ARS NET

WEAVING THEORY AND PRACTICE: DESIGN DISCOURSES, EXCHANGES, AND PROCESSES

Kristanti Dewi Paramita

WEAVING THEORY AND PRACTICE: DESIGN DISCOURSES, EXCHANGES, AND PROCESSES

Kristanti Dewi Paramita
Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Correspondence Address: Kristanti Dewi Paramita, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI, Depok 16424, Indonesia. Email: kristanti.dewi@ui.ac.id

The first volume of ARSNET creatively explores the interweave between theory and practice in design inquiries. Often seen as distinctively opposed to one another, this article follows Plowright's (2014) argument that "the division between theory and practice is artificial and imaginary.... It is not possible to divide theory from practice when engaging design" (pp.53–54). Allen (2008) proposes to draw connections between theory and practice by re-imagining them both as design practices. One is a discursive practice that is critical and interpretive, working on the space of conceptual and textual, while the other is material practice, which involves operations of visual translations and organisations of matter (Allen, 2008). Both practices are invaluable for the emergence of design. This volume presents investigations on how such practices may entangle with one another as an interweave between theory and practice in response to some design inquiries.

Understanding the different contours of design knowledge is a crucial design inquiry that enables designers to maneuver within the design process. Theoretical design knowledge, for example, creates sets of priorities and methodological instructions for designers in navigating their design process (Plowright, 2014). The discursive practice has the ability to guide such understanding. As part of the tools of the discursive practice, a text is essentially "a system of difference" that structure the "thought and experience" (Forty, 2004, p. 43) of architecture. In this sense, through critical texts, a different experience and thinking of architecture are offered. Across architectural discourses, such critical texts often entangled with visual translations (Yaneva, 2016), articulating the intersection between theory and practice. The use of both text and visual tools arguably creates a more precise articulation of the different contours of design knowledge.

The expression of architectural spatialities may also be significantly informed by both theory and practice. The production of spatialities in the design process derives from a mix between the bodily encounter and material expression (Atmodiwirjo & Yatmo, 2019), creating the spatial experience. In such expression, both the discursive and material practice may alternatingly become the starting point of such articulation. The text has been widely explored as the medium that allows further

understanding of "the spatiality and production of architecture and interior" (Atmodiwirjo & Yatmo, 2020). On the other hand, drawing is "a simulacrum of perception" (Forty, 2004, p. 41) that expresses architectural spatialities, generating shared understanding across stakeholders. The entanglements between discursive and material practice in expressing architectural qualities occur beyond the medium. The theory and practice weave with each other through the way spatial experience constructs its critical narrative (Psarra, 2009, Wigglesworth & Till, 1998), and vice versa. A critical text may expand the potential meaning and interpretation of architectural spatialities, which can be developed further through material practice.

The theory and practice connection also exist in the creative awareness towards the overall sequence of the design process. The process of design is largely thought to be invisible and unsystematic (Fraser, 2013). Being more reflective in navigating a design journey creates a deeper connection between designer and their design conditions (Schon, 1984), arguably enabling a more robust design outcome. The intersection between theory and practice in such inquiry can be seen in how the reflections utilise both the discursive and material tools of practice. Documentation of the designer's making process demonstrates the "interplay between rationality and creativity" which expresses the interaction between creative endeavour and theoretical design paradigm (Harahap et al., 2019, p. 191). Such interaction can also be found in how the material practice reflectively engages with its context within the design process, revealing and celebrating the discursive meanings and values that become the valuable basis of its architecture. In practices that aim to question or provoke the objectives of design critically, how design is conducted in engagement with its surrounding and the society may become more critical than the outcome itself (Hill, 2007; Rendell, 2013).

This edition of ARSNET presents a collection of works that articulates the interweaving between theory and practice and utilises an entanglement of the discursive and material practices. The first two papers hover between exploring the contours of design knowledge and delivering the expression of spatial qualities. Mikhael Johanes digitally maps the notion of design within academic articles collected from Indonesian architectural journals, constructing the understanding of how design is being discussed in Indonesia based on the past and present situations of its academic design discourse. The use of digital mapping creates a precise reading of such situations. It reveals the spatial qualities residing within each contour of design knowledge, enabling transformative propositions towards a more diverse, creative, and provocative development of Indonesian architectural academic scholarship.

Diandra Pandu Saginatari and Adrian Perkasa investigate the experience of urban heritage preservation through interdisciplinary conversation, exchanging the experience of material ruination and the complex agency of urban heritage

preservation. Utilising an array of creative drawing and historical images, the conversation between such different design knowledge creates multiple interpretations and speculations of spatial qualities in such context, significantly enriching the overall urban heritage discourse.

The other three papers are primarily concerned with the need to reflectively articulate the progression of a design process, particularly in architectural design pedagogy. Mochammad Mirza Yusuf Harahap examines how tectonic becomes the basis of architectural programming, arguing that tectonic as a form of theoretical design knowledge can inform inquiries in multiple design stages. The study explores students' process of making and reflecting how tectonic becomes the basis of a particular expression of spatial qualities, highlighting form-finding iterations that lead to architectural programs and atmospheres.

Ayesha Aramita Malonda investigates the process of tectonic learning through tambal, a culturally embedded practice of house repairs in Manado, revealing an array of design knowledge that demonstrates the material and structural understanding driven by locality. This article suggests the need to find alternative modes and media of design learning that can meet the students' learning needs while also celebrating their contextual diversity. Lastly, Afifah Karimah and Paramita Atmodiwirjo argue for an expanded definition of catalogue drawing in architectural design, not only to represent the finished design output but also to assist designers in managing information and design outputs. Detailed categories of catalogue drawing are suggested, with different roles and techniques that need to be approached rigorously to aid the designers in navigating their design process.

This issue presents an understanding of how theory and practices can be simultaneously and transformatively engaged along with the different design inquiries. It explores how the different entanglements of discursive and material practices create a precise yet often expanded and enriched reading of design aspects. At the same time, it is argued that investigations presented in this issue may also expand and blur the boundaries of design theories and practices.

References

Allen, S. (2008). *Practice: Architecture, technique and representation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Atmodiwirjo, P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2019). Interiority in everyday space: A dialogue between materiality and occupation. *Interiority*, 2(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v2i1.56

Atmodiwirjo, P., & Yatmo, Y. A. (2020). Reading between the lines: Revealing interiority. *Interiority*, 3(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v3i1.77

Ching, F. D. K. (2011). *A visual dictionary architecture* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Forty, A. (2004). *Words and buildings: A vocabulary of modern architecture*. Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Fraser, M. (2013). *Design research in architecture: An overview*. Routledge.

Harahap, M. M. Y., Tregloan, K., & Nervegna, A. (2019). Rationality and creativity interplay in research by design as seen from the inside. *Interiority*, 2(2), 177–194. https://doi.org/10.7454/in.v2i2.65

Hill, J. (2007). Introduction: Criticism by design. In J. Rendell, J. Hill, M. Dorrian, & M. Fraser (Eds.), *Critical architecture* (pp. 165–169). Routledge.

Plowright, P. D. (2014). *Revealing architectural design: Methods, frameworks and tools.* Routledge.

Psarra, S. (2009). *Architecture and narrative: The formation of space and cultural meaning.* Routledge.

Rendell, J. (2013). A way with words: Feminist writing architectural design research. In M. Fraser (Ed.), *Design research in architecture: An overview* (pp. 117–136). Routledge.

Schon, D. A. (1984). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Basic Books.

Wigglesworth, S., & Till, J. (1998). Table manners. In S. Wigglesworth & J. Till (Eds.), *The everyday and architecture* (pp. 33–35). Academy Press.

Yaneva, A. (2016). *Mapping controversies in architecture.* Routledge.