An analysis of sustainability evaluation in UK RIBA architecture awards drawing on institutional theory.

Conflict, contradiction and concern- Judges' evaluation of sustainability in architectural awards

Sonja Oliveira and Martin Sexton

Evaluation is viewed as key to design practice across the creative industries.[1] Evaluation consists of rules, codes and constraints by which the worth of an entity is defined and legitimated.[2] Evaluation of sustainability in architecture has been studied predominantly with a technical emphasis focusing on the characteristics of assessment models, benchmarks and tools. Characteristics of assessment models such as the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) are widely debated and a dominant strand of literature places importance on improving and standardizing overall model tool designs.[3,4,5] Little theoretical or empirical analysis has been undertaken to examine evaluation beyond the use of various assessment tools. In addition, few studies within architectural research focus on those who evaluate (such as judges or designers), instead placing greater emphasis on the views of users.[6] A recent study by Neena Verma has argued that there is an overwhelming emphasis placed on dichotomous approaches to defining and evaluating architecture, using pre-established tools and definitions, and widely accepted approaches with regards to technology or sustainability.[7] The emphasis on tools as a way of exploring the shaping of evaluative understandings may lead to a one-dimensional restricted view of evaluation.[8]

As the diversity and number of assessment tools grow, the importance of understanding how evaluation of sustainability takes shape, becomes legitimated and justified in architectural settings becomes critical for two reasons. First, a clearer understanding of the issues could assist scholars to better identify sustainable evaluative practice in architecture and other creative domains. Second, this understanding could expose the mechanisms that foster creative sustainability evaluation, allowing researchers, practitioners and policy-makers to determine the effectiveness of current measures of assessment with greater accuracy.

The central questions that guide this paper are: What happens when evaluation takes place without the constraints and demands imposed through assessment models? How does evaluation of sustainability unfold in architectural contexts that are not subject to rules or codes set out in policy, contractual arrangements or regulations? The purpose of this paper is to study evaluation in an architectural awards setting where judges come together to 'determine the worth' of a building. The primary focus

is to understand how sustainability is evaluated in order to expose the processes through which award winning architecture, recognised as excellent, is discussed and viewed. We draw on institutional theory to analyse the institutional logics that architects draw on to legitimise particular evaluative views. The utility of institutional theory as an analytical framework comes from its enquiry into how taken-for-granted conceptions develop, how certain views are legitimised and why particular evaluative understandings transform or endure.[9]

Awards are viewed in the wider sociological domain as settings where evaluation is particularly heightened and where evaluative practices can be most closely observed by researchers.[10] Also, within the architectural context awarded buildings are promoted in education, policy and practice. Despite the importance of awarded buildings for the development of 'sustainable' architecture, research has remained largely silent on the social processes, conventions and understandings that shape their evaluation. Opinions of peers such as judges in awards are highlighted as relevant to analyse[11], specifically in creative domains where quantitative objective evaluation and the use of numeric evidence and assessment criteria tends to be applied less. This paper examines how evaluative practices are shaped socially and culturally beyond the use of tools by paying attention to the multiple logics that guide the evaluation process.

The following section discusses institutional research as a theoretical framework and the insights that can be gained form an institutional logics approach. The empirical setting and methods are then summarised with the findings section discussing the outcomes of the research. Finally, the discussion and conclusion position the findings in current research and consider key contributions and implications.

The institutional 'logics' approach to evaluation

The wider sociological literature has engaged with examining evaluative practices for some time, viewing the social context, beliefs and rules as underpinning evaluation in diverse domains such as the fine arts, film and music.[10,12] In contrast to scholarship in the architectural domain, that tends to focus almost exclusively on the importance of tools and their underlying technical features, the wider sociological literature opens up discussions on the phenomenon more widely.

Institutional logics understands evaluative opinions and decisions to be guided by logics, which are seen as legitimating conceptions that provide the content for particular understandings to evolve.[13]Institutional logics are defined as 'socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence'.[14] Logics are viewed as important aspects of evaluation, that enable understandings to become classified, categorised and institutionalised.[15]

Institutional logics are also viewed as 'material-symbolic languages' that provide content to actors in defining new or redefining existing understandings on evaluation.[16] Material elements are primarily seen as structures and practices[17], whilst symbolic elements are identified as institutional myths through which the meaning of material practices travel.[18] Initially logics were mainly seen to occur at societal levels. Roger Friedland and Robert Alford argue that a societal context such as family or religion moderates the decisions, actions and behaviours of actors at multiple levels.[19] From that initial conception of logics as societal orders at family, religion, or market levels recent research examines logics at professional and industry levels.[20]

In examining institutional logics associated with awarded buildings and their clientele Candace Jones et al. show the analytical value of an institutional approach by demonstrating how understandings regarding 'modern' architectural practice developed over time.[21] Their analysis emphasizes the ways that material and symbolic elements that underpin multiple institutional logics shaped the emergence of 'modern architecture'. Underlying institutional logics such as commerce, the state, religion and family associated with different clientele were found to be have been enacted by key architects. Over time certain award-winning architects with a mainly public clientele were found to enact an organic aesthetic logic. The aesthetic organic logic favoured a sensitive approach to nature and a broad palette of materials. In contrast another group of award winning architects with a mainly business clientele was found to favour a more commercially functionalist aesthetic, characterized by a streamlined approach and material treatments that revealed the function of a building. The two logics with different orientations had developed a common focus on 'modern' thereby enabling the emergence and legitimation of a new evaluative category within architecture – that is 'Modern architecture'.

The above discussion draws attention to the analytical benefits institutional logics have in revealing how evaluative understandings concerning an issue are shaped. The following sections describe the empirical setting of the most established architectural awards programme in the UK - the RIBA Awards. This is followed by an outline of the research methods and a discussion of findings.

Empirical setting - The RIBA Awards Programme and Sustainability

The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Awards programme was founded in 1966 in order to give recognition to architecturally "excellent" buildings across the UK and internationally. The Regional and RIBA National awards in the UK are judged and presented locally and culminate in the prestigious RIBA Stirling Prize presented every autumn. Although sustainability is an integral part of the awards process, an award (the RIBA Journal Sustainability Award) specifically designed to recognise sustainability credentials was formally set up in 2000.This award was formalised further through the RIBA Sustainability Award (2004-08) and the RIBA English Partnerships Sustainability Award, founded in 2008. After 2008 the RIBA Awards Group made clear that all buildings across all awards should be formally judged for sustainability and the specific RIBA Sustainability award temporally ceased.

According to the Awards programme, a building is awarded for sustainability if it demonstrates 'most elegantly and durably the principles of sustainable architecture'.[22] All projects are required to submit a sustainability statement, which consists of a two-page document mainly describing the building's performance in use. Emphasis is placed on a building's energy use with evidence required for energy performance figures and statistics. The sustainability statement is required to be signed off by an environmental engineer for all projects with a contract value of over £1 million.[22]

In addition to the sustainability statement, the project also has to submit a brief description of how the building design meets the principles of inclusive design, i.e., in providing environments that are 'safe, convenient and enjoyable to use by people regardless of disability, age or gender'.[23] Additional criteria might include amongst others: consideration of appropriateness of its structural and servicing systems as well as budgetary issues such as the project providing value for money. Also, issues with

the building's capacity to 'stimulate, engage and delight its occupants, visitors and passers-by' as well as considerations on the complexity of brief / degree of difficulty and the project's architectural ambition and ideas are required to be evaluated. A total of 12 images, external and internal of the project and eight plans including a location plan, site plan, floor plans, elevations and sections are also required.[23]

The awards process commences with a regional judging process, that leads to a national shortlist from which winners are chosen. Two types of juries consider a proposal. The regional type of jury consists of a regional jury chair, regional representative, a regional lay assessor and a sustainability or conservation specialist. A National jury similarly is made up of a national jury chair, the regional jury chair and members of the Awards group.

Judges are required to be UK practising architects, whilst a chair would have to have won a RIBA Award previously as well as be involved in teaching at a RIBA-validated school. Any awarded project must be judged to be capable of enduring as a fine work of architecture throughout its working life. Jury Chairs for Regional RIBA Awards juries only serve for a single year, whilst those on National awards panels tend to serve a four-year appointment. Only those who have served at both regional and national awards for over four years can act as Chairpersons.[23]

The Research method

Data was collected from multiple sources including documentary evidence of the RIBA awards process, descriptions of awarded buildings, observations at RIBA Awards seminars and seventeen semi-structured interviews with awards judges. The authors studied awarded buildings and types of awards in relation to sustainability included in the period from the late 1990s until 2012. This period was chosen, as sustainability began to be assessed formally in the awards starting in the late 1990s, with the first Sustainability Award awarded for Greenwich Sainsbury store in 2000. Judges who had either participated in judging a particular awarded building recognised for its sustainability credentials, or had participated across a range of awards were selected. Generally, most awards judges tend to serve a four-year, with some acting as chairpersons during that term *[1]*.

<<Insert Table 1 here>>

The data was coded in NVivo initially using descriptive themes.[24] The initial stage of the analysis focused on the identification of codes related to evaluation in the awards: 1) criteria makeup; 2) criteria development influences; 3) criteria over time; 4) impact of evaluation; 5) views on evaluation. The coding resulted in forty initial descriptive codes from which four key themes (evaluative concerns) were extracted around ***justification of decisions***, ***evaluative priorities***, ***views of the process*** and ***evaluative influences***. These first order codes were then compared to text segments to understand how these concepts related to similar ideas. Examples of first order codes include: 'focus on appearance'; 'distrusting data'; 'evidence seeking' and 'meeting a design threshold'.

As themes started to emerge, literatures on institutional logics and evaluation were explored. From the initial analysis of the data and relevant literatures, two logic

types were identified: *Aesthetics-focused* logic and a *Sustainability- focused* logic *[2]*. The logics were identified through the use of material and symbolic keywords and phrases following the methodological design of Candace Jones et al.[15]. Keywords for an *Aesthetics-focused* logic included for example: 'beautiful', 'professional role', 'certain basic level of design criteria' and 'aesthetics'. The *Sustainability-focused* logic centred around keywords such as: 'duty'; 'evidence'; 'established standards' 'community and people'. Sub-themes were examined with each of the main theme found in the logics *[3,4]*.

<<Insert Tables 2, 3 and 4 here>>

The findings are discussed in relation to these logics in issues such as justifying decisions, views of the process, evaluative priorities and influences. This is in line with the institutional concept of logics and in particular, how logics guide action and provide content to actors.

Concerns, conflict and contradiction within and between logics

The findings discuss judges' views of the evaluative process, influences and priorities. The analysis suggests judges' views are shaped by two differing approaches regarding how the overall process is viewed, justified, prioritised and influenced. Based on these four evaluative concerns the analysis identified two at times contradictory and conflicting sets of views. The two sets of views reflected two logic types - one *Aesthetics-focused* and one *Sustainability-focused*. Conflicts manifested around judges' perceived views of the profession and its engagement with sustainability. Also, conflicts manifested through judges' diverse expectations of the awards process, criteria of judgement and their roles within the process. In addition, there were diverse approaches and perceptions of the extent of guidance provided in relation to sustainability *[5]*.

<< Insert Table 5 here>>

Within the *Aesthetics-focused logic* there was a less precise view of sustainability and a reliance on expert opinions viewing data and any numeric evidence as untrustworthy though necessary. Several judges expressed this view by questioning the comparability of buildings, data and issues. Some judges discussed difficulties and concerns when judging sustainability across different building typologies viewed as a process of '*comparing apples and pears'* (Judge K). In addition, the lack of more specific guidance on how to weigh sustainability issues against other issues, such as beauty, was presented as a big stumbling block. One judge described the difficulties with the awards '*competing set of values'* and what may be seen by the wider architectural community as established and 'shared' ways of evaluating.

> '*…And so there's almost, there's a competing set of values, which I think is rather difficult for the judging system to accommodate…Well (now)that there have become more shared and acceptable methods of evaluating sustainability? Now, as you know the whole thing is, you can go for one*

system which says this is a very green building and another system which says it's not a very green building...' (Judge P)

The comparability issues not only in terms of overall design but also in terms of the sustainability versus aesthetics debate were often brought up as a difficult part of the judging process. When issues of sustainability were highlighted, participants portraying the *Aesthetics-focused* logic felt they lacked the guidance and to some extent the means by which to make a judgement. One of the participants described this by comparing the Awards process to the *Crufts* Dog Show describing how not knowing what the comparators are, meant that judges were left not knowing what they were comparing something to.

'*…the thing is if you're thinking about the dogs' analogy, if you know that they're supposed to have a straight tail and it's set out how straight the tail is, then you know it's achieved that criteria. If there's no data presented on straightness of tails, then you will look at the tail and go, well that's a nice tail, and not know whether it's achieved what it's supposed to. Sorry about the dogs, it's Crufts*.' (Judge M)

Some judges expressed their competence and experience as well as their insecurity on both what they are looking for in terms of sustainability, what it is and how to judge it. Evaluating sustainability was described as *'impossible, hopeless and useless'* in terms of making any '*informed decisions'* (Judge K). Judges discussed how there seemed to be clarity and conviction in issues of beauty and context, however, sustainability seemed to be shrouded in uncertainty and confusion. This uncertainty was, at times, seen as arising through a lack of guidance from the Professional Institution and the Awards Group.

Terms such as *'difficult to understand'* (Judge M); '*nebulous concept'* (Judge K) and '*not sure what it is'* (Judge O) were regularly brought into the conversation. Uncertainty on sustainability issues were described as difficulties in understanding the scientific detail or trusting the numbers whereas issues of beauty and aesthetics although difficult to explain were regarded as not requiring justification or explanation. Gauging aesthetics was approached with confidence and was seen as requiring little explanation; however, sustainability was seen as being limited to an extent by the reliance on scientific data seen largely as untrustworthy**.**

'Because as I say for instance, we're never really analysing a building, we might have looked at the performance criteria at the same time as energy consumption…so because of the narrowness of the data and apart from the inconsistencies of the data, we have tended to ask one or two experts on the Awards group...'(Judge K)

Proponents of the *Sustainability-focused* logic presented dissatisfaction with the awards process, the overall profession and the professional institute itself. The discontent was described through their views not being considered by the wider awards panel specifically with regards to sustainability issues. Judges also discussed how they developed their own methods of comparability. Whereas in the *Aesthetics-focused* logic judges displayed dissatisfaction with the lack of guidance, here judges seem to take matters into their own hands. One judge described the methodology he developed when acting as chair in one of the judging sessions. The methodology consisted of grading sessions, whereby projects were classified according to their demonstrated '*interest in sustainability'* (Judge D). Others viewed metrics and evidence as a way of validating decisions regarding sustainability. One judge summarised the process:

'*…So I suppose you go through a process of identifying an issue, trying to put some metrics on it and then refining them and get, the information gets better and more valid...*' (Judge J)

Those adopting the *Aesthetics-focused* logic tended not to express their dissatisfaction in terms of lack of guidance or issues of comparability. Instead judges expressed discontent with other judges, the Awards Committee and the profession overall. Several judges described the rift in the Awards panel between those who championed sustainability issues and those who remained committed to established ideals of elegance, beauty and aesthetics. As one judge remarked:

'*And there is a dialogue between them (so) the sustainability people would say is not satisfactory; (they) would collectively say is not satisfactory at the moment, that buildings are being given awards that members of the Sustainable Futures Group wouldn't necessarily consider as sustainable*.' (Judge Q)

Concerns in this instance were not seen as arising through uncertainty on how to judge sustainability as in the *Aesthetics-focused* logic, rather doubts were voiced in terms of how the awards process was led as well as anger and distrust with and within the professional institute itself. Other judges who were not seen to support sustainability issues were perceived as decision makers at the top of the Awards panel hierarchy. It is their perceived rejection of the wider construction industry accepted ways of assessing sustainability that were seen as particularly difficult, as expressed, for example here:

'...And I was trying to argue, well look, hang on, the building is meant to be experiential as well as purely plastic; its not good enough to say well, I don't like the image of it, therefore it is a rubbish building. Its something you have to be there to see. And also I was making this point that the environmental performance needs to be championed. And of course, I got a lot of raised eyebrows from the powers to be...' (Judge E)

Terms such as '*not getting it'* and '*not wanting to take it'* as well as '*not having a clue*' (Judge A) were often expressed when discussing the process. In addition, the '*decision makers'* were seen as '*hypocritical*' in awarding buildings that do not seem sustainable; seeing the '*Stirling shortlist as unsustainable'* (Judge N) and not printing environmental data about the entries because they were '*ashamed of it'* (Judge L). One judge described how the RIBA did not seem to be required to legitimate its decisions with regards to the awards, saying, '*the RIBA can give a sustainability award and they only need to answer to themselves'* (Judge J).

One of the judges suggested decisions could be steered by the chair describing how opinions on a particular building by one chair could sway the entire panel despite their disagreement on issues of sustainability *'because he was keen for one building to win'* (Judge A). Judges often described their plight for sustainability whereby their arguments for an award based on environmental credentials were often silenced by judges who prioritised aesthetics. One of the judges discussed the process of presenting a regional shortlisted building to the awards committee whereby at the regional judging the building had been chosen based on the judges' visits and experience of it. At the point of presenting the images of the selected building to the awards committee the other judges discussed their dislike of the photos and appearance of the building despite it being selected for its sustainability credentials.

There also seemed to be despondency in participants' views of how the Awards system was perceived to approach both evaluation overall and sustainability in particular: in '*being told not to reward that'* or in seeing the process as self-

perpetuating as one judge described how the '*whole merry train keeps on running'* (Judge N). Those adhering to the more *Sustainability-focused* logic expressed views that their opinions were not being met and that higher powers were at play. The despondency expressed when discussing the process was at times conveyed in terms of the entire profession viewed overwhelmingly as failing on issues of sustainability. In the *Sustainability-focused* logic the awards process was viewed as being prejudiced in favour of aesthetics over sustainability. Judges discussed their decisions as being overruled by the '*powers to be'* (Judge E). The discontent with the awards process was often discussed in reference to the architectural profession, seen by many judges as failing on issues of sustainability.

Conflicts manifested between judges' perceived views of the profession and its engagement with sustainability as well as between some judges recognising a need to change and others committing to maintaining the status quo. Contradictions were reflected between judges' views of the awards panel's unjust decision making and apparent disregard for opinions of some panellists; as well as between expectations of the awards process regarding sustainability and supposed lack of guidance in its evaluation.

In the case of the *Aesthetics-focused* logic, opinions were sought from recognised experts in the field, whereas, in the *Sustainability-focused* logic actors referenced individual experience as a source of expertise. Although the source of the legitimacy for the role differed, justification had a common purpose or goal in terms of recognising sustainability as an issue of duty or responsibility. For the *Aesthetics-focused* logic, this common goal was about recognising sustainability evaluation as a professional responsibility. For the *Sustainability-focused* logic, on the other hand, it was about acknowledging responsibilities and roles at a collective societal level. Overall, general moral betterment was discussed as a way of addressing and limiting the wider sustainability issues, as for example in the following:

> *'But I think just also to add to that I think part of what I believe our professional role is, every architect, this isn't just our practice, this is every architect… I think it is massive and we've got a moral as well as professional obligation to participate in this debate but also to collaborate with other authorities and statutory consultees as such*.' (Judge H)

When viewing the awards process both logics displayed sources of discontent and dissatisfaction. For the *Aesthetics-focused* logic, this was directed towards the issue of evaluating sustainability, viewed with uncertainty, confusion and lack of guidance. For the *Sustainability-focused* logic dissatisfaction was directed towards the 'failing' profession itself, the professional institute and the awards panel, which were seen as outdated, caught up in tradition and oblivious of the importance of sustainability. For the *Aesthetics-focused* logic this was about acknowledging the work of the profession and the professional institute; for the *Sustainability-focused* logic it was about recognising improvements in knowledge on sustainability issues at a collective societal level.

Discussion and conclusion

Although the empirical study has focused on a prestige or status driven setting, which is to an extent, unique, the findings have implications that may be inferred for the wider architectural domain and for policy-making on sustainability evaluation. Overall, the findings in this study challenge the current emphasis of researching

sustainability evaluation through examining technical features of environmental assessment tools. An institutional logics perspective extends current work, which points to multidimensionality of evaluation by showing how plural logics emerge not as a reflection of varied tools, or different tool features rather as a reflection of wider professional, personal and societal perceptions on sustainability, architects and the awards. In examining the concerns, conflict and contradictions across the logics judges are seen to both 'lock in' views and simultaneously 'lock out' alternative approaches on issues of sustainability, the awards and the profession.

Contribution to literature on sustainability evaluation and evaluation in awards

The analysis is consistent with research by Libby Schweber, whereby designers are seen to be 'locking in' particular views of sustainability as set out by an assessment model tool.[25] The 'tool' in this paper, however, becomes less specific and is perceived as limitations set out by expectations of the awards process, the profession and society. Whereas some judges are viewed as adhering to traditional professional ideals and values, placing importance on aesthetics, prestige and status, others reject these ideals viewing moral responsibility, wider society and sustainability as a priority. Libby Schweber argues that expectations set out by a tool can have lasting effects in redefining what counts as both 'fair' and standard practice in the context of sustainability evaluation.[25]

In the wider sociological literature uncertainty is discussed as being an expected feature of evaluation in awards, defined by Michelle Lamont as a fragile, contested and tense experience.[11] However, though the uncertainty is largely accepted by most of the scholarship, it is rarely dwelled upon. Instead it is described as a product of the evaluative process which is usually (and unproblematically) resolved through respectful dialogue between panellists, who see the process as fair, and who share common interests. Brian Moeran and Bo Christensen describe how tensions and uncertainty in awards decision-making are resolved through personal interests with senior judges advocating a particular view which goes on unchallenged.[1] Michelle Lamont suggests panellists develop 'shared rules of deliberation' that facilitate agreement and lead panellists to perceive the process as just.[11] The analysis discussed in this paper, however, suggests a very problematic and unresolved process characterised by conflict, discontent and contradiction.

Implications for practice and policy

Approaches to policy on sustainability evaluation in the built environment have tended to focus on developing and improving technical aspects of various assessment tools.[26] Also, the persistent search for consensus on the meaning and ways to tackle sustainability are overshadowing other ideas, approaches or thinking. Sustainability in this paper is seen to be approached intuitively with professional judgement and personal experience providing some of the legitimation for the choices made. A greater flexibility in approach in current policy work and an allowance for professional judgement and experimentation may begin to shed some new light and novel ways of tackling sustainability issues.

There is a relevant and important need for further empirical analysis and theoretical insight that develops a body of research engaged in studying sustainability evaluation from multiple perspectives. The analysis carried out for this paper shows a

potential way of studying evaluation that takes into consideration the institutional logics, actors and activities involved. Rather than revealing 'alternative scenarios' this paper points towards 'complementary variances'. The two logics one *Aesthetics-focused* and other *Sustainability-focused* are characterised by conflicting and contradictory views on what counts in terms of sustainability in architectural awards. Decisions are, however, not seen to be reached through shared activities on a 'collaborative understanding' rather by side-lining those who do not always agree with the prevailing power structures and hierarchies.

Each logic does not act as a potential alternative, rather they show the plural perspectives and interpretations inherent in understandings of both evaluation overall and sustainability. Given the evident schisms between different logics within the process, we may ask if not only the awards panels at the RIBA, but also the RIBA, and the profession would benefit from a sustained and open debate over the priorities that they bring to judging the merit of architecture?

Notes

1 Moeran, Brian, and Bo T. Christensen, eds. *Exploring creativity: Evaluative practices in innovation, design, and the arts*, (Cambridge University Press, 2013).

2 Lamont, Michèle, and Katri Huutoniemi, "Comparing customary rules of fairness: Evaluative practices in various types of peer review panels." *Social knowledge in the making* (2011), 209-232.

3 Ding, Grace KC, "Sustainable construction - The role of environmental assessment tools." *Journal of environmental management* 86.3 (2008), 451-464

4 Haapio, Appu, and Pertti Viitaniemi. "A critical review of building environmental assessment tools." *Environmental impact assessment review* 28.7 (2008), 469-482.

5 Wallhagen, Marita, and Mauritz Glaumann. "Design consequences of differences in building assessment tools: a case study." *Building Research & Information* 39.1, (2011), 16-33.

6 Schweber, Libby, and Roine Leiringer. "Beyond the technical: a snapshot of energy and buildings research." *Building Research & Information* 40.4, (2012), 481-492.

7 Verma, Neena. "Insecurity in architecture." *Architectural Research Quarterly* 18.02, (2014), 106-109.

8 Zuckerman, Ezra W. "The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount." *American journal of sociology* 104.5 (1999), 1398-1438.

9 Powell, Walter W., and Paul J. DiMaggio, eds. *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. (University of Chicago Press, 2012).

10 Camic, Charles.,Gross, Neill and Lamont, Michelle., *Social knowledge in the making*, (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press 2011)

11 Lamont, Michelle, *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*, (Harward University Press 2009).

12 Douglas, Mary, *How institutions think*, (Syracuse University Press, 1986).

13 Thornton, Patricia H., and Ocasio, William., "Institutional Logics ", in C. O. Royston Greenwood, Salin Kerston Andersen, and Roy Suddaby, (ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage 2008).

14 Thornton, Patricia H., and William Ocasio. "Institutional logics and the historical contingency of power in organizations: Executive succession in the higher education publishing industry, 1958–1990 1." *American journal of Sociology* 105.3 (1999), 801-843.

15 Jones, Candace, Massimo Maoret, Felipe G. Massa, and Silviya Svejenova. "Rebels with a cause: Formation, contestation, and expansion of the de novo category "modern architecture," 1870–1975." *Organization Science* 23, no. 6 (2012), 1523-1545.

16 Friedland, Roger., "Book review: Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012) The institutional logics perspective: a new approach to culture, structure and process." *Management*, 15.5, (2012), 582-595
17 Thornton, P. H., "The rise of the corporation in a craft industry: Conflict and conformity in institutional logics." *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), (2002), 81-101.
18 Townley, B., "The Role of Competing Rationalities in Institutional Change." *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, (2002), 163-179.
19 Friedland, Roger, and Robert R. Alford. "Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions." (1991): 232-263.
20 Dunn, Mary B., and Candace Jones. "Institutional logics and institutional pluralism: The contestation of care and science logics in medical education, 1967–2005." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 55.1 (2010) 114-149.
21 Jones, Candace, Massimo Maoret, Felipe G. Massa, and Silviya Svejenova. "Rebels with a cause: Formation, contestation, and expansion of the de novo category "modern architecture," 1870–1975." *Organization Science* 23.6 (2012): 1523-1545.
22 RIBA, Awards, 2016, https://www.architecture.com/awards/awards2016/awards2016.aspx [accessed 16th November 2016]
23 RIBA, Awards Entry requirements, 2016 https://awards.architecture.com/Content/pdfs/RIBA%20Awards%202016_Entry%20guidelines2.pdf, [accessed 10th October 2016]
24 Richards, Lyn. *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. (Sage, 2014).
25 Schweber, Libby. "The effect of BREEAM on clients and construction professionals." *Building Research & Information* 41.2 (2013), 129-145.
26 HM Government, *2010 to 2015 Government Policy: Greenhouse gas emissions*, (Committee on Climate Change 2015)

Authors' biographies

Sonja Oliveira is an architect and Senior Lecturer in the Department of Architecture and the Built Environment at the University of the West of England, Bristol. Her PhD earned at the University of Reading explored evaluative practices regarding sustainability in UK architectural awards drawing on institutional theory concepts. Her current research examines diverse scales of energy evaluation in architecture including effects of emerging energy modelling tools on the design process; low carbon homes and occupants' evaluation of energy use approaches and evaluation of energy education in design.

Martin Sexton is a professor of Construction Management and Innovation and Director of Research in the School of Construction Management and Engineering at the University of Reading. He is recognised internationally for his research in the area of innovation management, particularly in the contexts of small construction firms and knowledge-intensive professional service firms.

Author's address

sonja.dragojlovic-oliveira@uwe.ac.uk

Table 1 List denoting number of interviewees and participation in awarded building/type of award

Interviewees Total 17	Total awards participated in	Awarded buildings/date of award that interviewees participated in										
		Cardboard School (2002)	Bed zed (2003)	Stock orchard St (2004)	Cobtun House (2005)	Upper Twyford (2007)	Manchester Justice (2008)	The Stonebridge (2009)	Cavendish Avenue (2012)	Centre for Alternative Technology (2011)	Sainsbury's Lab (2012)	Other National/regional Awards
A	2				×							×
B	1											×
C	4	×				×				×		×
D	8				×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
E	1											×
F	1											×
G	2											×
H	1											×
I	1											×
J	2											×
K	4								×	×	×	×
L	1				×							
M	4					×			×	×	×	
N	1											×
O	1											×
P	4					×	×	×	×			
Q	2											×

Table 2 Identification of the two logics

Logics (material and symbolic keywords)	**Coding examples**
Aesthetics-focused *Symbolic (How evaluation is viewed)* *Emphasis on: status, appearance, profession*	"…but a lot of the value judgements on the mainstream side are to do with short-term judgements, **how a building looks** on a certain day, in a certain sunlight..."(Judge P) "…I think if the **building looks** fantastic and it was built from asbestos and car tyres, it should still win an award..."(Judge O) "…But I think just also to add to that I think part of what I believe our **professional role** is, every architect, this isn't just our practice, this is every architect..."(Judge H
Aesthetics-focused *Material (How sustainability is judged)* *Emphasis on: meeting threshold, distrusting data, and drawing on expertise*	"…That's another **problem with this sort of data** when you get the new projects, etc, you're dealing with hypothetical figures..."(Judge M) "So, and because of the narrowness of the data and apart from the inconsistency of the data here…**We have tended to ask one or two sustainability experts**" (Judge K)
Sustainability-focused *Symbolic(How evaluation is viewed)* *Emphasis on: morality, point of no return and society*	"…We have a, yeah, **we have a duty to**, the built environment…"(Judge D) **"These measures have been absorbed** and adopted. There's certainly less as far as I can see there's less encouragement to break more boundaries."(Judge I)
Sustainability-focused *Material (How sustainability is judged)* *Emphasis on: evidence seeking, personalising and referencing)*	"And we would be trying to persuade the awards panel to insist on there being some **evidence** in the submission that the building is sustainable..." (Judge Q) "So I suppose you go through a process of identifying an issue, trying to put some **metrics** on it and then refining them and get, the information gets better and it becomes more valid, your judgments."(Judge J)

Table 3 The *Aesthetics-focused* logic subthemes

***Aesthetics-focused* logic Evaluative concerns**	**Key characteristics**	**Number of references in 8 sources**	**Total references**
Justification of decisions	Fairness	5	39
	Professionalism	10	
	Calling on expertise	24	
Views of the process	Difficulties	27	70
	Uncertainty	15	
	Confusion	28	
Evaluative influences	Books	5	43
	Buildings	5	
	People	33	
Evaluative priorities	Aesthetics	59	163
	Innovation	51	
	Prestige	53	

Table 4 The *Sustainability –focused* logic subthemes

***Sustainability- focused* logic Evaluative concerns**	**Key characteristics**	**Number of references in 9 sources**	**Total references**
Justification of decisions	Morality	13	50
	Individual opinions	30	
	Societal values	7	
Views of the process	Failing profession	18	110
	Discontent	46	
	Point of no return	46	
Evaluative influences	Technology	8	26
	Tools	4	
	Unintended consequences	14	
Evaluative priorities	Sustainability	38	162
	Data	73	

Table 5 Identifying conflicts/ contradictions between logics

Evaluative concerns	*Aesthetics-focused* logic	*Sustainability-focused* logic	Conflicts, contradictions	Crossovers
Justification of decisions	Fairness, Professionalism, Deferring to expertise	Moral responsibility, Individual opinions, Authority of knowledge	Conflict between the perceived views on the profession and its understanding and engagement with sustainability	Activities focused on 'deferring' decisions
Evaluative priorities	Appearance, Innovation, Prestige	Evidence, Data, Performance	Contradictions between the perceived views of the awards panel and the views of the judges	Activities focused on 'prioritizing'
View of the process	RIBA improving, Uncertainty on how to evaluate sustainability, Confusion	Dissatisfaction with process, RIBA and profession, Failing profession	Conflict between a need to change and a despondency to change, Contradictions between the expectation of the awards process -regarding sustainability and perceived lack of guidance	Focus on 'discontent'
Evaluative influences	Informal: Particular personal experiences, books, buildings and people	Formal: Technology and tools	Contradictions between informal and formal influences	Focus on 'triggers for sustainability changes'
Source of legitimacy	The profession, Professional Association, Awards panel	Wider society		'Anchoring decisions'

Table 6 Key components of two logics