

*Theme of the issue “The essences and meanings of architectural competitions”
Žurnalo numerio tema „Architektūros konkursų esmės ir prasmės“*

ARCHITECTURAL EXHIBITIONS-COMPETITIONS IN LITHUANIA AS A TOOL OF PROMOTING ARCHITECTURE

Rūta Leitanaitė

Architects Association of Lithuania, Kalvarijų g. 1, 09310 Vilnius, Lithuania

E-mail: ruta.leitanaite@gmail.com

Received 10 April 2013; accepted 06 June 2013

Abstract. An architectural exhibition-competition is analyzed as a type of architectural media, which performs as a promotion tool of architecture and education of the wide public. Via review of current architectural exhibitions-competitions in Lithuania, Baltic States and several European level architectural awards, the criteria and characteristics, defining and destining the quality and prestige of an architectural exhibition-competition are distilled and defined.

Keywords: Architectural exhibition-competition; award; architectural quality evaluation; representation, promotion of architecture; public awareness.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Leitanaitė, R. 2013. Architectural exhibitions-competitions in Lithuania as a tool of promoting architecture, *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism* 37(2): 133–140.

Introduction

A competition, a public prioritizing someone (or something) over the other is a universal method to raise the adrenaline level of the public and therefore get the attention. Applied in various realms, a selection of “the best” had become a very popular practice in cultural field as well since XX century (English 2008), with architecture not being an exception. Comparing with other cultural awards in Lithuania, the several existing architectural awards are not celebrated extensively enough, although they could be an efficient tool of promotion of architecture. Several architectural exhibitions-competitions (further in the text – AEC), followed by the awards for the best projects, attract the attention by the professionals, but the response from the wide public isn’t sufficient. Not trying to solve the long-term problems such as general public indifference towards the quality of environment, the article is set to analyze the possible improvement of architectural exhibitions-competitions in Lithuania, searching the answers to the questions: What is the mission and potential of an AEC and how do the tasks of it correspond to the mission defined? How an AEC can contribute to the quality of architecture, and how

to raise its efficiency? What destines the notoriety and quality, therefore – prestige of an AEC? What models of AEC are applied today in Lithuania, Baltic States and European context? What experience could be applied to AEC in Lithuania?

Mission of an architectural exhibition-competition

As the definition states, an AEC is a hybrid of an architectural exhibition and an award, that belongs to the realm of architectural media. An award, integrated into the concept of an architectural exhibition is essentially determining the content, aims and the results of the AEC, becoming the central axis of the whole event.

It is complicated to discern, is an award a part of an architectural exhibition, or an exhibition is a complement of an architectural award. As the mission of an exhibition and the award, as tools of an architectural media, is essentially the same (according to J. F. English (2008), the mission of any cultural award is to draw attention to the certain field of culture), therefore it could be said there’s a synergy between both. An award, followed by an exhibition, gets more validity

and “body” for representation. On the other hand, despite the fact that only some of the objects, presented in an exhibition, are awarded and get the maximum of appraisal, a comparing itself makes all the objects in display more significant and “visible”. According to J. F. English (2008), a prize energizes the event, sometimes “<...serving as little more than an excuse < > for such occasions”. Being a certain resume, critical evaluation of the content, an award provides an additional value and reason to the exhibition.

A contemporary critique on a cultural award blames it for a continual low quality content, shady process and results of evaluation and decreased prestige (English 2008); however, a cultural mission and the conjunctive aspect of the award as a tool facilitating the integration of art into the realm of different capitals make an AEC a relevant tool of architectural promotion, with a condition of a high quality.

The methodology of the analysis of contemporary AEC

During the recent age the quantity and variety of cultural awards – as well as the AEC – was replicating enormously (English 2008). Wikipedia (2013) mentions there are 81 architectural awards in the world, and the list isn’t complete.

The architectural awards are characterized by different nature, aims and content, therefore the article doesn’t intent to review and analyse all the architectural awards. The analysis is limited to the architectural awards since 2000 that present implemented architectural projects, the best projects are selected by a professional jury, and the award is granted to professional architects.

A short research of architectural exhibitions-competitions is based on scientific articles about architectural competitions, the analysis of other organizations (Wonderland 2008), practical experience of the author and a local know-how. The list of AEC is comprised of: **Lithuanian** – all current architectural exhibitions-competitions and architectural awards (“Žvilgsnis į save/Introspection” (AAL 2012), “Vilnius’ architecture” (Leitanaitė 2007), “Auksinė paletė” (Centras 2012), “Architecture of individual houses in Lithuania” (Doleta 2012a), “Dry construction in architecture” (Knauf 2012), An annual award for architecture by the Ministry of Environment of Lithuania (MEL 2012); **international** – selecting the international architectural exhibitions-competitions that are the most popular, celebrated and acknowledged; the ones that Lithuanian architects are invited to participate (via Architects Association of Lithuania) and entered by Lithuanian architects, or highlighted by Lithuanian

media (*Mies van der Rohe award* (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012), Prize for the European Public space (CCCB 2012); **foreign national** – Estonian, Latvian award (LAS 2012; EUA 2012; ACE 2012).

Methodology of the analysis

The scheme of the structural elements of an architectural exhibition-competition is a compilation based on Regulations of architectural competitions in Lithuania (AAL 2011) (with some sections discarded as not applicable to an AEC) and regulations of various architectural awards reviewed. Those elements are: the task, the content, the actors (the organizers, the participants, the jury, and the society), the means of presentation, the periodicity, the evaluation, the award.

Architectural exhibitions-competitions in Lithuania, Baltic States and Europe

The tasks

The current Baltic and European AEC’s declare similar tasks; these are: promoting architectural quality; promoting architects as professionals providing quality environment; providing architectural education to the non-professional society; rising prestige of the architecture, celebrating it; promoting certain material (optional).

The tasks of an AEC could be multifaceted: representation; review and monitoring; retrospective, tribute to some architect or period etc. However, a critical evaluation, a “why” is expected. As A. Visminaitė and J. Reklaitė (2011) cite Kristin Fereiss: “<...the central aim of an architectural exhibition is a presentation of ideas and concepts, not the art”. Besides fulfilling documentation and display function, an architectural exhibition is “a field of information, transition, experience, discussion”, it “supposes a broader discussion about the notion of architecture, it raises critical questions about urban environment” (Visminaitė, Reklaitė 2011).

It may seem that while one of the main aims of AE is to **rise questions** (and then – to search for the ways how the architecture can answer those) and discussion, a traditional AEC is orientated towards the analysis of the architecture represented. Today the analysis is usually limited to the marking the best works, but it could be expanded to distillation of the themes, problems and trends that the architecture represented is tackling with. In a way it is **providing the answers** via highlighting the best architecture specimen. While doing this the AEC at the same time is promoting certain architectural, social, environmental, technological, economical ideas, values and trends that these projects represent or it can serve as a tool to draw attention towards some issues or problems.

The content

The scope. In case of an AEC only minority of exceptional quality is highlighted (awarded) and, in many cases, exhibited (AAL 2012; Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; Centras 2012; Doleta 2012a). Thus the works, submitted to the AEC are not necessarily reflecting the overall situation in the country/region. These are just the most extraordinary examples, which usually are an exception. Even if they contribute significantly to the cityscape, the majority of the urban mass changing the landscape significantly because of the quantity, is left in the obscurity.

The types of content of AEC:

- **architecture generally.** The content can be limited according to:
 - **Citizenship of the participants and location of the objects** (AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007; Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012)
 - **The characteristics of the architects, usually the age** (ACE 2012; Mies van der Rohe fund 2012). The aim of such AEC is the promotion of young of architects.
- **Defined themes, types of architecture.** Certain characteristics, type or function of a building or space (Doleta 2012a; Centras 2012; CCCB 2012).
- **Certain materials.** This kind of AEC is organized by producers of building materials and it is a way to promote their production (Knauf 2012). The architecture becomes a kind of exhibition case for the production.

The quality control

In most of the AEC an open call for participants is announced, however, various models of admission are applied:

- **an exhibition-competition is open to all willing** (Doleta 2012a). In some cases the participants are required to meet requirements of a professional qualification, which is a supposed guaranty of minimum quality of the submissions (AAL 2012). The number of projects submitted can be unlimited too. The permission to submit unlimited number of entries, regardless their quality usually results in a chaotic exhibition, with just part of works submitted above the average quality (AAL 2012; Doleta 2012).

On the one hand, such an AEC becomes a vast incomprehensible display of mediocre architecture; on the other hand, it can serve as a reflection of the current creative level of the architects.

In order to keep the standards of the quality high, some measures are applied: a fee for an entry (LAS 2012); limiting the number of entries.

- **a call for entries is open, but a pre-selection by professionals is executed** (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; LAS 2012; MEL 2012; ACE 2012; AAL 2012; Centras 2012).
 - **pre-selection by the organizers** (a Curator / editorial: Centras 2012; Leitanaitė 2007).
 - **pre-selection by the partners.** This model is applied to a broad international AEC, where various different regions are participating and the number of entries is expected to be high, therefore should be limited for each participant (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012). With this model it's important to have professional, reliable, prestigious local partners – it's important not only for the quality of the selected entries, but for the acknowledgement of the AEC in all the participating regions / societies etc. The partners could be: professional organizations, established media or critics individually.

The actors

The organizers. The organizers can be: the non-profit professional organizations (AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007); the **governmental bodies** (MEL 2012); the **media** (Centras 2012); a **group of various organizations, experts etc.** (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012); profit organizations: construction materials, furniture, lightning etc. producers; real estate investors (Doleta 2012; Knauf 2012).

A curatorial team does an organizational job, but it usually doesn't influence the content of the exhibition and the results of the evaluation (differently from an AE, where the curatorial team is defining the concept, the content and implementation of the exhibition). The selection and evaluation is made by the jury. The rules and regulations are also compiled by professionals – architects, researchers, critics (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; LAS 2012; MEL 2012); ACE 2012; EUA 2012).

If the organizers are a commercial company (Centras 2012; Doleta 2012a; Knauf 2012), professional consultants are involved in constituting the regulations and evaluation process – in order to raise the prestige and credibility of the AEC.

The participants. According to D. Linartas (2011), the bigger quantity of qualified participants supposes wider diversity and innovativeness of ideas, therefore an open and international nature of an AC is recommended.

Usually there's an open call for participants, however, the qualification requirements are present: the participants of an AEC usually are professional architects. The quantity of the participants is an asset because of more explicit representation, but, with the priority given to the quality, the content submitted should be revised.

Internationality of an AEC is an asset, as it gives weight and broadens scope (therefore – notoriety, significance and attractiveness). Also it gives a reason to expect the acknowledged, world-famous architects as participants. Participation of the “stars” raises the prestige of the AEC, and vice versa – the AEC is a stage for the notorious architects to be noted. Both parties are in synergy, fostering each other's prestige (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012).

The jury. The result of the selection is to be achieved by the consensus of the jury: “Competence and consensus are therefore two essential factors that make jury members feel confident in their final choice of a winner” (Rönn 2011).

The more famous jury members – the more attention by the media, the wide public and the participants, motivating them to submit their works, can be expected (AAL 2012).

Foreign jury (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; Centras 2012; AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007) offers wider point of view of the “outsiders”, therefore **the evaluation of the local architecture in global context**. Local jury is often accused for protectionism; because of being not related to the local architects, the work of foreign jury members supposes **objectivity**, which destines the transparency and trust of the process. Foreign jury also serves as channels to promote the event and the local architecture in their local media abroad (Urbel 2012).

However, the foreign jury could be criticized for superficial attitude and commonplaces when it comes to argumentation. The reason of low-level evaluation can be personal approach by the jury member, but most often it's a lack of understanding of the historical, cultural, social, economical and political context. Therefore the involvement of a local jury member can improve or prejudice the jury's work and decision.

In many cases the practicing architects – the most celebrated names, preferably – are invited to the jury (LAS 2012; MEL 2012; Doleta 2012a; Knauf 2012; AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007). For sake of objectivity and transparency, jury's capacity to **discuss and come to a consensus** and, as one of the main aims of an AEC is promoting the architecture in an understandable, attractive way – to **communicate their decision to the**

public is crucial to the success of an AEC. These are the qualities that are not necessarily common to the architects. Researchers, sociologists, art critics have the qualities required and they could bring a multidisciplinary approach to the evaluation of the entries and more diverse attitude) however, they are barely engaged in AEC practice today.

If the organizers of an AEC are **not professionals** and the jury consists of the members of the organizer, the transparency and professionalism of the decision is questionable (Doleta 2012a). Therefore **the invited professionals** usually constitute **the major part** of the jury (Centras 2012; LAS 2012; MEL 2012 ACE 2012; EUA 2012; Knauf 2012).

The society. In most cases analyzed the society isn't participating in the formation the content or evaluation of the projects. The society is given a passive role of spectator and a “pupil”, which is guided by professionals, pointing at “good architecture”. If a professional opinion is represented in clear, attractive way, it is accepted and absorbed by certain part (which already is interested in architecture) of the wide public. However, an interactive nature of an AEC, letting the audience to express their own opinion and to judge by themselves, make the AEC much more attractive. Some of the AEC have public voting (Leitanaitė 2007; Centras 2012; Doleta 2012a) included, as an additional, second-rate category of an award. The comparison of public and professional opinion most often show the deviation of both – in all the AEC analyzed that had a public voting, the votes by the jury and the public hadn't coincided ever.

The presentation

Material presented. Some of the AEC analyzed include the renders, photos (submitted by the authors) and a text with modest information of the work (Centras 2012; Doleta 2012a; Knauf 2012). The material is easy to review and publish in various media channels, such as internet dailies (Doleta 2012b; Centras 2012). However the information submitted isn't sufficient to perceive the architecture fully and in some cases is deceptive, representing architecture from the most favorable points. Therefore the jury is submitted to the evaluation of representation itself, not the architecture.

The most acknowledged by professionals AEC (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007; LAS 2012) require more explicit material: a) photos, renders; b) several characteristic drawings – sections, plans – that facilitate analysis and present the organization of spaces; c) explanat-

ory text, describing the concept and the architectural means implemented. A video would be an efficient way to present architecture as it gives the perception of the spatial composition, proportions and the atmosphere of the structure. Yet video material isn't used for the AEC analyzed in this article.

In Lithuanian, Latvian AEC the material exhibited is the material presented by the **participants**. The **evaluation, comments** by the **jury**, other **experts** or **public** are not included (in case of "Introspection" the jury's evaluation is presented in the website). The exhibition is just partial – it has the "data", but not the analysis of it nor the results or feedback. Therefore the effect of it is just representative, but lacks educational, analytical approach. One of the reasons is the overlap of time: the exhibition opening coincides with the award ceremony so the jury's comments are given right after the exhibition is opened. The international AEC, analyzed in the article – AEC (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012) apply different time schedule: some months after the jury's decision is done, the winner awarded and the exhibition, including the evaluation remarks, is opened.

None of the AEC analyzed provides the interactive relation between the content and the visitor (voting, commenting etc.), giving him/her a role of recipient, not providing chance to contribute with some input.

The material is represented via various media:

- **A virtual exhibition.** Most often a special website for the virtual exhibition is created (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; AAL 2012; Doleta 2012a; Centras 2012). In some cases the exhibition is given a section in some related website (Leitanaitė 2007; LAS 2012). A virtual exhibition it expands the accessibility (in terms of location and time), therefore, the number of the audience, significantly. The characteristics, raising public interest in the virtual exhibition are: attractive and simple design of the website; interactivity; relevance of the content, regarding personal interests; quality of the content; extensive promotion of the AEC via other media.
- **A tangible exhibition.** An exhibition, displayed in a public space, is credited the value of a cultural event, worth visiting; on the other hand, an exhibition energizes the space it is set in. Despite various new tools of contemporary media, a traditional form of an AE, a set of **panels** (screens, rolls etc.) is applied widely still (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; LAS 2012; MEL 2012; AAL 2012; Doleta 2012a; Leitanaitė 2007; Knauf 2012).

Conventional way of representing architecture by pictures on the panels allows just partly experience.

Contemporary media, such as **video or interactive digital formats** has a huge potential to add a lively, interactive character of the exhibition, but it's not applied in AEC analyzed. Most probably the reason is that the content is submitted by the participants who are not all able to apply these techniques and the organizers are not provided with sufficient time and financing.

An exhibition, occupying some public space, has a potential to be used as an excuse and reason for chain of live events, such as **discussions, lectures** etc., dealing with the relevant architectural themes represented and disclosed by the exhibition content. None of the AEC analyzed include such side-events, except for the awards evening, where the jury presents the evaluation and remarks.

- **A book.** A catalogue, consisting of all or selected submissions follows most of the AEC analyzed (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; LAS 2012; AAL 2012; Doleta 2012a; Leitanaitė 2007; Knauf 2012). Besides being a comfortably transported and stored compact version of the exhibition, it has a historic value as an anthology of the contemporary architecture. A number up to 100 projects is the optimal extent for the catalogue, as it provides solid, but perceivable amount of information (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012). The catalogue of the AEC "Introspection 2006–2008", presenting over 200 works, testifies that the unlimited quantity doesn't enhance, but contrary, degrades the value of the book: a part of the projects presented is of arguable architectural and/or representative quality (AAL 2012).
- **A visit *in situ*.** No matter how comprehensive and attractive the representation of the architecture is in a website, book or panels, the real experience is essential to be able to evaluate the architecture – and not the pictures presented – in depth and objectively. Such an approach is supported in the biggest AEC analyzed (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; LAS 2012; AAL 2012): after selecting the finalists (from 5 to 20), a jury's visit on site is taking part. The visit to the site provides the jury with possibility to evaluate characteristics that are not revealed (accidentally or deliberately) by the material presented and to experience the ones that are hard to convey (real scale, relation with the surroundings, social charge, excellence of implementation etc.).

The periodicity

The repetition gives an AEC the nature of constant review, monitoring of an architectural quality. It warrants a possibility to compare, to highlight the progress and shift of tendencies and names. The age of an AEC contributes to its positive image and acknowledgement – the older it is, the more it proves to be necessary, reliable, integrated into the cultural tradition, therefore more prestige is credited. Such events are happening in defined frequency: 1 or 2 years. As the mission of the award is promotion of the architecture, thicker frequency – as 1 year – is desirable; however, with architecture being a slow art, 2 years is more reasonable period in order to get a set of more solid entries (AAL 2012).

The evaluation

Evaluation criteria. M. Rönn (2011) states “The judgment and evaluation of entries in competitions are strongly connected to the leading values, norms, regulations, organizations and traditions of [local area]”. Therefore, especially working with the foreign jury, it’s essential to clearly define the evaluation criteria: they orientate the jury, make the process more transparent and represent the values of the organizers and the character of the exhibition itself. Usually the criteria are defined by the organizers, but it’s not always the case in Baltic region – sometimes the jury members are given a task to select “the best architectural project” (Centras 2012; Knauf 2012; Doleta 2012a; LAS 2012) and are supposed to set the criteria themselves.

Other AEC define architectural quality criteria in different ways:

- Originality, consistency of the design (AAL 2012); **Excellence and authenticity of design; a genuine and innovative character** (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012);
- Harmonious relation with urban and natural surroundings (Mies); “placeness”, positive impact on urban or natural environment (social, economical, environmental, visual, semantic aspects) (AAL 2012);
- Innovativeness; improvements and innovations in field of sustainability and new technologies (“Award for architecture by the Ministry of Environment of Lithuania”);
- Appropriateness of the means, functionality; rationality and feasibility of the design, quality of ideas’ implementation (AAL 2012), **high-standard, well-executed and sustainable** construction (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012);

- **a social vocation** rather than an aesthetic emphasis or spectacular intent (CCCB 2012).

Evaluation process; evaluation in stages:

- **by a special professional board of experts, invited by organizers, but not the jury** – used to comply the pre-selection lists.
- **by the jury** (AAL 2012; Mies van der Rohe fund 2012).

The Awards

In most of the AEC, the material worth of the award, though not irrelevant, isn’t determining the popularity and prestige of the event. The most acknowledged (basing on the numbers of participants, media coverage, awareness and public comments) AEC in Lithuania (AAL 2012; Leitanaitė 2007), have no monetary awards established. The more prestigious AEC is, the less importance the size of the money granted has (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012):

- **One award.** The uniqueness of the award makes it exclusive, general, and, therefore, more valuable. While some of the awards and AEC favor just one architect or a piece of architecture (Mies van der Rohe fund 2012; CCCB 2012; MEL 2012; ACE 2012; EUA 2012) others mark several of them with prizes of equal worth (LAS 2012; AAL 2012).
- **Awards given to the each of the categories:** If the content of an AEC represent a vast diversity of the architecture, the selection of one best project faces ambiguities – objects of different sizes, types, functions are beyond compare (LAS 2012). Therefore some categories are introduced, awarding several projects that are marked as the best of their own category (LAS 2012).

The multitude of the categories implies specific criteria of evaluation (not always representing the general criteria of a quality), confuse the jury and the audience and diminish the oneness and therefore the value of the prize.

If the content of an AEC isn’t abundant, a problem of quality and inequality can arise, having several projects of very high quality in one category and being able to award just one of them; or having none quality specimen in another category, and being forced to mark one of them.

Categories can be established to accentuate (and promote) certain type of architecture (Doleta 2012a), or to separate very different kinds of architecture (Leitanaitė 2007).

An additional category can be established as a tool for special promotion: “Emerging architect”

(Mies van der Rohe fund 2012) seeks to bring the names of the most skilful young professionals to the global arena.

In order to draw the attention of wide public, make it feel participating in the process, a special Award by the Public can be established (Centras 2012; Doleta 2012a; Leitanaitė 2007; Knauf 2012). Apart from being a tool to raise the attention to the event, this category of an award has an educational (engaging, involving the audience) and exploratory nature, giving the material for a comparison of the public opinion on the architecture presented with the opinion of the professionals. Nonetheless, it is not widely applied in Baltic or European AEC.

Conclusions

The main characteristics of quality and prestigious AEC are:

- Clear, strong concept; having a list of ideas to promote;
- Transparency of the process, objectivity of the evaluation, credibility;
- Attractiveness, accessibility;
- Particularity; quality of the content;
- Notoriety, acknowledgement by the professionals, media and wide-public.

The quality and, therefore, the prestige of an AEC is determined by all the elements analyzed: the aims and the tasks programmed, the content, the actors involved (the organizers, the participants, the jury and the audience – the society); the ways and modes of presentation; the evaluation process; the award itself and the frequency of an AEC.

The analysis executed shows that so far the AEC in Lithuania, as in other Baltic States and Europe is **a monitoring and a review** of best contemporary architecture, offering a display of recent projects and marking the selected ones as the quality models.

An AEC contributes to the quality of architecture mainly through its **educational role**, introducing the society with problems, ideas, innovations. In Lithuania AEC has a potential to be exploited as an educational tool and an agent for social activity much more. A **critical analysis**, developed merely so far, of the architecture represented should be encouraged and facilitated while determining the tasks and program of an AEC. The educational role can be enhanced, making an AEC as a background for professional and public discussions. The awareness and involvement of the non-professional audience could be enhanced by providing the possibility to vote, establishing a special Public award; providing timely public lucid comments of the professionals.

The expansion of the tasks of an AEC suggests rethinking of the concept. In order to run a legitimate and full review of architecture, an AEC should include not only architecture of exceptionally good quality, but also the buildings and structures that have a significant (positive or negative) impact on the environment. As the quality of the content is one of the main conditions for the quality of the whole AEC, a professional supervision of the content should be performed by the curatorial team, partners or independent experts.

The success of the evaluation process depends on thorough analysis, including not only the digital or printed material, but also visits on site. Also – the competence, professionalism, impartiality and authority of the jury; therefore an involvement of a foreign jury and local consultants is recommended.

Clearly defined, representing local values and global tendencies, criteria are one of the most important conditions for of an objective, transparent and professional evaluation. The criteria declared can be uses by the organizers as a tool of promoting certain values.

The quality of organization process lies in professional skills of the organizers or involvement of professional expert into the most relevant stages.

The success of an exhibition also depends on the balanced extent – it should be explicit and comprehensible yet. Application of various modes of representation, allowing maximum accessibility and interactivity of the audience, is recommended. These are: internet (website), exhibition in a public space (applying various contemporary media tools); a book.

The prestige of an AEC is boosted additionally by the notoriety of the participants, organizers and the jury; a regular rhythm and longevity of an AEC (which enhances the reliability). The fiscal worth of the award itself doesn't have a major impact on the prestige of an AEC – the name is what really counts.

References

- Architects Association of Lithuania (AAL). 2011. *Regulations of Architectural Competitions in Lithuania* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.architektusajunga.lt/las-konkursai/las-architekturiniu-konkursu-organizavimo-nuostatai>
- Architects Association of Lithuania (AAL). 2012. *Virtual Architectural Exhibition "Introspection"* [online], [cited 18 January 2013]. Available from Internet: www.lietuvosarchitektura.lt
- Architects Union of Estonia (EUA). 2012. *Arhitektuuripreemiad* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://web1.arhliit.ee/et/eesti_arhitektuur/arhitektuuripreemiad
- Architecture centre of Estonia (ACE). 2012. *Young Architect Award 2012 goes to Veronika Valk* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.arhliit.ee/english/news/eal/young-architect-prize-goes-to-veronika-valk/>

- Centras. 2012. *Virtual Architectural Exhibition "Auksinė paletė"*. [online] [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: [www.interjeras.lt/interjero konkursai](http://www.interjeras.lt/interjero_konkursai)
- Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona (CCCB). 2012. *The European Prize for Urban Public Space* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.publicspace.org>
- Doleta. 2012a. *Virtual Architectural exhibition "Architecture of Individual Houses in Lithuania"* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.archparoda.lt>
- Doleta. 2012b. *Isrinktas „Tautos namas“!* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://gyvenimas.delfi.lt/naujos_formos/isrinktas-tautos-namas.d?id=33543855
- English, J. F. 2008. *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*. Harvard University Press.
- Knauf. 2012. *Interior Competition "Dry Construction in Architecture"*. [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://www.knauf.lt/www/lt/naujienos/2012/parodos___konkurso_architektams_11_rezultatai/paroda___konkursas_architektams_11.html
- Latvian Association of Architects (LAS). 2012. *Gada balva – atjaunotajai noliktavas ēkai* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.a4d.lv/lv/notikumi/gada-balva-atjaunotajai-noliktavas-ekai/>
- Leitanaitė, R. 2007. *Vilniaus architektūra 2005–2006*. An exhibition catalogue. Vilnius: Lietuvos architektų sąjunga.
- Linartas, D. 2011. *Significance of Creative Competitions to Lithuanian Art of Architecture*: Doctoral dissertation. Vilnius Gediminas Technical University.
- Mies van der Rohe fund. 2012. *The European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture – Mies van der Rohe Award* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.miesarch.com/>
- Ministry of Environment of Lithuania (MEL). 2012. *Regulations of the Award for Architecture by the Ministry of Environment of Lithuania* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://www.am.lt/VI/article.php3?article_id=6911
- Rönn, M. 2011. *Architectural Quality in Competitions. A Dialogue based Assessment of Design Proposals* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <https://journals.hioa.no/index.php/formakademisk/article/view/130>
- Urbel, E. 2012. *Viens, du, trys – graži Lietuva...* [online], [cited 19 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://www.sirp.ee/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=16517:viens-du-trys--grai-lietuva-&catid=20:arhitektuur&Itemid=25&issue=3418
- Visminaitė, A.; Reklaitė, J. 2011. Architektūra parodoje, *Urbanistika ir architektūra* [Town Planning and Architecture] 35(1): 51–61.
- Wikipedia. 2013. *Architectural awards* [online], [cited 18 January 2013]. Available from Internet: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Architecture_awards
- Wonderland. 2008. *Going Public*. No. 3. Wonderland – platform for Architecture.

ARCHITEKTŪROS PARODA-KONKURSAS LIETUVOJE KAIP ARCHITEKTŪROS POPULIARINIMO PRIEMONĖ

R. Leitanaitė

Santrauka. Straipsnyje architektūros paroda-konkursas tiriamas kaip architektūrinės žiniasklaidos (*media*) tipas, kurio misija – kokybiškos architektūros propagavimas bei architektūrinė visuomenės edukacija. Svarbiausių architektūros parodų-konkursų ir apdovanojimų, organizuojamų Lietuvoje, Latvijoje, Estijoje bei Europoje, analizė atskleidžia kokybiško, prestižinio architektūros parodos-konkurso kriterijus ir charakteristikas, kurias galima pritaikyti ir Lietuvoje.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: architektūros paroda-konkursas, apdovanojimas, architektūros kokybės vertinimas; architektūros propagavimas ir pristatymas, visuomenės sąmoningumas.

Nuoroda į šį straipsnį: Leitanaitė, R. 2013. Architektūros paroda-konkursas Lietuvoje kaip architektūros populiarinimo priemonė, *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism* 37(2): 133–140.

RŪTA LEITANAITĖ

Architects Association of Lithuania as a Creative, Kalvarijų g. 1, 09310 Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: ruta.leitanaite@gmail.com

Kaunas University of Technology, Bachelor of Architecture. Kaunas University of Technology, Master of Architecture and Land Management. Currently working at Architects Association of Lithuania as a Creative director.

Research interests: representation of architecture, architecture in contemporary media, architecture publicism and criticism.