Editor's comments, NJAR 2020-2

(article starts on next page)

EDITORS' NOTES

MADELEINE GRANVIK, DANIEL KOCH AND MAGNUS RÖNN

This mixed issue of the journal is made up of five scientific articles. The first two contributions are about the university understood as an institution in society and the department of architecture as a university building for design and learning. They are followed by two contributions dealing with the guidelines for housing and urban planning in Norway and Denmark. The fifth article in this issue focuses on architectural quality and cultural heritage values in a socio-economic context.

Before presenting the articles in this issue, we would like to comment on the demand for open access, and point out some impacts of this paradigm shift that publishers of scientific journals are facing. Of course, open access is positive for many reasons. From a scholar's point of view, communication with target groups is the main point of writing articles, book chapters and conference papers. Being able to reach out with research findings and freely discuss research results with colleagues is a fundamental objective, and publishing through open access on the web appears to be a good solution when seen in this perspective. However, there are also consequences that may come as surprising drawbacks for journals devoted to architectural research. Journals driven by independent associations of scholars, research communities or scientific societies are not at the top of future agendas. Instead, the publishing systems within the humanities and the social sciences are increasingly guided by principles developed in natural sciences in a joint venture with market-driven publishing houses. Subscription to journals is being replaced by open, online publishing systems financed through article processing charges (APC). This shift is supported by strong demands

for open access from public research councils. Scholars, universities, departments and journals within architecture, landscape architecture and urban design have to deal with several important challenges that coincide with the requirements of open access, specified as gold open access.

Since 2017, the National Library of Sweden has had an assignment from the government to coordinate, inform and introduce an open access publishing system. The assignment includes designing digital tools for scientific journals. The National Library of Finland and the Royal Danish Library[1] have corresponding responsibilities for developing digital platforms for scientific journals. In 2019, the National Library of Sweden presented findings and guidelines from the government assignment for scholarly publications. The directive to the National Library was to act as a national co-ordinating body for the work towards a transition to an open access publishing system. For this reason, the National Library conducted investigations on open access themes published in various reports. Topics for the investigations include both demands for open access for publishing of articles and books, review systems and merit systems at universities, financial and technical support and monitoring of requirements and licenses. The reports are divided into following themes:

1 See: https://tidsskrift.dk/

- Transition from a subscription-based to an open access publishing system
- Open access to scholarly monographs
- The merit system and resource allocation related to incentives for open access
- Financial and technical support for open access scholarly journals
- Monitoring of compliance with open access policies and mandates, including CC-licenses

The participants in the working groups consisted of representatives for research funders in Sweden, universities and scholars, associations for higher education and the National Library. However, editors, editorial boards and members from independent associations behind research driven journals seem to be lacking in the working groups. The National Library conducted literature reviews and collected empirical data from scientific journals. In 2017, the *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research* was included in the investigation. The editors-in-chief were asked to contribute with information about the number of published articles, published issues and type of published manuscripts, applied peer review system, organization, economy, etc. We were the sole scientific journal in architecture that was investigated by the National Library, which in turn shows the weak position for humanities and social sciences in the on-going transformation towards open access based on charges.

The transition from subscription-based journals to an open access publishing system in the hands of market-driven actors can become a threat to the journals' independence, and reduce the opportunity for scholars to publish research findings as peer reviewed manuscripts without paying charges. The overall goal for the National Library has been to produce recommendations for nationwide solutions, with the aim to support the transformation to open access of scholarly publications through APC. This alteration of the publishing system is in line with a declaration adopted by government agencies. The business model behind APC is based on invoicing individual researchers or departments when publishing articles through gold open access, which means that the article is accessible for readers through free download. The charges for researchers/departments is equivalent to an average of 1 300 Euro at commercial publishing houses that run journals in the humanities and social sciences, according to the National Library.[2] The direct production and operating costs of a journal in a transition to gold open access in Sweden are estimated at 1 100 Euro by the National Library.[3]

Individual authors do not pay any fee (APC) for publishing articles in the *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research*. We are financed by subscriptions from institutions, mainly university libraries. Subscriptions provide independence, crucial for credibility and scientific standards. The *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research* has solved the demand for open access for scholars on an individual basis through providing green open access: *authors have the right to deposit the published version of her/his article through the author's own institutional repository or open archive, immediately after it is published in the journal*.[4]

According to the report "Transition from a subscription-based to an open access publishing system" by the National Library, there are two main driving forces changing the conditions for scientific publications: demands from research councils to communicate research findings by gold open access and increasing publishing costs at libraries for online journals run by commercial publishing houses.[5] They constitute a paradigm shift, starting in the 1980s within the scientific publishing system, which operates in parallel with the need for discussing research findings on an international level. From a Nordic perspective, the on-going alteration can be summarized as an impact on the research community on three levels:

Firstly, commercial publishing houses have replaced scientific societies and research associations as publishers of journals, with dramatically increasing publication costs as a result. Libraries at universities find it increasingly difficult to support teaching and research with literature, and have been forced to stop subscribing to journals. Diversity decreases when selection procedures become tougher. The number of printed journals is declining, and has been replaced by a growing number

of online journals for specialized knowledge fields. Market oriented actors need manuscripts in order to make profit. Individual researchers are "bombarded" with publishing offers, both from serious journals and from predatory publications with impressive websites promising swift scientific peer-review. Warning lists[6] and criteria for revealing predatory journals have become part of researchers' everyday lives.[7]

Secondly, the requirement for gold open access from public research councils is part of a development where subscriptions to journals are replaced by a system where publication costs are transferred to individual researchers, institutions or universities. Instead of publishing articles free of charge in journals that are part of the library's subscription, the research grants are used to pay for new types of publishing costs. The National Library refers to a survey study from 2017 reporting that 78% of 332 scholars in Sweden paid for publication costs with their research grants. The result is based on researchers who received grants from five major research councils in Sweden. The creation of a market for scientific online journals makes it expensive for scholars without public grants to communicate research results in journals run by commercial publishers with ACP as a business model. How do the universities act in order to support academic freedom in architecture, landscape architecture and urban design? Is there any specific publishing strategy for communicating research findings at the architectural schools?

The National Library argues in their reports for the transition from a subscription-based system to an openly available publishing system. This is a strategy for solving publishing issues that generates new problems. Publishing houses run by commercial actors will dominate the development of publishing systems. Journals that depend on invoicing individual researchers or institutions for their operations have a financial interest that may have an impact on the peer reviews of manuscripts. Every choice of acceptance or rejection of an article, or even demands for significant revisions, becomes a choice that can have significant financial impacts for the journal, whereas in a subscription model, quality that warrants interest in subscribing is the economic driver. Reviewers of scientific articles can also be affected by the close link to economics. The willingness of the research community to review manuscripts is turned into a service that the market driven journal sells with profit. These problems have not been sufficiently highlighted in the surveys conducted by the National Library, which seems to make the guideline towards an open publishing system incomplete, unclear and untested. We may sound conservative. Perhaps we highlight the risks more than the opportunities. We acknowledge there are also risks in subscription models when commercialised; while there is a risk that judgement is affected by economic choices in APC, one could also find a risk of decisions being influenced by what could attract subscribers in subscription systems – but there is a much less direct and tangible link between decision and

6   See: https://predatoryjournals.com/journals/

7   See: https://thinkchecksubmit.org/sample-page/check/ and https://jefferson.libguides.com/c.php?g=250298&p=1666257

income, and hence arguably a smaller risk. However, funding of journals through subscriptions is a well-established system that gives editors an independent position. This is a crucial quality. Journals published by scientific societies and research association have no commercial interests and can therefore, on good grounds, be assumed to promote the quality of research through internal control. In the subscription-based system, libraries pay for journals and they become available for free downloading at universities by researchers, teachers and students. The *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research* does not need other financial resources than subscribers for its survival, as long as editors and peer-reviewers have positions at universities that include time for these research activities. Scientific societies and research associations need to articulate their role as publishers of scientific journals. The open and accessible system for publishing articles online promoted by the National Library does not – at least not so far – have the necessary guarantees to support free and independent architectural research.

Thirdly, the development toward internationalization for scholars, expressed as language issues, is followed by an administrative ranking system of journals and publishing houses. This is a new kind of "scientific bureaucracy" connected to open access. It has become increasingly important for researchers in the Nordic countries to publish research findings in English and in journals with a recognized scientific status. Denmark, Norway and Finland have introduced administrative systems for scientific ranking of journals and publishing houses.[8] Researchers who publish articles in ranked journals generate money back to their institutions.

8   See the Norwegian system for ranking. https://npi.nsd.no/fagfeltoversikt/fagfelt?id=1004

Internationalization is an expression of extended collaboration in architecture, landscape architecture and urban design for scholars in the Nordic countries. The target group has expanded. The fact that English nowadays is a dominant language for communicating research findings is clearly visible in the journal archive, which is available through digitalization on the website. In its first years, the journal was part of a national development of architectural research. From 1987 to 1992, a total number of 117 articles were published. Of these, 114 are in Nordic languages, primarily Swedish. Only 3 articles are in the English language. In 1992, the magazine was transformed into a Nordic project, and gradually began to publish more and more articles in English. For the past five years, from 2015 to 2019, altogether 69 scientific articles have been published. Of these, 66 are in English and 3 are in Nordic languages. The target group for researchers in Scandinavia has become worldwide. The journal's archive thus reflects not only the development of architectural research in the Nordic countries, but also its internationalization and expanding administrative system as being ranked at "top level". The transition to English, as the language for publishing research results, requires resources for professional proof reading. These costs are also an

argument for a system where journals have access to long-term secure income through subscriptions. A supplementary question, crucial to the journal's quality, is that the editors-in-chief, editorial staff and reviewers of manuscripts can perform their scientific tasks within the framework of their positions at universities. This, in turn, requires procedures for judging merits that reward participation in the publishing system organized by independent research associations, without commercial interests and underlying driving forces. Scientific quality should be the focus for scholars – PhD students, supervisors and senior researchers.

And now back to the five contributions in this issue of the journal. "The Epistemology of Campus Design" by Thomas Dahl is the first article. The research question is: does the way that universities arrange and design their buildings contribute to the purpose of the university? Dahl investigates whether buildings and their architecture operate as agents of learning in higher education. The University of Trondheim (NTNU) in Norway is used as an example of changing ideas and the search for a new role for universities. The board of NTNU has decided to close and sell the university site at Dragvoll in Trondheim and its building complex from the late 1960s. Dragvoll is a part of the massive expansion of higher education in Norway after World War II. Along with the abandoning of Dragvoll, the board of NTNU has designed a new future-oriented vision for education and knowledge production at the university. Dahl finds that the academy has turned into a problem-solving institution in a trans-disciplinary context. The board of NTNU is planning to develop a site for excellence, with the purpose to become internationally acknowledged. In a final remark on the planning and designing of the new vision, Thomas Dahl returns to Kant's ideas about aesthetics and Aristotle's comments on the sensation of inner emotions. They are still relevant for understanding the relation between design, building and learning.

The second article is "Emerging Architectural Makerspaces: Analysis and Design Strategies" by Se Yan, Hing-Wah Chue, Clare Newton and Shian Geng. The authors discuss "design-build" as a concept and method of teaching used in architectural schools. The concept refers to a pedagogical strategy in design and construction of projects, with the intention to create a stronger link between material experimentation and construction. The research presented in the article uses cases and comparisons as its fundamental method. Seven architectural schools (makerspaces) at well-known universities have been selected for the investigation: 1) Institute for Advanced Architecture of Catalonia, 2) Delft University of Technology, 3) ETH Zurich, 4) Princeton University 5) Royal Institute of Technology, 6) Massachusetts Institute of Technology and 7) Nantes School of Architecture. The cases are analysed in a matrix including Building Porosity vs. Community Engagement, Atrium vs. Collaboration and Built Pedagogy vs. Learning Materiality. In the comparison of workshop spaces at the schools of architecture, the authors use differ-

ent pedagogical tools, which in the Swedish case is summarized in two categories; materiality as "steel, glass and timber" and in the main design strategy as "exposing elements". This seems to be important as part of the "design-build" pedagogy.

"Design Performance in Planning for Densification – the Case of Oslo" by Gordana Zurovac is the third article. The focus in this article is on design performance in planning processes. In the early 1990s, Norway adopted a policy focused on "densification with quality" as a part of the orientation of urban planning and design towards sustainable development. However, according to Zurovac there has been a lack of attention to quality in research investigating how political goals translate into physical structures. For this reason, she performs an analytical-critical study of design performance in urban planning and architectural design. Physical outcomes of densification in Oslo are used as a starting point for the reserach. Zurovac selects three cases of recent residential developments for detailed analysis. The selection is based on a research project, which includes 71 cases of multi-family housing projects. In the conclusion, Gordana Zurovac points out that the implementation of densification policy in Oslo should be understood as a learning process. A stronger focus on spatial strategies at an urban scale could improve the design. She also states that public planners have to perceive the need for addressing spatial issues more closely, which in turn may improve the learning process.

"Systems, Policies, and Regulations Securing the Future of Danish Social Housing" by Nezih Burac Bican is the fourth article. His starting point is spatial qualities in Denmark, and how they are intended to support the welfare ideals of the social housing sector. Bican investigates housing and planning in relation to the socio-political systems, regulations and guidelines. The objective is to structuralize findings and to understand the sustainability of social housing and spatial quality. Methodologically, the article is based on a review of national governmental policies, regional spatial plans and local guidelines used by cities and municipalities, combined with legal regulative documentation. These provide a framework for the spatial decision-making studied in the article. According to Nezih Burac Bican the socio-political systems, regulations and guidelines in Denmark provide implementation mechanisms such as participation in planning, conservation and architectural design.

Denmark has been developing several architectural policies at a national level, starting in 1994. Architectural quality is a key-concept put forward in the policy from 2007 called *A Nation of Architecture*. In 2014, the Danish Ministry of Culture published an updated architectural policy entitled *Putting People First*. We find a continuous production of national policies that focus on architecture in Denmark. Bican claims that this development of regulation and policies has produced a qualified architectural know-how, which further enhances sustainability, spatial quality and social housing.

The fifth article is "Architectural Quality and Cultural Heritage Values in Economic Analyses" by Marie Oline Giske Stendebakken and Nils O. E. Olsson. Also, this contribution has architectural quality as a key concept, but seen in a different context compared to the other articles in this issue. Here, the focus is on how quality assurance as a system operates as a production of information for decision-making, in order to find the best design solution. The research includes a review of quality assurance documentation, applied to cultural heritage values and architectural qualities, in large public building projects in Norway. The authors represent two fields of competence; one is an architect and one is an economist. The joint venture seems to be fruitful.

Stendebakken and Olsson see a fundamental difference between understanding cultural heritage and architectural quality as axiomatic or relativistic values. An axiomatic understanding of values relies on expertise and the authority of the tools used. A relativistic notion of values represents a challenge in management and safe-keeping of qualities as subjective and objective characteristics. The findings presented in the article are based on documentation and reviews of early phases of investments in government-funded public buildings. In the conclusion, Stendebakken and Olsson state that qualities and values should be discussed in their own right. The research finding demonstrates the need for strengthening competence and emphasises the qualitative discussion. They find examples of socio-economic analyses in the studied public projects that may also be disputed.