (2008). Art and Knowledge. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), *Handbook of the Arts in Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

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

Philips, M., Stock, C. F., & Vincs, K. (2009). Dancing doctorates down-under? Defining and assessing 'doctorateness' when embodiment enters the thesis. In C. Stock (Ed.), *Dance Dialogues: Conversations Across Cultures, Artforms and Practices. Refereed Proceedings of the World Dance Alliance Global Summit, Brisbane, Australia, 13 – 18 July 2008*. Canberra: Australian Dance Council & Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from http://www.ausdance.org.au/resources/publications/dance-dialogues.html

Phillips, E. M., & Pugh, D. S. (2005). *How to get a PhD*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Redström, J. (2001). *Designing Everyday Computational Things*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.

Stock, C. F. (2011). Approaches to acquiring 'doctorateness' in the creative industries : an Australian perspective. In L. Justice & K. Friedman (Eds.), *Pre-Conference Proceedings*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Retrieved from http://www.sd.polyu.edu.hk/docedudesign2011/doc/papers/344.pdf

Syversen, I. L. (2007). *Intentions and Reality in Architectural Heritage Management*. Göteborg: Chalmers University of Technology.

Trafford, V., & Leshem, S. (2009). Doctorateness as a threshold concept. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(3), 305–316.

Vars, G. F. (2002). Educational Connoisseurship, Criticism, and the Assessment of Integrative Studies. *Issues of Integrative Studies*, (20), 65–76.

von Busch, O. (2008). *FASHION-able. Hacktivism and Engaged Fashion Design*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.

Notes

[1] The PhD students Joel Msami, Sarah Phoya and Daniel Mbisso, studied the doctoral thesis 'Intentions and Reality in Architectural Heritage Management' (2007) by Inger Lise Syversen in October 2011.

[2] Architect Nils Björling studied together with architect Stefan Lundin, both doctoral students at Chalmers Architecture, a doctoral thesis by Otto von Busch 'FASHION-able: Hacktivism and Engaged Fashion Design' (2008), in October 2011.

[3] The doctoral students Anthony Rowe and Jørn Knutsen at AHO, the Oslo School of Architecture and Design, studied the doctoral thesis by Johan Redström 'Designing Everyday Computational Things' (2001) in December 2011.

[4] Nicole Martin and Lothar Diem, doctoral students at AHO, studied the doctoral thesis by Otto von Busch 'FASHION-able: Hacktivism and Engaged Fashion Design' (2008) in December 2011.