

Summative Peer Review of Zhouyi Ding on 18th April

Category: Uncategorized

written by s2814160 | 18 April 2026

Below is the English translation of your peer review text. I have kept the content unchanged and only rendered it in clear, natural academic English with consistent terminology.

The most obvious strength of the blog is that the project does not move forward mechanically along a fixed path, but instead adjusts its methods actively as it develops. From Week 6 onwards in particular, the author begins to examine pacing, duration, suspension, display, and viewer experience in a more systematic way, and also starts to understand the exhibition as a structure that generates meaning through space, sequence, and viewing conditions. In addition, the actual influence of collective work on the individual project can be clearly traced: the spatial experiment at Summerhall, the practical experience of Our Shell, and observations of moving image display all feed directly back into the SICP, and in turn lead to revisions in structure and display.

One issue that still needs to be clarified across the SICP as a whole is how waiting can actually be experienced by viewers within the exhibition. In Week 4 and the Curatorial Pitch, waiting is divided into three levels: everyday, social/institutional, and existential. This structure helps the project establish a clear conceptual framework. By Week 6, however, the author realises that the layered structure works more as a mode of explanation than as the exhibition process itself. This is where the methodological shift in Week 6 could be developed further. Movement, pause, delay, spacing, and route all need to be written as mechanisms that generate waiting, rather than as supporting forms. In that way, the later Week 7 decisions about work sequence, title, moving

image, site, and access could all be brought together around one central question: how does the exhibition bring viewers into a state of time that is prolonged, organised, and endured? Lisa Baraitser's *Enduring Time* discusses waiting as a temporal state that is endured, stretched out, and unable to end quickly. This perspective would support the author's decision to place waiting within pacing and duration. David Bissell's "Animating Suspension: Waiting for Mobilities" would also be useful for helping the author address the bodily dimension of the exhibition. His account of suspension describes a state organised through pause, rhythmic change, enforced delay, and uncertainty. Bringing this text into the structural adjustments after Week 6 would give stronger grounding to the treatment of route, pause, and bodily experience.

The second issue appears in Week 7. By this point, the relationship between the works and the path has begun to take shape, but the writing still proceeds more through conceptual correspondence than through exhibition function. The problem is not that the works have been selected badly, but that the relationship between them still depends mainly on which type of waiting each one represents. The most effective revision here would be to define more clearly the specific role of each work within the full route: how the opening work changes bodily rhythm and attention as the viewer enters the space; how the works in the middle section organise waiting into a stretched condition through rules, distance, or route; and how the later works leave behind a lingering temporality. In this way, the relationships between the works would move beyond thematic relation and more clearly become experiential relation. Paul O'Neill's *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)* would be helpful here, because it supports writing sequence, viewing rhythm, and the organisation of relations between works as curatorial logic rather than simple thematic juxtaposition.

The third issue concerns the entry conditions and display decisions that gradually emerge between Week 8 and Week 12. In Week 8, the author begins to address the title, booklet, and printed matter. In Week 9, threshold, dark-space notice, and access-centred entry are linked to viewing rhythm. By Weeks 10 to 12, the project develops further into site choice, moving image display, floor plan, circulation, and access planning. What now needs strengthening is the compression of these separate decisions into one clearer question: through what kind of entry is the viewer brought into waiting? What kind of entry is already implied by the title *Right Here: While Waiting*? Within the project, does the booklet function as explanation, guidance, or a delayed interpretive tool? Why are short moving-image works suited to monitor encounters, while longer works require darkened space and seating? What kinds of temporal experience do these two modes of display organise? Once these decisions are written more specifically, title, threshold, display, and access will become more clearly identifiable as parts of the exhibition structure. Beverly Serrell's *Exhibit Labels* and Erika Balsom's *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art* would both be useful references here.

References

Baraitser, Lisa. *Enduring Time*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350008151>.

Bissell, David. "Animating Suspension: Waiting for Mobilities." *Mobilities* 2, no. 2 (2007): 277–98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100701381581>.

Balsom, Erika. *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art*. London: Routledge, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003695134>.

O'Neill, Paul. *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012.