Making Design Public

Making Design Public:

Education Beyond the Studio

Edited by

Vincent Peu Duvallon

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Making Design Public: Education Beyond the Studio

Edited by Vincent Peu Duvallon

This book first published 2026

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-0364-6423-3
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-0364-6424-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This publication follows the *Teaching Beyond the Curriculum: Focus on Pedagogy 2023 Conference* (Virtual), co-organized by Architecture, Media, Politics, Society (AMPS), The Glasgow School of Art, Louisiana State University, and Wenzhou-Kean University, held from November 15 to November 17, 2023. Its realization has been made possible with the support of Graham Cairns and his dedicated team at AMPS, whose contributions have greatly facilitated this project.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Albena Yaneva for her generous support and insightful discussions, and to Graham McKay for his valuable help in reviewing the manuscript. Finally, I wish to thank David Mohney for founding the School of Public Architecture and for his continued support of its work, which made possible the school's involvement in the co-organization of the symposium.

PREFACE

THE HYBRID PRACTITIONER

ALBENA YANEVA

Architectural education strives to keep abreast with professional developments to help architects prepare for the organisational, economic, and managerial realities of a world that keeps moving at a greater pace.[1] The crisis in thinking about architectural education furthered the need of new, radical approaches and gave way to new pedagogies that foreground the production of space.[2] The drive to rethink design pedagogy by introducing more practice components and by adapting the curriculum to the new challenges of professional practice has triggered numerous curriculum changes in the past few years across different contexts. Educators acknowledged that the old-fashion idea of the architect as a well-rounded jack-of-all-trades is to be reconsidered.[3] Today, the pressing challenges of the new climatic regime, of wars and economic uncertainty prompt us to rethink anew the ontological and epistemic basis of design education and to actively remodel design pedagogy.

As an applied and skills-oriented discipline, architecture's traditional orientation has always been that of a professional education. No matter where architecture is taught – at traditional universities, technical universities or universities of applied sciences – design studio remains at the centre of knowledge production and active knowledge exchange. It has a central role for shaping the fundamental characteristics of the discipline and its pedagogy. Design practice has evolved from apprenticeship

---

[1] David Nicol and Simon Pilling, eds., *Changing Architectural Education: Towards a New Professionalism* (London and New York: E & FN Spon, 2000).

[2] David Froud and Harriet Harris, *Radical Pedagogies: Architectural Education and the British Tradition* (London: RIBA Publishing, 2015).

[3] Roger Pringle and David Porter, "Education to Reboot a Failed Profession." In *Radical Pedagogies: Architectural Education and the British Tradition*, eds. David Froud and Harriet Harris (London: RIBA Publishing, 2015), 145-153.

through to the Beaux-arts and then the Bauhaus traditions,[4] and this has resulted in different types of studio teaching.[5]

The pedagogy of design studio and juries has been studied extensively from different perspectives.[6] The most exemplary study of studio-situated reflexivity of professional schools drew on a pragmatist mode of enquiry[7] according to which design education is based on actual experience where knowledge is no longer taught as predetermined norms and historical information, handed down by the educator, but rather based on actual, shared, and continued experience, and where the social and physical conditions of education are crucial. Arguing that 'reflection-in-action' stands against the systematic, scientific, linear way of knowing, Schön's theory[8] of 'reflective practice' made a revolution in design in the 1980s founding a new epistemology of practice, by taking as its point of departure the competence and artistry already embedded in skilful practice.[9] Yet, Schön explicitly positioned the student's prior knowledge as 'invalid' for the task at hand and thereby perpetuated an abuse of power that is unhelpful to the development of architecture as a profession.[10]

---

[4] Mark Crinson and Jules Lubbock, *Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

[5] Ashraf M. Salama, *Spatial Design Education. New Directions for Pedagogy in Architecture and Beyond* (London: Routledge, 2015) and Lesley Green and Edmond Bonollo, "Studio-Based Teaching: History and Advantages in the Teaching of Design," *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education* 2, No. 2 (2003): 269–72.

[6] Kathryn H. Anthony, *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991); Thomas A. Dutton, "Design and Studio Pedagogy," *Journal of Architectural Education* 41, No. 1 (1987): 16–25; Donald Schön, "The Architectural Studio as an Exemplar of Education for Reflection-in-Action," *Journal of Architectural Education* 38, No. 1 (1984): 2–9: Donald A. Schön, *The Design Studio: An Exploration of its Traditions and Potential* (London: RIBA, 1985); Garry Stevens, "Struggle in the Studio: A Bourdivian Look at Architectural Pedagogy," *Journal of Architectural Education* 49, No. 2 (1995): 105–22 and Helena Webster, "A Study of Ritual, Acculturation and Reproduction in Architectural Education," *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 4, No. 3 (2005): 265–82.

[7] John Dewey, *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process* (New York: Heath, 1933).

[8] Donald A. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner* (San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, 1983).

[9] Donald Schön, *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1987).

[10] Laurie L. Willenbrock, "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education." In *Voices in Architectural Education: Cultural Politics and Pedagogy*, ed. Thomas A. Dutton (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991), 97–120.

Following on these lines of criticism, Webster[11] and Mewburn[12] claimed that Schön promoted an inadequate idea of design learning as a mostly passive process of observation and replication in which the teacher's main role is to 'correct' the student's work, rather than help them to develop or hone their skills. This implied a narrow notion of how learning takes place through formal interactions only and failed to recognise the other dimensions of learning in addition to the cognitive – the affective and corporeal learning experiences and the student's potential to be an active learner. The idea of the studio as solely occupied by students and teachers was also questioned. Moreover, the wider networks of architectural education were not acknowledged, and learning was reduced to the confined spatial and social remit of the studio only.

The current trend towards practice-orientation and transdisciplinarity[13] makes us rethink some of the key foundations of design education, the distinctive knowledge cultures involved in it and the strategies for better adaptation of designers' education to the social and economic challenges of the day. Questioning further and adding to Schön's anthropology, the 'performative' dimension of design pedagogy is yet to be explored, and it becomes crucial to generate alternative accounts of its distinctive 'epistemic culture'.[14] A critical evaluation of the current forms of architectural pedagogy across different contexts is much needed. Recent studies of architectural practices took inspiration from Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) and paid close attention to the material, epistemic and social dimensions of design practice.[15] Yet, design pedagogy has been rarely explored from this perspective.

---

[11] Helena Webster, "The Analytics of Power – Re-presenting the Design Jury," Journal of Architectural Education 60, No. 3 (2007): 21–27 and "Architectural Education after Schön: Cracks, Blurs, Boundaries and Beyond," *Journal for Education in the Built Environment* 3, No. 2 (2008): 63–74.

[12] Inger Mewburn, "Lost in Translation: Reconsidering Reflective Practice and Design Studio Pedagogy," *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 11, No. 4 (2012): 363.

[13] Isabelle Doucet and Nel Janssens, eds., *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism: Towards Hybrid Modes of Inquiry* (Vienna and New York: Springer, 2010).

[14] Karin Knorr-Cetina, *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

[15] Sophie Houdart and Chihiro Minato, *Kuma Kengo: Une monographie décalée* (Marseille: Éditions Parenthèses, 2009); Yanni Loukissas, *Co-Designers: Cultures of Computer Simulation in Architecture* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012); Bruno Latour, Albena Yaneva, ""Give Me a Gun and I will Make All Buildings Move": An ANT's View of Architecture", *Ardeth* (Online) 1 (2017):

Taking an ANT perspective to explore design education today, we must ask: What is the specific role of design education at the intersection of research innovation and the multiple social, economic and cultural networks embedded in design? How do contemporary teaching formats incorporate design research and mobilise a large network of interlocutors from different disciplines? What is the content, and the skills taught, the partnerships, the spatial and material arrangements of the programmes, and the impact of various interprofessional networks? Finally, how can we craft a distinct epistemic culture while connecting a wide range of professionals and their social and economic networks in the relational orbits of knowledge production in architecture? These are also some of the questions examined in this volume.

From Reflective to Hybrid Modes of Enquiry

The type of studio-based reflexivity advocated by Schön is commonly privileged by the professional schools of many research universities. If reflection-in-action stands against the systematic, scientific, linear way of knowing, what kind of enquiry could compliment this way of knowing today? Are designers still merely reflective practitioners? I will argue that architects today need to engage with a pragmatist type of architectural enquiry that would require a hybrid, situation-based, distributed way of learning about architecture and its various social and political entanglements, rather than one that would rely on a stable stock of systematic knowledge or pure reflexivity. How could pragmatist, self-exemplifying pedagogical enquiries that question the multifarious connections of architecture, society, economics, culture, and politics counter the reflective studio-based learning?

Unlike Schön's bidirectional and reflective enquiry, architectural educators today devise innovative networked self-exemplifying multidirectional types of enquiries. If in Schön's interpretation,[16] the designer and the result of his design are affecting one another in a situation that renders both directions into a relation of cause and effect, where every design move 'bends back on' and affects the entity instigating the action, the hybrid practitioners engage with a variety of other data while designing. They do not engage in solitary coach-and-student problem-solving with

---

108; Albena Yaneva, *The Making of a Building: A Pragmatist Approach to Architecture* (Oxford: Peter Lang Publishers, 2009) and *Made by OMA: An Ethnography of Design* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2009).

[16] Schön, *The Design Studio*.

the help of a sketch. Instead, the reflective dialogue is complemented, extended and amplified by an intense search of data, design precedents, image retrieval, archival materials, government papers, and mappings. These new sources of design inspiration would imply a different mode of communication with materials and shapes, a different epistemic engagement. If the thinking about what they are doing while they are doing it makes the drawing design practitioners reflective, contemporary hybrid practitioners rely on surfing and browsing large amounts of data at the beginning of every enquiry. Design happens by surfing, mapping, drawing, and navigating a complex hybrid enquiry. In brief, the hybrid practitioners rely on an understanding of buildings as a plethora of material and subjective considerations, involving also multiple concerns. Moving beyond the traditional two or three-dimensional images, the hybrid practitioners engage in inventing a visual vocabulary that will do justice to the idea of buildings as 'things', contrasting with the older and more reluctant view of buildings as static objects. Design emerges as a web of moves and enrols a multitude of entities: swarms of birds, polluted air, neighbourhood organisations, contested zoning regulations, costs, local politics, legacy, and communities, among others.

In traditional pedagogical formats, the individual remains the focus of attention as the creator behind a project. Yet, even the greatest works of art, we know it after Alpers,[17] like the paintings of Rembrandt, were not marked by the loneliness of human conditions but rather by the hectic activity in his studio. The ways the work of the studio is organized, the atmosphere and the social life in the studio (the critics, the collaborators, and hired artists, the providers, etc.) all have an impact on the creative work, on the collaborative process and on the final content of the works. Similarly, revealing the actual dynamics of the creative process in contemporary design shows that hybrid practitioners never create in isolation, in solitude, but always surrounded by people, and supported by a larger network of practitioners where multiple initiatives can unfold synchronously, and synergies can be created. The results therefore no longer represent just one homogeneous body of work, one niche expertise, but rather an unfolding heterogenous network of creative practices.

Hybrid practitioners enable collaborations and set them in motion relying on an applied approach developed within a wider network of creative institutions, and disciplines. They seek to understand how this network forms and transforms over time, actively explore the types of

[17] Svetlana Alpers, *Rembrandt's Enterprise: The Studio and the Market* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

qualities and responsibilities that could be cultivated with collaboration and aim to reach a creative result that benefits from the contributions of all participants. Instead of being product-driven, they aim at nurturing the distinctive skills of network crafting. The collaborations are open, innovative, inviting, and inclusive and at the same time assertive, active and efficient. The networks extend, bifurcate, combine and interlink creating continuously new initiatives. They become, to paraphrase Michael Baxandall[18] a deposit of social relationships and reflect and shape back the multiple social connections crafted in design education. Thus, the work of the hybrid practitioners reveals to what extent design, and by extension design pedagogy, is not the special creation of an individual genius, but the mundane product of a dense and versatile networks of cooperations[19] between different participants: partners, advisers, materials, external contractors, markets, local suppliers, international organisations, etc. Moreover, the dynamic environment of design education showcases that there are many 'intermediaries' between design and the broader context/society: collaborators, alumni, design techniques and technologies, critics, materials, organisations, precedents, local communities and institutions. Scrutinising the participation of all these actors, both human and nonhuman, individual and institutions, involved in design education, and highlighting how they work together, their roles and impacts, can shed light on the distinctive network-inspired pedagogical philosophy of design education today.

Bibliography

Alpers, Svetlana. 1982. *Rembrandt's Enterprise: The Studio and the Market.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anthony, Kathryn H. 1991. *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Baxandall, Michael. 1972. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds. Berkeley: University of California Press*.

[18] Michael Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

[19] Baxandall, *Painting and Experience* and Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).

Crinson, Mark, and Jules Lubbock. 1994. *Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dewey, John. 1933. *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. New York: Heath.

Doucet, Isabelle, and Nel Janssens, eds. *Transdisciplinary Knowledge Production in Architecture and Urbanism: Towards Hybrid Modes of Inquiry*. Vienna and New York: Springer, 2010.

Dutton, Thomas A. "Design and Studio Pedagogy." *Journal of Architectural Education* 41, No. 1 (1987): 16–25.

Froud, David, and Harriet Harris. *Radical Pedagogies: Architectural Education and the British Tradition*. London: RIBA Publishing, 2015.

Green, Lesley, and Edmond Bonollo. "Studio-Based Teaching: History and Advantages in the Teaching of Design." *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education* 2, No. 2 (2003): 269–72.

Houdart, Sophie, and Chihiro Minato. 2009. *Kuma Kengo: Une monographie décalée.* Marseille: Éditions Parenthèses.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1999. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, Bruno and Yaneva, Albena. ""Give Me a Gun, and I will Make All Buildings Move": An ANT's View of Architecture," *Ardeth* (Online), 1 (2017): 108.

Loukissas, Yanni. 2012. *Co-Designers: Cultures of Computer Simulation in Architecture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mewburn, Inger. "Lost in Translation: Reconsidering Reflective Practice and Design Studio Pedagogy." *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 11, No. 4 (2012): 363.

Nicol, David, and Simon Pilling, eds. *Changing Architectural Education: Towards a New Professionalism*. London and New York: E & FN Spon, 2000.

Pringle, Roger, and David Porter. "Education to Reboot a Failed Profession." In *Radical Pedagogies: Architectural Education and the British Tradition*, edited by David Froud and Harriet Harris, 145-153 (London: RIBA Publishing, 2015)

Salama, Ashraf M. 2015. *Spatial Design Education. New Directions for Pedagogy in Architecture and Beyond*. London: Routledge.

Schön, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner.* San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, Donald A. 1985. *The Design Studio: An Exploration of its Traditions and Potential.* London: RIBA.

Schön, Donald A. 1987. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stevens, Garry. "Struggle in the Studio: A Bourdivian Look at Architectural Pedagogy." *Journal of Architectural Education* 49, No. 2 (1995): 105–22.

Webster, Helena. "A Study of Ritual, Acculturation and Reproduction in Architectural Education." *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 4, No. 3 (2005): 265–82.

Webster, Helena. "The Analytics of Power – Re-presenting the Design Jury." *Journal of Architectural Education* 60, No. 3 (2007): 21–27.

Webster, Helena. "Architectural Education after Schön: Cracks, Blurs, Boundaries and Beyond." *Journal for Education in the Built Environment* 3, No. 2 (2008): 63–74.

Willenbrock, Laurie L. "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education." In *Voices in Architectural Education: Cultural Politics and Pedagogy*, edited by Thomas A. Dutton, 97–120 (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991).

Yaneva, Albena. 2009. *The Making of a Building: A Pragmatist Approach to Architecture.* Oxford: Peter Lang Publishers.

Yaneva, Albena. 2009. *Made by OMA: An Ethnography of Design*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.

INTRODUCTION

Embedded in the modernist project, architectural discourses have been dominated by the great schism dividing the idealism of the discipline and the realism of the profession, the handless theory discussed in the Academies' salons, and the soulless practice driven by *passionate interests*.[1] In response to the demiurgic *pathos* of the modern movement, the 1970s opposed the autonomy of the discipline, exiled in the safety of the academic boudoir. And in spite of the efforts of post-war CIAM[2] and the short-lived movements of "participative architecture,"[3] early 21st century's return of history[4] and the economic and environmental crises, impacting deeply architectural practices, knocked again on the academies' doors. Nevertheless, the great schism has not been overcome. On the one hand, pretending to address contemporary issues, design practices draped themselves in green and social attire, while academia retreated into neo-modernist myths where "powerful explanations"[5] of architecture (economic, social, political, environmental) led to parodies of social engagement in which architecture feigns the ability to solve deep-rooted political and social issues. Conversely, inspired by late avant-garde models, a range of alternative yet marginal architectural practices took shape, adopting

---

[1] Bruno Latour, and Vincent Antonin Lépinay, *The Science of Passionate Interests: An Introduction to Gabriel Tarde's Economic Anthropology* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2010).

[2] Tom Avermaete, "The Architect and the Public: Empowering People in the Post-war Architecture Culture," *Hunch 14, Publicity* (2010): 48-62.

[3] From Rod Hackney, Walter Segal, Ralf Erskine and Lucian Kroll in Europe to Samuel Mokbee and Rural Studio in North America. See Johann Albrecht, "Towards a Theory of Participation in Architecture: An Examination of Humanistic Planning Theories," *Journal of Architectural Education* 42, No.1 (1988): 24–31.

[4] Jennifer Welsh, *The Return of History: Conflict, Migration, and Geopolitics in the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto: Anansi, 2017).

[5] Bruno Latour, "From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public." In *Making Things Public. Atmospheres of Democracy*, eds. Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2005), 29.

activist positions but lacking the resources to scale or achieve systemic influence.[6]

Meanwhile, some keep seeking academia's legitimacy by transforming the studio into a simulation of professional practice—stripped of its social complexity. This later model continues the tradition of the 19th-century Beaux-Arts apprenticeship, into the 21th century.[7] In this model, despite its alleged realism, the studio is understood as a laboratory,[8] developing architecture in vitro and mirroring a form of architectural practice that we could call "private," i.e., limited to the interests of the main stakeholders: client, designers, and consultants. This model replicates a limited form of engagement in a dialogue between the student and their tutor, abstracting external conditions such as culture, geographical or social analysis into design features.

Following the civil rights movements in the US in the 1950s, community design centers emerged to provide design services to disadvantaged neighborhoods. The work of Paul Davidoff on advocacy planning expanded these practices to give a voice to marginalized stakeholders in the case of urban planning.[9] Shortly after, community design centers opened in universities in the US and the UK, linking socially concerned practices in academia with local communities. Community design studios and service learning became part of the curriculum but remained marginal. Centered around disadvantaged communities and functioning as nonprofit volunteer practices, these forms of public engagement, that were "well-intentioned" and "in the public interest," faced a series of shortcomings such as limited in scope, poorly executed, patronizing and mismatching students' training.[10]

Assessing the result of community design, Graham Towers observed:

---

[6] Simon Sadler et al., "Field Notes on Design Activism: 1," *Places Journal*, (November 2022).

[7] Helena Webster, "Architectural Education after Schön: Cracks, Blurs, Boundaries and Beyond", *Journal of Education in the Built Environment* 3, No.2 (2008): 63-74.

[8] Donald A. Schön, *The Design Studio: An Exploration of its Traditions and Potential* (London: RIBA, 1985).

[9] Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, No.4 (1965): 331–38.

[10] Kathleen A. Dorgan, "Principle of Engagement: (mis) Understanding the Community-Design Studio, *Cityscape* 10, No.3, *Design and Disaster: Higher Education Responds to Hurricane Katrina* (2008): 9-19.

> "After more than 20 years' practice of community architecture, it is disappointing, and somewhat mystifying, that the educational establishment is still so unsupportive."[11]

Reinforcing this opposition between theory and practice, education and the so-called reality, Graham Towers summarized:

> "Education has not only failed community architecture, it has failed to provide for the predominant concern of professional practice. In producing graduates who are ill-equipped to practice, it has neither served the interest of the profession nor those of the public."[12]

In the same anti-intellectual vein, and drawing on the Luddite craftsmanship mythos inherited from the Arts and Crafts movement through to the Bauhaus, design-build programs emerged alongside architectural education in the United States throughout the 20th century.[13] While these initiatives have occasionally, though marginally, been applied in service of local communities, they often remain detached from actual construction practices, intersecting instead with volunteer-driven service design. These endeavors, while commendable, have framed public engagement as synonymous with nonprofit practices and relegated it to a subcategory within academia and profession.

Academia	Practice
Socially Engaged Studio	Activist and Nonprofit Practices
Simulation of Practice	Firms exploiting Performative Environmentalism
Community Design Studio	Community Design Centers

Fig.1: Current distribution of public concerns and design agendas within the great Schism between Academia and Practice

[11] Graham Towers, "The Ivory Tower: Educating Building Designers," in *Building Democracy: Community Architecture in the Inner Cities*, 195 (London: University College of London Press, 1995).
[12] Towers, "*The Ivory Tower*", 200.
[13] Zunaibi B Abdullan, "Exploring the evolution of design-build courses in architectural schools: A qualitative study" (2014). ETD collection for University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Making Design Public aims to unfold design practice's social and political nature in education by bringing it outside the studio and into the "contested territory"[14] of design projects while taking buildings' "Multiverse"[15] into the studios. In this framework, students are exposed to the Public assembled by architecture and design projects and learn to navigate the complexity of their contexts made of clients' biases, politicians' agendas, zoning laws, end users' tastes, environmental associations' struggles, and neighbors' visual habits, and to position themselves not as *Leviathans* arbitrating controversy in the name of "the Public Good"[16] but as both cartographers and navigators in this process, making academia a *situated practice*,[17] both emic and etic. As cartographers and navigators, students place research and communication at the heart of their work. How does one discuss architectural issues and projects with a broader audience, clients, or non-specialists? How do we translate local, environmental, and political issues into architectural ones? Public design studios and projects are, first and foremost, translation practices,[18] and designers are both makers and *messengers*[19]. Students are trained to become engaged practitioners more than reflective practitioners.[20] At the core of these forms of engagement, *representation* transcends its role as a mere tool for

[14] Bruno Latour, Albena Yaneva, ""Give Me a Gun and I will Make All Buildings Move": An ANT's View of Architecture", *Ardeth* (Online) 1 (2017): 108.

[15] Albena Yaneva. "A Building is a Multiverse." In *Making Things Public. Atmospheres of Democracy*, eds. Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2005) 530-36.

[16] It's the central argument of corporatist professional organizations, especially in Architecture to depict the practitioner as the "guardian of the public interest". But their conception of the public is the same phantom as described by Walter Lippmann in *The Phantom Public* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1993). For examples of the traditional understanding of the public mission of the architect See Tom Spector, *Architecture and the Public Good* (London: Athem Press, 2021) and Tom Spector, *The Ethical Architect* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2001).

[17] Isabelle Doucet and Hélène Frichot, "Resist, Reclaim, Speculate: Situated Perspective on Architecture and the City", *Architecture Theory Review* 22, No.1 (2018): 2

[18] Michel Callon. "Struggle and Negociations to define what is Problematic and what is not: The Sociology of Translation." In *The Social Process of Scientific Investigation: Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook 4*, eds. Karin D. Knorr, Roger Krohn and Richard Whitley, (Boston: Reidel, 1981) 187-219.

[19] *Messengers* is used here in Michel Serres' meaning as both "knowledge transmitters" and "communication parasites". See Timothy Barker. "Michel Serres' Messengers," *Media Theory* 5, No. 1 (2020): 163-184.

[20] Donald A. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner* (San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, 1983).

expressing design ideas; it becomes an integral part of the emerging political apparatus surrounding projects, serving both as a medium and a transformative process.

Extension of the Domain of Public

The recent pandemic revealed the fragility of abstractions such as "community," "society" and, even more "territory." As Bruno Latour noted in his analysis of the unfolding of events regarding individual survival, "interdependence replaces localization." He clarifies:

> "we call 'local' what is discussed and argued in common. 'Near' doesn't mean 'a few kilometers away', but 'what attacks me or provides for me in a direct way'; it's a measure of commitment and intensity. 'Distant' doesn't mean 'far away in kilometers', but whatever you don't have to worry about." [21]

This analysis is particularly relevant to design and architecture. If we traditionally associate a building's "site" or "condition" to its immediate settings or region, the *New Climatic Regime*[22] forces us to trace the extended condition of the building such as the provenance of its materials, the impact it can have beyond its surroundings, the location of the consultants, or the origins of the construction workers. This extended territory and how the designers navigate these networks (both physically and virtually) impacts how design is taught and practiced. In this new system of coordinates, the traditional distinction between the global and the local blurs. As Latour puts it:

> "the world we *live in* only rarely overlaps with the world we *live off*."[23]

In other words, design projects *depend*,[24] but their dependence extends beyond their production or design sites. Dependent design projects replace located design objects. Within this new positioning system based on interdependence, publics must be assembled on a project-by-project basis, networks must be traced and mapped, the commons must be acknowledged,

---

[21] Bruno Latour, *After Lockdown. A Metamorphosis* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2021), 64.
[22] Bruno Latour, *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2017)
[23] Latour, *After Lockdown*, 65.
[24] Jeremy Till, *Architecture Depends* (Cambridge, MA: the MIT Press, 2007).

and actors or their representatives must be identified. The public is therefore not limited to the civic[25] as it has been usually understood in architecture (when we talk about *public space*, or *public architecture*[26] for instance) but as the network of actors concerned by the project as well as the whole "production chain": designers, clients, manufacturers, construction workers, materials, local biodiversity and, to paraphrase Henri Lefebvre,[27] the end-users as *co-producer*s. Redefining the contours of the public domain mirrors de displacement of politics described by Ulrich Beck thought his notion of Risk Society.[28] As mentioned by Albena Yaneva, "in order to regain a handle on political dynamics (…) political scientist should engage in studying to 'subpolitical' process that take place outside the domain of formal politics."[29] This understanding of the politics and the public finds its roots in the Lippmann-Dewey debate a century before when the rise of the "great society"[30] made the Jeffersonian community based on rural society irrelevant. For Dewey:

> "The Public consists of all those who are affected by the indirect consequences of transactions. (…) Since those who are indirectly affected are no direct participants in the transaction in question, it is necessary that certain persona be set apart to represent them, and see to it their interests are conserved and protected."[31]

While Dewey and Lippmann distinguish between the Public—those indirectly affected by an issue—and private interests, which directly influence decision-making, Noortje Marres, in her thesis on the displacement of politics, challenges this separation by bringing them together into a single collective:

---

[25] Peter Rowe, *Civic Realism* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999).
[26] Dana Cuff. "Collective Form: The Status of Public Architecture." *Thresholds* 40 (2012): 55–66.
[27] Henri Lefebvre, *La Production de l'Espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 2000).
[28] Cited in Albena Yaneva, *Five Ways to Make Architecture Political. An Introduction to the Politics of Design Practice*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2017)
[29] Yaneva. *Five Ways*.
[30] Graham Walace, mentor of Lippman, defined the "Great Society" as "created by the industrial revolution and the media revolution, where people are enmeshed in a vast and interpersonal web of interdependent relationship". Cited in Noortjte Marres, *No Issue, No Public: Democratic Deficits after the Displacement of Politics* (Amsterdam: Ipskamp Printpartners, 2005) 35.
[31] Cited in Marres, *No Issue, No Public*, 48.

> "I hope to make it clear that both private interests, understood as individual actors' attachments to things like businesses and their profits, as well as public interests (attachments to a collective concern, such as climate change) are *caught up in one and the same tangle of issues.*"[32] (emphasis added)

Marres emphasizes that public and private interests are not distinct entities but rather entangled within the same network of concerns, where individual and collective stakes continuously intersect and shape one another. Noortje Marres expands her definition of *Public Affairs* through Actor-Network Theory and is informed by the capacity of Science and Technology Studies (STS) to compose publics around given controversies. In order to engage with these publics, the designer has to abandon his pretention to speak *in the name of* the Public (with a capital P) and start exploring, documenting, mapping, translating, and composing the complex networks, their actors, their attachments, and their resistances.

Exposing the Black Box

At the height of the postmodern moment, Reyner Banham, in his testamentary essay, defined architectural design—or the "architectural mode" (*modo architectorum*)—as a black box, "recognized by its output though unknown in its content." According to Banham, this architectural mode of design originates in academia, particularly in the design reviews where the instructors act as "gatekeepers"[33] of a secret value system in the studio, where "young architects are socialized into their profession."[34] In this entrenched culture, the *modo architectorum*'s black blox remains at odds with external factors, as encapsulated by Banham's apocryphal citation: "Don't bother with all that environmental stuff, just get on with the architecture"[35] reinforcing the myth of autonomy and the singularity of architecture within the academic realm.[36] Within the field of STS, the black box refers to the internal condition of production (whether scientific

---

[32] Marres, 57.

[33] Helena Webster, "Facilitating Critically Reflective Learning- Excavating the Role of the Design Tutor", *Art Design & Communication in Higher Education* 2, No.3 (2004):101-111.

[34] Reyner Banham, "A Black Box. The Secret Profession of Architecture", in *A Critic Writes. Essays by Reyner Banham,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996) 295.

[35] Banham, *"A Black Box,"* 296.

[36] Jeremy Till, "Architectural Research: Three Myths and One Model", *Building Material* 17 (2008): 4-10.

knowledge or technological innovation) as opposed to external factors (economic, institutional, or social)..[37] For Latour, "Black Boxism" relates to "the way scientific and technical work is made invisible by its own success."[38] The exhibition curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist, "Laboratorium," offered opening the black box by exhibiting the conditions of production of Art and Science (the laboratory and the studio) and to "bridge the gap between the specialized vocabulary of science, art and the general interest of the audience."[39] *Making Design Public* proposes to eliminate the black box by overcoming the distinction between the studio and the external world, the interiority of the design culture (or *episteme*),[40] and the exteriority of the design production by exploring alternative modes of design practices (*metis*[41] or know-how) bridging the academia and the world "out there."

Dēsignāmus: All Designs Are Collective Designs

As a corollary, *Making Design Public* recognizes the inherently collective nature of design—not as an argument for the "death of the author," since public practice demands designers remain accountable for their role, but as a commitment to engaging in dialogue with the many actors, both seen and unseen, who shape and are shaped by design. As Bruno Latour aptly put it in his lecture on the philosophy of design:

> "All designs are 'collaborative' designs — even if in some cases the 'collaborators' are not at all visible, welcomed, or willing." [42]

---

[37] Trevor Pinch and Wiebe Bijker, "The Social Constructions of Facts and Artefacts: or How the Sociology of Science and the Sociology of Technology Might Benefits Each Other", *Social Studies of Science* 14 (1984): 399-441

[38] Bruno Latour, *Pandora's Hope. Essays in the Reality of Science Studies* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999) 394.

[39] Hans Ulrich Obrist and Barbara Vanderlinden eds., *Laboratorium* (Kohln: Dumont, 1999),17.

[40] Tom Avermaete, "A Black Box? Architecture and Its Epistemes." In *The Tacit Dimension: Architecture Knowledge and Scientific Research*, ed. Lara Schrijver, (Leuven University Press, 2021) 69–82.

[41] Latour, *Pandora's Hope*, 174.

[42] Bruno Latour, "A Cautious Prometheus? A Few Steps Toward a Philosophy of Design with Special Attention to Peter Sloterdijk." In *Medias Res: Peter Sloterdijk's Spherological Poetics of Being*, eds. Willem Schinkel, Liesbeth Noordegraaf-Eelens, Lena Tsipouri, and Vanja Stenius (Amsterdam University Press, 2012) 151–64.

Rather than becoming entangled in sterile debates about the autonomy of design disciplines, the false opposition between pragmatism and idealism, the individual and the collective, the heroic artist versus the anonymous one, Roark against Toohey, public practices should prioritize meaningful interdisciplinary exchange. In this evolving landscape, designers are neither above nor below other actors. Their role is diplomatic[43] rather than pedagogical, and requires an awareness that counters the often unexamined privilege of wealth and education. [44] A genuinely collective design process must be carefully assembled—one in which architects, designers, faculty, and students work to identify those affected yet underrepresented, and amplify the voices of both human actors, which might otherwise go unheard and non-human one that are usually poorly represented, not to forget the mute future generations.[45] To the Hobbesian "war of all against all," the Public described here would match best Gabriel Tardes description of society as: "the reciprocal possession, in extremely varied forms, of everyone by each individual."[46]

Each contribution in this volume explores new ways to understand public practices within academia, drawing from actual experience. By redefining existing modes of engagement—such as community design—and reimagining tools of practice, such as representation or cross-disciplinary collaboration, these works explore new forms of collaborative design. Together, these contributions challenge traditional disciplinary boundaries and lay the ground for a more inclusive and participatory approach to design that is both reflective and action-oriented.

In this evolving landscape, *Making Design Public* means more than simply making it accessible; it means constructing spaces for genuine collaboration, redistributing agency, and ensuring that design operates as a genuinely collective act that is responsive, accountable, and deeply intertwined with the lived realities of those it impacts.

In the first chapter, Michael Grugl and Liliane Wong examine how emerging technologies challenge traditional modes of architectural representation. While architectural education has evolved toward more inclusive and equitable curricula, its methods of communication remain

---

[43] Bruno Latour. « Guerre des mondes - offre de paix ». *Ethnopsy*, (2000): 61-80.
[44]Towers, *"The Ivory Tower",* 199
[45] Edith Weiss-Brown. *In Fairness to Future Generations* (New York. Transnational Publishers, 1989).
[46] Cited in Bruno Latour, « Gabriel Tarde – La société comme possession. La «preuve par l'orchestre » », in *Philosophie des Possessions*, ed. by Didier Debaise (Dijon : les Presses du réel, 2011).

rooted in conventions that are often inaccessible to the general Public. Through the *Crossing the Pell* project, which proposes bike and pedestrian access to the Claiborne Pell Bridge in Rhode Island, the authors explore the potential of Extended Reality (XR) to transform design engagement. Instead of relying on standard drawings, the project utilizes VR and AR to create interactive experiences, allowing users to navigate and interact with design proposals in real-time. By integrating contemporary tools, this chapter questions the limits of conventional architectural representation and advocates for more experiential, participatory approaches to design communication.

In the second chapter, Mart Deceuninck, Angeliki Paidakaki, Emilie Taylor Welty, and Pieter Van Den Broeck explore how architecture schools can train students to become community-oriented practitioners. While scholarship on community architecture and disaster resilience has documented the role of architects in fostering community engagement, less attention has been given to how they are academically prepared for this work. This chapter addresses that gap by analyzing a 14-week design/build studio at Tulane University's *Small Center for Collaborative Design*, where students collaborated with a local farm to develop a community-based project. Through ethnographic research—including interviews, site visits, and project analysis—the authors examine the pedagogical model's strengths and challenges, highlighting key lessons for architectural education globally in fostering socially engaged and resilient design practices.

In the third chapter, Aanya Chugh examines how design education can cultivate cross-disciplinary collaboration. As design disciplines increasingly expand beyond their traditional boundaries, the need for transdisciplinary approaches becomes more pressing. This chapter presents a case study of a studio project that brought Interior and Product Design students together to redesign exhibits for a local children's museum. Using a user-centric design thinking framework adapted from Tim Brown and Barry Katz's *Three Spaces of Innovation*,[47] students worked in teams to address the needs of multiple stakeholders, particularly young children. By aligning their distinct skill sets around the shared goal of enhancing user experience, the project demonstrated how transdisciplinary design education fosters innovation. The study offers insights into such collaborations' pedagogical

[47] Tim Brown, and Barry Katz, *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation* (New York: Harper Business, 2019)

value and potential to generate meaningful community outcomes beyond conventional business applications.

In *Free Space for All! The In: Takt Project – A Bottom-Up Exploratory Teaching Project Towards a Transdisciplinary, Transformative, and Collaborative Design Approach*, Hendrik Weiner presents an innovative pedagogical experiment that bridges education, urban co-creation, and community engagement. Based in Magdeburg, Germany, the *In: Takt* project functions as both an interdisciplinary university seminar and an open urban laboratory, where students and local citizens collaboratively explore urban transformation, sustainability, and democratic discourse. Through self-organized, hands-on projects, participants engage in cross-sector partnerships with local authorities and businesses, blurring the lines between academia and civic activism. This initiative fosters a new infrastructure model where diverse knowledge systems are valued, and co-creation occurs in an inclusive and participatory environment. By reflecting on the project's successes and challenges, the chapter highlights the potential of engaged learning in shaping students' understanding of urban development and their role as active contributors to the public realm.

In the fifth chapter, *From Classroom to Community: Interior Design Students Tackle Energy Efficiency in a Public Facility*, Dr. Juntae Jake Son explores an immersive learning initiative that bridges the gap between sustainable design education and practical knowledge of energy efficiency. Through a partnership with a nonprofit organization in Indiana, 50 undergraduate Interior Design students conducted hands-on energy assessments in residential buildings, engaging with homeowners from diverse socio-economic backgrounds. Using tools like thermal cameras and light meters, students identified inefficiencies and provided actionable recommendations to improve energy performance. This experiential approach deepened their technical understanding and enhanced their client communication skills. The project demonstrates how applied learning can create meaningful community impact while better-preparing students for professional practice. By highlighting the benefits of such engagement, the chapter advocates for integrating similar initiatives into design curricula to foster socially responsible and practice-oriented education.

In the sixth chapter, *Towards the Creation of a New Paradigm of Tectonic Bamboo Education*, Mia Tedjosaputro, Siti Balkish Roslan, and Anastasia Maurina explore innovative pedagogical approaches for

architecture education in response to the profession's evolving demands. Drawing from Ashraf Salama's re-examination of architectural pedagogy[48] and the Royal Institute of British Architects' framework for professional development, the authors propose a *Tectonic Bamboo Education* (TBE) model that integrates hands-on learning with climate literacy. Through a comparative analysis of eight pedagogical theories—including Experiential Learning, Problem-Based Learning, and Project-Based Learning—the chapter evaluates their impact on student engagement, motivation, and satisfaction. The findings aim to inform a mixed-method approach that optimizes learning outcomes and prepares students for sustainable, practice-oriented design. Positioned within the broader discourse of "Education Outside the Classroom," this chapter advocates for pedagogical strategies that extend beyond traditional academic settings to foster meaningful, applied learning experiences.

In the seventh chapter, Loukia Tsafoulia and Severino Alfonso examine how architectural pedagogy can engage with neurodivergent communities to foster inclusive spatial design. The chapter presents findings from three interrelated initiatives at Thomas Jefferson University: a senior-level interior design studio collaborating with neurodivergent advocacy groups, an annual transdisciplinary symposium on neurodiversity and the built environment, and ongoing Synesthetic Research and Design Lab research. Through partnerships with institutions such as the *ShrubOak International School of Autism* and the *Jefferson Health Center for Autism and Neurodiversity*, students and researchers develop design methodologies that accommodate diverse cognitive and sensory needs. By integrating lived experiences, industry expertise, and experimental design practices, the authors advocate for a more equitable built environment. This work highlights the potential of architecture and design to move beyond conventional approaches, embracing neurodiversity as a central consideration in shaping inclusive spaces.

In the eighth chapter, *Bridging the Gap: Fostering Future Leaders through Creative Industry Engagement in Design Education*, Sadiyah Geyer examines the role of industry engagement in preparing students for professional success. Using case studies from the University of Johannesburg's third-year Interior Design program, the chapter explores how collaborations with businesses and industry professionals enhance

[48] Ashraf M. Salama, *Spatial Design Education. New Directions for Pedagogy in Architecture and Beyond* (London: Routledge, 2015).

student learning beyond standardized curricula. Through internships, guest lectures, and collaborative projects, students gain exposure to real-world challenges, develop critical problem-solving skills, and cultivate essential soft skills such as communication, teamwork, and adaptability. These experiences reinforce the relevance of their education and create pathways to career opportunities. Geyer argues that integrating industry engagement into design education bridges the gap between academia and professional practice, equipping students with the tools to navigate an evolving workforce. The chapter highlights how fostering industry connections can serve as a global model for enriching design pedagogy.

In *Toward Best Practices for Non-Extractive Outreach and Engagement in Living-Learning Communities: Rhizome at Virginia Tech*, Grant Hamming discusses the *Rhizome Living-Learning Community* at Virginia Tech, a program that blends global sustainability concepts with local, hands-on action. This interdisciplinary initiative engages students in design-based projects for local nonprofits, governments, and campus departments. One distinctive feature of Rhizome is its inclusion of first-year students in real-world design challenges, alongside the requirement that students must participate in the program to live in their preferred dormitory. This dual aspect creates a unique dynamic that necessitates careful outreach and engagement strategies to balance students' and community partners' needs and expectations. Drawing from three years of operation, the chapter explores key lessons learned and outlines best practices for managing these relationships in non-extractive ways, providing a model for similar initiatives in other academic institutions.

In Chapter 10, *Impactful Community-Based Design Project*s, Stephanie McGoldrick highlights how small-scale community design projects can create significant, lasting impact. Professor McGoldrick demonstrates how design proposals can meaningfully affect communities, residents, and local businesses through a series of student-led interventions. These projects improve the community and foster deep connections between students and their surroundings, providing opportunities for future collaborations. The chapter emphasizes the multifaceted role of interior designers, who must address both spatial solutions and safety, comfort, cultural diversity, and environmental responsibility. The author draws on research from Gerald Eisman and others to underscore the value of service-learning in design education, noting that such experiences help students build real-world problem-solving skills and greater confidence. The chapter advocates for small-scale community-based projects as a vital educational tool,

preparing students to tackle complex societal challenges such as climate change, health disparities, and economic inequalities in their professional careers.

In Chapter 11, *To Make is to Care*, Lee Ivett and Ecaterina Stefanescu critically examine the prevailing attitudes toward architecture, particularly in the UK, where architecture is often perceived as an exclusive, alienating practice. They argue that architecture today primarily serves those who can afford or profit from it, leaving the general Public disconnected from the field. The authors highlight how academic and professional systems in architecture reinforce elitism and marginalization, as they favor certain forms of language, behavior, and theoretical adherence. In contrast, Ivett and Stefanescu advocate for a pedagogy focused on "learning-through-doing" and "thinking-through-making," which extends beyond physical artifacts to emphasize active participation in creating architectural ideas. This approach encourages greater accessibility, engagement, and empathy, suggesting that the act of making architecture inherently fosters care for oneself, the surrounding environment, and the communities we share it with.

In the last chapter, *Making a School of Public Architecture in a Transnational Context*, David Mohney, Craig Konyk, Vincent Peu Duvallon, and David Vardy reflect on the development of the School of Public Architecture at Kean University, established in 2014. The school, which spans two locations—one in New Jersey and the other at Wenzhou-Kean University (WKU) in China—was founded with a mission to emphasize public engagement and outreach across its undergraduate and master's programs. The chapter explores initiatives that have emerged in both the US and China, where students have participated in design and planning projects that engage local communities. Focusing on two key projects—urban revitalization in Trenton, New Jersey, and the extension of the WKU campus in China—the authors interrogate the evolving role of public architecture in the 21st century, considering the unique contexts of each location. They also reflect on alternative teaching methodologies that bridge international and cultural divides in architecture education.

The different essays describe teaching initiatives where students are engaged with real projects and their Public: local community, decision-makers, existing building conditions, and associations. They have to invent new ways of representation to communicate: VR, models, online

presentations, and exhibitions. They reclaim the term "publicity" for architecture practice, i.e., "the art of making architecture public."[49]

Bibliography

Abdullan, Zunaibi B. "Exploring the evolution of design-build courses in architectural schools: A qualitative study" (2014). ETD collection for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dissertations/AAI3629987

Avermaete, Tom. "The Architect and the Public: Empowering People in the Post-war Architecture Culture." *Hunch* 14, Publicity (2010): 48-62.

Avermaete, Tom. "A Black Box?: Architecture and Its Epistemes." In *The Tacit Dimension: Architecture Knowledge and Scientific Research*, edited by Lara Schrijver, 69–82 (Leuven University Press, 2021)

Albrecht, Johann. "Towards a Theory of Participation in Architecture: An Examination of Humanistic Planning Theories." *Journal of Architectural Education* 42-1. (1988): 24–31. Doi: 10.2307/1424997.

Banham, Reyner "A Black Box. The Secret Profession of Architecture", in *A Critic Writes. Essays by Reyner Banham,* 292-299 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996)

Barker, Timothy. "Michel Serres' Messengers." *Media Theory* 5, No. 1 (2020): 163-184.

Brown, Tim and Katz, Barry. 2019. *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation.* New York: Harper Business.

Callon, Michel. "Struggle and Negotiations to define what is Problematic and what is not: The Sociology of Translation" in *The Social Process of Scientific Investigation: Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook 4,* edited by Karin D. Knorr, Roger Krohn and Richard Whitley (Boston: Reidel, 1981).187-219.

Cuff. Dana. "Collective Form: The Status of Public Architecture." *Thresholds* 40 (2012): 55–66.

Davidoff, Paul. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 31, No.4 (1965): 331–38. doi:10.1080/01944366508978187

Dewey, John. 1954. *The Public and Its Problem.* Athens, OH: Swallow Press, Ohio University Press.

[49] Salomon Frausto, "Introduction to the Topic", *Hunch* 14*, Publicity* (2010): 6.