



Miklós (Miki) Ambrózy and Sophie L.O. Durand

Kitchen Notes

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37522/crv79b38>

Peer-Review, Artistic Research, Research Communication, Practice-led-research, Editorial, Peer-Connect

Summary: LANDING's editors reflect on the nature of peer review in relation to the journal's aspirations.

Dr. Miklós (Miki) Ambrózy is a Vilnius-based researcher, writer, and artist working with film. He is an active member of the Why Cut When You Can Fade artistic research group and the co-founder of LANDING. His research topics include degrowth, pollution, film poetics, and the transfer of artistic methods to the broader public. He is currently employed as artistic researcher at the Vilnius Academy of Arts. Miki has studied Audiovisual Arts and Film Directing at the LUCA School of Arts, Brussels, and acting for stage at the Thessaloniki Centre for Experimental Theatre. Miki's films and installations have screened in Brussels, Paris, Vienna, Vilnius, Riga, Manchester, and Athens. His most recent work is a three-part artist's book *Degrowing Poetics* (2026).

Sophie L. O. Durand (born Boorloo / Perth, Australia, based in Vilnius, Lithuania) is an artist and researcher. Sophie's multi-disciplinary practice extends from the intersection of sculpture and performance art and draws from anecdotal histories and archives of landscape for subject matter. As an artist, Sophie works between scales from discrete gestures and actions to larger networked bodies of work, as well as programming, collaborations, and pedagogy, all of which are instances of a practice-led relationality. The artistic outcomes of these practices are most commonly installations, exhibitions, and happenings. Currently Sophie is thinking through ideas of the ocean existing as many times all at once, and how an artist might move beyond evidencing ecological entanglement in their artworks, to embody the interaction between object, individual, context, and connections through transforming the processes employed by creative practice.

Parodyk virtuvė is a Lithuanian phrase used to say: “Show me the kitchen!” It is used when somebody wants to know the secrets of a particularly tasty dish or hack. It is similar to “shop talk,” the difference being that “shop talk,” usually implies that those in the conversation are knowledgeable about the craft. “Show me the kitchen” is an invitation to look behind the curtain without reference to specific skills or discipline. It is a gesture to reveal what is going on before a dish—a delicious and graceful blend of art and research—is served.

Showing is a relational act. It implies interaction, questioning, trust, and generosity. Wealth is in the act of giving.

The concept of “*parodyk virtuvė*” is one that has guided *Landing* from the outset. It featured high on the shortlist of names for the journal. While usually issues of *Landing* are thematic, this issue takes the ethos of the journal—disclosing the kitchen behind creative practice—as a starting point.

Conditions for a Peer-to-Peer Review

Breaking with our previous approach, *Parodyk Virtuvė—Show Me the Kitchen* presents **curated contributions**. We invited six artists to reveal the behind-the-scenes of their studios, as part of an experiment with peer-reviewing in the context of artistic research.

Peer review is a process used to help editors make decisions on what counts as “good research.” It is a normative judgment on whether a piece of research is relevant, innovative, well-articulated etc. A peer review protocol is designed to improve the quality of contributions through feedback by people with significant knowledge in a given field, according to criteria that are expected or emerging. It is generally agreed in research publishing that peer review improves the quality of the discussion of research (Halder 2011).

But how does such a system fare with *Landing*? The short paragraph above is teeming with rhetorical claims, while lacking clarity on *what* goodness, relevance, innovation, articulation, and quality *are* in the context of *artistic practice as research*. Being in the process of building infrastructure, we have been grappling with these issues.

The practice of masked peer reviewing (double or single blind)¹ emerged from the assumptions of the scientific method, with an aspiration for objectivity and rigour, as well as freedom from conflict of interest and bias. Open peer review is another option deployed by many, whereby reviewers and contributors know each other’s identity. In previous issues of *Landing*, we offered peer reviewers the option to decide whether they want to remain anonymous to contributors, thus allowing our community to take ownership of this aspect of the discussion.² More often than not, reviewers chose to let authors know their identity.

¹ It is called blind because both the contributor and the reviewer remain anonymous to each other. In a single-blind review the reviewer knows the name of the author they’re reviewing (Shoham and Pitman 2021).

² The practice of face-to-face open reviewing is well-established within Vilnius Academy of Arts. Students at all levels (bachelor, master, and doctoral) are partially responsible for recruiting their own reviewers for their end-of-program works, with guidance. I (Miki) once asked a graduating BA student whether they wanted me to *critically* review their work, or to *curatorially* review it with the emphasis largely on its strengths. The student wrote in response: “I don’t care about the grade that much rather than the film itself, so real constructive criticism I’d value more. So yeah, i would lean to the real review you write, maybe not tank my grade but yeah :-).”

Landing is a value-based project, with an attempt at criteria-making and active engagement within a broad field.³ We aspire to publish contributions that are method-specific, situated, have transdisciplinarity and contemporary relevance, are considered and discursive, have an alignment between form, media, and content, and, especially for this issue, have a sense of transferability. By this we mean that there is an invitation into the world of a given artistic or research practice, and the possibility to bring methods from this world into another context. This is essential to escape the bureaucratic capture of creative practice.

³ Through its operations, *Landing* commits to:

- listening* to people, spaces, species, and milieus as they are present in the journal's content and to respond to them with purpose and respect;
- transferability*, nothing is done alone or for the first time, just as we ask others to invite readers into the world of their practice, *Landing* too is an open resource and method;
- sharing* research methods, and bringing them back to presentations that qualify as art and research in one performance;
- recognising* all materialities present;
- imbuing* encouragement and excitement about the trajectory of research; one's own as well as the research of others;
- speaking* in multiple tongues. While English and Lithuanian are our working languages, we acknowledge that all languages are equipped for artistic research;
- valuing questions* that are generative, adding to the conversation rather than critiquing;
- creating* a platform for sharing work, asking for and receiving feedback on research "in process;"
- an ethos of exchange value*, defined as providing a useful forum for the artistic researchers in our community;
- being flexible* and *adaptable* to a changing community and their unique needs;
- caring* for all submitted material and all material being prepared for presentation in the journal;
- a conversational* and discursive attitude;
- remaining* open and receptive to feedback while allowing space for sustained discussions;
- intergenerationality* and *being* accountable for our mistakes.

We review *Landing's* evaluative criteria regularly, making them transparent—a practice we share with other international publication initiatives.⁴ Our approach assigns special value to discursivity, even if we are humble about how well we have travelled thus far. Mick Wilson describes "discourse" as a situation with the potential for back and forth within a dynamic field of exchange. According to him, two key semantic themes appear across the terms *discurrere*, *discursus*, *con-versare*, *dialectic*: movement and plurality. "The figures of the discursive are figures that move and multiply, in contrast to the fixed and unitary" (2015, 29). Our long-term vision for *Landing* is precisely summed up in these themes: research moves us, the ones doing it, while affecting those around us.

Yet we understood from our own broad pool of peer reviewers, early- or mid-career artists, researchers, and artist-researchers, that the reviewing process needs to be facilitated. Not all contributors invited to develop an article will be published eventually. All contributors, however, receive feedback through the peer review process-in writing. This aspect of *Landing* makes it a pedagogically inclined journal, where peer-to-peer teaching and learning of how to publish/communicate is foregrounded.

We collaborate with individuals from both institutional and non-institutional contexts and backgrounds, who have their own demands and expectations towards the protocol of publishing. Sometimes individuals are aware of this and sometimes habits have been unconsciously ingrained. The texts we publish always carry residues of practice and relations, emerging from institutional conditions and art-world conventions. It is our hope that *Landing* both

⁴ Please refer to <https://landing.vda.lt/journal/about> and <https://www.jar-online.net/en/peer-reviewing-and-artistic-research>

acknowledges and challenges these trends. Through making visible the methods of practitioners doing research, we allow readers to connect to a field of practice more directly. By unveiling the mystique that sometimes surrounds the figure of the lone (genius) artist, we open up possibilities for connecting across disciplines beyond the artistic.⁵

A veteran of research in the arts pointed out to us the sense that there is too little critical engagement with what is being published. It is important to us that *Landing* has a utility function—it is meant to be read. After all, *Landing* emerged following the artistic research symposium *Not Quite King, Not Quite Fish* (2023), and we believe an issue of a journal could be viewed as a symposium. Our aspiration for connecting practices assumes that each journal issue creates a temporal knowledge community (Gedutis and Michelkevičius 2023).

Peer Connect as Art Assignment

For this issue we wanted to integrate the peer review process horizontally, expanding conversations and exchanges between contributors and editors. At an outdoor coffee table in Vilnius's loft area in Naujamiestis, Julijonas Urbonas discussed with us the possibility of turning these values into a protocol by coining the term *peer connect*.

⁵ This is discussed by Sofia Oloscoaga in the lecture *Symposium* ουν- (sun-, “together-”) + πίνω (pínō, “drink”), held in Kunstverin Frankfurt in 2023 and later published in the book *The Educational Web: Reader*. Oloscoaga asks “What may be the richest experiences to cultivate, which actually allow us to listen to ourselves and each other, in genuine attention and deep resonance?” (Oloscoaga 2023, 42)

According to our design, we asked contributors to work in pairs in the spirit of a relational review, where they swap their contributions and review each other. We asked them to discuss how they want to interpret the aspect of “connectedness.” We invited them to trace the discussion and the emergence of their final versions from this process. Our pairings were based on where we expected to find closer affinities, and we left the authors with the difficulty of freedom in how to orchestrate the process.

In this issue of *Landing*, Egle Davidavičė was in conversation with Adomas Žudys, Julijonas Urbonas was in conversation with Rūta Spelskytė, and Jess Day was in conversation with Nele Brökelmann.

This issue asks: *What are the potentials and pitfalls of peer connected reviewing?* For contributions to qualify as exciting propositions for *Landing*, we usually refer to our values (see footnote 3). Being reviewed by an empathetic peer who engages with the material through care and attention is an obvious benefit. But we enter muddier waters when it comes to the rigour of research, the lucidity of concepts, the craft of storytelling, and ways of situating one's work.

The figure of a dynamic back and forth might suggest a way forward. Peer-connected contributors, based on a relationship of trust, may allow the exchange to unfold in tune with the temporal-placial aspects of *doing writing* relationally. When we review each other's work in this mode, and by acknowledging the plurality of different knowledges we hold, we can generate a truly non-hierarchical discussion around what “the contribution” may be.

Importantly, this issue positions *Landing* away from the logic of artmaking, which assumes that art becomes complete, symbolically and physically, with the staging of an exhibition. The exhibition only

shows a temporal stop, while behind the scenes exists the ecology of life—a milieu of creative practice. Practice is as close to everyday life as nutrition is to biological existence.

In *Show Me the Kitchen*, we are staying with artists in their own milieu, detailing a plurality of knowledges they carry. Artmaking transforms into *art-doing*.

Whispering, conspiring, resonating, rocking, rotating, attracting, looping, co-conditioning, and defying gravity are the ways in which our authors are in their respective kitchens.

They are pleased to meet you, do come inside!

References

Ambrózy, Miklós, Sophie Durand, Povilas Marozas, et al. *Not Quite King, Not Quite Fish. Artistic Research Symposium*. 8 November 2023. <https://sodas2123.lt/en/not-quite/>.

Michelkevičius, Vytautas, and Aldis Gedutis. 'From Inter-Disciplinarity Towards Trans-Disciplinarity in Arts and Sciences: Presumptions for the Artistic Research and Doctoral Studies in Arts'. *Acta Aca-demiae Artium Vilnensis*, no. 109 (August 2023): 15–46. <https://doi.org/10.37522/aaav.109.2023.158>.

Natalie Shoham and Alexandra Pitman, 'Open versus Blind Peer Review: Is Anonymity Better than Transparency?', *BJPsych Advances* 27, no. 4 (2021): 247–54, <https://doi.org/10.1192/bja.2020.61>.

Neel Halder et al., 'Peer Reviewing Made Easy', *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* 17, no. 2 (2011): 150–57, <https://doi.org/10.1192/apt.bp.109.007294>.

Mick Wilson. *On discourse and the curatorial*. Floating Opera Press, 2025.

Kunstverein in Hamburg. 2024. "Sofia Oloscoaga: Symposium συν- (Sun-, 'Together-') + πίνω (Pínō, 'Drink')." YouTube. December 10, 2024. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C4TiwxP1IU8>

Milan Ther and Martin Karcher ed. *The Educational Web: Reader*, Kunstverein in Hamberg, 2023.