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ABSTRACT

This is a feminist poststructuralist thesis about studio-based, architectural critique in architectural education.

Critique is central to the teaching and assessing of design work in Architecture Schools and is employed in developing skills necessary for professional practice. Despite its importance and centrality in architectural education and the profession, as a process critique has not been subjected to a critical scrutiny to ascertain whether current critique processes are equitable for all students. Through undertaking a critical ethnography of a School of Architecture involving extensive observations and interviews, and the deconstruction of observations and interviews through a poststructuralist analysis, I argue from my location as a feminist researcher, architect and teacher that critique is not equitable for all students, discriminating in many ways against some students, particularly women.

The narrative which describes and reflects on the research process moves between the micro-scale focus on the seemingly unproblematic everyday practices in one School of Architecture, and the macro-scale notion of architectural education embedded in a culture of architecture which has a strong tradition of white Eurocentrism and male domination.

In the final Chapter of the thesis I describe alternative critique processes which seek to involve all students in the judgement of their own work. Critique processes which reduce students' dependence on expert judgement, and help students build confidence in their own judgement are potentially more empowering, and more equitable for all students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: A VIEW OF CRITIQUE AS CENTRAL TO ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION AND PRACTICE

Introduction

This thesis concerns the studio-based, architectural critique (the critical analysis of students' work) which is the most widely used protocol for both formative and summative assessment in Australian, British (Macleod, 1992) and North American (Anthony, 1991) Schools of Architecture. The architectural critique is a teaching method for architectural design, which is the core subject in the tertiary education of architects in Australia (Maher, 1992), the U.K. (Hinton et al., 1990), and the U.S. (Anthony, 1991). An acknowledged role for critique in architectural education is in developing skills necessary for professional practice (Maitland, 1991; Franklin et al., 1989). Therefore critique is central to the concept of a studio-based architectural education and, as such, is a powerful force in the life of a student of architecture.

The thesis describes the educational practices of critique in one School of Architecture through narrative, case studies and observations, to demonstrate and examine how architectural education in that School, and in particular architectural critique, sometimes discriminates. Through a feminist critical ethnographic account employed as the methodological approach in Chapter 4, the thesis seeks to provide a detailed account of the process of critique within architectural education. The feminist critical ethnographic methodology is used as a means to political consciousness raising about changes to the critique experience which might empower students and teachers within an institutional

1. Boud says that: "There are two main purposes of student assessment. The first intends to improve the quality of learning. Students engage in the problems and discourse of a given area and are given encouragement, response and feedback on what they do, as appropriate, with a view to them becoming more effective in their learning. This is formative assessment, or assessment for learning. The second concerns the accreditation of knowledge or performance: students are assessed to certify their achievements. This occurs primarily for the award of a degree or a diploma, though various components of assessment are usually taken into account in making this judgement. This is summative assessment, or assessment for the record". (Boud, 1990, 102-103)
context concerned with access and equity issues. This advocacy research approach is chosen for the Chapter most concerned with access and equity issues because it is a methodology which can shift core assumptions — most notably the positivist assumptions about "truth" and "reality" which so form and restrict research interpretations under the "old" paradigm (Reinharz, 1981; Harding, 1991). The "new" research methodologies are infused with the subjectivity of the researcher, who acknowledges that neither she, nor any other researcher, has access to objective "truth"; that what is being described is an interpretation through, in this instance, a feminist, poststructuralist lens.

The usefulness of this thesis is limited to that of a political consciousness raising tool: it is outside the scope of the thesis to demand transformation from the participants as a means of demonstrating either the utility or the validity of the feminist critical ethnographic approach. The real transformative 'work' of this ethnographic account, as a piece of text, commences after its publication to the wider community of students, teachers and administrators. It may be several years before it is possible to describe the changes that result from this thesis.

My thesis interprets critique through feminist poststructuralist concepts to demonstrate how critique sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessing and socialising students into the profession.

2. Smith (1993a) says of the role of critical ethnography as advocacy research that:

Critical ethnography...is distinguishable from other critical methodologies [is] in the role of the researcher as an 'emissary' and 'visionary' for a group of people, one who determines the sources of data and the particular theoretical constructs (and language) with which to analyse the data.

That is, critical ethnography, as a form of advocacy research, is essentially designed by the benevolent and socially critical researcher who, using the theoretical framework of critical social science, collects data on those meanings and events she/he perceives as significant (or problematic) in relation to selected critical theory constructs. (p. 220)

The notion of critical research as a form of advocacy or conviction research is worth emphasising. The critical researcher is an advocate for those traditionally silenced, suppressed or marginalised in any social situation. (p. 221)

3. I use this expression "old" as a counterpoise to the frequently heralded "new" paradigm research - post positivist research (Reinharz, 1981, 415).

4. The focus for the research project is not worded as a conventional hypothesis as the research project is concerned with 'how' rather than 'whether' processes of critique
The thesis considers

that by relating studio-based critique to developing students' sound self-judgement, a more effective use of critique by educators and students may be promoted.

In Chapter 5 the thesis explores the link between the above two theses with the aim of proposing

that all students may potentially be empowered when there are certain changes in the critique experience.

The focus of the research is only on the practice of critique in potentially contributing to discrimination and not on other forms of discrimination which may also be occurring in the critique situation, for example related to the content of students' designs.

The feminist critical ethnographic study, which forms the research component of the thesis, investigates educational practices through questioning whether current critique practices are discriminatory in that they better serve the interests of some students than others. Some of the questions investigated by the researcher concern the issues: Does the public nature of critique reduce women's confidence in dealing with negative critique? Should critique aim to build the development of confidence and self-judgement? Has the enhancement of confidence, and with it self-judgement, been identified and promoted as one of the primary tasks of architectural critique? Are students being encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning and self-knowledge in the practices of critique? Does the existence of a master critic subjugate student's self-judgement rather than increasing their confidence in their ability to judge their own, and other's work? Do particular practices discriminate against women?

discriminate. It is hardly possible that critique would never discriminate in any way.

Furthermore, in a project such as mine, concerning as it does the mechanisms of oppression which maintain hegemony, and employing a post-positivist methodology which questions the implicit rightness of positivist research, it does not bode well to adopt the "master's tools [which] will never dismantle the master's house" (Lather, 1991, 157 citing Lorde, 1984).

This is an old and primary tool of all oppressors to keep the oppressed occupied with the master's concerns. (Lather, 1991, 157 citing Lorde, 1994, 113)
The organisation of the thesis

The thesis is arranged in 5 Chapters and an Epilogue followed by an Appendix of published papers and a Bibliography.

Chapter 1

The Introduction: A View of Critique as Central to Architectural Education and Practice focuses on the centrality of critique in teaching, assessing students in their education, and socialising architecture students into the architectural profession. A picture is drawn of some of the ways in which critique is embedded in the studio culture in architectural education. The background to posing the research questions about critique is considered, and an argument is posed about why it is now timely to do this research.

In order to develop the argument concerning the centrality of critique in its role of developing self-judgement as empowering some, and disempowering others, particularly women, some of the contemporary theories in higher education are introduced. There is a brief consideration of why there has been little development in teaching methods informed by the "new thinking", and of the effect of the seeming unwillingness of educators to adopt the most effective practices in critique.

Chapter 2

The Literature Review: Architectural Education in Higher Education provides a review of the relevant literature organised to position this research in relation to research published previously in this field of architectural education. The literature review in Chapter 2 focuses specifically on a review of research related to the critique in architectural education. In particular, the significant contributions of Kathryn Anthony and Sarah Dinham to this field are highlighted. As important and insightful as their research has been, Anthony and Dinham have not examined the operation of studio-based architectural critique from a
perspective which considers the centrality of access and equity issues, nor the empowerment of students' self-judgement.

The review of research related to the Methodology is found in Chapter 3, and the review of research related to possible educational changes to strengthen the ability of students to show themselves in the studio learning environment is found in Chapter 5.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 consists of Methodology, comprising Methodology Literature Review, and Research Methodology including the Relationship between the Methodology and the Objectives of the Study. In this Chapter I emphasise the selection of a critical research methodology as central and integral to the objectives of the study, and I provide a detailed overview of the possibilities and limits of the chosen critical research methodology for broaching change and transformation. The literature which describes critical ethnography as advocacy research, and which differentiates feminist critical ethnography from critical ethnography, is also reviewed. The chapter includes a consideration of my feminist subjectivities in engaging the research process, and in constructing the textual outcomes, and a review of some literature contributing to my understandings of myself as researcher within the research process. The observations I made for two years in the studios of the School are thus positioned as an interpretation according to explicit feminist concepts which are reviewed in this Chapter.

Chapter 4

The Narratives, Interviews, Critical Analysis and Discussion which are the textual outcomes of the critical ethnographic process form Chapter 4. The selection of material to be included in the thesis from the extensive collection of observations, narratives, notebook examples, interviews, critical analysis and discussion from the research period was based on the need
to describe moments in the formation of the process of critique in the observed School whilst bringing the voice of the participants to the reader in the text.

Chapter 5

In Researcher Reflection and Transformative Action in Teaching I describe my approaches to teaching and those of another teacher, which were derived from the emerging understandings of the research process. They are aimed at developing students' self-judgement through a learner-centred approach which attempts to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate to each other, and to their assessors, their skills, understandings, prior knowledge and learning in the context of that project.

As the researcher-as-participant I refined my understandings about the potentials for different roles for critique through further cycles of the critical ethnographic process. I transformed my own teaching practices to reflect my new knowledges about the potentials of the critique to discriminate against some students, particularly women. My transformed teaching actions, and the theories and reflections on the critical ethnographic research which drove them, form this Chapter. Whilst the actions I undertook in my teaching as a result of my reflections on the findings from the feminist critical ethnography are context bound to the School, and that period of time, I make recommendations about the ways in which architectural education could be transformed to enable students to develop and demonstrate self-judgement. However, the text is not a generalised prescription for action either in other Schools, or for other teachers, but rather is an attempt to address, in my own teaching, the problems of silencing, isolation, exclusion and/or marginalisation, the constant pressure to conform and compete, as well as providing a focus on the means of developing students' confidence.

In this Chapter I consider alternative models for critique which promote a different view of relationships with pre-existing hierarchy - the "master critic" - to argue, in conclusion, that through participating in different types of critiques, students and teachers may become
aware of the power of expert critique to silence students, and to diminish their confidence in their own judgement. I argue that through the opportunity to participate in different critique situations in which students are more comfortable and confident to express their understandings and to acknowledge what they need to learn, students are encouraged to take control of their own learning, recognising this as a means of developing their self-judgement which is important in preparation for life-long learning.

Epilogue

In *Concluding the Process of Educational Research* I draw together the threads of the critical research to propose that it is only through the political and transformative actions of students, teachers and readers as a result of their own 'constructed' understandings of the research, to which I have also referred as political consciousness raising, that there will be change both at a personal and an institutional level as an outcome from this research. The changes will come after the publication of the research, as part of the cycle of critical ethnographic research which relies on readers' reflection on the text.

I conclude that there are myriad practices, personal and institutional, which contribute to the hypothesized discrimination, and I challenge educators to engage in a similar form of advocacy research to uncover the specific practices in their own institutional settings which contribute towards an unjust world, and to develop teaching practices which enable students to develop confidence in the judgement of their own and others' work.

**Studio critique scenarios and key terms defined**

Critique is employed in many situations in a studio-based architectural education. The concept of the architecture studio and studio-based education as the context in which critique is employed is described, and key terms defined. Thereafter, the critique situations described in this thesis are defined.
The Architecture Studio

The architecture studio refers both to a physical space as a site for teaching/learning experiences, and to an interactive culture between the students and staff developed within this physical space. The physical space is typically lofty and ideally south lit (in Australia) with ideally seven and a half square metres of space (Maher, 1992) per student which they design and decorate as they will. Usually a desk, drawing type work station, lockable storage space and pin-board space will be provided for each student (Olley, 1992).

The studio culture which grows up in the studio space is a result of the combination of the uniqueness of having "a place of one's own" on a university campus and the peculiar circumstances of architecture students who, during their professional degree, are committed to significant teaching contact hours in the studio space (Olley, 1992). As a result of the expectation that students will be present in the studio for long periods of scheduled time, the division between the space as a teaching/learning environment and a "home away from home" for architecture students becomes very blurred. The students, who are relatively unlikely to have significant contact hours outside of the studio hours (Olley, 1992), will become accustomed to using the architecture studio as a base for any other on-campus activities.

Studio-Based Education

The studio culture is manifested in frequent, informal, small group discussion between students and staff, or students, or staff, which Macleod (1992) refers to as the "uniqueness of the studio teaching method." Together with the "breadth of address...from cultural history through [to] technology" he claims that an architectural education alone is unique in that these two characteristics are always present. He defines the studio teaching method as referring to:

that manner of teaching which comprises the following: "Design problems" of varying degrees of complexity are presented to the students for individual or small group solution; the problems may be set with varying degrees of precision and thus
require varying degrees of research and analysis for their definition; the alternative
design "solutions" are (ideally) worked up in a common setting (the studio), and
aided in their development by direct tutorial advice, suggestion, provocation and
encouragement; then presented publicly for jury assessment.

For the essence of studio problems is that there is always more information available
to the problem than any designer can assimilate, even as there is never enough to
justify any decision about to be taken.

A further description of studio-based education is provided by Maitland who, writing in
Boud and Feletti (1991), refers to the design studio as a remnant of the origin of
architectural education in tutelage and apprenticeship to a practitioner.

This is the design studio in which the student is provided with a brief for a building,
is periodically tutored over the board in the studio, and finally presents a solution in
front of the class to a 'jury' of tutors and practitioners in the design 'crit' (p. 203).

Anthony expands at length on this theme from a historical perspective but does not diverge
from the stated view that physically the design studio is at the centre of architectural
education. She adds to Macleod's and Maitland's view a more critical view of the
development of the "studio subculture" as a social outcome of the long hours architecture
students spend together in the studio. She says:

The studio subculture bears a close resemblance to the sororities and fraternities
commonly found on university campuses. As early as their inception back in the late
1820s, "fraternities increasingly made it possible for the individual to find privacy in
his lodging and intimacy in a small group - a second family". The same can be said
of design studios where prolonged, intense interaction across an academic term can
result in a familial atmosphere - with the best and worst aspects of family life
manifested on a daily basis.

The intense contact with studio-mates often makes it difficult for design students to
maintain their friendships with those in other fields. As many students have
admitted, the more years they spend in design, the fewer nondesign students they
have as friends. Cloistered in the captivity of the studio, the studio commands an
increasingly greater role as the centre of students' social lives, and consequently, the
world outside the studio becomes less important. (Anthony, 1991, 12)

That the studio is a common site for an architectural education is agreed by architectural
educators from Australia, the U.K. and the U.S., and there is also support for the notion of
a studio culture. Within the studio-based architectural education and the culture of the
studio there are five main situations in which architectural critique is employed and they
will now be defined in the broadest terms. This description will serve to define the concept
of teaching through critique and assessing through critique, whilst the third term I have used in the thesis statement, socialising students through critique, relates partly to the concept of developing skills for professional practice, and partly to modelling the personal and professional qualities that the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, the State Architect Registration Boards, and the Architects Accreditation Council of Australia seek for their membership.

The Studio Critique in Architectural Education

Critique is employed as a teaching method, and as a means to formative assessment "one-on-one" at the drawing board (or the computer screen - a metaphoric drawing board). A very full and detailed description of architectural critique in this sense is contained in Schon (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner* and reused, so important it was thought to be to the development of his argument about education for reflective practice, as Chapter 3 in *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (1987). Schon documents in detail the exchanges between a student, Petra, and her tutor, Quist, to build up a picture of an across the drawing board situation which is familiar to students and studio-based staff (hereafter called "tutors" as is the common practice in Australian schools of architecture regardless of the academic status of the staff member). The modelling of professional behaviour implicit in this tutor/pupil relationship is brought forth by Schon to reinforce the concept of the relationship between the knowledge which competent practitioners have in their field and the practices these practitioners adopt to prepare their students for professional practice. Schon argues that an essential component of successful, or even adequate, professional practice is the ability to *reflect-in-action*.

As Boud (1990) recalls, Schon's work:

has provided convincing arguments for the proposition that a vital element of competent practice, in whatever field of endeavour, is that of reflection-in-action; that is, the ability of practitioners to monitor what they do as they are doing it, and to make assessments of what they need to do, drawing upon both their tacit knowledge and their technical skills. (p. 108)
Boud continues that "the current domination of thinking about assessment in terms of the demands of accurate marking is such that there is a temptation to include assessment tasks which can easily be marked at the expense of those which might mirror reflective practice" (p. 108, my italics). Schon, in reifying the over-the-drawing-board exchange into reflection-in-action and Boud, in reflecting on the importance of self-reflection as an essential professional skill, are both mindful of the tenuous nature of the relationship between assessment tasks and empowering and disempowering modes of developing self-judgement.

Macleod (1992) comments that "advice, suggestion, provocation and encouragement" are the curriculum for the student/tutor across-the-drawing-board exchange on the tutor's part, whilst Maitland (1991) sees the opportunities for the student to exchange ideas and present a point of view. While the tutor is providing feedback or engaging in exchange with students in the formative stages of their design across the drawing board in the one-on-one situation, the critique may also serve to provide formative assessment. As the major site for studio teaching the one-on-one teaching at the drawing board is also a major site for critique, 5.

The second place for critique in the studio is in the context which largely produces the studio culture - the critique within small groups. When architectural educators refer to students "using the studio" or "jelling with the studio experience" they are not referring to the presence of students in the physical space, the studio, but to their willingness to participate in critical analysis with their peers, both proffering and receiving and responding to critique. This risk-taking behaviour, which may first be encountered in the studio, is not an easy step for students coming from a traditional secondary schooling based on didactic instruction and where success is often correlated with the ability to learn and reproduce

5. The consideration of the mode of critique proffered at the drawing board is not an area for significant consideration in this thesis. This has been decided for three reasons. The first is an acknowledgement of the extent of Schön's existing work about across-the-drawing-board critique in modelling reflection-in-action and therefore contributing to students' self-judgement. The second, and more important, which follows on from the extent of Schön's research is related to the relative lack of significant consideration for the educational role of critique in other than across-the-drawing-board contexts. The third relates to a background research finding (Ch. 1, p.23) that students in the surveyed group reported that across-the-drawing-board critique was less problematic for them in a number of ways than other critique contexts.
information, and the ability to operate various techniques of analysis and classification in a competitive examination situation (Macleod, 1992). Nor is it easy for students coming from other undergraduate studies which may not have addressed at all, nor in addressing, *emphasised*, the value of peer discussion and assessment. As Collier (1985) citing MacKenzie affirms:

> a student's colleagues often represent the least recognised, least used and possibly the most important of all the resources available to him [sic]. (p. 7)

The third use for critique in the architecture studio is as public critique with a small group (which may be tutor selected or self selected). This context differs from critique across the drawing board one-on-one or in small group discussion in that it is a critique context formally and publicly constituted by the tutor as part of the formative or summative assessment of students' designs. However, it is not uncommon for the public critique with a small group to serve the purpose of providing feedback to the students for the pursuance of their design development without formalising assessment outcomes. Nevertheless, although there is no *assessment mark* involved, the critique is *formative* to their design development.

The introduction of the description *public* is intended to flag the difference between the informal, small group discussions in the studio which are essentially elective, and the more formally constituted sessions with a small group and usually a tutor. Typically, these public critiques with a small group are convened at regular, intermediate periods during the design development stage, and are often called "intermediate pin-ups." At this time students will pin up their prepared intermediate designs, which they will describe and explain to the group as well as responding to the questions and concerns of the group members. This formative work will, after the *description*, and *clarification* part of the proceedings, be *critically analysed*, either by the tutor alone or by the tutor and the other members of the small group.

This is the first public airing of what may hitherto have been privately held, and otherwise publicly undisclosed, design. The critique of the work, in this context, takes place outside
the private domain of the one-on-one exchange across the drawing board or the exchange of critique within the studio culture of small group discussion. For this reason this critique assumes a different importance for the students, despite the (often) small size of the group and its constitution (i.e. membership and self- or tutor-selected status), as the critique of each student's design is carried out necessarily in the presence of others - and it is therefore public. It is also at this point, in a perceived hierarchy of critique as existing on a continuum from private through to public, that critique, no matter how gently, crosses the threshold from being an essentially private experience - as in self-critique, one-on-one across the drawing board critique, and self-selected small group discussion - to being an essentially public experience. It is at this point that critique also differs from most other forms of feedback to tertiary students on prepared, intermediate work in that the feedback is given *publicly* as opposed to *privately* as a comment in the margin of an essay or on the cover sheet of a tutorial paper (Anthony, 1991, 14). Macleod (1991) comments on this point that:

> There is another important characteristic of the studio teaching method which is sometimes overlooked; it is, for the students, exceedingly public in all its important aspects. The work is drawn, displayed, described, defended and possibly decried, in public. It is the subject of diverse, and sometimes contradictory expression of opinion. It is ruthlessly dissected, and is expected to be vigorously defended.

The fourth typical use of critique in the studio is as public critique with the whole-of-class. Often a whole-of-class critique is convened at the end of the design process as a means of enabling summative assessment and to provide substantial feedback to the whole class on the design project. The format for whole-of-class critique may follow that of the public critique with the small group: students will pin-up their finished (presentation) work, either individually or in the syndicates, in which they worked to produce the design. They may be given an opportunity to *describe* and *explain their intentions* and the means employed to achieve them, followed once again by a *clarification* period of general questions and comments eliciting further response from the students. This exchange is often referred to as

---

6. Collier defines a syndicate: "In a syndicate-based course a class of (say) 30 students is divided into 'syndicates' of 4–8 students, and the bulk of the work consists of a series of assignments carried out on a cooperative basis by the syndicates working as a team, for much of the time in the absence of the tutor." (Collier, 1985, 9)
"defence of their design" (Maitland, 1991; Dawson, 1992; Macleod, 1992), and is followed by critical analysis and feedback from the tutor or other critics, and possibly other members of the class. Whole-of-class critique is frequently justified on three grounds:

- that it is public;
- that the equity of the occasion is defensible;
- that it models presentation skills for professional practice.

However, whole of class critique poses significant difficulties which will be further elaborated in Chapters 4 and 5.

The final category of critique which is defined is that of critique occurring in the "jury" situation with a panel of experts. Whilst Anthony (1991) recalls the introduction of the jury system as we know it today as having its origins in the Ecole des Beaux Arts, she relates that the literature is unable to provide a clear account of the link between design "juries" and court-room juries. In describing the Ecole des Beaux Arts process by which students' work was judged, she paints a clear picture of the role, even today, of the design jury as sitting "in judgement" on students' work:

The jury system in design education can be traced back to its roots in the nineteenth century Ecole des Beaux Arts (School of Fine Arts) in Paris. At the Ecole, the design problem superseded the lecture as the primary method of teaching architecture. Learning by doing was stressed almost exclusively. The process of educating students in the design studio typically included a fixed curriculum where design study began upon entering school, students being divided into ateliers, or studios, led by a patron, or master; the use of the esquisse, an initial sketch solution to a problem that would be further developed; the tradition of the older students, or anciens, helping younger ones; the teaching of design by practicing architects; and the evaluation of projects by a jury. The students' fate ultimately rested "in the hands of the gods" - that is, jury members - who decided whether they passed or failed.

Students' completed design work was evaluated behind closed doors by a jury of design faculty. After the jury was over, students retrieved their work and noted their marks, usually with little or no comment from their instructors. (p. 9)

What the jury system of today has in common with its predecessor is likely to be its composition of "experts" drawn from the Faculty, or the profession, or a mixture of both, and the privacy in which the jury conducts its final deliberations. However, unlike the Ecole des Beaux Arts system where students were not able to make a presentation at all, the
jury situation today is either the public critique with a small group, or a public critique with the whole-of-class. There would usually be an opportunity for a student led description and student centred clarification process before the jury convened privately to critique the work. The "jury" critique is frequently associated with summative assessment for architecture students, particularly at the conclusion of their final year of study. In this sense it can be viewed as one of the rites of passage to the profession.

Summary

Critique lies near the core of architectural education when considered from the broad perspective outlined. As a teaching method in the core subject, architectural design, critique is employed extensively in situations from completely informal (one-on-one at the drawing board), to absolutely formal (the design "jury"), to provide instruction, to respond to the design ideas of the students, and to provide a forum for formative and summative assessment. The reciprocal nature of design teaching, based as it is in a studio situation, places heavy reliance on the students making explicit their design intentions, and following critique from the tutor or other critics, their responses to the critique. In this respect design instruction has not altered educationally from the inception of formal (i.e. non-apprenticed) design instruction in the Ecole des Beaux Arts in the nineteenth century.

In its commonly constituted forms:

- one-on-one at the drawing board;
- within small group discussion;
- as a public critique with a small group;
- as a public critique with the "whole-of-class"; and
- in the "jury" situation with a panel of experts

the centrality of critique to architectural education is not in dispute. The frequent practice of critique at all stages of the design process in situations ranging from informal to formal ensures that it remains a powerful force in the life of a student of architecture.
Critique is extensively used outside the architecture design studio in applied and fine arts education - in painting, sculpture, film-making and graphics classes and also in the performing arts as the primary means of teaching and assessing students' work particularly in a formative way. Its efficacy and continuance as an appropriate protocol for teaching, assessing and modelling professional behaviour is by no means limited to its use in the architecture studio. Therefore, whilst the breadth of address of this thesis is limited to an account of studio critique in architectural education, the narrative and discussion may encourage a reflective consideration of the use of critique in a broader context of education.

Mastery/Mystery

It is through critique one-on-one at the drawing board that the architecture student perceives the mastery of the subject of architectural design by the studio tutor. Argyris and Schon (1974) have utilised the expression "mastery/mystery" to explain the mastery of knowledge of design and designing by the tutor and the mystery with which the student views the "master's" apparent knowledge. The discrepancy of the knowledge base from which either party works is made more apparent in critique exchanges, at all levels of formality, than in didactic instruction which does not often focus on a concept which is put forward by the student but rather on a universal concept, or commonly owned fact or on an attributable knowledge or interpretation. Critique, therefore, in its teaching role, goes beyond describing the apparent (propositional) knowledge base of the tutor to defining the tutor as a 'master of design knowledge', and the student as in 'a state of mystery in relation to design knowledge'. This sense of the apparent powerlessness of the student in the situation is described in this quotation from Plato cited in Schon (1987). When Socrates induces Meno to admit that he has not the least idea what virtue is, Meno bursts out with this question:

But how will you look for something when you don't in the least know what it is? How on earth are you going to set something you don't know as the object of your search? To put it another way, even if you come right up against it, how will you know that what you have found is the thing you didn't know? (Plato, 1956, 128 cited in Schon 1987, 83)
A more contemporary text relating to 'mastery/mystery' is this poem sent to the Portsmouth School of Architecture after a research interview carried out by the Design Studies Group described by Powell (1987, 199). The poem expresses the paradox that will always exist between architects and information:

There is something I don't know
That I'm supposed to know
I don't know what it is I don't know
And yet am supposed to know.
And I feel I look stupid
If I seem I don't know it
And not to know what it is I don't know
Therefore, I pretend I know it.

This is nerve wracking
Since I don't know
What I must pretend to know
Therefore, I pretend to know everything.

I feel you know
What I'm supposed to know
But you can't tell me what it is
Because you don't know
That I don't know what it is.

You may know what I don't know,
But not that I don't know it,
And I can't tell you.

So you will have to tell me everything..........................
.......................... but in no more than five minutes per occasion. (Laing, 1970, 56)

Examples from teaching in Chapter 5 further describe the relationship between power, subjectivity and self-judgement, to argue that some students are resistant to the teacher's intentions with regard to dismantling taken-for-granted hierarchy because their view of themselves - their subjectivity - situates them as dependent on the teacher's authority to judge their own work.

Collier (1985) considers this dependency both from the stance of students and teachers. He writes about the prospect of a change of role for teachers that

[m]ost teachers in higher education have been taught on traditional lines, where the habitual assumption of both teachers and students is that the teacher has the authority to define the subject matter to be acquired and to reinforce this definition by his function as an examiner (Rudduck 1978; Powell 1981b; Black and Sparkes 1982). Students expect the teacher to act as instructor and their attitude is one of
dependence. Thus when a teacher tries to change his role he finds powerful resistances at work both within himself and in the students. Abercrombie quotes from transcripts of video recordings of teacher’s groups and of students to illustrate the intense pressure of expectation and habit both in teachers and students. (p. 8, my italics)

Collier (1985) continues that there are even greater self-expectations on the part of students to remain in a traditionally dependent role in relation to their teachers as

[students also have built-in assumptions about their hierarchical relations with their teachers, and the authority-dependency relationship is reflected in the expectation that the teacher will give such instruction, whether in lectures or discussions, as will ensure a pass in their examinations (Goldschmid and Goldschmid 1973; Abercrombie 1978; Rudduck 1978; Powell 1981b). It requires skill and self-restraint on the teacher’s part to establish a habit of student/student interaction. (p. 8)

As stated by Collier, it is very difficult to overcome the "mastery/mystery" cycle as many teachers and students are accustomed to, and cling to their familiar roles in relation to each other. Chapter 5 considers some teaching strategies aimed at disrupting existing power relationships within the studio - strategies directed towards overcoming resistances both within teachers, who are recast from "masters" to facilitators, and students, who are recast as adult learners, with an attendant expectation of self-direction, and who are learning in studios where the critique structure obviates the "mastery/mystery" cycle.

Background to the Research

To describe my research proposal I refer back to five years of teaching in a School of Architecture from 1987-1991 before I commenced my PhD research in 1992. I came to this part-time teaching in the School from more than ten years in architectural practice. Throughout the teaching, and PhD research, I have maintained my interest and involvement in practice work.

The School in which I taught and researched, to which I simply refer throughout the study as "the School", so as not to identify it, is the School of Architecture in one of the oldest Universities in Australia. The University has a proud tradition of scholarship, teaching and research, and would be considered by many as the premier University in its state. Graduates of the University have taken the highest positions in the land in the worlds of business,
politics, the judiciary and the church. Past scholars of the University have gained Nobel prizes, and this tradition of excellence in scholarship and research dominates.

The School has a central site on the city fringe campus of the University. The location of the School places it within 1 kilometre of the major cultural sites of the city - the Art Gallery, Natural History Museum, State Library, and Performing Arts Centre as well as at the hub of public transport. Its fringe location in the city places it adjacent to parklands and river, as well as University sponsored sports fields, tennis courts and gym. There is one other School of Architecture in the State, located almost adjacent to the School. Despite their proximity there is little exchange between the Schools due, in part, to their different histories, traditions and aspirations for their graduates.

Founded in 1959, the School now has an enrolment of about 260 students in two degrees. Students are enrolled in either the three year undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies, which "consists of core studies which deal with design, environmental and building topics together with electives," or the graduate Bachelor of Architecture degree which is "studio-based...project-oriented and concerned with the technical and practical matters of practice within a philosophical and theoretical context of professional ethics, aesthetics, design, management, and many other issues that concern practitioners."

The School has an academically competitive access policy to the undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree based on high school year 12 results, as well as several special entry programmes for mature age students, students from other first degree backgrounds, Aboriginal and Islander students, full fee paying (overseas) students (FFPOS) and students from schools which are considered disadvantaged. The enrolment demographics of the School are considered in detail in Shannon (1993) Report to the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture and Planning concerning Peter Ninnes (1993) Student Home Language and Participation in Undergraduate Degree Courses. In the report I summarised Ninnes'

---

recommendations pertaining to *Commencing and Continuing Students 1989-1991* in the Faculty of Architecture as follows:

There is a significant difference in the student profile [in the School] compared with the general [state] population. These differences relate to members of the Slavic, Mon-Khmer, Sino-Tibetan, Other European and Others language groups which have high participation rates. English Speaking Background [ESB] students are statistically under-represented in both degrees (p.28). In the Bachelor of Architectural Studies [degree] the Slavic and Sino-Tibetan groups have higher than expected participation; in the Bachelor of Architecture the Hellenic, Slavic, Sino-Tibetan and Semitic groups have substantially higher than expected participation rates (p.5,8).

There is a significantly lower than expected level of participation by female English speakers (37% of enrolments were women compared with expected enrolments of 51% [in line with the [state] population]), whilst there is no significant difference for other language groups, by sex, (p.7) except the All Others (non-European language) group where there is some evidence of over-representation by males (p.34).

The Full Fee Paying Overseas Students (FFPOS) were all males and were all enrolled in the BArch St. This is unsurprising considering the commencement of the FFPOS scheme in 1989 would have precluded any enrolments in this category in BArch. One can only speculate about the decision making of FFPOS parents contemplating a $14,000 p.a. commitment in that the enrolments were all male. Five of the FFPOS were from Sino-Tibetan language groups and one from All Others group.

The figures for 1992 and 1993 enrolments are given but not analysed. They show high participation by Sino-Tibetan, Romance, Slavic and Hellenic groups and low participation in 1992 (of 79%) and 1993 (of 65%) from English speaking groups [ESB]. In 1992 36% of ESB were women; in 1993 this figure had risen to 40%. (Shannon, June 1993, p.1)

My report included recommendations which stated that:

As a Faculty enrolling commencing and continuing students in patterns which are different from the University experience we will have to develop strategies for teaching and learning which reflect the knowledge that, in 1993, 35% of our students in total are enrolled from Language Other Than English [LOTE] backgrounds, and this percentage is rising.

In 1993 in the BArch degree 75% are ESB students of whom 55% are ESB males. The 25% LOTE students comprise 56% males; in the BArchSt degree 61% are ESB students of whom 63% are males. LOTE students in the BArchSt degree are represented by 60% males. We are enrolling proportionately more LOTE students and males than the University average. (Shannon, June 1993, p.2)

As a teacher I believed that the rapidly changing enrolment demographics of the School have had a major influence on the traditional expectations that students accepted for enrolment in the School would succeed by their own and the School’s standards. Through
survey work I explored the gap between the School's expectations and some students' ability to demonstrate skills, knowledge and understanding.

The gap is reflected in the results of a survey which I conducted with every student enrolled by the School of Architecture at the commencement of the PhD research in 1992 before any teaching had commenced for the year. The survey sought to uncover "base-line" results before this educational research project commenced in the School. The students were asked one question:

"As you enter the 1992 academic year, on behalf of the School of Architecture, I am keen to establish how you rate your own communication skills in a number of areas:
- oral communication skills,
- written language skills,
- graphic communication skills,
- computer modelling and
- physical model making skills."

A four point scale for self-assessment was used by all respondents.

1 Very confident
2 Confident
3 Not very confident
4 Not confident at all.

The results, indicated that the confidence expressed by those students commencing the first year of undergraduate studies in the Bachelor of Architectural Studies (B.Arch St) leading to a qualification which would permit enrolment in the professional Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch) course was generally higher than that of any other group in the B.Arch St or B.Arch enrolment across a broad range of oral, written, graphic, and computer and physical model making skills.

The apparent confidence with which these new undergraduates approached their studies that year was also generally higher than those who had received significant teaching in that curriculum area. This led me to consider the multiple factors which could be responsible for

8. When numbers are low (as a general rule when n < 20, although this does depend on other factors such as the overall size of the sample space) the use of inferential statistics to determine significant differences is usually inappropriate. This is quite problematic for this type of quantitative research where the small numbers of women in each year level place their results, no matter how useful otherwise, into a category where they cannot be statistically manipulated. This is a further reason for my decision to use qualitative research to understand the meaning of the statistics.
this apparent drop in confidence from commencement of their studies through to a period of a more advanced status in their studies towards becoming an architect. Three main hypotheses emerged.

The first was that up until the point of entry to University, the cohort of young University entrants (SATAC, 1992) had been formally taught the curriculum for the purpose of demonstrating to assessors their knowledge of any subject. This approach to learning may have encouraged a dependent, convergent learning style. This group of students, after an academically rigorous University selection procedure, had every reason to feel confident about undertaking tertiary education (Murray-Harvey and Keeves, 1994). The focus of the latter part of their secondary schooling was to adequately prepare them for success in undertaking higher education.

The second hypothesis is related to the possibility that the teaching/learning process in the tertiary institution had somehow modified their dependent, convergent approach to learning. Students well into their undergraduate or professional degree qualifications could possibly now see that there were no "right answers" in comparison with their University entrant peers, and that realisation had contributed to an apparent lowering of their confidence.

The third hypothesis concerned the possibility that the teaching and learning experiences the students had experienced during the first, and subsequent years of their education had somehow contributed to an apparent lowering in confidence. It is on the third of these possibilities that my research argument is focused. Some 1991 pilot studies asking students about their responses to various teaching/learning experiences encountered in the professional degree indicated that it may be through a close consideration of the studio critique, as the central vehicle for teaching, and formative and summative assessment, that some sense could be made of the responses to the "Why have students lost confidence through the years of learning?" question.
All students at the end of their first year of the professional degree Bachelor of Architecture in 1991 were asked:

"There are a variety of teaching/learning situations in the course. Can you rate these contexts in terms of whether you feel they have contributed to your confidence increasing or decreasing?"

A three point scale was used to record their responses.

+ confidence increased
0 no change
- confidence decreased

The results of this survey indicated that some students rated all critique contexts other than one-on-one across the drawing board as confidence decreasing. Most women related that the class and staff assessor focusing on her work was confidence decreasing, whereas most men did not. What can be derived from this survey is a knowledge that there are students, of both sexes, who found that many critique contexts contributed to decreasing their confidence. A focus for this current research began to develop as I linked together the notions that a diminution of confidence was suggested by some students only, and that with the exception of one-on-one at the drawing board critiques, some students reported a diminution of confidence in all other critique contexts.

This background work of 1991 and 1992 has not been considered in detail other than to inform further research questions as I have progressed from a consideration of the nature of critique as contributing to, or detracting from, the development of confidence to a broader consideration of the extent to which critique can contribute to developing students' sound judgement. The link between confidence, sound judgement and discrimination needs to be unpacked in order to understand one of the underlying premises of this thesis - that differently worked critique experiences could contribute to developing all students' sound judgement or that, as it is experienced in the School under observation and stated in the thesis statement, some existing critique experiences serve better the needs of some students than others. The underlying premise of the thesis concerning discrimination through certain critique practices relates to this early research in this way: there is an embedded research premise that if all critique practices contributed equally to developing confidence for all
students, and with that confidence the ability to take risks, to participate in giving and receiving critique, and to developing sound judgement for all students, there would be no possible thesis concerning discrimination. The thesis arises because the practices of critique are not perceived equally by all students.

This wider focus has developed partly from a recognition that educationally the practice of critique within design instruction has not changed effectively from its use in the Ecole des Beaux Arts despite considerable developments in understandings about how adults learn and how and why the development of all students may be facilitated in developing sound judgement of their own work within educational institutions where access and equity issues are a matter of concern. Furthermore, the development of confidence, I consider, is related to developing sound judgement in this way: acknowledged skill with self-judgement - as a necessary element of professional practice - promotes confidence in that the student knows that she is equipped with the means for decision making to evaluate her own, and others' work; the confidence to seek out criteria for judgement; the confidence to engage in the risk-taking required in public critique situations; and the confidence to give, and receive feedback. This enables the learner to move from a dependent, to an independent learning situation. One of the roles for critique is in the development, modelling and affirmation of that self-judgement. The Chapter 5 case studies will show that acknowledged skill with self-judgement promotes confidence by equipping students with the means for decision making which enables them, as learners, to move into an independent learning situation from a dependent learning situation. Such a move is a necessary element of preparation for professional practice, and preparation for life-long learning. Conversely, the narratives of Chapter 4 will show how the presence of a master critic pre-empts early attempts at self-judgement by some students, and underlines the implicit and often unwitting discrimination which is a feature of these critique sessions.

Definitions employed in the background research
At a macro-level "sound judgement" is used to define an accurate view of the multiple and always changing factors which combine in "responsible" architecture. Louise Cox, 1994-5 President of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, defines "responsible architecture" as "not merely to complete a building according to the determined technical and aesthetic parameters, but also be concerned about the long-term effect their building will have on the life of a city, suburb or community". This "responsible" view should also reflect the concerns of the various stakeholders in any building project - "the people who buy and use and live in the shadow of architects' products" (Robotham, 1994, 134).

"Access" is defined as the thrust of higher education institutions, in the current political, social and cultural environment, to provide open and accessible enrolment to students from many different ethnic, cultural, and learning backgrounds in contrast to the restrictive enrolment policies of previous decades which effectively ensured that the majority of students hailed from homes possessed of social and cultural capital.

"Equity" concerns the provision of equivalence of opportunities for students of both sex from diverse backgrounds once enrolled, to achieve their own educational goals.

**The Educational Context of Critique**

In this section some of the contemporary theories in higher education will be introduced as a basis for discussion in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 about the adequacy of current practices of critique in their roles as teaching, assessing and modelling professional skills.

Collier (1985) reviewed developments in teaching methods in higher education, with particular reference to research on small-group techniques. He commenced his analytical framework by reviewing the two intersecting frameworks of concepts on which his analysis is built. The first is from Bloom's (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives I: Cognitive Domain* which presents six categories in the classification of intended cognitive outcomes which are:
1. Knowledge (in the sense of discrete items closely similar to those originally encountered in learning)
2. Comprehension
3. Application (i.e. of learned principles in unfamiliar situations)
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation (Collier, 1985, 4)

The second is the pattern of changes in thinking about higher education which he describes as "the very significant shifts of perspectives and values, and hence of emphasis in thinking, that have taken place in this field in recent decades" and are listed as:

1. The definition of purposes (a greater precision in the definition of the intended results of higher education);
2. Individualized learning (a fuller provision for the disparities of learning capacity and style among individual students);
3. Depth or vitality of learning (a certain receptiveness and alertness of mind in the student...willing to question the assumptions underlying his own and other people's assumptions);
4. Practical judgment (a reorientation of courses towards the development of practical judgment, of 'capability' for handling the problems of daily life);
5. The discrimination of values (a more open exploration of value questions in higher education);
6. Skills of collaboration (Collier, 1985, 4-5)

His belief is that the thrust of the "new thinking" recorded is the force behind the recent developments in teaching methods, but regrets that "the shift of perspectives and values has been by no means universal", with "many practitioners continuing in previous habits" (p. 6). He then records that the well researched and often ultimately unsuccessful experimental efforts of educational researchers to penetrate the routines of higher education has caused a rethinking of the relationship between practitioners and innovators (or educational researchers) in terms of an encounter of cultures where the two groups differ "in respect of the web of perceptions, meanings, beliefs and values which constitute their 'culture'"(p. 6). His critical point here is that the "balance of emphasis among the various possible outcomes" depends on what is perceived to be the dominant culture in the institution at a given time and that tensions between the different cultures can be acute (p. 6).

Collier's retrospective and prospective view of recent teaching developments in higher education is never critical, in the sense of a critical theorist, in that he never relates
observed practices to underlying political and social forces which are constructing and
controlling the observed practices. However, he is clearly frustrated with the resistance to
change of entrenched practitioners against a background of thirty years of significant
findings in educational research from the time of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Chapter 3 will expand in detail on the use of a critical approach in this research. However,
in contrast to Collier's recognition of the hesitance of practitioners to adopt the findings of
current educational research in their teaching practices but his seeming unwillingness to
relate this hesitation to a broader critical stance, I have no such hesitation. It is my assertion
that in their frequent unwillingness to adopt the most effective teaching practices in critique,
architectural educators do three things:
1. fail to recognise that a most important role for critique in architectural education may be
that of empowering self-judgement and with it increasing students' confidence;
2. privilege the current make-up of the architectural profession (RAIA, 1992) particularly
through maintaining some critique practices, demonstrated by Anthony to be unproductive,
(Anthony, 1991, 236-243), which are oriented to the immediate needs of the profession for
graduating students equipped with certain immediately useful skills and knowledge (AAACA,
1993; Architects Board of the ACT, 1993). This suggested orientation in graduates to
existing professional values, is somewhat contradictory to:
   i. the current role of higher education institutions in providing education for life-long
learning as opposed to vocational "training";
   ii. the significant unemployment and underemployment of architects in their traditional role
in the architectural profession in this decade;
   iii. the knowledge that some critique practices, based in a culture which promotes the
worthiness of individual competition (the studio culture), are oppositional to the
acknowledged mode of co-operation which is the hallmark of many successful architectural
   iv. the recognition of the importance of self and peer-critique amongst successful students
3. Help to maintain the current make-up of the architectural profession with its overwhelming population by males from traditional backgrounds (RAIA: Committee on the Status of Women, 1991) by unwittingly engaging forms of critique which are counter-productive to the development of confidence and self-judgement in women.

My argument (Shannon, 1994d) in this regard attempts to explain why it is that women fail to register as architects in greater numbers than men relative to their proportion among graduates (by taking their Architects Accreditation Council of Australia (AACA) professional registration exams (Australian Practice Examinations (APE))). The reasons are many-fold, but one among many is the general lack of confidence, lack of will to succeed, and lack of a vision for how the profession could be differently shaped than at present, which this thesis describes is prevalent among many women graduands. This (negative) view, combines with structural difficulties which are exacerbated for women graduates (RAIA, 1992) to result in an widening gap between the number of women graduates and the number of women registrants, (Shannon, 1993; Shannon, 1994d).

Through showing that the central educational practice in architectural education - the critique - is not equitable for all students, and in particular is not equitable for

---

9. Until I gathered statistics in 1993 for the number of men, and women who successfully completed their AACA registration examinations which are conducted annually in every State and Territory of Australia, there had never been an attempt to determine the number of successful candidates for the Australian Practice Examination by gender. In fact the statistical compilation was not available by gender, and the State Registrars obliged me by manually compiling new lists which separated "Paul" and "Pauline". This is a perhaps trivial point until one considers that this information was considered unimportant in the annual statistical returns to the AACA. In comparing the number of potentially eligible female and male applicants, by looking at graduate numbers from Schools, a picture emerges of the differential application rate by women, and men. Furthermore, although Schools across Australia are now enrolling women in proportions now approaching 40% of enrollees, the number of female registrants is not increasing at such a rate which means that the "gap" is growing between female graduates and registrants because there are increasing numbers of female enrolments but relatively stable numbers of registrants. For example, in 1990, Australia wide 70% of graduates were male and 30% female; that year 82% of successful APE candidates were men and 18% were women. In 1991, Australia wide 63% of graduates were male and 37% female; that year 84% of successful APE candidates were men and 16% were women. A fuller picture of the requirements for the APE is painted in Shannon 1994d, along with an explanation of the relationship between in-school education, graduate experience requirements, and the APE.
women, this thesis will show how architectural educators may contribute (possibly unwittingly) towards the current predominantly male make-up of the architectural profession, both as design practitioners, and as teachers.

**Learner Centred Approaches**

This thesis will consider architectural studio-based critique from the position of the student, recognising the emergence of the learner-centred approach, focusing on the primacy of the learner's constitution of knowledge, and the centrality of the learner's experience in learning as an important focus in higher education. A learner-centred approach:

1. treats students as adults in their learning and taking the responsibility for learning;
2. gives students control over their own learning;
3. promotes the teacher's role as facilitating and promoting learning.

(Boud, Anderson and Sampson, 1992; Boud, 1991, 1990; Boud and Lublin, 1983a; Ramsden, 1992, 1988, 1985). Central to this agenda is the ability of students to develop sound judgement patterns through the curriculum and assessment tasks to:

> ultimately make decisions on criteria and performance which may of course be informed by statements from teachers, peers, professional practitioners and the appropriate literature. (Boud and Lublin, 1983a, 94)

This view of the centrality of self-judgement is supported by Macleod's belief that there are "certain essential ingredients of the design process" with "the centrality of judgment" at the top of his list (Macleod, 1992).

**The Relationship between Assessment and Learning**

Boud (1990), in his paper *Assessment and the Promotion of Academic Values*, says that there is an undisputed relationship between assessment and learning. He asserts that assessment tasks frequently encourage an instrumental approach to learning at the expense of critical thinking. Existing assessment practices emphasizing the staff controlling the aims and objectives, the assessment tasks, criteria for judgement, and the final outcomes of the
process may obstruct one of the common goals of higher education which is self-determination. Boud believes that

students should become autonomous learners who can take responsibility for their own learning – i.e. they are self determining. (p. 104)

through being encouraged to

develop the skills of learning how to learn, how to monitor their own work, how to establish their own criteria and how to make judgements about the worth of their achievements all of which are necessary elements of professional practice. (p. 104, my italics)

The major question arising out of his paper is whether current assessment practices exist to serve the needs of teaching or the needs of learning. Boud says that all the time teachers are thinking about assessment they need to be mapping it onto their experience of how they know actual professional processes happen and that so often they fail to consider higher education assessment in the way they would look at any other professional dealing.

We need to examine assessment tasks to see if they reflect adequately the decision making processes which are required of practitioners in any given domain of knowledge. (p. 108)

Boud places a strong emphasis on the importance of self-assessment and on the process of self-assessment and peer review with cycles of feedback and reworking until a satisfactory piece of work is produced as being an ideal simulation of professional practice.

Why it is timely to do this research

There are several reasons why it is timely to do this research. There is a need for research which more closely binds together the educational literature on teaching and learning with

10. See, for an exposition of teacher's theories and actions, Bowden, John 'Achieving Change in Teaching Practices' in Ramsden, Paul (1988) (ed.) Improving Learning: New Perspectives London: Kogan Page. Bowden, reviewed Fleming and Rutherford (1984) who considered "the generally negative reaction by academics to a set of 'Recommendations for Learning' arising from a recent British National Study into the Future of Higher Education (the 'Leverhulme Study')" resulted from the incompatibility of the academics' espoused theories, and their prevalent theories-in-use "which means their actions are both secretive and competitive; they seek control and power over both colleagues and students." (Bowden, 1988, 257)
the concept of critique: research that locates critique in educational theory. There is a need for research which looks closely at the response of people from different backgrounds to the experience of critique; and there is a need to examine the thesis that critique, in its present forms, sometimes discriminates against women. This concern derives from a knowledge that architecture students are enrolled from a variety of social, cultural, educational and learning style backgrounds (Shannon, 1993); backgrounds which are not always acknowledged in the complex, and sometimes contradictory roles of critique in teaching, assessment and socialising students into the dominant *habitus* of the profession. There is a need for research which show-cases critique considered from a learner-centred approach, one which focuses on a central, and hitherto largely overlooked, role for critique - that of empowering self-judgement and developing students' confidence equally for all students.

In summary, there is a need for research which, from the rather negative basis of demonstrating some of the ways in which discrimination can, and does happen in critique sessions, proposes, and develops in the researcher's and others' teaching (see Chapter 5) context specific models for architectural studio-based critique which better reflect the changing needs of the student group as adult, life-long learners.

**What this research sets out to do**

In this thesis I will examine the place of critique in teaching and learning in architecture. The thesis will consider the centrality of critique to the studio experience, and the centrality of the studio experience to an architectural education as a means of understanding how students can be empowered through their education. Students are empowered when there are certain changes in the critique experience which include overturning the 'mastery/mystery' cycle and when notions of hierarchical power are examined and overturned, both by teachers and students.

---

11. *Habitus* is used to define that mode of perception, of thinking, of appreciation and action which is the dominant mode associated with any given collectivity (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977 in Churchman, 1992).
The purpose of this study is to relate how studio-based critique in architectural education could be linked to the development of students' self-judgement, thereby promoting the reflective use of critique by students and educators. The purpose of the study (which is further elaborated on pages 2-4) concerns the question: how do educational practices influence students' developing abilities in self-judgement? It is my assertion that some critique practices, particularly whole-of-class critique, exist to serve the needs of teaching (in its role as an assessment and feedback task whole-of-class critique is possibly quite efficient for the teacher) and the perceived needs of the profession ("a degree of toughness is a necessary development in the persona of the student" (Macleod, 1992)), denying students the opportunity to participate in forms of assessment which develop skills which are "necessary elements of professional practice" (Boud, 1990, 104). Nowhere in the current practice of studio critique is the role of self-assessment significantly encouraged as a central concept for critique, given the importance of skills of judgement for designers in assessing both their own, and others' work.

Schon (1983, 1987) has strongly linked one-on-one across the drawing board critique to notions of reflection-in-action and to the basis of professional practice being grounded in the ability of practitioners to reflect-in-action. Boud (1990) has supported the notion of accurate self-assessment being fundamental to all aspects of learning and has asserted that assessment by peers, staff and expert practitioners is essential in assisting learners to form sound judgements. What is not discussed in the architectural literature on critique, and seems to have been outside the scope of Anthony's recent study on design juries, is the question of whether critique, in its varied practices encourages, supports, and promotes the acquisition of self-judgement or whether critique sometimes undermines existing confidence and discriminates against some students. Whilst Anthony and Dinham have both considered the critique in their research, and their work will comprise one of the two major foci for the Literature Review in Chapter 2, the work of this thesis is firstly to show the student's perspective on the studio learning environment to uncover how critique discriminates against some students and secondly to show-case some critique alternatives which have as their purpose the building of students' judgement.
Summary

This thesis will show that many critique practices undermine students' confidence in their own judgements to the extent that students cannot relate the critique they have received to their critical thinking, thence to action in the iterative and reiterative cycle that Boud (1990) espouses as central to the use of self-assessment and peer review in the production of a piece of satisfactory work. This thesis will show that this undermining of students' confidence does not happen equally for all students, and that women suffer more in the public aspect of critique as they struggle to maintain an outwardly confident persona whilst publicly receiving potentially negative critique. When critics lose sight of the learning outcomes of critique and promote critiquing practices which are not equally empowering to all students in the development of their skills of self-judgement and self-assessment those students' needs are not being met. In the context of this research I call this process discrimination.

Through the students' voices in the following texts, I show how critique, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessing and socialising students into the profession, sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women, through disallowing opportunities for them to develop and demonstrate sound self-judgement.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study is to provide an insightful text relating studio-based critique in architectural education to developing students' self-judgement, and thereby to promote a more effective use of critique by students and educators. It is argued that critique in its many forms many be disempowering, and sometimes discriminatory to some students, particularly women.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The major published text on studio critique is Anthony's 1991 book: Design juries on trial: the renaissance of the design studio which presents the first substantive, empirical research on the subject. Prior to the publication of this book, there had been some discussion about criticism in the context of studio based education in Architectural Record in the 1980s. In particular Rapoport brought forth a considerable response to his view "that the studio is nothing but one method of teaching (and learning) among many others" (Rapoport, 1984, 103). He further confronted the mainstream expectations of architectural education with his view as a teacher that:

One of the things wrong with most schools of architecture and which affects the profession is the absence of scholarship, research and publication compared with other disciplines. Part of the reason for this is lack of time - what little is done is often in one's own time. One can only do scholarly work if there is uninterrupted time for it - and that can only happen if that most wasteful method for teaching, in terms of time - the studio - is reduced. One does not have time to sit around with students, do desk crits, repeat the same thing to each student, go through project after project in juries, again repeating the same thing, and deal with trivial subjective matters that cannot be judged (p. 103).

Rapoport's "heretical" comments about the dominance of the design studio in teaching were taken up in the same issue by his colleague Beckley who believed, to the contrary, that studio teaching should remain part of the curriculum and that, in summary:

---

1. Unpublished texts on critique include:
   Unpublished manuscript, Department of Architecture, University of California, Berkeley.
   Hassid, Sami (1960) Interest Distribution in the Evaluation of Architectural Design
   Paper presented at the Faculty Seminar on Architectural Research, Department of Architecture, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

2. Rapoport was well aware that his remarks would be seen as a heresy. He wrote:

   The following remarks may be seen as heretical since they question the most central characteristic feature of architectural education - the design studio.(p. 102)
Architectural studio education produces holistic thinkers. It also tends to produce people capable of solving problems that have not yet been identified. (Beckley, 1984, 105)

The matter did not rest there. Hurtt (1985) "read with interest and a mounting sense of rage" Rapoport's and Beckley's essays (p. 49). In particular, in countering Rapoport's commentary about architectural criticism that it is "hardly the subjective and personal phenomenon that Rapoport finds it to be" (p. 49) Hurtt comments on his view of the nature of criticism:

But it [criticism] is not personal or subjective except to the extent that it is known by the teacher and possibly as yet unknown to the student. The critic is obliged to place his criticism within the framework of a knowledge base available to the student. Velling that knowledge is anti-academic and less than honest. (Hurtt, 1985, 49)

Although criticism was not the focus of Schon's books The Reflective Practitioner (1983), The Design Studio (1985) and Educating the Reflective Practitioner (1987) the concept of a reflective conversation between the designer and the design born in these books has at its base the notion of the iterative quality of design responding to criticism received and being submitted for further critique. Whilst Schon largely focuses his interest on the 'desk crit' and in the development of the reflective conversation of a student Petra with her design tutor Quist, Schon also develops an argument in The Reflective Practitioner that confidence and competence are inextricably linked, as are credibility and commitment.

Confidence and competence are closely tied together... Credibility, commitment, confidence and competence are interdependent, in this sense: "The more credibility I have, the more confident I can be." "The more confident I am, the more confident I appear." "The more confident I appear, the more I am seen as credible and competent." (Schon, 1983, 161)

I will return to the relationship between confidence and the critique process in Chapter 4.

Schon's published work had grown out of Porter and Kilbridge's (1978) general study to which he and Argyris had submitted. In Argyris' paper the expression "mastery/mystery" was used for the first time to describe the difference between the knowledge of the studio master and that of the novice student. Notions of developed skill at self-judgment and a
knowledge base against which to appraise one's own design attempts were implicit in the students' ability to attain mastery of the subject.

In the U.K. at the same time there was discussion of criticism in architecture schools (Hall Jones, 1992), led perhaps by the irreverent account of Pawley (1975) *My Lovely Student Life* in Gowan (1975) *A Continuing Experiment: Learning and Teaching at the Architectural Association* which was taken up by Anthony (1991) who selected an emotive quotation from it to commence her book:

> At one crit during my fourth year at the AA [Architectural Association in London] a student collapsed while his project was being energetically ridiculed by a visiting critic. The critic did not notice this event until a dreadful silence caused him to turn around some moments later. At Oxford girl students sometimes had to burst into tears and lock themselves in the lavatories, under similar circumstances...At the Beaux-Arts some students had committed suicide. My own route, as you have gathered, was to go mad. (Anthony, 1991,1)

With the exception of these instances of educators and students considering critique there was, for a process absolutely central to architectural education, surprisingly little discussion and critique of architectural critique until the publication of Anthony's research in 1991.

**The Major Text: Kathryn Anthony (1991) *Design juries on trial: the renaissance of the design studio***

Anthony believes that juries have not hitherto been questioned, studied in detail and evaluated because they "remain the taboo topic of design education and practice, that sacred turf upon which one dare not walk" (p. 4). Her explanation accounts in part for the surprising lack of writing on the crit during the 1960s and 1970s (Hall Jones, 1992). Anthony's book is an expose of design juries as they are practised today across the U.S., and indeed, she asserts, in the English-speaking world; and is intended to be instrumental both for students, architectural educators and practitioners in changing jury practices. Her aims and objectives for the study are explicated in the Introduction as being:

> to improve the quality of the studio experience both in school and in the office, and to inject greater sensitivity and objectivity into this emotionally charged process
and to:

speculate about how the improvement of design juries might, in the process, help improve the image of the design professions to society at large. (p. 7)

As a result of trying to serve these many needs, of necessity the book speaks in different voices at different times. Educators may be dismissive of the entire volume because they are dismissive of her focus on instrumental study skills tips, the seeming validation given to the concept of the "star" system (Scott Brown, 1990) by employing it in the book whilst criticizing it in the text, and the promotion of current, destructive jury practices by their support from some of the interviewed "stars". Such dismissal denies the validity of the important central focus of her argument "What's wrong with the jury system?" which she diagnoses as "chaos" by the symptoms of students feeling "distraught, angry and humiliated over their own poor performance and loss of control at the jury"; by students not attending to the criticism of other students work; and by critics "handing out" criticism which is rude, insensitive and personal. She recalls that whilst there is no systematic instruction for students in how to "get through this gruelling emotional experience", nevertheless the "grades in design courses usually depend on their jury performance". For the other group participating in the jury - the staff or visiting critics - there is no training or instruction in how to conduct jury sessions. All too often, she asserts, there is a reliance on the techniques used when the jurors themselves were being educated. Furthermore, the hidden agenda of the jury is that the staff and visiting jurors are often more concerned about how their peers will respond to their criticism than the response of the student.

Anthony defines her view of juries as that in which:

3. The "star system", as it is frequently called in the U.S., refers to the elevation of a few designers to stellar heights as "stars, authority figures and role models" (Anthony, 1991, 165) for students and other members of the profession alike. Anthony discusses that the "star system in the professions has long been a galaxy full of men", excluding people of colour (Anthony, 1991, 165). Denise Scott Brown, writing of her personal and professional association with Robert Venturi, a "star", declares that "[t]he star system, which sees the firm as a pyramid with a Designer [Venturi] on top, has little to do with today's complex relations in architecture and construction. But, as sexism defines me as a scribe, typist, and photographer to my husband, so the star system defines our associates as 'second bananas' and our staff as pencils" (Scott Brown, 1990).
[Students present their completed design work one by one in front of a group of faculty, visiting professionals, their classmates, and interested passers-by. Faculty and critics publicly critique each project spontaneously, and students are asked to defend their work. (p. 3)]

She reports the expression "jury" as being synonymous with the procedure referred to in other places as reviews or critiques but thereafter adopts the use of the expression jury throughout the volume. There are at least five main situations as described in Chapter 1, Introduction in which architectural critique is employed in a studio-based architectural education, and the jury situation as Anthony has defined it is but one of these situations. Anthony's definition has something in common with the fourth and fifth categories of critique which have been identified in the Introduction as: public critique with the whole of class and critique occurring in the "jury" situation with a panel of experts. For this reason Anthony's work does not address many of the issues raised in Chapter 1, Introduction because she mainly focuses on the most public end of the critique continuum. It stands to reason, then, that her main arguments about its shortfalls are related to the publicness of the experience: the lack of preparation (for public speaking) and anxiety (about public speaking) of students preventing them from deriving maximum benefit from their jury experiences, and even occasionally resulting in their sense of public humiliation.

However, within her stated breadth of address, this is an excellent guide for practitioners teaching in design as well as for students. Being intensely readable and given its commercial publication, and presumed wide-spread distribution amongst architectural educators and students, it has a significant potential to influence thinking about the jury system and more generally thinking about criticism in an architectural education.

In summary,
- it is the first, major published text on the jury system;
- it presents empirical, substantive research findings;

4. Patrick Quinn, Education Roundtable member, reported in Kliment (1991) 'Panelists at A.R.'s Education Roundtable take a frank look at the future of the architects' education', Architectural Record, July 1991: "In the last twenty years the idea of review has replaced the idea of jury in many schools, claimed Quinn. The review is a learning experience, with the faculty involved, and maybe visitors." (p. 190)
- it is intended to be instrumental in changing jury practices for students, architectural educators, and practitioners;
- its commercial publication will facilitate its widespread distribution.

The central thesis of Anthony's scrutiny of the jury system is that the jury system is embedded in the studio culture - a culture which to the casual observer is co-operative but which is based on fierce and relentless competition between students. This location within the studio culture validates the continued presence and activities of the jury despite the evidence that the jury can be destructive and counter-productive. Anthony considers the difference in jury experiences for students from different backgrounds but the focus of her research was not on possible discrimination between students based on their response to the jury situations she investigated. In her later work with Ahrentzen (Ahrentzen and Anthony, 1993) gendered educational practices, including those of the jury through reference to other published studies of how instructors spend their time differently with men and women, are considered.

Much of what Anthony encountered in conducting the surveys which form the data for her book has its origins in the history and tradition of the design jury: a history and tradition which has endured relatively unquestioned from the Beaux Arts, when a 'student' was invariably a 'male student'.

The Historical Context of the Design Jury

As described in Chapter 1: Introduction, Anthony traces the jury system in design education back to its origins in the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris in the nineteenth century where the jury was an inspection of esquisses [sketch designs] by a jury "processing down the rows like royalty inspecting adolescent militants" (Dunster, 1966, 1365 cited by Hall Jones, 1992, 4). In the Ecole there was an emphasis on:

producing a solution rather than solving a problem; the educational philosophy stressed product rather than process. (Anthony, 1991,23)
Dunster expresses a stronger opinion that "for each scheme there is little discussion, simply pass, fail, credit. The myth of rational judgment of an art-architecture work is here acknowledged, and because no lengthy discussion takes place, all schemes can be assessed in the same day by the same people" (Dunster, 1966, 1365 cited by Hall Jones, 1992, 4).

Whilst Anthony refrains from discussion about the origin of the legalistic analogy "jury", and indicates that the literature provides "no clear answer", it is tempting to speculate that it is in the power of the court-room jury to produce an outcome - a result, a finding, a pronouncement - on the fate of the case (the design) under scrutiny that the court-room jury’s operation is mirrored by that of a design jury whose role is to ultimately make a pronouncement - a verdict (summative assessment) from the evidence produced (the product), not from hearsay or idle speculation about intent (the process). What Anthony does offer is the criticism that:

the term jury conjures up images of a hierarchical relationship where an individual is on trial in front of others who stand in judgment. By today’s standards, this is indeed a questionable image for an educational exchange. (p. 9)

The design jury concept crossed the Atlantic at the turn of the century, and gained a firm foothold in the education of American architects by the 1930s due to the increasing importance of the design studio in the curriculum and the influence of Beaux Arts trained American and French staff in American and Canadian design schools. Originally the American versions of design juries owed much to their practice in the Ecole as many American schools, ateliers, and architectural clubs were affiliated with the New York based Beaux-Arts Institute of Design (BAID) which could, in instances where the school relied upon it entirely, issue design programs and conduct the evaluation.

Anthony reports that there was contemporary criticism of the BAID for two reasons. Firstly, the programs were "the hurried efforts of busy practitioners" (p. 10) which often made little attempt to fit into the design curriculum, and that the programs, arriving "like a revelation from an architectural heaven with whose mysterious workings he [the student] has no concern"(p. 10) failed to encourage an appreciation of the realities of design practice
where the work often involves co-operative brief formulation and writing with the client. Secondly, there was intense competition not only within, but between schools, for the awards of the BAID which led to unhealthy staff competition through their students.

Anthony asserts that the concept of the design studio was even more strengthened in its conceptualisation when the influence of the Ecole des Beaux Arts was superseded by the influence of the Bauhaus on teaching methods in North American Schools of Architecture with the appointment of Walter Gropius, the founder of the Bauhaus, as the Head of the Architecture Department at Harvard (1938-1952). She says that the literature does not reveal, for all the Bauhaus' impact on design education, that there were any significant changes to the jury system. Then, as in the education influenced by the BAID, design juries were conducted *privately*, without the presence of the students.

One of the outcomes of closed juries was that the reasoning behind the grades awarded was rarely discussed, asserts Anthony, who goes on to say that there was a critical point in the history of design juries when they "went public, that is, when they switched from a closed to an open format" (p. 11).

Whilst Anthony theorises about the trends which may have led to the gradual opening up of juries from the late 1940s until the 1960s, she says that there is little documentation to support her theories. The move may have been part of a greater responsibility of institutions towards enrolled returned servicemen - to provide them with some feedback about their work as opposed to just returning it to them with a mark in the border - and that this, in turn, was part of a larger trend in education to accountability to individuals. She is nevertheless able to report that the origins of the practice, which remains today, for architectural educators to compete with each other to see who can attract the most prestigious jurors was developing at this time, as juries gradually became public, of their role as a "barometer by which one could judge the intellectual rigour of a particular school" (p. 11). She recalls that it was not uncommon for students to sit in on jury sessions at different schools as part of their selection process for an appropriate graduate school.
Anthony concludes this detailed historical overview by saying that

[i]n sharp contrast to the original Beaux Arts design juries, this new era of juries is perhaps best characterized by their extremely open, public nature. Students orally present their work one by one before a design jury, who then evaluate their work on the spot in front of the rest of the class. Even the casual passer-by, a total stranger, can listen to virtually every ounce of criticism delivered to a student in a jury. Juries generally last several hours. While at some schools juries are held over several days, in extreme cases they can extend into marathon sessions of eight hours or more at a time. More typical is a jury of about three to four hours long. This process has remained relatively unchanged for decades, albeit with isolated exceptions at a handful of schools. (p. 11)

Her new definition for a design jury positions it as being closer to public critique with the whole-of-class, which I have defined in the context of studio critique in the Introduction, than the critique occurring in a "jury" situation with a panel of experts.

The Educational Context for the Design Jury

In the Introduction there is reference to Anthony’s view of the studio subculture arising more as a social outcome from the long hours architecture students spend in the studio together, (unnaturally, she claims) than from any great desire to share knowledge with one’s peers. She then likens design juries to a "rite of passage" within the studio culture - "designed either to make or break you" (p. 12). She further defines the cultural nature of the design studio by acknowledging that the other agenda of the design studio is in "transmitting to students the basic value systems and ethics of the profession" (p. 12).

She describes the continuum of criticism delivered in the design studio as ranging from the most private - "the desk crit" - a private meeting between the student and the instructor, through to "the jury" as the most public, delivering praise or admonishment in front of one’s classmates, as being little different from criticism in elementary schools. However, Anthony asserts, unlike criticism in elementary schools which emphasises the positive aspects of students' behaviour, the findings of her research indicate that:

students overwhelmingly report that criticism at juries, and to a lesser extent at desk crits, is weighted heavily toward the negative. (p. 13)
It is, she asserts, the emphasis on negative criticism, in contrast to the emphasis on praise which characterizes earlier schooling, which makes the introduction to design education for the new student that much harder. This provides some corroboration for my view that it is in the teaching/learning experiences that the answer to the "why have students lost confidence through the years of learning" question may be answered in a consideration of the nature of the processes engaged in critique and the studio.

Introducing her theme of comparing the lot of design students with their peers in higher education, Anthony says there is a distinct contrast between the process of execution of a design project which is intensely dialogical and interactive and the process of preparation of "the term paper" or "the final exam" in terms of the essentially singular and solitary nature of other students' work. Turning to the comparison of the treatment of the product once again the two groups differ substantially in that design students' work is publicly displayed whereas other students' work is privately submitted. In fact, in examination situations knowledge of another student's work constitutes cheating and attracts severe penalties. The contrast continues during a consideration of the method of evaluation which for design students is exceedingly public, through the jury's comments, whereas for other students it is a private and personal happening. She concludes by saying that there are aspects of a design education - notably the individual teaching, the studio camaraderie, the opportunity for students' work to be considered from multiple viewpoints, and the rapidity with which feedback is given - which have been argued (Macleod, 1992) to be preferable to other (standard) methods, but she sets these possible advantages against the possibility that students can be overwhelmed by the amount of contact with staff and other students, confused by multiple viewpoints and feel "short-changed by the realisation that weeks' worth of work are evaluated in only a few short minutes" (p. 14).

Whilst this is the extent of Anthony's critique of the design jury in an educational context, in her few pages devoted to this theme she has raised, or touched on, several points which will be greatly expanded in the latter part of the literature review - points such as the out-of-step nature of critique in comparison with the techniques used in the assessment of
adequate process and product in other professional courses and general studies in higher education, and the overwhelmingly public nature of an education in design in comparison with an education elsewhere in a higher education institution.

Design Juries in Comparison with other forms of Teaching, Evaluation and Socialisation.

In comparing design juries with a number of other training, professional education or work cultures, Anthony emphasises the peculiarities of studio-based architectural education. In comparing design juries with sports training she alludes to the similarities between the studio culture and the relationships within a sports team, likening the studio tutor to a 'coach' in the attempts they both make to get the best from their 'team', and contrasting the role of the 'coach' in using a "you can win" type of positive encouragement with the likely effect of the negative criticism she found was commonly employed in the studio.

It is here that Anthony first introduces what becomes, in the recommendations resulting from her research, her key text: Kohn (1986) No Contest: The Case Against Competition. She reports that Kohn draws a distinction between intergroup competition among groups, for example between Schools of Architecture for awards, and intragroup competition among individuals within a group, for example between students in the design studio, which demands individual excellence. Kohn claims that the three ways to achieve goals within a culture which demands individual excellence are:

- competitively - working against others
- cooperatively - working with others
- independently - working alone, without relation to others.

Anthony identifies the rarity of opportunities for students in the design studio to demonstrate excellence working cooperatively (i.e. in team projects) for, as Kohn

expresses, working cooperatively is not confined to sitting together, talking together and sharing materials but that

successful completion of a task depends on each student and therefore that each has an incentive to want the other(s) to succeed. (Anthony, 1991, 16)

Anthony believes that this ideal is rarely achieved in the design studio, stating that

[although the design studio gives the illusion of a cooperative setting, students' rewards are based on independent rather than collective performances. (Anthony, 1991, 16)

Anthony concludes her comparison with sports training and military training by saying that men rather than women are likely to feel comfortable with this culture of fierce competition and with the oft used metaphors of design tutors likening the studio class to a (sports) team or an intake of 'rookies' who need to be 'drilled'.

There is support amongst feminist architectural writers for this point. Vytelcil (1990), writing about the important role for skills of collaboration for women in the architecture studio being at odds with the established studio culture, says:

In architectural education, then, the intuitive and self developmental processes of learning design would appear to create a fundamental conflict for women between a motivation for individual achievement and a concern for cooperative relationships and responsibilities. (Vytelcil, 1990)

When turning her attention to a comparison of the architectural design jury with their counterparts in the fine arts, Anthony finds a great similarity between the public review to evaluate student performance and the design jury. In looking at professional training in medicine she finds that the studio in the design fields can best be compared with the internship in a teaching hospital. In terms of the level of physical input required there are similarities, and similar justifications for the expectations as were expounded in the belief that jurors modelled their practices on those which they endured: "If I went through it so can you." However, when looking at the primary focus of the internship - the maintenance of a close relationship between the future doctor and the patient - there is a divergence from the common experience of the design student who has almost no contact with clients.
Looking further at the method of assessment used to evaluate the competency of the future doctor, Anthony lists the variety of forms of evaluation used that Dinham and Stritter (1986) list which she says compare medicine favourably with the ideal where students need information from "multiple sources - self, peers, patients and clients, and instructors" - in order to compare themselves with a standard. Dinham and Stritter (1986) expand this evaluation concept into:

(1) a clearly established purpose for the evaluation
(2) clear performance standards
(3) validity, reliability, and practicality of the system
(4) training for evaluators to reduce misunderstanding and increase reliability
(5) a variety of approaches assuming that no single method will provide all the information necessary.

(Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 961)

Anthony concludes that whilst the routine use of different modes of evaluation in assessment of student performance in the health professions meet these criteria, evaluation of student performance in the design professions fails on almost every category.

In her consideration of legal education, Anthony finds some of the same problems identified as being endemic in the design jury in the tension experienced by law students involved in the Socratic teaching method. The destructiveness of legal education makes its graduates "increasingly insensitive and less compassionate towards others", and there is monotony of the continual reliance on case studies. However, in contrast to the almost universally ignored status of communication studies in the education of design students (Tsow and Beamer, 1987), Anthony acknowledges that in a legal education, in deference to the recognition that "developing strong rhetorical skills and a sharp command of the language have long been considered key ingredients of success", these skills are emphasized and taught by staff, who, themselves, once again in contrast with the majority of design staff, have undertaken formal training "aimed at helping new faculty members become good teachers" (p. 19).

Through her consideration of medicine, the law, sports and military training Anthony emphasises the out-of-step nature of studio-based architectural education, and in particular
the heavy reliance on the jury as the sole means of assessment and feedback. She seeks to explicate the peculiarities of the design jury.

**The Psychology and Sociology of Design Juries**

In the last section of her Part 1 *An Overview Of Design Juries* Anthony turns to sociology and psychology for a deeper understanding of design juries. She holds that it is the "charisma" of design tutors which explains the disciple-like behaviour of their students (although prudently offering other plausible explanations such as "fear, desperation and sheer dedication" and then down playing them by asserting that they are all in the nature of discipleship), and the "cultish" worship of design gurus by the profession upon which this student behaviour is modelled. Anthony says that charismatic figures have great authority which she uses to explain the behaviour peculiar to architecture students:

- fear of being thought lazy or uncommitted *motivating all night sessions in the studio*
- fear of humiliation, or of being proven wrong *preventing students from engaging in dialogue with tutors or jurors.*

She cites the origin of this behaviour in the modelling of the existing relationships between more senior or powerful members of the profession and more junior, or less powerful members.

Argyris (1991) concurs with Anthony's surmise about the *fear of humiliation* or of being proven wrong preventing students from engaging in dialogue with tutors or jurors and would go even further than this to say that it is the *defensive* nature of this behaviour that prevents students from really learning in the exchange with tutors and juries. Defensive reasoning can block learning, he says, even when the individual commitment to learning is high.

Anthony believes that one of the most powerful forms of authority is paternalism, and raises the following relevant points: that paternalism is a current running strongly through
the profession and design education *although it is rarely discussed* (and this thesis asserts that this is not unexpected in a largely male-dominated profession); and that upon graduation the architects' worth is considered in a currency which places employment with leading practitioners as the ultimate goal. Anthony concludes by saying that it may be a consideration of the role of patriarchy and the "unquestioned authority of the studio master" that "helps shed some light on why the design studio has become a mysterious, curious world all its own" and "provides partial explanations of some otherwise puzzling phenomena: the prominence of a distinct hierarchy in the studio with students at the bottom and jurors at the top; the unusual reverence and placement of the professor or top designer "upon a pedestal"; why jurors' comments usually remain unquestioned; and the sense of isolation that design students experience from the rest of the university" (p. 23).

It is the assertion of this thesis that through changes to the critique experience, which will be discussed in Chapter 5, students' ability to develop sound judgement of their own work may be empowered. The contention arising from the work of Argyris and Anthony is that a lesser reliance on 'mastery' judgement may also reduce the prospect of 'losing face' or 'humiliation' and therefore challenges the generally unchallenged prominent and distinct hierarchy in the studio.

In later work (Ahrentzen and Anthony, 1993) the gendered nature of 'mastery' is raised - Ahrentzen and Anthony refer to the 'mister-mastery-mystery' phenomenon to assert that there is a reinforcement of the mastery of men in prestigious, upper level studios, almost always taught by men, in which students have a "highly patriarchal" master-apprentice model reinforced (p.16). Here in this later work Ahrentzen and Anthony begin to differentiate the jury experiences of women, and men: differences which were not separately documented by Anthony (1991) in many of her survey questions. Furthermore, and adding weight to my gathering argument that Anthony's careful survey work necessarily disguised much discrimination and unevenness of experience for individual learners, is her overwhelming respondent majority of male, European students. This, she says, is difficult to avoid when men are in the majority, and minorities are under-
represented. My argument, developed further in Chapters 3 and 4, is that it is as useful to look at the individual experiences of students regarding their response to critique, as a means of changing action through self-reflection, as it is to consider survey responses from hundreds of students. Although this builds a useful macro-picture, it does not illuminate the lived experience of students which is so useful to pin-pointing where, and how, discrimination happens - as differentiated from how much it happens.

Survey Outcomes

In Part 2 *Research About Design Juries* Anthony details the survey outcomes from her research which show that staff, students and practitioners view differently the purposes and goals of juries. Summarizing these disparities she concludes by saying that:

*A fundamental flaw of the traditional jury system, then, is that its goals are rarely spelled out, and to make matters worse, faculty, practitioners, and students have widely differing opinions about what they believe juries ought to accomplish. It is not surprising that juries often result in chaos and confusion.* (p. 31-32)

She introduces a major assertion of her book here: *that juries may be trying to accomplish too much* and that the plurality of viewpoints about the goals of juries should be turned to an advantage by openly discussing and reaching a consensus on the purpose to which a particular jury would be put.

Following her theme of the *How Do Students, Faculty, and Practitioners View Design Juries?* Anthony introduces further survey results about the best and worst design jury attended by the survey respondents to reveal that the features characterizing the *best* jury experiences for students are:

- those where students believe they actually learn something that can help them become better designers;
- a balance between positive and negative criticism;
- specific and constructive criticism;
- jurors pin-point where their designs are strong, or weak, and what would help improve them;
- those where the students become actively involved in the process;
- those which provide an opportunity for the students to discuss their work with critics and peers;
- juries using unusual or innovative techniques.

By contrast students' worst jury experiences are typified by:
- strong threads of negativity delivered in a heavy-handed way (undiplomatically, condescendingly and insensitively) and in large doses; and
- boredom.

In surveying students about aspects of their design education to ascertain "How satisfied are they with their design education in general?" the results showed that juries are the greatest source of student dissatisfaction. Undergraduates were slightly less satisfied than graduates with several aspects of architectural education, including design juries; and women were consistently more dissatisfied than men with every aspect of their design education. Summarising the results from multiple sources (student surveys, student diaries, interviews with students, faculty and practitioners) interim (or intermediate) juries were found to be more effective as a learning technique than final juries and were seen to serve many useful purposes, whereas the educational value (their primary purpose for existence as expounded by the students) of final juries "appears to be minimal at best" (p. 35). Anthony contrasts the learning experience of the jury with other learning opportunities to show that students reported learning the least
- from criticism of their own and other students' projects at final juries;
- from visiting critics in comparison with their instructors and their peers;
and the most
- from informal discussions and desk crits with their instructors;

6. In the observed School the two tier degree system, with a Bachelor of Architectural Studies followed by a Bachelor of Architecture approximately maps onto the U.S. undergraduate and graduate degree system.
- from positive instead of negative criticism;
- from discussions with other students. (p. 35)

As to what they learned from juries, students often reported learning more about presentation style or 'how to play the game' than about their designs. Anthony also believes that students' frustration and depression at "never having gotten it 'just right'" may bar students from learning from the "desk crit" as well as from more formal jury situations, and concludes by saying that:

*Ironically*, students are often most clear about what they have learned when they discuss their projects not with their instructor or a jury, but with other students. (p. 36, my italics)

**How self-judgement might be developed**

Given current knowledge about self and peer-assessment and their part in the development of autonomous judgement, this outcome would not be unexpected from a scrutiny of educational literature. Anthony does not develop this point but it will be considerably expanded in Chapter 5 of this thesis where the assertion that the changes which are necessary to the critique experience must reflect the new knowledge we have about teaching and learning. I argue that self-judgement is not developed as a result of humiliating public critique, but as a result of the action and reflection cycle which characterizes the activities of a professional. However, Anthony's results support the implicit assertion of this thesis to the extent that the vast majority of students believe that juries and design studios need to be improved, with women more likely than men to suggest that design education needs improvement, whilst undergraduates rather than graduates call for improvements to the jury system. Furthermore, students call for juries in which they believe they actually learn something and that can help them become better designers. It is the assertion of this thesis that the core skills of developed sound judgement patterns and facility with self-critique are developed through juries where students become actively involved, and where there are opportunities to involve critics and peers in innovative techniques. Examples of juries which address these concerns are described in Chapter 5.
Anthony's view of women and the studio, further explored in Ahrentzen and Anthony (1993), is consistent with the view of Vytlacil (1990) that for women the changes to accommodate the demands of the traditional studio's way of thinking and acting are entirely at odds with their innate personality traits. Whilst the contrast between high school assessment, learning styles and outcome expectations and higher education assessment (in particular the jury system) may account for the higher dissatisfaction Anthony found in undergraduates compared with graduates, the graduates' views are consistent with the findings of the Australian survey carried out by Martin, Ramsden and Bowden (1989), reported in part in their paper Student Conceptions of Adaptation to Higher Education.

In the first year students will still have school learning in mind and adapting means coping with the move from school to higher education. By the second year the memory of school learning is fading. Our results show that the notion of adaptation is now related to student interpretations of what learning in higher education should be. Students have had time to reflect on their new learning environment and all have developed ideas about what learning at tertiary level should be like. (Martin et al., 1989, 7)

Students' Survey results

Anthony continues in the exposition of the survey results to question the purposeful outcomes of design juries about which the comments are overwhelmingly negative. She says that negative comments from jurors beget negative responses from students. Graduates more than undergraduates, and women more than men, became angry and upset after receiving negative criticism at a jury. Although not a surveyed outcome, Anthony suggests

7. Through the years of study undergraduates doubtless become more accustomed to the practices of the jury system; if they remain unable to deal with juries they may no longer be students of architecture, and therefore never be graduate architecture students.
9. Whilst this finding appears at odds with the other research findings cited about students acculturization into the teaching-learning situation, Anthony suggests that this may be:
   Perhaps because they are more experienced than their younger counterparts, they may believe they are more deserving of praise and are thus even more devastated when they are reprimanded. (p. 36)
that other anecdotal evidence would support the view that some coloured students experience the same emotional difficulties as women at juries: difficulties of having to maintain emotional control in a high pressure situation. Anthony says that reactions to negative jury or desk crits presage students:

- doubts about the design project itself ("My concept is wrong")
- bewildered and negative feelings about oneself ("What am I doing here?")
- negative relationships with others outside the studio ("I have to work on my design")
- seeing "the design as the enemy" ("My design is torturing me") (p. 37)

It is at this point in her book that the results of Anthony's research reveal a rather different scope of enquiry: she has focused on design students' eating, sleeping and working patterns. She leads into this area by establishing the reality of the subculture of the design studio. The survey results reveal undisciplined work habits for architecture students which force them to put in long hours toward the hand-in time because at the beginning of the project "when they should have been gathering information about the experiences of other designers and about the successes and failures of previous designs, they are often simply wasting their time" (p. 39). The results show that:

- few students attempt to manage their time whilst working on design projects;
- few students prepare in advance for their oral presentation to the jury;
- the night before a project is due (which in her surveyed sample was generally also the night before the jury) one-third of architecture students do not sleep at all and another half sleep one to four hours only.

10. A total of 15% of Anthony's respondents were not Caucasian. Across the U.S. Kliment (1991) gave the figures as 19.8% of architecture students as minorities so Anthony's survey had a slight under-representation of minority groups in her survey group. Similarly with women - Kliment had 29.9% of U.S. architecture students as women, Anthony surveyed 27%. Frederickson, Mark (1993) 'Gender and Racial Bias in Design Juries', Journal of Architectural Education 47;1 38-48 considers the practices of juries concerning racial and gender bias at greater length.
- students are aware that their poor sleeping patterns before their juries affect, and worsen their jury performance.
- compared with their peers in other disciplines, architecture students eat poorly or skip meals before jury deadlines, their menu often comprising "junk food".
- students are aware that their poor eating patterns affect, and worsen their jury performance. (p. 38-39)

Anthony concludes from her survey results that "the studio subculture may well be harmful to students' mental and physical health" (p. 40). This knowledge can be loosely linked to her consideration of the nature of juries in her statement that in over half her surveyed schools instructors almost always hold the jury on the date that the project is due which means that students are participating in the jury at much less than their optimum physical level. However, this thesis asserts that her well-meaning concern for architecture students' well-being contrasts with notions of architecture students as adult learners and positions the students in the text as dependent in relation to the paternalism and control exerted by studio staff about aspects of students' lives which have little concern for them.

Further conclusions from the survey section are the knowledge that there is no agreement between students, staff and visiting practitioner jurors as to the aims of juries; negative commentary prevails in the majority of juries leaving students feeling depressed; little is learnt from final juries, whereas rather more is retained from interim juries; compared with other methods of learning about design, students learn least from design juries; the jury system may be "partly responsible for driving away many qualified women and people of color" (p. 40); and the studio sub-culture may be harmful to students' physical and mental health all of which combine to prevent many students from making "a successful leap into practice" (p. 40).

Anthony claims that students, faculty and practitioners need not be content with the status quo as revealed by her surveys. She believes that the succeeding chapters of her book

11. See for example Julie Diaz' narrative in Dutton, 1991b.
address some of the concerns raised by the surveys as well as offering "a survival guide" to the jury and the studio. Although her survey results may have caused her to call for the abandonment of the jury system altogether, she believes that the jury is an inevitable process. This is a very confusing message for the reader, whose conclusion from her survey outcomes may have been to call for their abandonment. The conclusion the reader makes is that there is no point in condemning such an entrenched practice; one's effort can be best expended at the margins - leaving the central practices virtually unchanged. Perhaps the strongest validation for the continuation of the jury system is that the recommendation in her book does not argue for a complete abandonment of these practices, calling instead for changes to them.

The Changes for Students

In the central section of the book Anthony provides a survival guide to the jury for students with prescriptive Chapters on time management, project research, communication, graphics and avoiding stress, which are a mixture of instrumental study skills tips which cross discipline boundaries:

- on time and stress management
- on the role of sleep and food
- on becoming an effective communicator
- on negotiation
- on broadening one's horizons

and issues which lie at the very core of the nature of architecture and design:

- how to apply knowledge of precedent to design

or are skills related closely to the discipline and which are indivisible from the notion of designing itself:

- the selective process of showing the most critical information in a presentation;
- preparing effective graphic presentations for the jury;
- communicating clearly.
Whilst it could be argued that these intensely instrumental chapters would not be unwelcome to an architecture student struggling to come to terms with the expectations of the jury they do not necessarily belong in this book. Once again the criticism which could be mounted by faculty or practitioners as jurors is that there has been a shift away from the central purpose of the study and the research outcomes to an area which is not closely related to the study or assessment of architecture, or the jury system, and which may be better served in general study skills texts.

Architecture students have no ownership of poor work, sleep, exercise and eating patterns whilst at University - these tips could be directed at many other students. However it is undeniable that the studio culture imposes norms on all but the least conformist student, and as Anthony has pointed out in earlier chapters, the uniqueness of the studio on campus as a 'home-away-from-home' may exacerbate these 'lifestyle problems' particularly for architecture students who become increasingly a social group themselves and are then less able to compare their dysfunctional lifestyle with their more 'normal' peers in other disciplines. However the link between the jury and poor eating, sleeping, exercise and work patterns is not clear; there is more evidence to suggest the link between the jury and high stress levels as at each stage of their design development students will typically have their work reviewed by a jury. Similarly there are good arguments for effective communication with good negotiation skills for students facing a public jury although the power differential between jurors and students tends to militate against workable communication and negotiation (Ward, 1987, 1990, 1991; Dutton 1987, 1991a, 1991b). Lastly, looking at poor time management, architecture students once again would not be alone on campus in this respect, but the prospect of handing one's work for public scrutiny and facing the possible humiliation of a public drubbing by a jury for presenting unfinished work which fails to meet the jury's expectations, spurs architecture students on to possibly unparalleled feats of endurance.

12. "To many students architecture is almost a cult. It becomes a new religion, a cause to devote one's life to - which is not all that far from the truth."
In summary, the essence of these five chapters is that architecture students may be more stressed than their on-campus peers as a result of the jury system, and therefore need to be well prepared for the jury by an appropriate lifestyle which may help to reduce stress. They will need to have effective graphic, oral and written communication skills to perform well at the jury. Good time management skills are necessary to be able to utilise other discipline specific skills such as gathering, documenting and applying existing information and knowledge of precedent to design, and selecting the most critical information to include in the presentation.

The Changes for Jurors

The next part of the book turns the tables and deals with rather instrumental tips for jurors. Here Anthony exhorts jurors to deliver constructive criticism, which, she says, is not easy within a culture which attributes negative connotations to the concept of "critic" and "criticism". She outlines Weitz' taxonomy of criticism procedure which includes "description, interpretation, evaluation, and theory" (p. 105) and compares it with notions of "connoisseurship" in which ""connoisseurs", be it of wine, photography, or design, make proclamations of "good" or "bad" based on their own particular tastes. The supporting reasons for these proclamations are rarely given, and without the benefit of explicit criteria, they are merely idiosyncratic, don't lend themselves readily to discussion, and are not informative" (p. 105). Anthony says that jurors who frequently rely on their "connoisseurship" reflecting their own personal taste create "chaos and confusion for students" (p. 105). As novices the students are unable to draw on the same knowledge base, nor possibly the same cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1976) as the jurors which encourages blind emulation of the juror's values and assists in socialising students unthinkingly to the propounded values of the critic.

When jury criticism is viewed from a sociological perspective, Anthony says, "one of the hidden agendas of criticism at design juries is to acculturate students from popular, or mass, culture into high culture" (p. 107). This covert agenda, she says, accounts for the personal
attacks on students who are not complying with the "high culture" values of the jurors, who have as a part of their mission the transmittal and imbibition of these taste values. Here Anthony touches briefly on the issue of to what extent juries control access to the profession and thereby ensure the continuance of juries in their present form. It is the contention of this thesis that the acculturation role of juries is far from unintentional, or marginal to their generally accepted purpose in teaching and assessment, having some interest in the future 'shape' of the profession.

Until the publication of Anthony's book specifically addressing the jury system, jurors and students alike wanting to prepare themselves for critique may have turned to Wayne Attoe's classic book *Architecture and Critical Imagination* (1978) which identifies ten fundamental methods for architectural criticism falling into three basic groups: normative, interpretive and descriptive. Anthony, in briefly mentioning Attoe's contribution to a taxonomy for architectural criticism, highlights Attoe's summary comments that "criticism is first and foremost about the critic, not about the object criticised" (p. 108) which ties in with my comments about the role of the jury in socialisation. The quotation continues:

> The self-image of the critic, the way he views his role and the biases inherent in him as a thinking, feeling, self-moving creature at that point in time are important considerations when designers and others face criticism and begin to respond to it. This is true regardless where the critique appears, whether in the daily newspaper, the design studio, or in the form of vandalized windows in a housing project. *Once the bias in a critic's assessment or position is recognized, those who are the object of criticism are freed of the burden of Final Judgment and can drop defences and learn from the frank encounter with the other whose life has been touched.*
> (Attoe, 1978, 8, my italics)

Attoe's point is a subject which is the focus of Sarah Dinham's writing (1989a, 1989b) on studio criticism: that there are substantial differences between studio teachers and that studio teachers' conceptual framework, including notions of their world view, influence their selection and preparation of a good problem as the "academic task" and the way in which they help students through a solution. I will return to this point later in this chapter.

Whilst Attoe assures us that "criticism is not only a negating activity and that the response to criticism need not be only defensive" (Attoe, 1978, 8) Anthony confirms from the
research results that "design critics have a strong tendency to emphasise the negative" (p. 108). She says that this disproportionate slant often means that students cannot recall if there was anything good said about their work "because recipients of criticism naturally tend to focus on the negative aspects." However, whilst calling for a balance between positive and negative criticism, Anthony reports that the research results from the students' point of view showed that "the key issue is not whether or not criticism is positive or negative, but rather how the criticism is delivered" (p. 109).

This is where Anthony begins her crusade to convert jurors to the right and true path with much the same methods as she used for the students a few chapters previously. She commences by counselling jurors to have a good night's sleep the night before as the jury will be hard and taxing work; and proceeds to suggest that practising active listening during the oral presentation whilst simultaneously looking at and interpreting all drawings and models will enable one to be an effective juror. Anthony emphasises the need for critics to refrain from interrupting the student's or another critic's presentation. She says that the "pecking orders" set up by interruptions tend to discriminate against women "who are less likely to do the interrupting, and when interrupted, they often fall silent" (p. 110). This observation is confirmed by Frederickson (1993). She advises strongly against delivering criticism which is personal, or so vague that the student is unable to ascertain the substantive nature of it.

Moving on from these "jury skills tips" about the delivery of criticism directed at jurors to the content of criticism, Anthony writes that criticism "needs to be constructive rather than destructive" (p. 112) taking her theory in this assertion from two books: Skinner (1961) The Behaviour of Organisms and Watson (1930) Behaviourism from which she deduces that "psychologists and learning theorists have clearly demonstrated the educational value of positive as opposed to negative reinforcement" and somewhat incredibly asserts that: "the same principles that apply to teaching animals and small children apply to design students".13 (p. 112).

13. Argyris (1991) would not concur with this generalisation from his position trying to pin-point the barrier to learning presented by defensive behaviour and fear
Anthony does not have Attoe's insightful consideration of the uses to which critique is put in the context of how it is delivered. He believes that

[i]f critical processes are in fact as widespread and found more frequently than we might realise we should be aware of the methods of criticism employed and their uses and abuses so that critical activities can truly support our understanding of the physical environment and efforts to improve its usefulness and quality.

For some people criticism is useful because it facilitates understanding...Historians have typically addressed this audience.

For other people, criticism is valuable as feedback. Architects, planners and policy-makers need to know how successful previous designs were so that future decisions may be influenced.

Because we have these two very different consumers of criticism, responses to it can vary markedly. For those in search of understanding, responses might range from pleasurable insight to boredom. For recipients of feedback, responses range from confirmation to intimidation and defensiveness.

(Attoe, 1978, Ch. 1, my italics)

This description begins to suggest relationships between critical intent, the response that critique may elicit, and the context in which it is proffered. Anthony returns to her instrumental style of 'juror's tips' to discuss the importance of proceeding with caution in delivering constructive criticism, by perhaps issuing a written critique instead of delivering it verbally, and considering the pace and style of delivery without addressing at all the notion of the content of the criticism in the way that Attoe does.

This topic is also disregarded in her section on "Helpful Desk Crits". Whilst confirming that the same principles apply to desk critiques as for the design jury, she does have research outcomes to report in terms of the timing of the critiques. "Past a certain stage, [identified as the production stage of their drawings and models] substantive criticism about the design is of little use" (p. 115). Anthony draws attention to the fact that, such is the common studio layout, desk crits are unlikely to happen in acoustic isolation and are

of embarrassment neither of which seems to worry animals or small children; neither would Bereiter and Scardamalia (1986) when looking at the learning style factors which are present in the learning approaches for expertise, although there is interest in heightening the awareness of the emotional factors linking learning and teaching by focusing on the emotional interaction between the teacher and the student in Salzberger-Wittenberg, Isca; Henry, Gianna and Osborne, Elsie (1983) The emotional experience of learning and teaching; Ingleton (1995, 1995, 1994, 1993).
therefore in themselves public, a fact to which she returns when summarising the destructive effects of competition on individuals. However, she reports situations where this knowledge (the publicness of even "desk crits") has been used to advantage for group teaching. She also suggests innovations such as students' audio recording their desk crits for future reference, staff conducting desk crits as small group pin-ups to facilitate teaching/learning (without saying how this happens), and staff recording the date on which a student received a desk crit, the problems the student was having, and the advice proffered, in order to check on progress at the next desk crit. Once again Anthony's suggestions are intensely instrumental, as are her closing remarks in the chapter recommending compulsory workshops and orientation sessions for design critics.

Summary

Anthony concludes this chapter by recalling that some of the most significant problems in juries and at desk crits arise because they are not truly situations in which dialogue takes place due to the vast power differential between the student and the juror. Whilst this powerful differential remains, Anthony questions whether students can become empowered and whether knowledge of this power differential predicates a different type of jury system altogether. This thesis asserts that the present jury system is both a cause of, and a result of, the power differential; and that "a different type of jury system altogether" will never be possible whilst staff alone are empowered to judge students' work. This point, which I will take up again in Chapter 5, is expanded here in the concluding remarks about Anthony's book.

In summary, Anthony included five chapters in Part 3 What Students Can Do of recommendations about appropriate responses to juries from the students' point of view. Jurors were then addressed in two chapters in Part 4 What Faculty and Visiting Critics Can Do. This proportionate weighting towards telling the students how to survive and perform well in the jury compared with telling faculty and visiting critics how to critique well, once again underlines the argument in this thesis that this book will not be instrumental in
causing a shift away from the current jury paradigm. The "problem" seems to belong to the students who are exhorted to take control of their own lives to improve their lot in the jury; whereas jurors are prevailed upon to be more even handed with their criticism and to consider other innovations in lieu of the traditional jury. Anthony does not emphasise that it is not the students' problem and that much of the responsibility for their stress lies with the expectation of the jurors and the jury, not with their own personal habits which arguably detract from optimum performance. There is a sense in which this is once again tipping the balance of power in favour of retaining the status quo. Moreover, in the preceding chapters, Anthony has provided a survival guide to what she clearly sees as the inevitable occurrence: namely students' and jurors' need to continue to perform well in a jury situation (p. 40).

There is a limited sense evident in her writing of the ways in which students, faculty and practitioners "need not be content with the status quo" in the intensely instrumental focus of the succeeding seven chapters. It is the contention of this thesis that Anthony's concerns are not addressed by maintaining a scholarly stance acknowledging the short comings of the jury system whilst encouraging students into jury processes and relationships with hierarchy which will promote their continuation unchanged despite their faults; whilst simultaneously

14. Anthony's concerns include the suggestion that the jury system sets up some students for a life of consistent underachievement due to their poor self-confidence. She quotes Coxe (1989) who said that

[There is growing evidence that overall, a large percentage of architects lack desirable self-confidence and their careers are being limited as a consequence... The result is an often demoralized profession that continues to have great doubts about its ability to achieve lofty goals... Another theory about why so many architects lack self-confidence is that improper delivery of criticism in architecture schools undermines rather than builds self-worth... few will contest the generalisation that 90 percent of the graduates of the leading business schools seem to go out into the world confident of their eventual success, while a very high percentage of architectural school graduates come out with doubts about whether they will ever have a chance to succeed... If misguided criticism during the studio education process is at fault... the tragedy is that it is entirely unnecessary... (Coxe, 1989, 111-112)]

Further concerns were that minority groups were significantly disadvantaged by the in-place system. 29.9% of current U.S. architecture students were women and 19.8 % minorities (Kliment, 1991, 192). In Australia in 1990 37% of all enrolments in architecture schools were women (RAIA, 1991). No statistics are available for minority enrolment although Ninnes (1993) discusses participation of non English speaking background students. The lot of women and minority groups in juries in the U.S. system is considered in Frederickson (1993).
exhorting jurors to improve their jury performance within the existing system. One of the ways Anthony challenges the status quo is through describing alternatives to traditional juries.

**Alternatives to Traditional Design Juries**

In Chapter 10 *Alternatives to Traditional Design Juries* Anthony makes the point that there are examples of innovation in the jury system "ranging along a continuum of minor to major modifications of the traditional system" (p. 120). She believes that the expression "jury" with its negative connotations implying judgement does not adequately describe these innovations and would prefer to see the terminology abandoned in favour of alternatives such as "presentations, critiques, reviews, workshops, working sessions, or otherwise." She concludes by saying that whether or not the term jury remains, the current system should be changed and changed quickly (p. 121). She focuses her argument on the emphasis of the jury, believing for alternatives to be successful there need to be some basic shifts in emphasis of the jury and the jurors' roles. She recommends that:

- studio instructors rather than jurors grade students' work;
- the jury does not serve as a forum for assessment;
- the purposes of design juries be mutually agreed on and stated;
- the criteria for the eventual critique be established early for students and jurors;
- the jurors be briefed about general educational goals of the course;
- the same jurors serve on interim and final juries (p. 122-123).

Anthony reports the various alternatives to the traditional jury as well as ideas proposed and trialled by colleagues responding to her nationwide invitation for information about innovative juries. In summarising this broad collection of ideas for alternatives to the traditional jury system, Anthony says that the thread which binds them is a desire to shift the emphasis from an individual public critique to a more democratic debate and discourse. In particular there is a need to more closely involve students in the process in order to encourage them as participants rather than as spectators. Anthony believes that both of these
broad strategies should discourage replication of students' worst jury experiences typified by heavy-handed delivery of negative commentary and boredom and that other demonstrated outcomes from the departures from the traditional process are:

- a focus on the design process as well as the outcome;
- an emphasis on making criteria used to evaluate design work explicit;
- an ability to engage in more broad based discussion encouraging a higher level of learning on Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956);
- less emphasis on the need for every student to present before a jury;
- less tension and no public humiliation;
- less time is expended compared with traditional jury review;
- the opportunity to familiarise students with different physical environments and presentation media (p. 132 - 134)

and concludes that a combination of major and minor changes to the jury system ensures that it "can and should continue to play an important role in design education" (p. 134).

Anthony's listed outcomes summarising commonalities of departures from traditional jury processes are very similar to the outcomes from Problem Based Learning which Boud and Feletti claim is "the most significant innovation in education for the professions for many years; some argue that it is the most important development since the move of professional training into educational institutions" (Boud and Feletti, 1991, 13). The outcomes which Problem Based Learning emphasises are:

- process as well as content
- deep learning approaches rather than surface learning approaches
- self directed learning rather than staff directed learning
- group work and team building rather than competitive effort
- personal development rather than striving for predetermined outcomes
- student centredness rather than staff centredness
- preparation for lifelong learning rather than strategic learning approaches
- students accepting the responsibility for learning
- students' increasing confidence in their ability to learn.
In order to achieve these outcomes Problem Based Learning (PBL) emphasises assessment practices which are:
- holistic rather than fragmented
- self and peer-assessed rather than staff assessed.

This emphasis is at the core of understanding the reason why PBL is such a major innovation, why it has such a lot to offer architecture as a discipline, and how it can alter the way teaching and assessment are conceived in architectural education. As a result of this reconceptualisation the power of juries to intimidate and humiliate may disappear; the unequal power distribution which has permitted this system to remain in place, virtually unchallenged, until the arrival of Anthony’s book, could cease to be the dominant feature of assessment as students learn to take responsibility for their own learning and assessment.

Features which Could be Borrowed from Professional Juries

Returning to Anthony’s text, in her extensive chapters on juries in practice - in awards programmes, design competitions and architectural practice - there does not seem to be evidence of practitioners recalling that their own architectural studies assisted their abilities at self-judgement to any great extent, although Cuff (1989a) is clear that skill with self-critique is critical in the design of excellent buildings. Anthony asserts that the schemes which are rewarded by the professions' own juries are often not held by the public or their detractors (neighbours and other stakeholders) to have award winning qualities. Although awards juries do have a different purpose, following on from her commentary about the need for major and minor changes to the jury system, Anthony has looked to the differences between the academic and professional jury for inspiration for changes in the academic jury. In the professional jury the awards are normally the result of peer review with the assessment criteria having been made explicit, whilst in the academic jury the assessment is imposed on the design, often, Anthony asserts, without the assessment criteria having been made explicit. The nature of criticism, and how it is delivered differs significantly in that

15. Whilst academic design juries "are conducted largely to evaluate student design", "awards and competition juries' purpose is to select winners" (p. 139).
professional juries are called upon to "write a report explaining the rationale for their final selection" whereas academic juries are often not required to justify their assessments by any criteria. Moreover the professional jury deliberations are usually "closed" sessions which Anthony asserts "spares those who do not fare well public humiliation and embarrassment" (p.143).

Anthony argues from the comparison of professional and in-school juries that the features of design juries which should be maintained and enhanced are:

- debate and discussion from many different viewpoints;
- the opportunity to deliver, receive and learn from constructive criticism of one's own work and that of others (p. 158).

Aspects which must be eliminated are:

- psychologically destructive and unethical behaviour
- antagonism
- fear
- boredom
- insensitivity
- competition (p. 158).

Anthony concludes that in order to be able to promote discussion and debate about design and the ability to criticize it, which is the other half of the essence of a design education along with the ability to produce high quality design work (Macleod, 1992), the studio should become less dominant in the education of design students who should be encouraged to learn outside the studio. This view is supported by the philosophical underpinnings of PBL (Boud and Feletti, 1991) with its emphasis on individually motivated self-study which recognises that learning and knowledge is different for every person.

To support the promotion of discussion and debate about design, and the ability to criticised it, Anthony believes that a wider range of teaching/learning formats can be adopted for teaching and assessment than the current variations on the jury system. Many of her suggestions for jury formats adopt less adversarial roles for the participants - thereby
promoting not only a better image of architect/client interaction but also easing the passage for women and minorities in particular into the profession. The recommends

- panel discussions,
- colloquia - panel discussions focusing on socially relevant issues,
- exhibits,
- debates,
- role-playing exercises,
- workshops,
- small group discussions,
- critical questioning, and
- developing team work (p. 128-132)

Anthony's ideas are supported by the tenets of PBL with its emphasis on individualised learning with the group as a motivator, and the learning structured around a real world problem (or simulation) rather than as discrete content coverage tied to a curriculum strand.

**Competition - Co-operation**

Purist exponents of PBL may argue that other than for the purposes of summative assessment there is no place in learning for academic results which do anything other than inform students that, in the eyes of the institution, they are making adequate progress. Their argument as educators would be that it is far more important for the students to be able to assess their own, and their peers' work adequately as a part of their growing professional expertise than to receive gradings based on the assessment of an already competent professional. By this argument, the rationale for academic competition as the basis for learning motivation is largely removed. Anthony argues in her closing pages for a reframing of the competitive spirit which, she says, is "endemic to design education and practice" and "underlies both the jury process and the entire design jury experience. Without it, the rationale behind the jury system crumbles" (p. 163). As previously noted, she takes as her text Kohn (1986) *No Contest: The Case Against Competition* from which he concludes that "the problem is not only with the way we compete or the extent of our
competitiveness; it is with the fundamental nature of the competition itself" (Anthony, 1991, 163).

Anthony's argument is that despite the co-operative appearance of the studio, underlying that camaraderie is a fiercely competitive environment in which students compete for their tutor's time and favour and for assessment grades whilst working side by side although certainly not co-operatively. The public nature of the studio teaching at the drawing board and the jury assessment process all serve to exacerbate the problem of entrenched competitiveness. There is a sharp contrast between this competition fostered in academia and the co-operative nature of professional design offices where teams work closely together to produce design solutions to the point where Anthony claims that students find it very difficult to make the transition from academia to practice.

Furthermore, she asserts, students are preoccupied with "winning" and are reluctant to share their ideas with their "competitors" which results eventually in an inability to be receptive to the criticism they receive because they are not open to criticism, but guarded and defensive as a result of the competitive, dependent nature of the design studio.

This is one of the key points from her book for this thesis: that the critique situation itself predisposes students to a certain type of response despite the content of the criticism, and that this response is counter-productive to developing the skills which have been identified as being present in excellent designers. This response is problematic for at least two reasons: ability with self-critique is an essential part of successful practice, and co-operative team approach is instrumental in the successful design of buildings.

Anthony writes that recent studies conducted by the American Institute of Architects revealed that the ability to critique their own work was one of their key success factors for firms that had achieved design excellence (Coxe, 1989, 112). Cuff (1989a) says that "constructive board criticism helped them [practitioners] to continually refine and improve their design at many stages of the design process" (Anthony, 1991, 163).
Another key success factor Cuff (1989a) found present in the design of excellent buildings was the concept of team-work which is the foil to individual effort and which is capable of providing *peer critique*. Cuff (1989a) summarises the type of collaboration producing excellence to say that:

It is apparent then that design as the act of the creative individual is a simplification; virtually no building is made single-handedly.

Neither do these exceptional projects result from capable management or the user's participation alone. Instead individual talent and leadership are important to design when they exist in a social context that is conducive to such efforts - a context that consists of other demanding, talented individuals who act as a team. The context of co-contributors and constraints, crucial to the success of a project, is not static, but a vital, dynamic field that is actually formative. (Cuff, 1989a, 86)

**A Primary Role for Critique**

In recognition of the role of the architect in the twenty-first century not as a "solo artist, engrossed in competitive, individual pursuits" but as a team member, working co-operatively "with design teams and joint development efforts" (Anthony, 1991, 167) a *primary role for critique is to develop and enhance students' ability to critique their own and their peers' work* in preparation for their professional role. It is then critical that, if they pass on no other values, Schools of Architecture develop in students a significant sense of their self worth. Their professional self-worth partly derives from their sense of self-worth as a student, which in turn is reflected in the worthiness of their design thinking, making and communication. There is no mesh of this notion of developing self-worth through a process of building the validity of students' skills at self and peer-critique and thereby enhancing self-judgement, with the notion of students receiving harsh negative critique from an "expert"; critique delivered in a way which means that its origins are unintelligible as the criteria for critique have not been made explicit. Critique in this form cannot be used as a model for self-critique, nor as a model for professional practice.\(^\text{16}\).

---

\(^\text{16}\). Coxe (1989) quotes Joseph Esherick's remarks on accepting the Gold Medal of the American Institute of Architects in 1989:

It would be healthy if in some cases the jury system as an educational device was re-evaluated. I have visited too many schools where abuse of the students in juries was
It is unsurprising that students' complaints about the critique process are most focused on the so called "subjective" nature of critique and assessment, and with unexplicated criteria or holistic judgement scenarios prevailing. The argument that the informed judgement of a mature professional is the most appropriate assessment for an architecture student is not supported by the argument from the proponents of PBL (Boud, 1990; Boud and Feletti, 1991) and elsewhere in literature considering the reflective and reiterative nature of the professional's thinking (Schon, 1983, 1987), that the education of a professional must instil in that student an ability to judge their own work by standards and criteria which they have established themselves.

Nowhere does Anthony bring this intention for critique to the foreground. There is no mention of this goal except a brief passing reference in the section about the ill effects of the dependent paternalism present in the architectural and studio cultures:

Students' rigid dependence upon their instructors and jurors for criticism often leads them to overlook a most valuable source of criticism: their own. *Yet it is just this ability that can aid tremendously in the professional world.* (p. 165, my italics)

Until the community of educators and practitioners accept this primary role for critique - there will not be any major shifts in the practice of critique. Anthony is merely "fiddling at the margins" if critique remains grounded in the understandings of the Beaux Arts. She advocates the development of structural change in the jury system through achieving a greater balance of power among students, faculty and practitioners. The rigid hierarchy of power among these three groups must begin to loosen up (p. 158).

She does not hint at how these massive changes to the entrenched system will be made. She concedes that competition is an inevitable part of education (p.164) and the demands for

for some faculty and visitors customary behavior. In some cases the jury was turned into a license for vindictiveness and hostility. If it is a learning environment the wrong things are being learnt...I have seen and heard enough about client relations as conflict that I am convinced that the origin of at least some of the antagonistic and adversarial attitude lies in a perversion of the jury system. The minimal cure is to stop calling them juries and call them reviews and to treat them as important learning experiences.(Vonier, 1989, 111)
assessment require it to remain so. The initiative remains with educators and students to change their world view.

Change is a fearful experience for many and a change which compels the relinquishment of long held rights will not come easily. Despite the best attempts of committed educators to enact Anthony's "reformist approach" which calls for accreting modest reformist measures to attain profound consequences, the overwhelming hegemony of the power differential between the student and the juror, or the assessed and the assessor will render the reforms inadequate to the task of producing profound consequences. When students are invested with the responsibility for their own learning, and are equipped with skills of self-judgement there will be profound consequences for the present critique system. Research being carried out in other professional fields demonstrates that students need a variety of means and styles of feedback in order to develop sound self-judgement.
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Dinham and Stritter on Professional Education

The contention that students need a variety of means and styles of feedback in order to develop sound judgement leads to the work of Sarah Dinham, an educational psychologist with long-standing ties to the College of Architecture at the University of Arizona, who has looked in depth at the education of architects, the critique (often referred to as a review, or
jury), and the education of professionals during a long term interdisciplinary research program examining teaching in several professional fields. Of particular interest were the observations made in the design studios of four schools of architecture between September, 1985 and December, 1986.

As previously discussed, (Ch. 2, p. 46), together with Stritter in Research on Professional Education (1986) Dinham has established that professionals need a range of feedback from a variety of sources in order to develop their skills of self-judgement.

Whatever the specific format [for evaluation of student performance], students must develop a picture of themselves which they can compare to a standard. That picture is based on information from multiple sources: self, peers, patients and clients, and instructors. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 961)

The "business of professional education", assert Dinham and Stritter is:

[t]ransforming the student's gestalt from confusion to familiarity, so the student comes to inhabit the professional world. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 953)

Dinham and Stritter describe three stages in the evolution of professional education.

- first, professional training based entirely on apprenticeship;
- second, professional training in formal settings separated from the profession's practice;
- third, the current mode of theory-based programs incorporating both traditionally taught subject matter and integrated apprenticeship experiences. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 952, my italics)

It is this reliance on theory, together with the development of "theories of action by which the profession is practiced", which is among "the most telling distinctions between a profession and a trade or craft" (p. 952). Together with "theories of practice" the profession develops "theories of action by which educational programs are practiced" (p. 952). Dinham and Stritter report Mayhew's (1971) study in which professional education curricula in higher education settings were generally found to include some or all of the three types of educational experiences:

(a) courses in the "basic arts " or "basic sciences";
(b) courses addressing the profession's typical problems and activities but taught in traditional formats;
(c) the professional initiation, that is, the apprenticeship, the clinical studies, and the internship providing the link between theory and practice, the means by which students become practicing professionals and fill the void between professional preparation and professional practice as it is actually encountered. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 952, my italics)

Focusing their paper on the last of these three types Dinham and Stritter write that:

In the apprenticeship the aspiring professional learns many facets of the profession from the master...[These include] cognitive and intellectual learning... the rich fabric of socialization, interpersonal skills, moral reasoning, and attitudes distinguishing the profession's members...[as well as] a high level of technical skill. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 955)

They further assert:

Beyond competence and the ability to articulate it, the instructor also models professional standards in self-confidence, leadership ability, dealing with clients or caring for patients, relationships with peers or subordinates, awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses, and ability to accept constructive criticism.

Yet [clinical] instructors cannot be and need not be universally expert and perfect. Rather they are most effective if they show students their reasoning, and encourage students to question them. They should reward students for analyzing and reflecting on the model they present. They should discuss their strengths and their uncertainties, their values and how they cope with the profession's demands. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 958)

Dinham and Stritter, through exploring the example of clinical apprenticeships, reinforce the view that the professional is skill and theory competent and this largely derives from the role modelling of the "master" - which in architectural education is often the studio instructor, but is also a role which in undertaken by the juror, and becomes a focus for the critique. Beyond the ability to instruct, the further role for the instructor is as the model for professional knowledge, competence and values. Integral with the concept of the instructor providing guided practice is the notion of the instructor providing evaluation which is critical for the student's developing self-analytical and self-critical abilities.

Dinham and Stritter write that evaluation is as critical to students' quality apprentice education as is students' guided practice.
Evaluation must include feedback to students, intended to help them improve their comprehension and/or performance. Whether reinforcement for correct performance or constructive criticism of errors, evaluation:
- should be specific;
- it should occur frequently;
- it should be administered both formally and informally;
- it should include explanations and remedies.
Initially instructors may compare performance to some commonly accepted standard. Later, students may be asked to assess their own progress compared to that standard, in discussion with their instructor, since professional development requires self-analytical and self-critical ability. (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 959, my italics)

In summary, the assertion that a primary role for critique should be in developing students' self-judgement is supported by the concept of evaluation playing a critical role in developing self-analytical and self-critical skills.

Architectural Education

Sarah Dinham's research writings are primarily concerned with studio observations she conducted in four varied U.S. architecture schools in a sixteen month period in 1985 and 1985. This research was reported in two major papers An Ongoing Qualitative Study of Architecture Studio Teaching: Analysing Teacher-Student Exchanges (1987a) and Performance Assessment in Architecture: The Role of Criticism in Studio Instruction (1987b), and other conference papers and journal articles as detailed. Dinham concentrated on analysing qualitative data about desk crits for the first paper. She relates that this is because, whilst there is some published research on architecture studio reviews/juries in the literature (Porter and Kilbridge, 1978; Dinham, 1986; Anthony, 1987), "there is absolutely no published research literature on desk crit teaching, a much more private and less easily captured set of events" despite the fact that "desk crits form the core of the educational experience for students as well as the bulk of teacher contact hours" (Dinham, 1987a, 9).

Writing in the architectural education pages of Architectural Record (1986), Dinham refines her argument to refer to architectural education, and specifically to criticism. Concerning the centrality of criticism to architectural education she observes

[that criticism is fundamental to architectural thought is indisputable; it follows that criticism therefore must be fundamental to architectural education. (Dinham, 1986, 51)
In situating her argument "for basing juries in sound criticism" Dinham returns to the Dinham and Stritter (1986) paper to emphasise the importance of the role model to the student’s learning. It is, Dinham states:

In their juries [that] students see their first example of experienced, academic, practicing architects demonstrating the thinking that is at the core of their field. (Dinham, 1986, 51)

If this thinking is modelled as "adopting, executing, and defending personal likes and dislikes" this is what architecture students will come to see as architectural thinking, concluding that "rigorous thinking is unnecessary in architecture" and that "their passing opinions are the only criterion by which they should judge their own work" (p. 51).

It is for this reason, she states, that there is no place in juries for jurors who "over the years have rested their arguments in their tenaciously held but unexplicated private opinions", and that "we must design our juries as the models for the thinking we value in our students", demonstrating "criticism at its very best: reflective, artistic, analytic, and eloquent expressions by thoughtful, experienced professionals" (p. 51).

Dinham referred to the (then) forthcoming work of Anthony (1987) which reported the "widespread discontent with the jury system in education, with only a "minimal level of learning about design"", and the writings of Rapaport (1984), Beckley (1984) and Hurtt (1985) about the dominance of the studio system and thence the widespread use of the jury system to provide criticism. She writes that it may serve architectural educators well, when considering the role of juries and jurors, to "stress ideas, theory, and knowledge, and to avoid the pretence of unclear evaluative criteria" (p. 51). By supporting Hurtt’s assertion that the critic is "obliged to place his criticism within the framework of a knowledge base available to the student" she validates Argyris’ use of the expression "mastery/mystery" in Porter and Kilbridge (1978) to describe the employment, by critics, of

mystifying language...to display their personal mastery of architectural wisdom and skill, often to the utter confusion of students or colleagues, who in turn must mask their confusion with impenetrability intended to convey expertise.
There is no better way, Dinham asserts, for critics to mask personal likes and dislikes than to disguise them in a language so mysterious to the student that rejoinder is prevented, and to employ language which tends to "represent their private and unsubstantiated feelings as scholarly criticism" (p. 51).

Dinham moves on from these comments about the importance of the juror as role model to a description of a taxonomy for purposes for architectural juries as an outcome from her into studio instruction.

First,

The jury might be intended to criticize individual students' own designing as it is demonstrated by the work they present. (Dinham, 1986, 51)

It is this individual learning purpose, Dinham asserts, that is at the core of Rapoport's, Hurtt's and Anthony's criticism of the functions of design juries. It was this central function for design juries which was assumed by Anthony to be in the minds of students and jurors and which was found by Anthony, and Porter and Kilbridge (1978), Architectural Education Study, to not always be adequately addressed. Dinham writes that individually focused juries are "sometimes said to simulate the life of the practicing architect" (p.51) but points out that even when practice simulation is intended the purpose of the jury is individual criticism. Furthermore what is simulated are the external qualities needed for adequate jury performance (for example she cites here the need for grace under pressure), whereas juries fail in this simulation role to model essential qualities of the successful architect (and here she cites the mental activity of a busy and skilful architect).

Second,

the jury might be intended for general instruction - as a means of teaching the whole group of students about design. (Dinham, 1986, 51)

Dinham reports that skilful jurors can switch criticism from the individual learning purpose to general instruction whilst making clear to the students the purpose for the shift, and that
juries conducted for *general instruction* are conducted differently from those whose sole purpose is the criticism of individual student work.

*Third,*

the jury might serve the faculty and advanced students as an arena for scholarly exchange, as a seminar on topics of the jurors' special expertise." (Dinham, 1986, 53)

Dinham particularly notes that Porter and Kilbridge (1978) report that the seminar-jury format contributed to *mid-level* students *learning little* when their work was the stimulus for the jury, but that this format has inspired and challenged faculty and *advanced* students alike.

In considering the general question "What is the real task of architecture schools in education?", and concurring with others that it is in students "learning to think", Dinham argues that there is no better place for this core activity than in the studio and the jury where "the jury has the potential of being a powerful teaching tool for 'learning to think!'" (p. 53). Dinham lists that the jury's two benefits, beyond the experience of public demonstration and defence of one's work, are:

- *providing criticism to students about their own design work so they will learn to design better;* and
  - exposing students to ideas beyond the realm of their individual projects and beyond their particular experience with a particular critic. (p. 53, my italics)

and records that both are ultimately "intended to influence students' learning to think." She writes that for reflective jurors, making a commentary about their own criticisms is the most powerful means of the student coming to understand "that neither criticism, nor thinking-about-criticism is casual, mere opinion, purely instinctive" but that through the window into the reflections of "the virtuoso juror" students will be able to model the nature and quality of these reflections in their own reflection (p.53). This ability to hold simultaneously in mind the processes of reflective criticism - "the quality of procedure and
criticism, the level of discourse and the appropriateness of the communication" - whilst offering architectural criticism in the present educational context, as Dinham identifies, "challenges even the most experienced juror" (p. 53). However, she believes that with experience the "juror's architectural criticism, competently and eloquently expressed, becomes second nature" freeing the juror "to concentrate on the criticism process itself: to reflect and act upon the criticism as it is offered and the educational process as it progresses" (p. 53, my italics).

Dinham acknowledges that there are detractors from her view; in particular those who would see their role in the jury as proffering instant criticism. In Research on Instruction in the Architecture Studio: Theoretical Conceptualizations, Research Problems, and Examples (1987d) Dinham cites this example from the Architectural Education Study:

*Student:* There are a lot of students in the class who want to hear something about their designs....

*Critic:* The only reason why I'm here is to talk about whatever this thing [design] triggers in my mind. I am not here to listen to endless explanations of students who tell me what's on their minds. It's as simple as that....

(Porter and Kilbridge, Vol II, p. 492)

She believes whilst students learn something even from these untutored exchanges, and from discussion between jurors, what they do not learn about is their own thinking, their own designing, their own work. Esherick (cited by Coxe, 1989; Ch. 2, pp.69-70) would concur - and this constitutes a good example of students learning through the processes of critique about the hierarchy in the architectural profession, and about the unchallenged demeanour of the 'master'.

My research argument is strengthened by the findings of Dinham's research as reported in this article. If one of the aims of architectural critique - the jury - is for students to become more self aware, then this is advanced best by good juror role models who are prepared to reflect on the thinking which has led to their critique in language appropriate to the students.
as a means of modelling good, critical architectural thinking (as a necessary adjunct to good designing). This process does not happen in the same way with unreflective jurors, whose commentary concerns what they know, rather than the students' understanding of it.

As Dinham reports in *Architectural Record* (1987c) new knowledge about architectural education can advantage architects of the future "when new knowledge about students' thinking influences studio criticism, or when reflective teachers add new talents to their teaching repertoires". When these two concepts are combined and reflective teachers allow students to have a glimpse into the thinking processes which predicate their criticism, the outcome may be a greater likelihood for students' thinking to influence studio criticism as students will seek rather to represent *their thinking processes about design* for criticism instead of *just their design*\(^\text{17}\). Furthermore, it is in the constant modelling and imitation of this skill (presenting one's thinking processes about design) that students ultimately refine their self-criticism which hones their self-judgement.

In her paper *Research on Instruction in the Architecture Studio: Theoretical Conceptualizations, Research Problems, and Examples* (1987d) Dinham expands further on the research she carried out on instructors', and students' thinking. Her conclusion that no research methodology exists for examining teachers' thinking\(^\text{18}\) invites further research on appropriate methodologies. Nevertheless, Dinham has identified several themes which are critical in instructors' thinking from her own extensive observational study of teaching in four schools of architecture (Dinham 1987a, 1987b) to which she refers in this paper.

These critical themes in instructors' thinking are that:

- *teachers' conceptions of their own roles* influences their approach to, and thinking about, their students' work;

- *teachers' thinking is reflected in their planning* for instruction;

---

\(^{17}\) In this event critics, such as the one quoted by Porter and Kilbridge (1978) in the *Architectural Education Study, Vol II*, p. 492 (Ch 2, p. 78) will be out of a job.

\(^{18}\) Dinham reports (1989d) that a trial has been made of "stimulated recall", in which video-tapes of instruction are replayed for the teacher and a trained questioner who together try to reconstruct the teacher's thinking.
- teachers think simultaneously about myriad aspects of instruction;
- teachers' successful communication is very complex in architectural instruction.

Dinham (1987d) reports that research on student thinking is as difficult as research in teacher thinking due to methodological constraints, and suggests that Porter and Kilbridge (1978) provide the most complete picture of student thinking thus far because of their interviews with students whose desk crits and reviews were also observed. This ethnographic method for gathering information about students which has been adopted in this research will be described in Chapter 3. In her own research observations Dinham has identified the following themes as prevalent when focusing on student responses to criticism in final reviews:

- mixed messages are inevitable; to what extent students can distil the spirit of the criticism is undetermined;
- students learn early to deal with negative criticism; but the means they adopt of denying the credibility of the opinions of any one other than themselves or merely concluding that the outcome of a lengthy and detailed criticism was either "they liked it" or "they didn't like it" denies the complexity of the criticism given.

Dinham's (1987a) paper was an outcome of her focus on teaching activities in two contexts: first, critics meeting with students individually and in groups during the project for discussion of general points applicable to all students work, or for an interim review of their progress to date; and second, critics participating in final project reviews. After setting the research context and discussing how the researcher's predilections were inextricably woven into the fabric of the study, Dinham precised the findings of Performance Assessment in Architecture: The Role of Criticism in Studio Instruction (1987b) which preceded the larger study (1987a). The (1987b) study analysed the notes she assembled from observations in the design studios at the four studied schools of architecture for themes concerning the assessment of student performance. Overall, Dinham concluded that
the study has drawn one general conclusion about studio instruction and student performance assessment: *that assessment of student work is the primary form of instruction.* Criticism in its broadest sense indeed forms the theoretical foundation for teaching philosophy and practices. In contrast with other segments of contemporary higher education, assessment of student work is the very warp and woof of instruction, rather than being merely one thread of instruction, as is the case particularly for college liberal arts/sciences [and that] the implications for this link between the field's epistemological foundations with its traditional instructional practices in the design studio are being further explored. (Dinham, 1987b, 2)

In the knowledge of these research findings Dinham sought further

to highlight the pivotal role of the teacher in studio education. Given that the prevailing paradigm is criticism, what more can be revealed about architecture studio teachers and teaching by more closely examining the data for a variety of studio teachers in a variety of schools? (Dinham, 1987a, 8)

Dinham's larger study *An Ongoing Qualitative Study of Architecture Studio Teaching: Analyzing Teacher-Student Exchanges* (1987a) was designed to build upon the previous study of performance assessment, where the findings were not only about teaching, but also about criticism as the epistemological foundation of teaching, to determine whether these findings about teaching should be augmented with evidence about desk crits to more fully describe the realm of teaching activities and concerns occurring in studio teaching (Dinham, 1987a, 10). Eight categories of findings about student-teacher exchanges in desk crits were summarised:

1. *Philosophies/views manifest in teaching*

Dinham's research revealed that the philosophical underpinnings of the school under study (e.g. Bauhaus with its emphasis on self-directed learning compared with Beaux Arts with its emphasis on learning from the master and always producing a result acceptable to the master) affected the type of discourse between teacher and student.

2. *Ideas about teaching and learning* with two sub-themes:

   *Perceptions of teaching;*

   *Perceptions of learning.*

The researcher’s findings were that the students and teachers had varied and firmly held ideas on what teaching and learning are; views which were expressed verbally and in their
participation before, during and after desk crits in the studio. Additionally, students and teachers have rich perceptions about how to teach and to learn.

Dinham reports that among the most important themes in defining teaching and learning are studio teachers' concerns that students "keep options open and think broadly for as long as possible in developing a design" resisting students' premature attempts at closure. She also observes that teachers, rather than reacting spontaneously to each student's work as it is encountered, often planned thoughtfully for the group as a whole or for individual students. Additionally, teachers design their instruction for individual students in almost imperceptible ways.

3. **Student preparation** (thought, planning, work) before a crit with two sub-themes:
   - *Student activity before crit;*
   - *Student benefit from crit.*

The research concludes that it is students' thinking, planning and work before and after desk crits which provides the context in which crit teaching is embedded.

4. **Time**, with three sub-themes:
   - *Student work time before studio;*
   - *Teacher time during studio;*
   - *Student use of available studio time.*

Time is both "important and unimportant" to the students and teachers (p. 18). She observes that the importance of time is evident in the response of some students and staff who understand the inexorable march of time during a studio project, whilst acknowledging the somewhat more relaxed attitude to time in the studio characterized by the late start to almost all scheduled teaching observed and the casual approach of some students and teachers to inevitable interruptions to studio time.

5. **Teachers' responses to students** with two sub-themes:
   - *Teachers' judgements;*
   - *Teachers' feelings.*
The research substantiated the findings of the earlier study on Performance Assessment in Architecture: The Role of Critic in Studio Instruction (1987b) in that the same two themes reappeared in the research's findings about teachers working solely with their "own" students. These themes had emerged from the data in the second general category "findings about teachers/reviewers": evaluation. There was an easy, well humoured exchange between the teacher and "better" students, whereas teachers tended to deal humorlessly with less able students and/or weaker work, or were more oblique in their commentary. Even otherwise excellent teachers, Dinham observed, found it difficult to confront a student directly about weak work. In this category the researcher also considered another aspect of teachers' responses to students not covered in the earlier study; that of teachers' feelings. She concludes by asking whether a teacher feels like a better teacher when the student's work is better work; and/or when the teacher simply "likes the student." She surmises that with either particularly weak, or particularly outstanding work the teacher might feel frustrated and unnecessary.

6. Two-way communication with two sub-themes:

   Logistics; and

   Content.

Dinham observes that all teaching occurs within the context of communication; but what is of peculiar interest here is the concept of two-way communication - whether students follow the logic of the teacher and whether students can satisfactorily explain their progress to the teachers. She highlights as one of the difficult problems in studio teaching the situation when the teacher is conveying a difficult idea which the student seems not to grasp, and when the teacher and student are speaking at different points on a continuum of definition or understanding of the problem.

7. Student talk with two sub-themes:

   Student ideas;

   Response to teachers' ideas.

---

19. Here Dinham refers to the Beaux Arts atelier system where each critic has been assigned their "own" studio with their "own" fifteen or fewer students.
Dinham reports that "student talking in desk crits" became a separate category from the general nature of two-way communication when the data about student talk was reviewed in detail. There was a marked difference reported between students who talked a great deal in the explanation of their thinking and planning to the teacher and others who just moved aside to let the teacher look without commenting. The way that students respond to teacher's talk represents another range of differences. There is a marked contrast between the distinctly collaborative interaction Schon (1987) has called "joint experimentation" where the students enthusiastically and often experimentally embrace the teachers' comments; and the limited non-committal responses of "Hmmm" or similar.

8. Teachers' guidance based on students' work with two sub-themes:

   Elaborate from students' work;

   Redefine students' work.

This is the pre- eminent field for teachers' depiction of their role with students: that of providing guidance in students' thinking and designing. Dinham writes that although teachers guide students in different ways, the data in this study was not sufficiently detailed to differentiate between them. However, two distinct patterns in desk crit teaching emerged from the data: elaboration, in which the teacher relies on the student's work as presented to stimulate instruction; and redefinition, in which the teacher must redefine the student's thinking or work before the discussion can become fruitful.

There is some commonality in the distinction between elaboration and redefinition with Schon's distinction between "joint experimentation" and "Follow me!". Schon writes that "joint experimentation can be used to help a student see that she is free to set her own objectives", where "Follow me!" lends itself to communicating a way of working where "the dominant pattern is demonstration and imitation" (Schon, 1987, 214). Dinham concludes in the paper that:

the findings about teacher elaboration vs. teacher redefinition may be the most exciting as they touch on many basic chords of educational principle and practice. (Dinham, 1987a, 26)
In a later paper *Dilemmas in Architecture Studio Instruction Research and Theory about Design Teaching* (1987e) Dinham further explores the challenges and dilemmas of the studio teacher which she briefly lists as:

- considering the developmental nature of student's thinking in the design of studio curricula; and
- fostering students' thoughts about alternatives to design problems throughout the program (Dinham, 1987e, 1).

She writes that the investigations she has carried out from 1984 which have been described (Dinham 1986, 1987a, 1987b) are incomplete in two dimensions: the studies have not been tied to the pertinent research literature on teaching; and the research's practical consequences for teachers has not been explicated. This was the subject of her paper *Dilemmas in Architecture Studio Instructors Research and Theory about Design Teaching* (1987e).

Dinham records that there are varied theoretical positions on students' thinking. One interesting body of work she cites, Knefelkamp and Slepitz (1976) suggests that it is a process of intellectual maturation resulting from students participating in a well designed educational program which enables students to move from simpler, dualistic (high school) thinking, through confusion about the multiplicity of viewpoints, to later, fuller understanding of their field's complexities and its consequences for their practice (p. 5). She further writes that cognitive psychologists during the last decade have contributed to a richer understanding of students' thinking from research on students' attitudes, students' information processing and how students struggle to find new meaning in information and ideas (Dinham, 1987e, 5). She reports that a third source of ideas has come recently from research on design thinking (Akin, 1986), and particularly from Porter and Kilbridge (1978) *Architectural Education Study*, which discusses how gifted teachers probe and guide students' design thinking (p. 5).

Dinham then selects three examples of practical aspects of architecture studio teaching to explore their base in the current literature on teaching: (1) an aspect of student thinking; (2)
teachers' conceptions of their roles; and (3) a typical instruction decision. It is on the second of these aspects that I would like to focus.

Teachers' Conceptions of Their Roles

The philosophical roots of the architecture school may partially determine ideas about "teachers' proper roles", writes Dinham, but there are two other sources for considering studio teachers' roles with their students: the body of work on teachers' thinking in general; and, the specific work on roles taken by teachers in professional fields.

Dinham cites the work of Peterson (1987) who concludes that thoughtful teaching has, in its intellectual complexity, much more in common with being a thoughtful practitioner (be it physician, lawyer or architect) than it has with being a technician. She further reports that teachers are involved in complex thinking, making decisions almost constantly as they teach, and that teachers belief systems profoundly influence their perceptions, plans and actions as they teach (Dinham, 1987e, 8, my italics).

Furthermore, Dinham citing Peterson quotes that it is not enough to be a gifted designer to be a gifted teacher of design:

one must not only be knowledgeable about, and able to "do" design, but also knowledgeable about the specific strategies that enable one to design well, and the strategies by which one becomes a good designer; moreover, teachers need to know how to facilitate these...strategies and processes on the part of the student. (Peterson, 1987, 13)

Dinham summarises by referring to Yinger's (1987) work Learning the Language of Practice on defining experienced, skilful teaching. She quotes that the complexities of architectural studio teaching require the teacher to "effectively draw upon and orchestrate large bodies of knowledge using skills uniquely suitable for the problems at hand" (Dinham, 1987e, 8).
She reports that Schon's work (1983, 1987) has illuminated another way of thinking about the intricacies and demands of teaching in a professional field. She records that he concentrates his discussions on the role of the "coach" - a term he uses to describe the role of teaching in professional "apprenticeship" settings. Schon describes three models of coaching, of which "joint experimentation" and "Follow me!" are held by Dinham (1987a, 26) to be particularly appropriate to architectural education.20. Dinham concludes that "the two streams of literature on teachers' conceptions of teaching present parallel but related streams of thinking about how studio teachers might think of their roles". All thinking, she writes, described by Peterson (1987), occurs within the context of one of the "coaching" roles described by Schon (1987).

Process or Product Focus

In Dinham (1988) Recurring Elements of Studio Instruction in Architecture Dinham concludes that the tension between "process" and "product" is a major theme in the current research literature and that it is also an enormously complex educational matter. In her data review Dinham found that:

- faculty attention to design process predominated in day-to-day studio instruction; whereas
- faculty attention to final product predominated in final reviews. (Dinham, 1988, 2)

Another important finding was that cross intensioned communication occurred when "teachers might discuss one of the two when the student or another teacher might be discussing the other" and that "these cross purposes were usually not acknowledged" (p. 3).

A conclusion with an instrumental focus for teachers was that:

Students were unsure about discussing their design products vs their thought processes at design reviews, and indeed some reviewers refuse to hear stories of their thinking. (Dinham, 1988, 3)

20. This theme was further expanded by Dinham (1987a) (Ch. 2, pp.80-84) as a finding of the scrutiny of the role of teachers in desk crits in providing guidance. In this section of her work Dinham particularly refers to the similarities with Schon's work in describing teachers' guidance in the "coaching" setting.
Language Focus

Dinham's (1988) review focused on two distinct uses of language referred to in the literature: use of obscure language and teachers’ responses to students’ requests for guidance. In the category "obscurity" her data base yielded examples of obscurity in instructors' directions, in instructors' observations of students' work, in giving negative criticism, in asking questions and in reviews. There were two findings in the "teachers' responses" category. There were examples of "students hoping to discuss ideas and thought processes being disappointed by instructors intent on repairing student errors" and more frequently "students asking for detail from instructors who answered with questions, concepts, and advice". The data showed that instructors use questions and advice for various purposes including "getting students to think" and "forcing students to make their own decisions" (Dinham, 1988, 3).

Writing in Design Studies (1989b), Dinham gives a broader audience a review of her recent research and introduces a theme she has found successful with architecture practitioners and academics alike: the notion that since architects are expert designers they ought to be able to approach teaching itself as a design task.

Dinham states that as there is little literature on forms of apprenticeship teaching such as studio teaching (Dinham and Stritter, 1986) this knowledge, combined with knowledge about the centrality of the studio in architecture teaching, (Rapoport, 1984; Beckley, 1984) has directed her current research effort necessarily towards a scrutiny of studio teaching.

She states that in architecture many instructors see teaching solely as criticism:

either because they believe criticism is the epistemological foundation of architectural thought or because to them criticism represents the 'real world' (Dinham, 1989b, 81).

This is unproblematic, she writes, when criticism is defined in the largest sense; but a narrower focus can give exclusive attention to the design product and scant guidance on how to think about producing better design products (p. 81).

This outcome emerges again as one of her major research findings. It is important for this thesis inasmuch as critics who are not encouraging students to make statements about their processes, and critique formats which preclude or discourage such reflective activities, discriminate against poor designers improving their processes in that the opportunity to hear about how good designers "design" is prevented, underplayed or presumed to be unnecessary. The "message" here for student designers is several fold: that design is secretive/competitive; it is intuitive; and it is unnecessary to either understand or be able to recount the processes engaged to arrive at the product as the product is what the architect is judged by.

Models for teaching

Although abandoned "some years ago by learning and instructional theorists" Dinham suggests that there are many persistent cases of the model of teaching as "teacher as teller" in which "knowledge is seen as a commodity to be transferred from one vessel to another and the teacher's role is to possess and dispense the commodity" (p. 82). Dinham is pleased that "more recent conceptualizations of instruction apply more felicitously to the studio" (p. 82). Two common views are that of "controller" which sees teaching as a process of shaping or moulding the student to a predetermined pattern, or "orchestrater" which proposes that the instructor is the manager or "orchestrater" of events occurring simultaneously in the studio.

In that these two roles emphasise the teacher in the learning context they are too simplistic to adequately address the requirements for successful learning as they imply that the
responsibility for student learning lies largely with the instructor. Additionally, as Fenstermacher (1986), cited by Dinham, cautions, there is no causal link between teaching and learning. Fenstermacher argues that learning results when the process, *the task*, of being a learner has taken place, and *that teachers influence learning by fostering students' attempts at this task*. Dinham quotes Fenstermacher's assertion that

> a central task of teaching is to enable the student to perform the tasks of learning. (Fenstermacher, 1986, 39 cited in Dinham, 1989b, 82)

It is the assertion of this thesis that the primary role for the studio teacher should be as a facilitator. Fenstermacher replaces ideas of the "teacher as teller", or "controller or "orchestrater" with the view that *teaching involves designing an environment for maximizing learning* 22 (p. 82). Dinham does not deny what this might involve in the architecture studio, writing that "designing an environment to promote learning is an extremely challenging task" (p.82) and that the expertise of an experienced professional is thence required. In order to do this she reviewed her research which has attempted to delve into instructors' thinking and actual communication with students in order to better illuminate the thoughtful design of the learning environment. In Pinnegar and Dinham (1987), a study of teachers' thinking and planning, the theoretical foundations were the arguments of Fenstermacher (1986) and others that the 'practical arguments' teachers hold in their thinking about teaching are not traditional logical arguments but *propositions which link teachers' beliefs about students or learning to the topic to be learned* with their actual or intended teaching.

Pinnegar and Dinham's findings supported their research thesis in that the study divulged several propositions about the relation between teachers' beliefs and their teaching actions, the hypotheses upon which they base their actions and the assertions teachers make and act upon, and which may or may not be tested overtly through their teaching. The example cited is the belief that "leaving studio problems 'open' is helpful for students' learning and

---

for fostering the design process" (which contrasts strongly with the views of some students expressed in Chapter 4 of this thesis that the projects they have "done best at" are ones where they have "got onto something early" and really worked with it.)

In the second piece of research reviewed, Dinham (1987a) studied how the results of teachers' thinking and planning are manifested in their studio instruction. Dinham concludes that there are definite implications for the practice of teaching from the consideration of the research on teachers' thinking and planning and the research on studio instruction. The primary finding is that:

Teachers' frames of reference and pragmatic heuristics for teaching govern their teaching. (Dinham, 1989b, 85)

Dinham believes that "any identifiable factor in teaching this important deserves - or rather demands - explicit articulation and discerning analysis" (p. 85).

Only if teachers unfold their beliefs about design and about teaching and learning, examine them carefully, and discuss them with colleagues can they, or can the faculty at large, ensure that faculties will teach what they believe, and will teach what they intend to teach. (Dinham, 1989b, 85)

Although Dinham lists refinements for the current practice of studio teaching based on the research findings, she is acutely aware that the processes she has proposed for informing architectural education may not see changes being adopted by members of the design teaching profession. She turns to the findings of the Portsmouth Design Information Research Group (Newland, Powell, and Creed, 1987) to state that

no matter how perceptive the findings or provocative the questions about teaching and learning, practising teachers might not ever apply new ideas to their studio teaching. (Dinham, 1989b, 87, my italics)

This statement is made in cognizance of the typology of information seeking and working strategies developed to describe ways in which practising architects seek new information. Dinham has then extrapolated from this research to propose that, as in the studio the instructors are the practitioners, their take-up of academics' ideas about teaching and learning may parallel the (non) acceptance of academics' ideas by architectural
practitioners. If this is so, the Portsmouth Group's typology of information seeking and working strategies to explain differences in the ways practising architects seek new information may be instrumental in examining the ways in which academics may then accommodate new ideas.

For 'dynamic' practitioners Dinham cites Powell (1987) as "providing a 'challenging' form of information acquisition" - e.g. the mandate from the rest of the Faculty to experiment with their studio teaching; 'rigorous' thinkers need structured and carefully designed presentations of new teaching ideas; 'focused' teachers (e.g. new or beginning teachers) need tangible, immediately useful information; 'watching-thinking' contemplative teachers are better influenced by a conceptual and detailed set of ideas addressing the full range of educational thought and teaching practices (Dinham, 1989b, 87). Dinham concludes that in the application of the results of research on studio instruction "questions of selective information handling are as convoluted for education as they are for design" (p. 87).

In 1989 Dinham's major research dissertation College Teachers' Thinking and Planning: A Qualitative Study in the Design Studio (1989a) which concerned teaching in an apprenticeship setting - the design studio - was published. In it Dinham cites examples of conversations of instructors "helping students through to a solution". Insights for this thesis come in the teachers' reflections on the role they see for criticism. Dinham quotes one of the instructors reflecting that one of the important roles in studio criticism - desk crits - is to

help [the students] with the method, with the design process; you have to tell them that they ought to do this or they haven't done that or that they ought to try this, so that when you walk away you not only leave them with suggestions as to what to do but you leave them with suggestions of how... and if you can you give them three or four ways of doing that. (Dinham, 1989a, 57)

The sensitivity with which the study's instructors viewed their role of facilitator of learning and the actual instructional strategies employed can be clearly seen in this example of an instructor's thinking about desk crits.
In the studio Dinham observed that students were given the opportunity to "present and refine their projects several times during the semester"; the instructors were "counting on the presentations to be instructive as well as coercive" (p. 55). In that the instructors "planned the review [critique] sessions in order to reveal the disagreements that informed, committed professionals can have..." by inviting review participants who disagreed with the views of the instructors a further purpose for reviews is acknowledged: that of providing the opportunity for pluralistic thinking and moving away from the positivist notions of beginning students. Overall Dinham states that the "multiple presentations [to a larger group or the whole-of-class] were ...designed as a means for students to move ahead [the coercive sense] and to continuously refine their work [the instructive sense]"(p. 57) whereas the instructors believed that, whilst at desk crits individual students could be helped in a very directed way "they would not give these suggestions to the entire group lest they be seen as a mandate "(p. 58).

This differentiation of the roles Dinham observed for the "desk crit" and the "review session" in terms of their coercive potential is a very important point for this thesis in underlining an unspoken focus for the larger reviews that Dinham observed was to coerce students "to move ahead" - to achieve at a higher level or to push the process/product along as much as the students' peers had done. This unstated focus happens under the guise of providing feedback and evaluation of the design. It is the hypothesis of this thesis that it is the public aspect of larger critiques, or reviews as Dinham calls them, and with that the potential for humiliation that provides the coercion.

Conclusion

In her chapter Architectural Education in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Dinham, 1991), Dinham directs attention to the previous early research efforts which examine the process of architectural teaching (Porter and Kilbridge, 1978; Schon, 1983 and 1987; Argyris, 1976) and to the (then) most recent work of Anthony (1987) examining critical review as a pedagogical technique. Dinham states about Anthony's work:
She rested her work on the assumption that criticism of students' studio work is intended to be educationally beneficial, an assumption that not all studio teachers share. Anthony points out that, although criticism is a fundamental component of architectural education, critics are seldom prepared to deliver constructive, creative, and educationally pertinent criticism. Her studies of how studio criticism is delivered and received led to conclusions that shatter the field's complacency about design education and suggestions for improving the critical review process in studio instruction. (Dinham, 1991, 79)

Dinham's work itself in the consideration of architectural teaching is more concerned with criticism as the model for studio instruction, where she has found that the critique in its role in assessment of student work is the primary form of instruction in the studio. In her studies of architectural education since 1984 she has found that the jury is the educational mechanism but that the underlying theme is criticism. In her writings (1986-1991) Dinham has concentrated on the theme, rather then the mechanism, whereas Anthony, certainly in Design Juries on Trial has concentrated on the mechanism. Dinham (1991) writes about her own work (1989d) that in studying the use of criticism in teaching in four schools of architecture in situations ranging from initial discussions of design problems to teachers' coaching on student projects to final reviews she found:

substantial differences among teachers in their views of architecture, design, teaching and learning, in their communication and language use with students, and in the nature of their guidance of students' work. (Dinham, 1991, 79)

This summary is instructive in that she underlines that differences in teachers' approaches are reflected in every aspect of their interaction with students, and certainly her research has found that not all approaches are helpful to all students.

In the summary of her own findings Dinham's research complements Anthony's research by revealing that students receive often brilliant and constructive, but sometimes uninspired and occasionally destructive, instruction of greatly varying complexity and educational effect. (Dinham, 1991, 79)

This would also be my assessment from this review of the major published texts on studio critique - that these two pre-eminent writers in the architectural education field on the subject of criticism and the modes in which it is delivered in an architectural education
write about matters complementary in that Dinham focuses on the teacher, and instruction, whereas Anthony focuses on the jury as a mechanism and on the student's and critic's roles in improving this central feature of studio based education.

What they do not examine is the operation of the studio-based architectural critique from a learner-centred perspective which considers access and equity; nor from a perspective which brings to the forefront the aim of the critique as ultimately to empower students' self-judgement so that students are led through an educational process so sensitive to their growing sensibilities that at the end of their formal education they have powers of self-judgement honed to a level where their judgement of their own, and their peers' work, is explicit and consistent.

This thesis addresses these questions. Anthony has conclusively demonstrated with innumerable examples the sometimes humiliating and destructive effects of critique - but except for scant attention (Anthony, 1991, 36) she has not focused her argument on the extent to which these effects are differently experienced by students. Are current critique practices discriminatory in that they serve better the interests of some students than others? Does the public aspect of critique reduce women's confidence in dealing with negative critique? Should critique aim to build the development of confidence and self-judgement? Has the enhancement of confidence, and with it self-judgement, been identified and promoted as one of the primary tasks of architectural critique? Are students being encouraged to take responsibility for their own learning and self-knowledge in the practices of critique if the current practices of the "teacher as teller" (Dinham, 1989b, 82) remain in force as a validity in teaching architecture (with its epistemological roots in the Beaux Arts tradition and currently promoted in the "star system"). Does the existence of a 'master'

23. Anthony's later work considers this perspective to some extent. In Ahrentzen and Anthony (1993) 'Sex, Stars and Studios: A Look at Gendered Educational Practices in Architecture', Journal of Architectural Education 47:1 September, 1993, Ahrentzen and Anthony "provide a series of questions to help faculty and administrators engage in critical self-examination, and suggest ways in which educational practices might be restructured to enhance opportunities for women and men" (p.2). In the same issue, Mark Frederickson 'Gender and Racial Bias in Design Juries', "raises some disturbing questions about the ways in which men and women and students of different racial backgrounds are treated in design juries" (p.2). These texts are further considered in Ch 4, p.215.
critic subjugate students' self-judgement rather than increasing their confidence in their ability to judge their own, and other's work? Do particular practices discriminate against women?

These are some of the questions which Anthony's and Dinham's work invites the researcher to consider using an appropriate research methodology which is sufficiently fine-grained to acknowledge and expand on the major finding from Dinham's work - in short that the same practices in the hands of different teachers will produce different outcomes because, as Dinham says, it is "teachers' frames of reference and pragmatic heuristics for teaching that govern their teaching" (Dinham, 1989b, 85). A learner-centred approach, which acknowledges that the different life experiences, different learning backgrounds and different learning approaches and motivations students bring to the learning task will largely determine what they "take up" of the teachers' profferings, is useful to further describe and define the 'learning environment' of studio instruction. Dinham's research focuses on what the teacher did to determine the ways in which teachers design 'learning' environments.

The only process teachers can control in the 'learning environment' is their teaching. This thesis looks at the students' perspective on the 'learning environment' of studio instruction.

Dinham employed an ethnographic data gathering and coding methodology in her 1989 study of Schools of Architecture; she described the methodology as "naturalistic" and as "raising questions answerable only through exploratory methods employed in a naturalistic setting, through context-responsive research approaches yielding narrative data" (Dinham, 1989a, 6). She writes about her role as an "ethnographer" where "the investigators themselves provide the instrumentation and hence the constructed reality for a study like this (Smith, 1988)" in order to say that:

although the present study was not an ethnography, these principles [concerning ethnographers, where]...ethnographers are "able to go beyond... recording and to raise finely tuned questions, test out hunches, and move deeper into the analysis of issues"... nonetheless influenced the study in important ways.

24. This requires a very broad definition of teaching to encompass the studio-based activities over which the teacher traditionally exerts control - e.g. selecting and designing the project, the pragmatics of her delivery and the social organisation of the studio as a learning environment - i.e. group-work or individual endeavour.
The principles of ethnography as a method for recording the life of architecture students in relation to the studio critique have been adopted in this research, inasmuch as an ethnographic approach of any type concerns the centrality of the use of the "human instrument [usually the researcher himself or herself], because it would be virtually impossible to devise a priori a non-human instrument with sufficient adaptability to encompass and adjust to the varieties of realities that will be encountered" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.39 cited by Candy, 1991, 454) and that "the researcher physically goes to the site, the group of people, the institution, 'the field' to collect data" (Merriam and others, 1983, p.261 cited by Candy, 1991, 454).

However, this thesis does not rest in the naturalistic paradigm, which holds an apolitical stance. The work of Anthony and Dinham serves as an introduction and a background and as a body of scholarly reporting upon which to draw, but it does not go far enough towards uncovering the critical aspects of architectural education which promotes a system of critique as its central tenet - a system which, in its present forms, this thesis hypothesises, is disadvantageous to some students.

There is an argument (Lather, 1986a, 1986b) for suggesting that a critical ethnography, where the writer deliberately sets out, from an ideological position of "commitment to social change (and indeed to political reform)" (Candy, 1991, 435) to write a fine-grained account of the everyday architectural studio life, and of the practice of critique, intertwined with a critique about the taken-for-granted, may be more appropriate as a means of transforming teachers', students' and administrators' habitual and unquestioned practices through praxis based on self-reflection than merely describing a situation as is the case with naturalistic research.

An emancipatory social research calls for empowering approaches to research whereby both researcher and researched become, in the words of the feminist singer-poet Chris Williamson, "the changer and the changed". For researchers with
emancipatory aspirations, doing empirical research offers a powerful opportunity for praxis to the extent that the research process enables people to change by encouraging self-reflection and a deeper understanding of their particular situations. (Lather, 1986a, 263, my italics)

Candy (1991) describes well the generic differences between praxis potentialities of interpretive and critical research methodologies.

In its commitment to social change (and indeed to political reform), the critical approach abandons any pretense at neutrality, and recognizes "that questions of ethics, morality and politics are interrelated with science to orient individuals to what is right and just in a given situation" (Popkewitz, 1984, p.46). The critical approach seeks explicitly to identify and criticize disjunctions, incongruities, and contradictions in people's life experience. Whereas interpretive approaches may be inclined towards simply revealing misconceptions and confusion while leaving situations unchanged, "the function of critical theory is to understand the relations among value, interest, and action and, to paraphrase Marx, to change the world, not to describe it" (Popkewitz, 1984, p.45). (Candy, 1991, 435-436)

However there are a vast number of critical research methodologies, and the genre critical ethnography, whilst abandoning the value free stance of the interpretive paradigm ethnography, limits its transformative - "to change the world" - outcome to that of political consciousness raising. Through the textual product of critical ethnographic research the researcher has an ability to influence the process of political consciousness raising whilst not engaged directly in that process or the political action that may subsequently be forthcoming as a result of that consciousness raising.

Whilst Chapter 5 will provide examples from my own and others' teaching of transformations to teaching as a result of self-reflection on this research, as stated in the Introduction to Chapter 5, this section of writing rather than concluding the process of critical ethnographic research, follows it. The intention of the critical ethnographic

25. Lather (1986a, 260) provides an insight into the use of "empirical" in this context.

The foundation of postpositivism is the cumulative, trenchant, and increasingly definitive critique of the inadequacies of positivist assumptions in the light of the complexities of human experience (Berstein, 1976; Cronbach, 1975; Feinberg, 1983; Giroux, 1981; Guba and Lincoln, 1981; Kaplan, 1964; Mishler, 1979). Post-positivism argues that the present orthodoxy in the human sciences is obsolete and that new visions for generating social knowledge are required (Hesse, 1980; Reason & Rowan, 1981; Rose, 1979; Schwartz and Ogilvy, 1979). Those committed to the development of a change-enhancing, interactive, contextualized approach to knowledge-building have amassed a body of empirical work that is provocative in its implications for both theory and, increasingly, method. (my italics)
methodology is to focus only on the process, and the product - the textual outcome - of the critical ethnography. The (hoped for) transformations for teachers and students, it is emphasized, may come as a result of the connection between their reading of this research text and their own lived experiences. Lather (1986a, 271-272) refers to the notion of research validity enshrined in interconnectivity as the "'click of recognition' and a 'yes, of course' instead of 'yes, but' experience" which she considers (along with Reason and Rowan, 1981, 240 and Brown and Tandem, 1978 cited by Lather, 1986b, 67) expands into a "catalytic validity" representing "the degree to which the research process reorients, refocuses, and energizes participants towards knowing reality in order to transform it."

Lather (1986b) further considers that the

the overt ideological goal of neo-Marxist critical ethnography is to expose the contradictions and delusions of liberal democratic education in order to create less exploitative social and economic relations (Willis, 1977; Apple 1980-81; Reynolds, 1980-81). The substantive task is the portrayal of the role of schooling in the reproduction of inequality in all of its content and specificity, its contradictions and complexities. The methodological task is the ethnographic revelation of participant's views of reality, where these views come from, and the social consequences of such views, all situated with in the context of theory-building. The overriding goal, then, is to produce "an adequate theory of schooling in the context of cultural imperatives" (Ogbu, 1981, p.9). The theory is to make clear "the order of structural transformation necessary to honour commitments to human rights and justice" (Pinar, 1981, p.439). (Lather, (1986b, 70-71, my italics)

However, as hinted at by Lather, in the critical ethnography paradigm the Marxian concept of "changing the world" is a process over which the researcher exerts no direct control, other than through "portrayal" and "theory-building" which forms part of the research process.

For these reasons, which will be further detailed in Chapter 3, the "ethnographic" stance considered by Dinham does not go far enough towards uncovering participants' individual realities, which are "held to be something more than negotiated accounts" in critical ethnographic research (Lather, 1986b, 70). Lather says about the difference between neo-Marxist critical ethnographies (Masemann, 1982; Ogbu, 1981 cited in Lather, 1986a, 258) and non-Marxist ethnographies, which reside in the interpretive paradigm, that:
Critical ethnographers hold that by limiting analysis to the actor's perceptions of their situations, non-Marxist ethnographies and phenomenological research reify interpretive procedures and reduce research to a collection of functionalist, subjective accounts that obscure the workings of false consciousness and ideological mystification. (Lather, 1986b, 70, my italics)26

From the careful survey work of Dinham (1987a, 1987b) and Anthony (1991, 1987) it is possible to gain a deep insight into studio life, the 'desk crit' as a major teaching site (Dinham, 1987b) and the final jury/review as a powerful experience in the life of the architecture student. Through engaging a feminist critical ethnographic approach which is described in Chapter 3, it is possible to move on from this rich body of evidence and my own observations, described in Chapter 4, to demonstrate how critique sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women.

The way in which it is possible to "move on" is inextricably linked with the insights into "false consciousness" provided through the process of conducting and participating in openly ideological research. As a researcher who considers a thesis of discrimination, I must, as was argued in Ch 1, use a methodology which can shift the core assumptions of the reader about the interpretations of the "taken-for-granted" through finding a way of revealing the "false consciousness" of the 'actors'. Such a tool is provided by openly ideological research - in this case the combination of feminist poststructuralist analysis and the fine-grained accounts of feminist critical ethnography.

26. Lather (1986a, 264) defines the Gramscian view of false consciousness:

   False consciousness is the denial of how our commonsense ways of looking at the world are permeated with meanings that sustain our disempowerment (Bowers, 1984; Gramsci, 1971, Shalamini, 1981)...

27. Lather (1986b) tempers her support for the seemingly unproblematic nature of neo-Marxist ethnographies "which argue that Marxism's profound scepticism of both appearances and common sense produces a more valid analysis than does phenomenological research" (p. 70-71) in at least two ways: for their reliance on a flawed central thesis of Marxism - "the economistic reduction of humanity to pawns in the great chessgame of capitalism (Apple, 1982; Giroux, 1981; Willis, 1977)" - and for their sometimes impenetrable "alienating jargon" (p. 72).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

comprising

METHODOLOGY LITERATURE REVIEW and
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY including
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE METHODOLOGY AND THE OBJECTIVES OF
THE STUDY

Introduction

My project is about architectural education, and particularly the main teaching and
assessment protocol, which is architectural critique. I have used feminist critical
ethnography, which is a form of advocacy research, to investigate the architectural critique
in studio-based education. This chapter will provide the background to, and explain the
reasons for the choice of this methodology.

This methodology has, as its hoped for outcome, the transformation of students' education
through a focus on praxis - informed practice based on self-reflection. As has been
discussed in the conclusion to Chapter 2 Literature Review there is not a direct relationship
between conducting critical ethnographic research, and the demonstration of praxis
outcomes. Rather, the evolving genre feminist critical ethnography relies for its
transformative outcomes on its fine-scaled approach which results in a detailed narrative.
The narrative provides readers with a "click of recognition" (Lather, 1986a, 271-272) so
energising (Stake, 1985, 280) that the possible resultant political consciousness raising, is,
in time, translated into collaborative political change (Smith, 1993b, 9). However, as will
be described, this phase of the process is outside the scope of the researcher's direct
devour.
This Chapter:

(a) addresses the evolving role which I played as researcher-observer;
(b) discusses the insights into the construction of text and meaning from narrative that a hands-on approach as researcher-participant can offer; and
(c) describes the departures from 'master narrative' theory about the conventionally accepted 'right' way to structure an ethnographic piece of writing from a feminist perspective.

The research has both a wide (macro-scale) focus, on the place of critique in architectural education, and a narrow (micro-scale) focus on how particular practices discriminate against some students. I refer first in this chapter to the micro-scale focus the research methodology adopts to view particular practices through a macro-scale focus on the social and cultural factors into which particular practices are embedded.

**Single event or case-study research**

At the micro-scale the research is concerned with single events in students' lives (Bassey, 1981) which may be the occasion for intense self-reflection and eventual transformative outcomes for the student and the educator as a result of political consciousness raising.

Single event study is commonly called case study. Stake (1985) says:

Case study is the study of a single case - whether simple and specific, [such as Miss Valdaz, last year's teacher of geography], or abstract and complex, [such as all the legislation in Nordic countries to keep small rural schools open]. It is a case, a bounded system. The case is usually an entity of intrinsic interest, not merely a sample from which to learn about the population. It is similar to others, yet distinct, and yet each of the cases is to be noted for a certain unity within, a certain systematic character (Goode and Hatt, 1952).

Case study researchers seek to learn a great deal about a single case, examining events and measurements, trying to fit them all together. Sometimes they seek grand understanding, a generalization, one that perhaps has not emerged from studying many cases all at once.(Stake, 1985, 278, 279)

Bassey (1981), in *Pedagogic Research: on the relative merits of search for generalisation and the study of single events* stresses again and again, through the selection of a large
number of examples from educational research, that *generalised* research questions were answered in a way that did not produce useful outcomes for teachers, administrators, parents or children. He refers to the preferable fine-grained approach as *case-study research*, and implores the community of researchers to:

...distinguish between pedagogic research and other forms of educational research, and in relation to pedagogic research [they] should eschew the pursuit of generalisations, unless their potential usefulness is apparent, and instead should actively encourage the *descriptive and evaluative study of single pedagogic events*. In this way pedagogic research will contribute effectively to the improvement of pedagogic practice. (p. 86, my italics)

A contrary argument to the value of single event or case-study research propounded by Stake (1985), Stenhouse (1985), Bassey (1981) is advanced by Walker (1983) in *Three Good Reasons for not Doing Case Studies in Curriculum Research*. He argues that:

Case Studies are, to me, primarily documentary and descriptive in character, but are marked by the attempt to reach across from the experience of those who are the subjects of the study to those who are the audience. (Walker, 1983, 155)

and Walker summarises his problems with case-studies as follows:

(a) Case-study research is an intervention, and often an uncontrolled intervention, in the lives of others.
(b) Case-study research provides a biased view, a distorted picture of the way things are.
(c) Case-study research is essentially conservative. (Walker, 1983, 156)

Walker's last point provides perhaps the greatest cause for concern. He believes that:

the very process of conceiving, writing and publishing a case-study solidifies and crystallizes a reality in the minds of the readers and the writer...The act of case study...is to describe reality in order to create it...Once fixed, the case-study changes little, but the situations and the people caught in it have moved even before the image is available. (Walker, 1983, 163)

A more dynamic methodology than one which "embalms" the in-School situation, reporting it with an authority which suggests that the researcher's interpretation is valid as a fixed and unchanging representation of some essential truth about the School, is demanded. Stake
(1985) disagrees with Walker about the researcher's authority necessarily being more prominent than the reader's interpretation, saying that

Research aimed at generating grand generalization increases the authority of and dependence upon the specialist. Case research aimed at enabling users to increase understanding through naturalistic generalization offers a greater possibility of facilitating the autonomy and sense of responsibility in the practitioner. Epistemologically again, with case study the researcher may be attempting to provide information that facilitates the reader's own analysis more than to deliver statements of generalization. (Walker, 1980 cited by Stake, 1985, 280, my italics)

The selected critical ethnography methodology is very concerned with providing information "that facilitates the reader's own analysis", relying methodologically as it does on political consciousness raising as its means to empowerment (Smith, 1993b, 14).

Walker's second point about the inevitability of distortion demands some comment. A statement about researcher bias and distortion constituting the view of "the way things are" is important. In accepting that the subjectivity of the view creates a "picture of the way things are", the value of conducting case study research can be promoted through arguing that, contrary to Walker's view, there is no inherent situational 'essence'; and that it is the researcher's view which eclipses any situation. Stake says

[but subjectivity and especially disciplined criticism (Lakatos and Musgrave, 1970) are sometimes the power of educational case study. Processes not anticipated can be discovered; the full intuitive and rational powers of the researcher can be brought directly to bear on the phenomena. The report is recognized not as veridical representation of reality but as interaction - hopefully a meaningful, useful and rich interaction - between observer and observed, a 'constructed' reality. (Stake, 1985, 282)

Stake, in writing about the necessity for the researcher to bring both "intuitive and rational powers" to the research, and of the report being recognized "not as veridical representation of reality but as interaction... a constructed reality" anticipates the obvious question of atypicality.

One of the objections to case study is often voiced in the question, 'But is this case typical?' (Of course it only makes sense to talk about typicality if a population, a

1. Despite the knowledge that one can never wholly constitute oneself for others, see my partial statement in search of my own subjectivity, later in Chapter 4, commencing on p. 182.
reference group, is agreed upon.) It is contended by Kemmis (1980) and others that understanding the general can often be enhanced by studying the atypical. The atypical can often alert us to variables or happenings that we regularly overlook. And the atypical case long-watched may inform us better than the briefly-watched more typical cases. Our philosophy of science fails to tell us how much to expect complex social processes to be correlated with the demographic characteristics by which we usually define typicality. For demographic representation a typical case needs to be studied. For problem solving, typicality may be of relatively small importance. (Stake, 1985, 280, my italics)

Although I have used the essence of case study construction extensively in the formulation of the narratives, which are a record of the observations I made over two years, and to which I refer extensively in Chapters 4 and 5, case-study is unsuitable as the principal research methodology for this project, driven as it is by a belief "that they [interpretive approaches] do not go far enough" (Candy, 1991, 433). Candy continues:

What is required is a broader and more inclusive perspective than any one participant, or group of participants may bring to bear.(p. 434)

Those who favour critical approaches argue that, by emphasizing the subjective meanings of social action, other interpretive researchers often neglect the relationship between individuals' interpretations and actions and external factors, ignoring the fact that social reality is shaped by, and shapes, the interpretations and perceptions of individuals. Critical researchers maintain that research can legitimately look beyond the perceptions that individuals have, to the factors (often ideological) that influence such perceptions, for "the very process whereby one interprets and defines a situation is itself a product of the circumstances in which one is placed (Cohen and Manion, 1985, p.38)". (Candy, 1991, 434-435)

I will return to Walker's three points again in Chapter 5 to argue that his criticisms of case study research are not denied in the construction of the narratives. My role of researcher as observer is interventionist, biased, (although in so far as possible my bias is disclosed), and therefore distorted, and presents a (conservative) picture of a moment in time which does not address, in its fixity, the inevitability of change. In support of Bassey's view, the narratives, as case studies of one studio, or one critique, "eschew the pursuit of generalisations" to describe and discuss single contextualised, and bounded events, from which I do not seek to generalise. Therefore, any implications for action must be based on changes in the reader's thinking, as the changes cannot result from generalising and translating the findings from the critiques discussed directly to other cases. Stake (1985) comments about the possibility of generalising from case studies that:
An alternative inference model [to that of generalising from a sample] is implicit in case studies. The researcher optimizes reader opportunity to relate the case described directly to their own cases, to infer particularistic understandings not necessarily mediated by general rules...A researcher who tries to promote reader-made naturalistic generalizations usually tries to provide the elaborate information on which readers decide the extent to which the researcher's case is similar to (and thus likely to be instructive about) theirs. The pursuit of contextuality then is not only for consideration of interactions but also for clarification of possible use. (p.280)

This argument, expressed by Stenhouse (1985) and Stake (1985) is the essence of the Epilogue, and is further considered in Chapter 5: that whilst the case studies can comprise "thick data", rich with the dialogue of the participants, the ability of the reader to transform her own actions as a result of reflection on the case study, is a matter of the reader's judgement about the degree of similarity between the case described and her own context.

What the research could uncover

At the macro-scale the research is concerned with the notion of an architectural education embedded in a culture of architecture which has a strong tradition of white Eurocentrism and male domination. As stated by Ward (1991, 93) "[i]n design, our built history tends to be that of the dominant Eurocentric culture". The methodology must account for the position of the "other"; its purpose is to privilege students' voices, and it must grapple with the underlying social dimensions of education. Therefore, whilst at the micro-scale the research is concerned with "making everyday routines problematic...recognising practices as ideological (which makes the unnatural appear natural)" (Smith, 1990, 181), at the macro-scale it is concerned with shifting power relationships, examining structures, and overturning notions of hierarchy in order to optimise the limited empowerment potentials of

2. Stake offers the following explanation of the term "thick data".

Case study data have often been called 'thick data', not necessarily stacked high, but 'thick like spaghetti', highly interconnected. (Geertz, 1973, cited by Stake, 1985, 279)


4. "Other" than white, "other" than male, "other" than heterosexual, "other" than middle class, "other" than the son of a professional, "other" than a school leaver, "other" than in a family situation where all efforts can be directed at study...the list is endless. For a fuller description of "marked and "unmarked" categories, see Davies, 1994, 5-16.
this research methodology through the reader's own self-reflection about the nature of "taken for granted" practices in the studio.

Self-descriptions of student experiences at the state-supported University of California at Los Angeles speak about the students' sense of exclusion from what they observed as "mainstream thought and practice" (Dutton, 1991b, 127). The following quotations are good examples of "the everyday made problematic" - that is, the questioning of micro-scale practices, in themselves seemingly trivial, accreting to question the macro-scale or structures of the profession, and the School's preparation of students for the profession.

About being privileged as a white woman, Shirl Buss says:

> To me, the architecture program was a classic case of institutional and personal racism, sexism and elitism...most important, on the institutional level many of us failed to see how racism, classism, and sexism were tightly intertwined and automatically structured into most of the systems we encountered in our educational experience, especially within the studio system...I became increasingly aware of how I benefited from my own white privilege. (Shirl Buss, Anglo female student with a feminist orientation, 133-5, in Dutton, 1991b)

Sheryl Tircuit writes about being disadvantaged as a member of an ethnic minority:

> In my final year, a school wide competition was held to select students to study under Los Angeles architect Frank Gehry. I was one of eight students chosen to participate in this advanced master studio. Students, some not even involved with the competition, openly questioned and expressed strong resentment of my enrolment. They speculated that I was chosen only because members of the selection committee were intimidated by my black activism...My time, effort and level of accomplishment were not considered. A school cannot be held responsible for every act of racism, but it should not reinforce such ignorance.

> The ignorance was not only racial, but cultural as well. The view of the world we were taught was Eurocentric and Anglocentric. Other cultures were viewed as subcultures without true histories, and their contributions were considered primitive and irrelevant. (Sheryl Tircuit, African American female activist, 130-131, in Dutton, 1991b)

About gender and racial expectations Julie Diaz writes:

> In addition to racial and ethnic biases, I was also confronted with gender discrimination. One instructor became aware that I was a parent, and during class time confronted me with this fact. He questioned my ability to succeed in the program because I had a child...Another male professor told me that I should not have had a child prior to studying architecture...My family situation, no matter how healthy and positive, was seen not as a contribution, but rather an obstacle to my education. (Julie Diaz, Chicana parent, 125, in Dutton, 1991b)
The adopted methodology refrains from taking the value neutral stance of interpretive research - standing outside the situation and looking in. The research question, pointing to possible discrimination in critique protocol, cannot support the apolitical, value-free stance of the interpretive paradigm. What the hypothesis is calling for is a research methodology which is sensitive to different student voices, as much as to different teacher voices and my own view of studio education.

Critical Ethnography

Angus (1986) argues in *Research Traditions, Ideology and Critical Ethnography* that, on the basis of his critique of the use of conventional (positivist and interpretive techniques) methodologies:

> the use of critical ethnographies in schools is advocated. Such ethnography, it is argued, is capable of bridging the gap between macro- and micro-analysis because it addresses the dialectic between broad issues of social structure and issues of social interaction which involve human agents. Moreover, such critical ethnography is also appropriate for the cumulative work of interrogating theory with data and vice versa. In this way, it may contribute both to more sophisticated and better understanding of the situation being investigated and also to more complete and better theory. (p. 61)

Mine is not value free research, and in adopting a critical ethnographic research approach as a vehicle for the textual description of sites of learning at the micro- and macro-scale, I welcome the opportunity to have the means to position 'data' as the micro-scale to be viewed through the macro-scale of theory; and conversely to interrogate 'theory' through the macro-scale of data.

I came to the decision to adopt a critical research methodology through a consideration of the merits of qualitative research approaches which remain entirely within the interpretive research paradigm. Qualitative, often called interpretive or naturalistic, research, takes an apolitical or value neutral stance. In this paradigm, the researcher is an outsider, viewing the situation dispassionately, documenting what she "sees" and later, in the "writing up"
stage, grounding in theory the derived generalisations or "overarching theories" which seek to explain the natural world. Whilst this approach has been extensively used in educational research and evaluation for the last twenty years when it began to largely augment quantitative methodologies, it does not readily account for different subject positions and the agency of each actor in the natural world. Burgess (1984) comments that the qualitative methods most commonly used - observation, participant observation and informal or unstructured interviews - take into account the fact that "research is infused with assumptions about the social world and is influenced by the researcher" (p. 3). But within the interpretive paradigm the assumptions remain unspoken and the researcher's value system undeclared. Goodman (1992, 122) critiques the foundation supposition of "qualitative inquirers" that their value systems do not enter the research arena saying that the "[c]laims of value-neutral knowledge production camouflage the social, political, and psychological interests intrinsic to all human actions including the work of academics and other producers of social knowledge".

The logic is that the researcher plays the role of neutral adjudicator of what goes on in a given setting without realizing that his/her own observations, questions, analysis, and theorizing contain implicit interpretive and political content. In situating the researcher in the role of a privileged, external observer who is politically neutral, social phenomenology in some instances has merely become a form of clandestine positivism. (p. 122)

Such supposition about the role of the researcher's value systems is not the case with critical research. A consideration of interpretive research through a lens of feminist poststructuralism suggests that the researcher does not even have the availability of a value neutral stance location as viewer in relation to the natural world. To look in one direction is necessarily to avert the gaze from another. To adopt one subject position is accordingly to place any other in the background. To claim the possibility of an apolitical subject position is to deny that politics is inscribed on the body; women, people of colour and lesbians often do not have the luxury of claiming an apolitical stance. Nor do the poor. If adopting the guiding principle of the women's movement from the 1960s that "the personal is political" and that "consciousness raising is feminism's method of analysis" (Leavitt, 225, 245 in
Dutton, 1991b) the research needs to go beyond the interpretive approach (to data gathering and analysis) to the notion of critical research.

The move in educational research toward critical research

Before I detail the critical ethnography research protocol I have selected, I will consider briefly the move away from positivist, and interpretivist, or naturalistic research paradigms, towards a criticalist paradigm in educational research.

Although I could refer to Goodman (1992); Harding (1991); Reason (ed.) (1988); Lather (1986a,b) as well as Reinhart (1981), all of whom devote considerable energies to teasing apart the seemingly conflicting paradigms which are now sometimes referred to as the "paradigm wars", I will limit my discussion of this burgeoning field of enquiry and publication to Gage (1989) who presents, in his review essay The Paradigm Wars and Their Aftermath, something of an overview of the "paradigm wars" literature.

The expression "paradigm wars" was brought to prominence by Gage (1989) in this essay which reviews the "wars" in the context of research on teaching from 1989 up until his

5. Hammersley (1992, 133) refers to Smith and Heshusius' (1986) view of paradigms which postulates "that the differences between paradigms lie not at the level of methods or techniques but rather at that of philosophical assumptions, both about the nature of the social world and about knowledge and the process of inquiry." Comber (1988, 777) says that:

Paradigm can refer to differences in ways of operating or to differences in ways of thinking. This is important because, if a paradigm simply refers to choices in technique, then there is no difficulty with compatibility and eclecticism. A researcher can simply review the best techniques for answering the question and select the most appropriate. However, if a paradigm (e.g. rationalistic vs. naturalistic) is a way of thinking, then the choices the researcher has to make are always based on a value laden world view rather than a pragmatic mode of operation leading toward an accepted validity.

6. It is interesting to speculate on the masculist framing of this intense academic debate, which preoccupies many researchers. From my reading those it most occupies are male. There is another intense debate in the feminist literature about ways of framing feminist research - but the emphasis from writers like Lather (1991) is on bringing practitioners of different paradigms together, rather than setting them against each other. Typical of her statements to this effect are "[r]ather than establish a new orthodoxy, we need to experiment, document and share our efforts towards emancipatory research" (Lather, 1991, 69, my italics). This is rather different language than that used in preparation for a battle. Reinhart (1981), a feminist writer on research traditions, outlines why it is so difficult to implement a new paradigm in that the "development of an alternative paradigm involves a
hypothetical vantage point set in 2009. I find this essay very amusing, as much for the facetious approach Gage takes which reminds me of a statement of Carr and Kemmis (1983, 107) to which Comber (1988, 778) directs readers that

[The testing ground for educational research is not its theoretical sophistication or its ability to conform to evaluative criteria derived from the social sciences, but rather its capacity to resolve educational problems and improve educational practice as for the dawning realisation that researchers operating in different paradigms will probably never agree on the veracity of their academic peers' approach and that the "war" will never be won. Certainly Hammersley's (1992) response to Gage, titled The Paradigm Wars: reports from the front, which also reviews new work of Guba (ed.) (1990) and Smith (1989) suggests that the "battle lines" are drawn.

In short, what Gage (1988, 4) says is that researchers from the positivist tradition of educational research "had come in for a severe beating during the 80s. Such research had been characterised as "at best, inconclusive, at worst, barren" (Tom, 1984, p.2) and [was] inadequate to tell us anything secure and important about how teachers should proceed in the classroom" (Barrow, 1984, p.213)". Gage then states that interpretivists gained ground by strongly criticizing positivists' "standard" approaches.

They [interpretivists] rejected the conception of cause as mechanical or chemical or biological, a conception they said was used in the "standard" approaches to research on teaching. They also rejected the assumption of uniformity in nature...the use of linear causal models applied to behavioural variables as a basis for inferring causal relations among the variables, because models presuppose fixed and obvious meanings of certain types and actions by teachers. (Gage, 1989, 5)

Therefore, Gage (still at this stage of the essay speaking of events that had already happened) wrote that interpretive researchers "emphasized the phenomenological perspective of the persons behaving" with "individuals as able to construct their social reality, rather than having reality be the determiner of the individual's perceptions" (p. 50).

---

continuous effort to work through the blinders of mystification" which is impossible without excellent support structures which "counteract[s] the insidious obstacles of self-doubt, lack of faith, and the inability to persevere in the face of outside attack or lack of support" (p. 425-426). Clearly when you are trying to develop something new, feminists writers suggest, you cannot afford to also be waging a war.
If this is the case, Gage states, in the view of interpretivist researchers, positivistic and behavioural research "ought to be supplanted by interpretive research on teaching, which would examine the conditions of meaning created by students and teachers as a basis for explaining differences among students in their achievement and morale" (p.5). Not so, says Gage of the view of critical theorists. Gage (1989, 5) states critical theorists' ideologically driven view was that all the while positivist researchers "had been governed by a merely "technical" orientation aimed at efficiency, rationality and objectivity" (p.5)

we should have been looking at the relationship of schools and teaching and society - the political and economic foundations of our constructions of knowledge, curriculum and teaching. The critical theorists emphasized the importance of power in society and the function of schools in defining social reality. They stressed the way in which education serves the interests of the dominant social class, which in our society has consisted of the rich, the white, and the male...These class interests had led educators to serve, however unwittingly, the functions of reproducing the inequitable social class structure and other arrangements that currently exist and to proceed as if the societal status quo should go unquestioned.

But, the critical theorists asserted, human beings can change the social structure...Properly educated and motivated people can undertake to change our society...Schools, like other social institutions...must be scenes of the necessary struggles for power. Educational research ought at least to be aware of the possibilities of such struggles.

The implication of the critical theorists' position was that the kinds of research on teaching that had been done until 1989 by the so-called positivists, attempting to use scientific methods, and even to some degree by the interpretivists, exploring social constructions of reality, had been more or less trivial. This research has constituted a kind of technical attempt to improve the "fine details" (Erickson, 1986, p.120) of teaching - "the little differences in everyday classroom life that [according to both positivists and the interpretivists] make a big difference for students learning" (Erickson, p.128). Instead, the critical theorists implied, what is needed is a reconsideration of the whole structure of society in which education, including teaching, goes on. (Gage, 1989, 5-6)

Gage's early hypothesis in his essay is that the critical theorists "win" the war early on, but he discusses, in the remainder of the paper, the far reaching implications of this success for educational research and researchers.

Critical Research

Robinson (1993) argues:
Critical research is attractive to many educational researchers because they perceive it as overcoming the limitations of both the empiricist and interpretive traditions. (p. 226)

She considers that critical researchers reject the "political and value neutrality of positivist versions of empirical inquiry" and that critical theorists also see "their approach overcoming the idealism and relativism of interpretation" (p. 226). Conversely, it can be argued that critical theorists are some of the most idealistic of researchers, driven to a "do-gooder" approach to solve social problems of inequitable distribution of power and wealth through research aimed at the enlightenment of the researched from their false consciousness which is blinkering their potential. Whilst it is outside the scope of this thesis to consider this topic extensively, I include Fay's (1987) thoughts on the limited potentials of an idealistic critical social science.

An idealistic critical social science would picture suffering people as eager and able to transform their lives simply on the basis of a new account of them, and would portray their suffering as caused simply by their ignorance of themselves. [But we know that this is not the case.] Often the suffering of people is caused by their domination by others; often sufferers are not willing to consider alternative accounts of their experience, their needs, and their capacities; and often when they are willing, indeed even when they do learn a new theory about themselves, they are unable to behave differently from before. An idealistic social science cannot face the problems of domination, resistance, and weakness of will, and it cannot face the problems because it denies the causal embeddedness of self-ignorance in concrete social structures. (Fay, 1987, 25)

The aim of critical social researchers, as stated by Goodman (1992, 122) citing Fay, (1987, 75) "is to help people not only to be transparent to themselves but also to cease being mere objects in the world, passive victims dominated by forces external to them".

What then is critical research? It is research which is concerned with "emancipation - emancipation of social classes, from oppression or contempt; emancipation of people throughout society" (Braybrooke, 1987, 68 cited in Robinson, 1993). "Critical approaches are distinguished from interpretive approaches primarily by their connection to theoretical perspectives which are linked to a general theory of society and a concept of social structure which exists beyond the actor's perception of it" (Masemann, 1982, 9). It is a methodology which is "openly ideological, socially critical, overtly political and emancipatory in orientation" (Smith, 1993a, 184). In short a critical research approach differs from an
empiricist or interpretive approach by its active, emancipatory intent (Smith, 1990, 175). Smith says that generically

"Critical research is designed to involve and inform people (especially traditionally oppressed groups) about the strategic actions necessary to promote their emancipation from forms of life which perpetuate irrationality, social injustice and exploitation in all its forms (Smith, 1990, 175)."

Critical research rejects the apolitical or value-neutral stance of the qualitative research paradigm (Gage, 1989, 5-6). It holds that no research is value free; that the values with which the researcher has imbued the work are simply not disclosed (Goodman, 1992, 122). Critical research holds that the world is unequal, not through natural occurrences, but through the agency of human intervention (Harding, 1991). It aims to identify and disclose those practices which are active contributors to the presently inequitable state of our world, as well as identifying those passive behaviours which are complicit in perpetrating and enabling the practices which are oppressive and contributing to imbalance (Harding, 1991).

The notion of a critical methodology involves the researcher in seeking an understanding of the "natural made unnatural" which, in my instance, involves deconstructing the practice of critique in architectural education to question taken-for-granted practices. Smith summarises the possibilities for a critical research approach:

*The critical research approach provides the means by which practitioners can participate in explaining and challenging sources of domination and exploitation that are institutionalised and legitimated by policy.* (Smith, 1990, 175)

There are many critical research methodologies and the detailed discussion of the different nuances of each constantly evolving methodology is beyond the scope of this thesis. Recent documents including Hammersley (1992a) *The Paradigm Wars: reports from the front* and

---

7. As could be predicted from the discussion of the framing of the tussle for supremacy among research methodologists as the paradigm "wars", there is no "essentialist" critical theory. Candy states that the "label "critical theory" has been applied to a range of phenomena (Carr and Kemmis, 1983, p.129) and, like both positivism and interpretive approaches to research, critical theory is not, and never was, a "fully articulated philosophy shared unproblematically" (Giroux, 1983, p.7)." Candy, 1991, 435.

8. The example Smith (1990, 174) cites is Brecht, in Sargent (1983, 181), "'famines do not occur, they are organised by the grain trade'".
Lather (1994) 'A Curriculum of Angels: On (Not) Writing About the Lives of Women with HIV/AIDS' attempt a taxonomy of differences of research methodologies ranging from empiricist through interpretive to critical and beyond to post-positivist new paradigm enquiry. As Lather remarked, in presenting this taxonomy in social science research, "there's no one best way any more" and "it is now legitimate to do social science research across paradigms" and that "there is no innocent space to stand in". One of the major differentiations between the rapidly evolving formulations of post-positivist research arrives from a consideration of the empowerment potentialities of the different emergent paradigms.

The Empowerment Potentials Of Critical Ethnographic Research

Smith (1993b), who considers at length the potential for empowerment of different critical research methodologies in his paper Potentials for Empowerment in Critical Educational Research, writes that

Critical research is a form of conviction research. It is designed not just to explain or understand social reality but to change it. Research with an emancipatory intent which strives to empower participants to make changes, is the raison d'etre of critical research. However, as reminded by Acker et al (1983):

10. Smith (1993a) lists "a bewildering array of critical research labels":
   - action research
   - critical constructivist research
   - critical cultural analysis
   - critical educational research
   - critical hermeneutics
   - critical policy analysis
   - educative research
   - emancipatory praxis
   - feminist post-structuralist research
   - feminist praxis research
   - Freirian/dialogic research
   - participatory action research
   - participatory research
   - political anthropology
   - research as praxis (Smith, 1993a, 218)
An emancipatory intent is no guarantee of an emancipatory outcome (p. 431).

The emancipatory potential of action research (as one example of critical research) is not something that can be guaranteed (Kemmis, 1991, p. 60; Grundy as cited in Tripp, 1987, p. 211; McTaggart & Garbutcheon Singh, 1986, p. 46). Similarly, following her critique of the critical pedagogy literature and language that has burgeoned over the last decade, it would seem that Ellsworth (1989) could be equally critical when she argues that the "key assumptions, goals, and practices [of critical research] ...namely, 'empowerment', 'student voice', dialogue... are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination (p. 298). All descriptions or reports of critical research designs and projects share a common critical/emanicipatory language. This is no guarantee they are all equally empowering. Rather than empowering some may be quite impotent (see Maeroff, 1988, p. 474). (Smith, 1993b, 3)

Smith believes that there are three "potentially interrelated" ways in which empowerment is conceived and used in educational and social discourses.

These are three identifiable but also potentially interrelated spheres of empowerment: one sphere emerging from the discourse of social psychology, being concerned with self-growth and personal liberation from dependency; another sphere emerging from the discourse of critical social theory, being concerned with a political reading of the world and the unmasking of false consciousness; the third sphere emerges from the closely related discourse of social activism, being concerned with strategic resistance and social transformation through the mobilisation of collective action. (Smith, 1993b, 4)

Smith in stating that the spheres are "potentially interrelated", refers to the consideration that they may be misinterpreted as either completely independent, or linear. He considers that rather than these conceptualisations, alternative critical research methodologies "can energise and enable interested parties through variously weighted or combined spheres of empowerment" (p. 4), which he cautions are long-term (Wallerstein and Berstein, 1988, p. 388 cited by Smith, 1993b, 4). "Time is needed for either personal exploration (self-searching), establishing trusting relations...promoting the abilities in the researched to share understandings coherently, for developing a sense of solidarity with the dispossessed in a particular social setting, or to undertake a critical reading of the practices and conditions that are the focus of the research project" (p. 4).

Smith considers that critical ethnography, as a critical, non-participatory and non-interventionist (Smith, 1993a, 218) methodology, contains its empowerment potential to that of political consciousness raising through "inbuilt research procedures" (Smith, 1993b,
This is worthy of further comment concerning the methodological conduct of the research which limits its potential to political consciousness raising as a means of empowerment. Smith states that, in general terms,

empowerment conceived as political consciousness-raising has the potential to be realised in critical projects which:
- collect participants' interpretations of reality
- re-interpret participants' interpretations using such critical tools as:
  - social reproduction and resistance
  - re-situating the micro in the macro socio-cultural setting of 'raced', classed and gendered relations
  - values and interest identified as being served by such understandings
- report back the reinterpretations to participants. (Smith, 1993b, 13)

Smith illustrates this containment with regard to critical ethnography diagrammatically "where a 'gap' is evident between the production of a critical report (i.e. the critical re-interpretation in the from of a narrative) and the possibility that stakeholders will read that report, reflect on its cogency and consequences, and proceed to initiate change (or transformative action)" (p.14).

Critical Ethnographic processes illustrated diagrammatically in Smith, 1993b, 14.

For the sake of simplicity the research design for critical ethnography can be represented as a set of sequential activities - the boxed activities being planned and controlled by the critical ethnographer, the circled activities being hoped-for outcomes of the critical process. (Smith, 1993a, 222)
Smith writes of the break between the boxed and the circled activities that:

Assuming optimum skill and care is evident in the conduct of the critical ethnography, and that the critical researcher's report is read by all concerned, the politics of the method (as defined by the indicators above, and, as cogently reinforced by Gitlin et al., 1989) intrinsic to critical ethnography will delimit its empowerment potentials to political consciousness-raising. (Smith, 1993b, 14)

I sought a methodology which would provide a fine-grained account yet avoid the exploitation, intervention and conservatism of case-studies, whilst examining events as common as those which occur everyday in Schools of Architecture from a consideration of larger social structures. After a consideration of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of other critical approaches (Smith, 1993b, 15) I selected the critical ethnography methodology for this research project. My decision was influenced by the ability of ethnography to provide a fine-grained account of everyday happenings; by the legitimate role of the researcher as observer, instead of experimenter; and by the location of ethnography within the interpretive paradigm - seeking always "to produce descriptions and interpretations of events and social structures in which selected groups of people live" (Smith, 1993a, 219).

My selection of the critical ethnography research methodology from this critical, non-participatory and non-interventionist category was considerably influenced by the structure of the research project. A PhD researcher operates with in a narrow expectation in terms of the thesis displaying original and critical thought, making a significant contribution to knowledge, relating the topic of research to a broader disciplinary framework and being well written. A PhD researcher does not want to have to prove, as an integral part of demonstrating the thesis, that certain collective action, and/or political struggle over which he or she exerts no control, either did or did not take place as a necessary condition of the research project being considered worthy. PhD research is not an "aid to the revolution"; rather it is a highly controlled and supervised endeavour in which the novice researcher must demonstrate her capacity to, in its entirety, conceive of and carry out a worth-while research process which will contribute to, and extend, a body of knowledge all within three
years (in the case of a Scholarship student). Therefore, it is outside both the expectations of the PhD paradigm of research, and the potentials of critical ethnography for the potential transformations of both participants and readers to be a necessary and demonstrable outcome of the research process. As Smith (1993b, 4) reiterates, change as transformation, when it comes, is a long-term process, reliant on many factors outside the scope of the critical ethnographic researcher and probably not achievable within a three year time span:

To change practices, therefore, requires more than a change in beliefs; it requires a change in the structures which have significantly conditioned and shaped those beliefs.

In moving beyond interpretive ethnography to critical ethnography, the researcher moves from providing an anthropological account of the everyday - possibly akin to a case study,11 - to examining structures. The aim becomes:

to portray vivid accounts of negotiated understandings of people's social situations in order to assist them in self-reflection and thereby to seek improvements in their understandings and situations. (Smith, 1993a, 219)

Smith (1993a, 1993b) has presented an argument for the use of critical ethnography as a process of non-participatory advocacy research which, through political consciousness raising as a result of self-reflection, assists people to seek improvements in their understandings and situations. In adopting the critical ethnographic research approach, I seek to support Smith's (1993b) argument that the transformative outcomes of critical ethnography are linked to its ability to empower even the least empowered through political consciousness raising.

---

11. Taft (1988) distinguishes between the terms used in describing ethnographic research in education, which range from "microethnography" in Smith and Geoffrey (1968) to describe a study of classroom processes on anthropological field studies, through Erickson (1975) who considered that the term "microethnography" should be confined more narrowly to studies that used extensive observation and recording to establish the interactional structures in the classroom, a usage Mehan (1978) called "constitutive ethnography". Taft says that:

For the purposes of this present article, the term ethnography is interpreted liberally to include case studies, the concept preferred by the ethnographers in the United Kingdom. The intensive study of a bounded community is a clear example of a simple case study, even though there are many individuals who make up that community. (Taft, 1988, 60)
The genre critical ethnography: its proponents.

Conventional ethnography had traditionally been a form of cultural reportage (Van Maanen, 1990) and the preserve of cultural anthropologists who had seen ethnography as a commitment to providing a cultural account of a given group:

to grasp the native's [sic] point of view, his relation to life, to realise his view of the world. (Malinowski, 1922, 25 cited in Taft, 1988, 59)

Their core methodologies of participant observations, open ended interviews and review of documents have remained a vital force in cultural reportage\textsuperscript{12} as well as now being widely used in educational research\textsuperscript{13}. In moving beyond interpretive ethnography to critical ethnography, the researcher moves from providing an anthropological account of the everyday - possibly akin to a case study\textsuperscript{14} - to examining structures. The aim becomes:

to portray vivid accounts of negotiated understandings of people's social situations in order to assist them in self-reflection and thereby to seek improvements in their understandings and situations. (Smith, 1993a, 219)

Smith cites Carspecken (1991) and Simon and Dippo (1986) as prominent proponents of critical ethnography. Masemann (1982) speaks of the use of critical ethnography as an effective tool for education research, and reviews the work of others who have used it in Critical Ethnography in the Study of Comparative Education. She defines "critical ethnography" as referring to studies:

\begin{itemize}
\item 12. Herzfeld, 1987; Waterson, 1991; Clifford and Marcus (eds), 1986.
\item 14. Taft (1988) distinguishes between the terms used in describing ethnographic research in education, which range from "microethnography" in Smith and Geoffrey (1968) to describe a study of classroom processes on anthropological field studies, through Erickson (1975) who considered that the term "microethnography" should be confined more narrowly to studies that used extensive observation and recording to establish the interactional structures in the classroom, a usage Mehan (1978) called "constitutive ethnography". Taft says that:
\end{itemize}

For the purposes of this present article, the term ethnography is interpreted liberally to include case studies, the concept preferred by the ethnographers in the United Kingdom. The intensive study of a bounded community is a clear example of a simple case study, even though there are many individuals who make up that community. (Taft, 1988, 60)
which use a basically anthropological, qualitative, participant-observer methodology but which rely for their theoretical formulation on a body of theory deriving from critical sociology and philosophy. (Masemann, 1982, 1)

She details the historical development both of the genre "ethnography" as an anthropological approach and of the sociological approaches to educational research, concluding that:

In the study of comparative education, it should also be possible to use such a method [critical ethnography] to investigate the lived life in schools while not necessarily limiting the analysis to the actors' perceptions of the situation. (Masemann, 1982, 13)

In reviewing Foley's work on critical ethnography based on Habermas' work on miscommunication, Masemann reports that:

Foley notes that the only way of studying the techniques that schools and teachers use to organize, model, practice, and reward the behaviours that socialize students into the technological rationality is in critical ethnography. (Masemann, 1982,14, my italics)

On Foley's "technological rationality",15, Masemann reports Foley's outcomes that:

teachers and students learn to transform questions of ethics into questions of technique, and schooling becomes an attempt to carve up knowledge into manageable curriculum pieces. Knowledge becomes conceived as "(1) form with little immediate substance or use value and (2) a commodity with considerable exchange value through the organisation's credit and credentialing system". Such knowledge also becomes theoretical and disassociated from praxis; indeed praxis itself becomes irrelevant, as knowledge and credentials are hoarded for future "use". (p. 14)

Following on from Foley's consideration of the link between knowledge and praxis, Masemann adds that productive sites for investigation using critical ethnographic techniques could include studies

[a]t the University level, [of the] socialization of elites and concomitant value orientations. (p. 14)

15. Rationality has been considered as problematic by Fay (1987), and Nyiri (1988) amongst others.
In *Critical Ethnography in Education: Origins, Current Status, and New Directions*, Anderson traced the development of critical ethnography in education, recalling that its origins lay in the merging of interpretivist movements in anthropology and sociology with neo-Marxist and feminist theory to produce a unique genre of research in the field of education (p. 249). He believed that the emergence of critical ethnography is:

the result of the convergence of two largely independent roles in epistemology and social theory. The epistemological movement was the result of a shift in research paradigms within the field of education that reflected an attempt to "break out of the conceptual cul-de-sac of quantifiable methods". Of all the qualitative research traditions available, ethnography most captured the imagination of researchers in the field of education. Although ethnographies of schooling have been done by a small group of anthropologists for some time, the ethnography "movement" began in the field of education during the late 1960s and early 1970s. (Anderson, 1989, 250)

At the same time the ethnography "movement" was beginning in education, "neo-Marxist" and feminist social theorists in other disciplines were producing works that would soon make their way into American educational discourse. This "critical" thrust would raise serious questions about the role of schools in the social and cultural reproduction of social classes, gender roles, and racial and ethnic prejudice. (Anderson, 1989, 251)

Anderson concluded that whilst Lather (1986a) had separated critical research into three overlapping traditions of feminist research, neo-Marxist critical ethnography (Masemann, 1982) and Freirian empowering research, he preferred to combine them "under the critical ethnography rubric to emphasize the commonalities in their research programs and to highlight those areas where they can learn from each other" (p. 263). He concluded that the "future of the marriage [of critical social theory and ethnographic methods] will depend on an ongoing dialogue between social theory and the day-to-day experience of the ethnographer in the field" (p. 263) which referred back to Lather's (1986a) insistence that "dialectical theory building versus theoretical imposition" must be present in any research design which seeks to be empowering. Lather (1994) reconsiders the empowerment potentials of any interventionist research in her forthcoming research (previewed Lather, 1994) yet considers that there must be self-disclosure about her own agenda, and to a lesser extent self-reflection on the stories of the participants by the researcher.

**Critical Ethnographies - the genre**
Before considering the conduct of my critical ethnographic project, to provide the reader with an insight into the breadth of address of the genre critical ethnography, I will provide a brief review of four ethnographies to consider their aims, methods and outcomes. Three are concerned with education: Weis (1985) *Between two worlds*, Carnoy and Levin (1985) *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State*, Holland and Eisenhart (1990) *Educated in Romance* and the last, Poland and Stanley (1988), *Feminist Ethnography in Rochdale* is the urban ethnography of work-life in Rochdale in Britain. I will review these critical ethnographies through the framework of critique of 'Critical Theory as a Model for Ethnography' developed by Hammersley (1992) in Chapter 6 of *What's Wrong With Ethnography?* and Masemann's (1982) *Critical Ethnography in the Study of Comparative Education*.

Weis (1985), in her ethnography *Between two worlds* focuses on the structure of Urban College, a community college on the edge of an urban ghetto in a large north-eastern city in the United States, to argue that although urban colleges are "structurally designed to allow opportunities for mobility...they may well serve fundamentally to reproduce structured social inequality. The way in which this occurs... however, is tied in contradictory ways to the culture students themselves produce within the institution - a culture that is rooted in but not determined by the existing social structure." (Weis, 1985, 13). She commences the book by introducing the ideological framework concerning 'Blacks in US society' and 'Schools and the reproduction of structure' from which she reviews the 'meaning' underlying the data she collected. Thus the reader can see the implicit although unstated connection between what Weis was looking for, and what types of data may have confirmed her search. This departure from 'textbook' theory was not important to Michael Apple, the series editor, who believes that this book, "by taking seriously possibilities for reform, raises issues that policy members, educators, government officials and community members cannot ignore" (p. xv). In her Appendix A on 'Methods', Weis details how through photocopying and cutting up all the transcripts of interviews, notebooks and observations which arose from her participant observations her "salient cultural categories for both students and faculty" were "systematically identified" (p.174). "This is a relatively
objective way of categorizing qualitative data", Weis says (p.174). The themes arise out of the data as Weis struggles to remain "objective" in a major project such as this one which has so much potential for political action arising from her detailed findings which are generalized as 'Possibilities for Action' in other urban community colleges in Chapter 8. It was difficult in reading this book to ascertain how Weis concluded the major and minor themes as she had already, in preparation for publication, streamlined the enormous amount of transcript data into themes and her snatches of narrative and interview dialogue serve only to illustrate the point she has already theorised. Knowing little of the institutional structure within which Weis conducted her research, one can only surmise from her generalizations that she may have been commissioned to develop a list of policy recommendations for improving the outcomes of students in these urban colleges.

In summary, Weis makes significant departures from 'textbook' theory about how to write up a critical ethnography. She theorises on a grand scale from a contextualised ethnography, and mentions her keenness to maintain the "objectivity" of the data. One must remember the 1985 publication of this book, the data gathering period of 1979-1980, and how much the genre "ethnography" has moved from a position of its then sometimes alignment with positivism, as the then most dominant research paradigm, to a position where ten years later there is close questioning of educational research which purports to produce data untainted by the ideologies of the researcher. In concluding this brief review, I believe that nowhere does Weis herself refer to this work as "critical ethnography" - not even as ethnography - although Michael Apple frequently refers to it as such (p. xiii). Weis prefers to record her methodology as "participant observation" (p.171). Therefore it is unfair to judge this important ten year old ethnography by the current tenets of the critical paradigm.

A work contemporary with Weis is Carnoy and Levin (1985) *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State* which is a comparative ethnography of two first grade classrooms - Smith, in a lower-middle-class neighbourhood and Huntingdon, in an upper-middle-class neighbourhood - undertaken "[i]n order to understand reproduction according to social class
origins" (p. 112). Although published in 1985, the ethnographic part of the larger study was undertaken in 1974-1975 so the theories which are put into practice in current ethnographic educational research were possibly not mainstream then. In common with Weis and notable given the mid-seventies period of the observations, there is a high emphasis on observer reliability and observational replicability. These two emphases, along with the means of statistical manipulation of qualitative data developed by Carnoy and Levin, mimicked the scientism of empiricist research. The "results" of the study were far-reaching in their generalisations. Findings such as "[s]chools differentiate the socialization of the young for work along lines that conform to parents' occupational roles" were presented as a result of 4 months observation in 2 schools. The questions I asked myself about this research are "is it openly ideological research?" and "is it critical research?" Although the answer is possibly a qualified "yes" to both questions, the study nevertheless is dated by many moral and methodological factors including the evident lack of feedback to anyone evident except through the publication of the report. Neither Mrs Jones, the teacher at Smith, nor Mrs Newman, the teacher at Huntingdon, was ever presented with a narrative understanding about how their in-class practices supported reproduction theory through separating the aspirations of the working class and the middle class so strongly, and yet they had a researcher in their classroom, observing everything, for 4 months.

For the reasons cited concerning objectivity, data coding and inductivism and the moral position of the researcher-as-observer, and especially because critical ethnography as an emerging research paradigm has moved on so much in ten years neither of these ethnographies provide a model for the conduct of my research project.

Holland and Eisenhart (1990), a more recent work, considers what the lives of women at Bradford (predominantly black) and Southern (predominantly white) Universities tell us about schools and the reproduction of patriarchy in the United States (p. 25). However,

16. Lather (1994, 243) writes that "[a] core feminist belief is that patriarchy, the socially sanctioned power of men over women, operates in both the private and public spheres to perpetuate a social order that benefits men at the expense of women (Sokoloff, 1980; O'Brien, 1981; Barret, 1980). Patriarchy is reproduced through the social construction of gender that reflects and reinforces the splits between nurturance and autonomy, public and private, male and female (Flax, 1980; Grumet, 1981). Which biological sex we are born
R.W. Connell, in previewing the volume, writes that "a vivid description of student life is merely the starting point for a train of argument that ranges from the language of romance to the interplay of gender and race, and the social relevance of universities" (p. viii, my italics). The study followed 23 women through a 3 Semester period as they commenced University. The researchers, Holland and Eisenhart, paired interviewee and research assistant - aiming for them to form a friendship (p.68).

To me this research is not a description of openly ideological research, but of an ethnographic research process very much along the lines of Weis (1985) which correlated data with the stated theoretical premises of the researchers. There is no mention of presenting the researcher's emerging understandings to the participants - in fact the researchers Eisenhart and Holland's contact with the participants was limited to reading and rereading the 200 + pages of interview transcripts and note-taking from observations of each participant. The role of the research assistants (chosen for their "match" with the participants) was to befriend the participants one-on-one and to "trust and openly share with each other" (p.68). There is plenty of evidence of sharing by the participants, but none of the researcher's - Holland and Eisenhart - nor their assistants, sharing their constructions with the participants. It is difficult to judge the reciprocity of the researcher-researched pairing as the interview comments are usually, but not always, presented out of context of the interview questions, or the discussion which led to the researched's "revelation".

Holland and Eisenhart, through close familiarity with the interview and observation data, under Part 4 'Gender Relations' discuss and theorise 5 themes. It is not obvious how these overarching themes arose, although the authors describe, in their Appendix 'Research Design and Methods' what they did to arrive at the themes (p.234).

into makes an immense difference in the material and psychic patterns of our lives. Patriarchal hegemony, however, obscures both male privilege and gender as a cultural construction that profoundly shapes our lives." Lather writes that "[g]ender as a social construction is a key assumption of all strands of feminism. Feminism argues that what gender is, what men and women are, and what types of relations they have are not as much the products of biological "givens" as of social and cultural forces. Symbolic and ideological dimensions of culture play especially important roles in creating, reproducing, and transforming gender" (p. 248)
Analysis of the ethnographic cases involved reading and rereading the approximately two-hundred typed pages of fieldnotes and interview transcripts accumulated for each participant. *We attempted to maintain an inductive appreciation of our data.* On the basis of our initial readings of the data we categorized the women's college experiences into four types: school-work, romance relationships, friendships, and family relationships. We then reread and coded the data into these specific categories and into several sub-categories...we searched for patterns within and across boundaries. (p. 234, my italics)

Holland and Eisenhart's analysis process is reminiscent of Weis' (1985) and Dinham's (1989a) process in that they have categorized absolutely the participant's experiences. Although the "ethnographic component of the study was largely oriented to learning the meanings that the women themselves attached to their experiences" (p.67) there is no inkling of how the meanings the researchers attached to their experiences fed back to their view of themselves. In this respect the study is neither participatory nor openly ideological.

In treating their lives as revelatory of the lives of young women in a system of patriarchy, we take up only one aspect, albeit an important one, of who they are and superimpose upon it anthropological and sociological analyses that some of them would possibly reject. In other words we have risked violating the study participants' own sense of themselves and memories of their experience. (p. xii)

In an attempt to draw from the particular to address the general theoretical "anthropological and sociological analyses", there has been a drawing away from the unique opportunity the research design offered with the paired researcher-participant for reciprocity and sharing understandings. In concluding this review I acknowledge from the conduct of my research project the enormous difficulties textually of which Holland and Eisenhart write in the Preface, struggling always to maintain participant anonymity whilst promoting particularity. I laud Holland and Eisenhart who demonstrate formidable skills as researchers in this book whilst somehow overlooking the then contemporary feminist critique of ethnographic research which does not build in reciprocity, as detailed by Poland and Stanley (1988).

Liz Stanley, (p. 56 in Poland and Stanley, 1988) in outlining the eight interrelated analytic concerns which explicitly informed her ethnographic practice in Rochdale, comments on the methodology she has used. I contrast it to that adopted by the three reviewed ethnographers.

These [concerns] derive, not quite from 'prior concerns', as I said before, nor from 'research in Rochdale', conducted by myself as a *tabula rasa*. There has been a complex process in which these analytic ideas and interests have interrelated in
diverse ways with 'my experience' of research in Rochdale. In other words, neither the classical formulation of 'grounded theory' (Glaser and Strauss, 1968) as a pre-theoretical data-gathering from which theory is later derived ('inductivism' in its pure form), nor research as 'theory testing' ('deductivism in its pure form'), adequately describes the process involved. Certainly some research - including some variants within ethnography - does indeed set about gathering facts to test prior theory in the form of hypotheses; and in this sense 'deductivism' can become actual research practices. However, as I and Sue Wise have argued before (Stanley and Wise 1979), neither naturalism nor its sister-under-the-jargon 'inductivism' are possible research practices for similar reasons: we can never have 'empty minds'; instead, the aim is to find out, present and analyse as much as we can what changes in our 'intellectual autobiography' are wrought by research involvements. The main aim, for me at least, is to understand how I came to understand what I understand. (p. 57)

In their study of Rochdale, a cotton milling town in the Midlands of England, Poland and Stanley (1988) uncover what a feminist ethnography might be in the making and in the telling. It is possible that coming from a background in sociology (Stanley), and anthropology (Poland), instead of education, has given these feminist researchers an appreciation of what it means to conduct a "moral ethnography" (p. 50). Not for them the conventional ethnography writing which they assert "neither intellectually nor politically benefits the ethnographer-writer, nor readers, nor the people whose lives have been turned into ethnography" (p. 94). In their conduct and theorising the concerns which governed their day-to-day experiences and their writing have far-reaching implications for feminist ethnographers. Stanley writes about the link between feminism and ethnography:

This discussion...brings me to the subject of feminist method, methodology and epistemology and the place of feminist ethnography within this.

'Feminism', like 'sociology' is often treated as a seamless 'thing' which one 'has' or 'does' and has/does correctly or incorrectly. Alongside this, 'method', 'methodology' and 'epistemology' are often conflated, so that 'ethnography' comes to be treated like a type of method, a set of procedures like the procedures for 'doing a survey', but which carries with it the additional conviction (usually on the part of newcomers) that to be a 'good method' it has to be unproblematic.

The first point to make here is that ethnography is less a method (a procedure for gathering data), not even ontology (a general methodological 'approach'), but more an epistemology or 'framework of knowledge' variously put into practice in method and methodology. More simply, 'how you do it' all depends, on time place and circumstance.

The second is that precisely the same is true for feminism both in life and social science: a moral/political framework (or more accurately overlapping frameworks) of understandings variously practised. Feminism, or trying to do feminism, poses at least as many interactional dilemmas as it solves; this isn't because those feminists who experience such dilemmas are 'unsorted out', failed feminists in some sense, but rather because the kind of feminism which recognises complexity also permits dilemmas and puzzles. This kind of feminism is not an end-state but a gloss on a
process. "In feminism", to use this gloss, the interactional dilemmas occur all the time - indeed, for me they bear a remarkable resemblance to the dilemmas that occur in research and some of which I have outlined above. Ethnography is as interesting to me as it is because (in at least one of its overlapping variants) it provides an ontological framework for getting at moral dilemmas, not solving them...

Stanley then writes of the concept of the ethnographer, through fieldwork and textual artifices "doing power over" (Poland and Stanley, 1988, 94) participants in, and readers of, the ethnography. This has concerned me in reading the work of Weis, Carnoy and Levin, and to some extent, Holland and Eisenhart.

One of the perplexing things about the general run of ethnographic writing is that the ethnographer as thinking person vanishes: we might get, if we are lucky, 'personal asides' or even less commonly - a fuller treatment of the 'emotional' aspects of fieldwork. But its intellectual process, the process of its production as a piece of fieldwork and a piece of writing both, is usually invisible, a silence, an absence. What we-as-readers get is, typically a product, a complete rounded finished piece of writing and a completed 'the facts about it as a sociologist/anthropologist understands them' ethnography-as-product as well.

This is to render invisible those aspects of ethnography and ethnography-writing which are most important and interesting to the ethnographer. It also makes active thinking disputing readership an impossibility; instead reading necessarily takes on a 'take it or leave it' quality. In essence, then, such a style of ethnography-writing does indeed 'do power over readers'...

However, another 'doing power over' is involved here: that in which convention is placed over and above the actual importance of ethnographic experience and thinking and grappling with how to account for these in a written text. (p. 93-94)

Poland and Stanley's insights provide the link between feminism and ethnography, and particularly between methodology and morals which is lacking in the three other works. In this they provide a significant insight into what it means to 'do' ethnography, with all its dilemmas, within a framework of feminism. Thus Stanley concludes that "feminists can continue to do ethnographic work: although there cannot be a 'fully feminist ethnography', there can be "ethnographies that are partially feminist, accounts of culture that are enhanced by the application of feminist perspectives" (Stanley, in Poland and Stanley, 1988, 92 citing Stacey, 1988, 26).

Critical Ethnography as emancipatory research through collaborative approaches
Lather (1986a) in *Research as Praxis* referred to many of the key texts in education research over the past two decades which had focused on praxis and empowerment. These included Bullough and Gitlin's (1985) early attempts at building-in reciprocity through including a written response from the teacher to a preliminary interpretation of the data; and Willis' (1977) influential work as the "most oft-cited example of neo-Marxist critical ethnography" (Lather, 1986a, 260) in which he built into his research design an attempt to take the research findings back to the "lads" for further dialogue. She believed that a more collaborative approach to critical inquiry is needed to empower the researched. She saw praxis as "the dialectical tension, the interactive, reciprocal shaping of theory and practice which I see at the center of emancipatory social science" (p. 258). For praxis to be possible, Lather says:

> not only must theory illuminate the lived experience of progressive social groups; it must also be illuminated by their struggles. Theory adequate to the task of changing the world must be open-ended, nondogmatic, informing, and grounded in the circumstance of everyday life; and, moreover, it must be premised on a deep respect for the intellectual and political capabilities of the dispossessed. This position has profound substantive and methodological implications for the post-positivist, change-enhancing inquiry in the human sciences. (Lather, 1986a, 262)

Lather concludes that for a research design to be empowering it must address three issues above all else:

> the need for reciprocity, the stance of dialectical theory-building versus theoretical imposition, and the question of validity in praxis-oriented research. (Lather, 1986a, 263)

Her suggestion is somewhat in contrast with Smith's (1993b) view that critical ethnography is a non-interventionist process. Lather believes that empowerment is predicated on the ability of the 'researcher' and the 'researched' to be changed by/to change the process and to be able to contribute to a development of the underlying theory. This is reciprocity. Lather's view, particularly as expressed in Lather (1994) is attractive to me as a researcher. In rejecting the notion that the research process is non-interventionist - that the "researched" and the "researcher" are unaffected by the research process which is somehow external to the "real" happenings of their lives - Lather's call for reciprocity is strengthened. If interventionist, then the researcher, as well as the researched, become changed by/
the process and the findings of the research - they act on one another in a power-neutral setting.

The issue of ethics is strongly related to achieving reciprocity. Walker, in his classic book *Doing Research* (1985) elucidates ethical concerns amongst a number of the key issues affecting the educational researcher. He reiterates the concerns of Kemmis and Robottom (1981) about the centrality of ethical concerns regarding the possible interventive effects on the researched by advocating appropriate controls on negotiating access, negotiating boundaries to the research, and negotiating the release and publication of the accounts.

These theoretical concepts related to conducting research are illustrated in the day-to-day experiences of the ethnographer in the field. Such an example is Woods and Hammersley's (1993) *Gender and Ethnicity in Schools*. The contributors vary in the extent to which they make their value system overt, and in the extent to which they theorise about the social forces shaping the observed in-School experiences, and thus not all chapters are *critical* ethnography, but the value of this contemporary text lies partly in its descriptions of the *conduct* of the ethnographic research projects reported, as well as in the critiques by Hammersley and Foster of ethnographies reported in the book. The text provides the reader with some comprehension of the underlying difficulties particularly inherent in extrapolating from single classroom events to generalisable accounts: difficulties which have raised widespread debates about the use of ethnographic approaches and have caused the editors to call for vigilance and self-reflection.

**Conducting the critical ethnographic research project**

Having selected a methodology for the study of the critique in architectural education I turned my attention to *conducting* the critical ethnographic field project. The term "ethnography" refers both to a research methodology and to a textual product (Agar, 1990; Atkinson, 1990). A considerable contemporary debate concerns the "split" between
ethnography as "fieldwork" and ethnography as "textual representation". Agar cites Van Maanen's (1988) quotation from Marcus (1980) as exemplifying the "split":

Ethnography as a written product, then, has a degree of independence (how a culture is portrayed) from the fieldwork on which it is based (how a culture is known). Writing ethnography is office-work or deskwork, not fieldwork. (Marcus, 1980, 4 cited by Van Maanen (1988) cited by Agar, 1990, 73-74)

Agar disagrees with Marcus, and believes that "a focus on the text to the exclusion of research process risks the development of twin theories - one for writing and one for research - that are seriously out of sync" (Agar, 1990, 74).

Simon and Dippo (1986) report that "[w]hen we speak of ethnography we reference more than a particular research method" and that "[t]o actually do ethnography is to engage in the process of knowledge production" (p. 195). Thus, say Simon and Dippo:

the interest that defines critical ethnographic work is both pedagogical and political. It is linked to our assessment of our own society as inequitably structured and dominated by a hegemonic culture that suppresses a consideration and understanding of why things are the way they are and what must be done for things to be otherwise. (Simon and Dippo, 1986, 196)

Simon and Dippo assert that for:

ethnographic work to warrant the label "critical" requires that it meet three fundamental conditions: (1) the work must employ an organizing problematic that defines one's data and analytic procedures in a way consistent with its project; (2) the work must be situated, in part, within a public sphere that allows it to become the starting point for the critique and transformation of the conditions of the oppressive and inequitable moral and social regulation; and (3) the work must address the limits of its own claims by a consideration of how, as a form of social practice, it too is constituted and regulated through historical relations of power and existing material conditions. (Simon and Dippo, 1986, 197)

Proceeding from this organisational framework, Simon and Dippo argue that "a critical ethnography must contend with the task of understanding, materially and historically, this nonarbitrary specificity" which they take as "the social stock of knowledge, what is legitimated and available in the way of particular practices in the domains of body, language and activity" (p. 197). They argue the point that qualitative data is important in this process because it provides "access to the practices (the words, the actions, the
personally appropriated signs that mark one's place in social space) of social actors" (p.198) and that the use of quantitative data "as a way of indexing practices and characterizing the distribution and extent of particular material circumstances" is not precluded by the methodological emphasis of critical ethnographic work (p.198). There is a clear invitation to the critical ethnographer from Simon and Dippo (1986) to include both qualitative "case study" observations and quantitative data selected and presented for its ability to contribute to an understanding of "why things are the way they are and what must be done for things to be otherwise" (p. 196).

The stages of the critical research project

The stages of a critical ethnographic research project, informed by the conventional critical ethnography, include (Smith, 1993b, 14):

1. Negotiated attendance at studio critique sessions - for participant observations, open ended interviews and review of documents.
2. Validating interview transcripts for a negotiated understanding.
3. Critical analysis acknowledging the socio-political context being researched.
4. The production of a critical narrative
5. Researcher self-reflection leading to a further cycle of negotiating access, participant observation, critical analysis and critical narratives.

Participant reflection and transformation are hoped for, but not methodologically essential outcomes.

Carspecken (1991) *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research* recommends five suggested steps in conducting a critical ethnographic project:

1. Weak interactive data collection (observation and 'shallow' interviewing).
2. Preliminary reconstructive analysis.
4. Empirical exploration of system relationships.
5. Explanatory use of system relationships. (Carspecken, 1991, 1)

Whilst his recommendation does not differ substantially from that of Simon and Dippo (1986) and Smith (1993a, 222), his focus is on the difference between the 'lifeworld contexts' of the observation and data collection stages and the 'system relationships' of the textual construction phase. This is also the process detailed by Simon and Dippo (1986) when they separate out the practices of data collection (utilising "a problematic intended to reveal social practices as produced and regulated forms of action and meaning" (p. 197)) from the pedagogic/political project of critical ethnographic work to foster "critique and transformation within the public sphere" and further "to reflexively address its own situated character" (p. 198-200). There is ongoing debate amongst critical ethnographers about the relationship between the 'data' collection phase and the transformation of observations into political action through textual construction. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider these contemporary arguments at length, but what is perhaps most important for critical ethnographers is the need to revisit the processes involved in data collection equipped with some of the understandings gleaned from the 'political action through self reflection' stage, and to interrogate the practices which were instrumental in gathering 'data' and in textual construction to ensure that the 'political project' has been realised in the ethnographer's own practices. As the process is cyclical (Smith, 1993b, 14), refinements to political practices in the 'production' phase can reflect new insights. Indeed, Holland and Eisenhart (1990) reflectively questioned their initial research premiss following through into a textual truth when they wrote "[I]ooking back at our original research proposal, we realised that we had scarcely attended to the significance of gender relations, and upon reflection it seemed that we were likely to underestimate it again in the analysis" (p. 19).

Issues of Validity and Reliability
Much contemporary debate around ethnography relates to the issues of validity (Hammersley, 1992). As was suggested by Lather (1986a), Walker (1985) and Le Compte and Goetz (1982), issues of validity are central to the widespread acceptance of ethnography as a research approach. Le Compte and Goetz believed that this was the case because the "results of ethnographic research often are regarded as lacking in validity and generalizability" (Le Compte and Goetz, 1982, 32). Along with replicability, these are the tenets of the then dominant positivist research paradigm (Reinharz, 1981, 421).

Le Compte and Goetz summarise the feeling of the day:

Reliability in ethnographic research is dependent on the resolution of both external and internal design problems (Hansen, 1979). External reliability addresses the problem of whether independent researchers would discover the same phenomena or generate the same constructs in the same or similar settings. Internal reliability refers to the degree to which other researchers, given a set of previously generated constructs, would match them with the data in the same way as did the original researcher. (Le Compte and Goetz, 1982, 32)

Validity necessitates demonstration that the propositions generated, refined, or tested match the causal conditions which obtain in human life (Le Compte and Goetz, 1982, 43)

Le Compte and Goetz believed that, whilst the problems of reliability threatened the credibility of much ethnographic work, the data collection and analysis techniques used by ethnographers gave rise to high levels of internal validity (p. 43). Walker (1985) reproduced Boehm and Weinberg's (1977) substantial check-lists developed with the purpose of quantifying observation techniques so that observer reliability and data validity could be ensured.

Lather (1986a) devoted considerable attention to issues of validity. Lather believed then that triangulation was critical in establishing data trustworthiness - triangulation

22. Lather writes about her later considerations of validity, a project which had then occupied her for at least ten years, that "I continue my seeming obsession with the topic of validity; the conditions of the legitimation of knowledge in contemporary postpositivism". (Lather, 1993, 673)

23. Wiseman (1993) describes one of the ways in which integration between the empiricist and interpretive approaches to research may be promoted is through triangulation in which "different research methods are directed towards the same topic or activity and compared to improve the adequacy and validity of the results" (p.122). He says that "triangulation may
"expanded to include multiple data sources, methods and theoretical schemes" (p. 270).
Secondly, she called for construct validity as an outcome of a systematized reflexivity which "reveals how a priori theory has been changed by the logic of the data" (p. 271); and thirdly for face validity ("the click of recognition") which is enhanced through "recycling description, emerging analysis and conclusions back through at least a subsample of respondents" (p. 271). Finally she called for the unorthodox notion of catalytic validity: "the degree to which the research process reorients, focuses and energises participants towards knowing reality in order to transform it, a process Freire called conscientization" (p. 271). In conclusion Lather opposed "those who claim that empirical accountability either is impossible to achieve or is able to be side-stepped in praxis-oriented, advocacy research" (p. 272).

With the benefit of hindsight, the early ethnographers were perhaps too deferent to the established positivist research paradigm. This may have been because they wanted their research to be accepted by the empiricists and therefore paid them deference by overlaying their simple anthropological techniques of
- observation,
- recall,
- thick description,
- "what does it mean through my organising problematic", and
- "what sense do "the social actors" make of my account of their actions",
into a quasi-scientific endeavour with coding, triangulation, member checks and negotiated understandings. I suggest that the emergence of the post-positivist research paradigms posed a threat to traditional research methodologies and that the reasons for this deference to empiricist methods were at least two-fold:

take several forms. One is to use different techniques to try to collect information - interviewing, collecting documents, questioning and observing about the same or related activities. Another is to use more than one informant, more sources of information on what happens. Yet another is to use both" (p.168). See also Mathison (1988) Why Triangulate? which discusses triangulation as a strategy for increasing the validity of evaluation and research findings.
(1) funding and publication of research was often controlled by powerful and conservative influences trained in the scientific paradigm and unquestioningly accepting quantification as revealing a "truth" that was reliable as the results were replicable, validated by accepted procedure, and free of self-interest; and

(2) that a surprising number of the early, and ground-breaking ethnographic studies were carried out by women who were marginalised and silenced in the research field without the additional burden of arguing for a new methodology which questioned the very premiss of positivist research - that there was an ultimate "truth" that could be revealed through research. Their counter claim that "interest free knowledge is logically impossible" (Reinharz, 1985, 17 cited by Lather, 1986a, 257) and their substitution of explicit interests for implicit, or self-deceptive ones, may have further marginalised and alienated their research endeavours and induced a frosty reception for their research products.

In its maturity as an established research paradigm (Hammersley, 1992) some critical ethnographers feel freer now to move away from these prescriptive "rules" concerning validity and reliability.

One notable example is the repositioning of Lather in *Fertile Obsession: Validity After Poststructuralism* (1993) through a consideration of "transgressive validities" away from an earlier insistence (1986a) on the need for careful checks on validity and reliability of data through such devices as triangulation and member checks which Carmen Luke suggests "is an anathema to a contextual/textual feminism" (pers. corr. 17-1-1994). By "transgressive validities" Lather suggests

a call for a different kind of validity after poststructuralism in which legitimation depends on a researcher's ability to explore the resources of different contemporary inquiry problematics and, perhaps, even contribute to "an 'unjamming' effect in relation to the closed truths of the past, thereby freeing up the present for new forms of thought and practice." (Lather, 1993, 676 citing Bennett, 1990, 277)

Another example is the feminist/poststructuralist consideration that the recognition of the subject position of the observer as fluid, agential and subjective will always be reflected
substantially in the nature and "face validity" of the textual product. A good example of this can be found in Magda Lewis and Roger Simon's (1986) *A Discourse Not Intended for Her: Learning and Teaching Within Patriarchy*, a wonderfully insightful text typified by the turn-taking of Lewis and Simon as their struggle to reveal a common experience unfolds. The text was critiqued by Brodkey (1987) who says about their demonstration of subjectivity that

> [t]he turn-taking draws attention to their [Lewis' and Simon's] respective narrative voices, insofar as readers are able to hear that Lewis and Simon did not have the same, or even a common experience, even though they agree the story is about silencing. (Brodkey, 1987, 74)

Whilst understanding the attention to scientific validity and reliability of the early ethnographers, along with Lather (1993), and others (notably Davies), I have adopted a poststructuralist understanding of the position of validity in this research: that is to say that I accept that in research which acknowledges the validity of subjectivity there cannot also be an expectation of "truth" as supposedly "found" through rigorous scientific triangulation which contradicts the very essence of subjectivity and agency.

> [P]ost-modernism \(^24\) involves the development of new rhetorics of science, new stories of knowledge 'after truth'...The postmodern world is without guarantees, without 'method'...All we can do is invent. (Lather, 1993, 673 citing Tomlinson, 1989, 44,57)

Davies (1994) summarises the view that "what we are studying as an active, moving, shifting subject...is no longer a 'thing' out there" and further, that, (on the topic of object-subject subjectification) "as an agent who can speak and create the world, as the speaking subject, you are also, at the same time, utterly subjected to the world." There is an

---

24. Concerning moving between the use of the expressions postmodernism and poststructuralism, Lather (1993) says:

> Distinctions between postmodern and poststructural can be made in various ways. The former raises issues of chronology, economics (e.g.post-Fordism) and aesthetics whereas poststructural is used more often in relation to academic theorizing "after structuralism". They are often used interchangeably, driving some cultural theorists to distraction. (Lather, 1993, 688)

altogether new understanding of "truth" through poststructuralism, an understanding which will be unfolded through discussions later in this chapter about the nature of subjectivity.

The role of the researcher in critical ethnography made problematic

In Brodkey's (1987) conclusions about "the complexity of experiences that any story necessarily reduces" in relation to the subject positions occupied by Lewis, or Simon (1986), she states that:

their attempt to document the unevenness of their respective experience seems to me an effective demonstration of why theory, including critical theory, without *research on practice* is dangerously abstract. (Brodkey, 1987,74, my italics)

Brodkey's paper prompted me to a reflexive questioning of the researcher-observer's role in the research process. There is a cautionary voice in Stacey's (1988) critique of critical ethnography as a feminist research approach. Stacey, in asking, *Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?* critiqued the relationship of the researcher to the researched in the context of both the research methodology and the textual outcome, claiming that the great intrusion of the ethnographer into the lives of the group under study makes leave taking very difficult. And, despite often considerable earlier collaboration the textual product is usually solely the researcher's voice. Stacey claimed that, whilst ethnographic studies are in many ways suited to what she calls "traditionally female strengths" such as empathy and human concern, and they allow for an egalitarian, reciprocal relationship between knower and known, they also, ironically, "subject research subjects to greater risk of exploitation, betrayal, and abandonment by the researcher than does much positivist research" (p.21).

...fieldwork experiences forced my recognition that conflicts of interest and emotion between the ethnographer as authentic, related person (i.e. participant), and as exploiting researcher (i.e. observer) are also an inescapable feature of ethnographic method...[i]ndeed the irony I now perceive is that ethnographic method exposes subjects to far greater danger and exploitation than do more positivist, abstract and "masculinist" research methods. *The greater the intimacy, the apparent mutuality of the researcher/researched relationship, the greater is the danger.* (Stacey, 1988, 23, 24, my italics)
Stacey's concerns underline the ethical approach to ethnographic research which must be central to its conduct. Stacey believes that there is a need for a greater dialogue between feminism, and the new ethnography, as they address similar methodological concerns about the dialogue between researcher and researched.

Lather states that

[The essence of my argument, then, is that we who do empirical research in the name of emancipatory politics must discover ways to connect our research methodology to our theoretical concerns and commitments. (Lather, 1986, 258)]

I believe that it is partly in the nature and conduct of the researcher-observer role that the connections between the researcher's "theoretical concerns and commitments" and actions undertaken are made. My approach in establishing a researcher-observer role which confirmed my "theoretical concerns and commitments" became central to the conduct of the research. I considered that the adoption of a participatory research role could enrich the observations and diminish the apartness of the 'researcher' and the 'researched'.

This is the way that I approached the research project. I realised that I participated in the world of the researched all the time whether or not I had a voice. What this has meant for the project is my total immersion in the School under observation for two years since I commenced the study - and for five years before that on a teaching basis. I seek not to differentiate between teaching and research or observations and teaching. Therefore this decision has implications both for my teaching and for my research. The participant role - teaching - has made me much more aware of the students' world and of the notion of a hierarchy in the School than I perhaps would have understood as an observer only. It has given me privileged access to staff and students. It has allowed me to observe students in critique situations as a participant and then to discuss their presentations with them and other staff participants to gain a negotiated understanding of what I saw happening. It has allowed me to co-develop new teaching and assessment paradigms as a result of the research outcomes, and to try out, evaluate and report on their successes and failures to students and staff. People seek me out: staff want ideas for teaching/learning situations;
students want to discuss their projects and critiques. The School itself wants my opinion on proposed curriculum changes and there are many opportunities for demonstrating transformative outcomes from the research as a result of my self-reflection on the practices I uncovered which contributed to the hypothesised discrimination. All this, I claim, has been possible partly because I was a participant-observer with legitimacy with both the students and the staff. Stanley, in Poland and Stanley (1988, 50-95) devotes considerable attention to the role of the ethnographer as participant, insider and authentic person, despite her statements that it was not always her intention in her research plan for Rochdale to adopt this role - it became an academic notion that she had to abandon.

I believe that the preferable term researcher-participant is an inclusive term which acknowledges the centrality of the research mode to any project and links the importance of the research to the participatory modes in which this research is conducted. A distinction must be made between the researcher's role as participant - "the description of the investigator as a participant in the life of the group implies that he or she has some role in it which is recognised by the group" (Taft, 1988, 60) - and the inclusion of the 'researched' as participants in the research process. A critical ethnography is not a participatory approach in Taft's sense (Smith, 1993b) - the difference between participatory and non-participatory research is in the blurring or total removal of the distinction between researcher and researched and in the participation as equity partners in the methodology and ownership of the outcomes of the participants together with the researcher. The self-determination or empowerment of participatory research is clear. In the case of educational research executed through the critical ethnographic means, the opportunity for participation (in the sense I describe, that is, guaranteed through the methodological constraints imposed) by the educational institution, the students, staff and others, is limited. The hoped for transformative outcomes result from the abilities of the observed participants, as stakeholders in the outcomes, or the reader, as part of the web of architectural education, to reflect deeply on the narrative and the critique. The narrative, as so-called "thick data" - that is rich with the dialogue of the participants - will transport the reader first hand into the described situations so familiar to the observed participants. Through self-reflection comes
the impetus for change. In educational situations, where the researcher is also a teacher, there are many opportunities for transformative action in the teaching arising from researcher-as-teacher self-reflection. Chapter 5 describes some activities I undertook in teaching in the studio to change existing practices as a result of my self-reflection.

Bringing an understanding of feminist theory and poststructuralist practice to the conduct of an ethnographic study

Whilst it is outside the scope of this thesis to widely discuss the emerging field of feminist poststructuralist theories, I will define, inasmuch as is possible, the feminist poststructuralist perspective I bring to this research. I concentrate here on the definitions of poststructuralism and feminism I employ.


poststructural (verging on what is called postmodern in the United States)...means that there is a focal interest in signification, in power/knowledge relationships, in the harm done by master-narratives, and in the way institutional structures are controlled.

Kenway and Modra in Luke and Gore (1992, 139) set out a clarification of the meaning of feminism to them. It is one that I support. They say:

Feminism is premised on the recognition that gender is a phenomenon which helps to shape our society. Feminists believe that women are located unequally in the social formation, often devalued, exploited and oppressed. Education systems, the knowledge which they offer and the practices which constitute them, are seen to be complicit in this. Feminists share a commitment to a form of politics directed towards ending the social arrangements which lead women to be "other than", less than, put down, and put upon. Feminism, then, is a social theory and a social movement, but it is also a personal political practice. For feminist educators, feminism is a primary lens through which the world is interpreted and acted upon. Of course, feminism is not a monolithic discourse. There are, in fact, many feminisms informed by various social theories and research traditions and motivated

26. I further provide on p. 165 part of a reading list which I received from Carmen Luke (pers. corr. 17-1-94) which is intended to lead the reader through some of the main theories of feminisms and poststructuralisms.
by somewhat different social, political and educational projects, each experiencing their own theoretical and practical problems... (Kenway and Modra 1992, 139)

Weedon (1987) also includes detailed description of feminisms and poststructuralisms, including a section which teases out the different potentials for branches of feminist politics (broadly liberal, separatist and socialist) "[as] a politics directed at changing existing power relationships between women and men in society" (Weedon, 1987, 3). A further partial account of Weedon's understandings of feminist postructuralist theory is provided later in this chapter on pages 161-3.

I will return to a consideration of the suggested five main activities for carrying out a critical ethnographic project as a framework for discussing how I conducted the critical ethnography, as well as the departures from the conventionally accepted 'right way' to conduct a critical ethnography, for example as described by Smith (1990, 1993a) or Carspecken (1991), which were demanded by the conjunction of feminist theory and poststructuralist practice.

Section 1: Negotiated Attendance

The site for the educational research which I undertook was the architectural studio of an Australian university. The university was chosen for its:

a. willingness to host educational research;

b. long research tradition and mature research culture;

c. bureaucratic organisation which permitted autonomy to co-operate with educational research at a Departmental level; and was further suitable as

d. the researcher was an "insider" not an "outsider".

Negotiating Access To The Institution And The Department

This last point was perhaps the most important in this regard. It is doubtful whether a research University with no previous knowledge of the researcher would have encouraged
and permitted such a piece of educational research to be carried out within its institution, involving as it did a research design encompassing three years of observations in the design studios. The personal knowledge of the researcher residing in the staff of the "host" Department was a major factor in the acceptance of the researcher, and the research question by the staff and students of the Department. The concept of the researcher as an "insider" encouraged the willingness of the Department to host this educational research.

The concept of negotiated attendance relates not only to the access to individual sites for case studies, but also to access to the Institution and the Department. In the case of the Institution, the then Head of the Department and Dean of the Faculty interviewed me in January 1992 about the acceptance of the topic by the Department. They were already familiar with the general field of study through my previous research and considered the proposed field of study to be a further consideration of the topic in detail. At this meeting the de facto acceptance of the Faculty and the Department of my topic was received; this informal acceptance was formalised by the Departmental Meeting in July 1992 at which time the Concise Outline of Research describing the Brief Outline of Proposed Research and the Description of Work/Method of Research along with the Code of Ethics were presented to the Departmental Committee. The research proposal was the first proposal ever to be submitted to the Department by a researcher for Departmental approval; it was considered that as the Department was to "host" the educational research they should formally elect to support the research in the Department. Such approval was received. The broader institutional acceptance came during the following September on the acceptance of the Concise Outline of Research by the University Board of Graduate Studies.

Negotiating Broad Acceptance By Staff And Students

27. For a discussion of research "insider" and all that this implies, see Stanley (1988) 'Searching for 'Moral Ethnography' in Poland and Stanley (1988).
29. Appendix I: Code of Ethics
In order to further explicate the research intentions to the Department I presented a Seminar to the staff and postgraduate students of the Faculty in August, 1992. The intention on this occasion was to answer the questions of the staff raised at the Departmental Meeting, namely: "What did the researcher want from the Department?" The staff wanted to know more about how they would be affected by, and affect the research. The response ranged from enthusiastic acceptance of the topic through to anxiety about methodological questions. The lack of a control group and the architect-as-anthropologist were two concerns expressed on the day.

The students in the school were also participants in the research and as such needed to be fully informed about my research intentions and their rights under the adopted Code of Ethics in order to be able to give their informed consent to my presence in their critiques. To this end I presented a scheduled lecture to the students in September, 1992, at which time I discussed the nature and purpose of my research contextualising it with the notion of critique preparation and the importance of developing sound judgments of their own work. Inasmuch as a group ever speaks for the individual the research proposal was accepted by the students.

*Negotiating Access To Studios And Critique Situations*

I was prudent and mindful that, despite the 'in principle' acceptance of the research topic by the Institution and the Department, there were varying degrees of support shown for the research project by individual staff and individual students. This became an issue to be considered in negotiating access to studios as although staff do not have any 'ownership' of student learning they may control access to the departmental teaching sites: the studios and the critiques. Certainly whilst strangers could, and would, drop in on crit sessions, it was a different matter for me to presume unrestricted informal access to critique sessions for research purposes for two years. Ethically, as the researcher, I was bound to seek the broadest possible understanding of the research intentions and agreement to be present as an

observer from all the participants prior to attending any studios or critique sessions for observations, despite having been forewarned about the likely lack of success of the approach to negotiate access with some staff members.

The nature of negotiating access varied depending on the context of the request but generally I approached the staff member first to ask whether I could be present in an observer role in forthcoming studio and critique sessions for the purpose of data gathering. If this initial approach was met with a positive response, which on the majority of occasions it was, I then sought an opportunity to ask the students, usually through their class representative, whether they would be willing for me to be present during specified forthcoming studio and critique sessions. The students as a group never refused a request. Where multiple staff members were involved, as was often the case in studio sessions, the subject co-ordinator was approached. In these instances the co-ordinator consulted independently of me with peers and colleagues about my presence. Where I was also involved in teaching in the studios which were the subject of data collection, the negotiation for access for data collection was made through the year co-ordinator or the studio staff in the same way but the access to the students was not presumed solely as a result of teaching duties. At the first scheduled class meeting I informed the students of the nature and purpose of my research and further directed the students to the Code of Ethics for anonymity and confidentiality clauses. The students, during the operation of the studio,

31. Individual students declined to have me present for their final juries in November, 199_, whilst other students in the class agreed to my presence. I negotiated access to otherwise closed juries with individual students.
32. Anonymity for all the participants was pursued through the use of pseudonyms for everyone (see also Ch 4 p. 295 regarding the difficulty that arose when people wished to feature as themselves in the research project); through a decision not to name the University, or the School as a further means of protecting identities; through a decision taken early on in the research project not to reveal the dates on which particular interviews, critiques under observation, or notebook observations occurred; through the adoption of pseudonyms for project names and events which figure in the narrative; and lastly through omitting identifying details of the students/teachers individual histories. Holland and Eisenhart (1988), in their Preface (p. xii) refer to similar difficulties with establishing and maintaining anonymity:

We have tried to minimize that risk [violating the study participants' own sense of themselves and memories of their experience] by letting their ideas and feelings come through, in their own words and in the actual complexities of their lives. Yet by revealing so many details we have run another risk, of violating the anonymity we have promised the women. Where pseudonyms did not seem protection enough, we have altered or omitted background details in their stories.
were aware of me in my usual role of studio-based educator, but were reminded, from time to time, of the other agendas being pursued through questions to students about the processes adopted in design presentation in the critique situation - questions which may not otherwise have been asked. I prefaced these questions with commentary about my interest arising from my research - thereby always drawing the students' attention to the two roles I was discharging - as teacher and researcher.

There was always unresolved conflict in the fitting together of these two roles. Whilst some of the richest specific data and most contextualised knowledge data came from these situations where I was a researcher-participant there was sometimes a doubt that the students fully understood the dual role of the researcher; and that having understood it; they felt empowered to deny access to studios or critique situations to a researcher who was also a teacher with other legitimacy in these situations. Being aware of this conflict led me to seek situations for observation in which I was not also involved as a teacher; these situations had problems of negotiation of their own related to the varying degree of support for this educational research exhibited by individual staff members.

In one instance, a senior staff member denied access to the observation of his studio as a case study. Whilst respecting absolutely his right to do so I was nevertheless disappointed and frustrated in the context of Departmental in-principle support for hosting the educational research. Moreover, I believed that I was welcome in the studio from informal discussions with the students in the year, and informal discussions with the other studio-based staff. The lack of access to this particular studio, as the site for particular critique protocols specific only to that year level, presented a further methodological problem. If the research was to be carried out in the planned way: critiques over the three year levels, critiques involving the same students in critiques over the three years of their study, critiques carried out by Departmental staff and outsiders, critiques involving large and small groups and critiques from informal one-on-one at the drawing board to formal juries and "whole-of-class" critiques would be observed. To be denied access to one type of critique session was (methodologically) regrettable. However, there was no intention at the outset to
survey all known critique protocols, nor was there an intention to observe all members of staff in critique situations.

There are two examples from my field notes, both involving the same student, Rhianna, which illustrate the difficulty involved in negotiation of access.

The first narrative concerns the student identifying with even the silent observer, and as such makes a comment on the role of the silent observer as an "insider" suggesting that the role of observer only is not a passive role - and that active meaning is constituted even from silence. Having negotiated access to this classroom on the basis that I observed only and did not participate, this exchange illustrates the participatory role the research "insider" holds as a result of historical associations and personal relationships regardless of distancing oneself from the participant role at any particular time.

Excerpt from Notebook 2 April 199

Personal Relationship

During the peer review session on 2 April, 199 after the morning tea break when we were filing back into the room Rhianna drew me aside. She said that she was concerned that she was saying more than her peers and that she wanted to know whether I thought that she should draw back a little to let her colleagues have more opportunity to say something. The way that she framed her question to me was the most interesting part of the exchange as she said that she thought that I would have had this problem as well as I was (like her) a forceful person who was opinionated and assertive. In identifying with me - her previous critic and now observer of the proceedings - she was asking "What do you do in this situation?" to which I could reply that I acknowledge that quite often the more I say the less others will say so that I need to balance my willingness to proffer critique from my position of 'mastery' with my knowledge that my more valuable educative role is in facilitating review sessions which allow many voices to be heard. Often this simply means saying nothing and listening to others.

33. Rhianna, a pseudonym that Rhianna told me on several occasions she "hated" (in retrospect I probably should have negotiated the pseudonym) was prominent in the research for several reasons. She was in the minority in her year as a female student returning to study after a break, and through her reflexive personality and her role as the class representative became interested/involved in the research from the outset. Some of her reasons for her interest in this type of advocacy research are implicit in her interview responses in Chapters 4 and 5. I do not believe that it is problematic methodologically for Rhianna to be prominent in the research: she was particularly prominent in the class. Her election as class representative confirmed this. Hers was not the only viewpoint considered, as will be seen in Chapter 4, but she became a research 'informant'.
The second narrative concerns the rights that Rhianna felt the students had in regard to educational research being conducted "on them" and their concomitant right to participate in it. It illustrates very well the notion that neither the researcher, nor the teacher, 'own' students' participation in educational research, and that no amount of academic positioning on limiting the participation of the 'researched' in a critical ethnographic project is useful if it conflicts with the expectations of the 'researched'.

Excerpt from Notebook, March 199_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very early in the year during Orientation week after we had not seen each other for more than six months, Rhianna stopped me in the corridor to ask me how my research was progressing and whether I would be involved with her class, the third year students, during Semester 1. I replied that as I was heavily involved in the first year studio where I was able to participate in my preferred role of researcher-participant - a role with which I felt comfortable, which was supported by the texts on educational research and by the Department - my involvement there may preclude much wanted involvement in the final year. I then recounted to Rhianna that I would very much like to be involved in the third year studio particularly during their Semester 2 project (when I would not be involved with the first year students) but that the opportunity had been denied me in the previous year. Rhianna, who is the class representative said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We wouldn't stand for it. As a class we just wouldn't let that happen. No-one can tell us that you cannot be there if we want you to be.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readers may want to know more of the methods I adopted, both to record such exchanges as the one above with Rhianna, and more generally to gather and record data in such a setting.

With the exception of formal interviews (which were formalised in the sense that participants had an appointment for the interview - they knew on what day, and at what time the interview would take place) which were all tape-recorded with the prior knowledge and in full view of the participants who could request that the tape recorder was switched off/or that certain things were "off the record" - I did not record other informal exchanges with a tape recorder. I carried both a diary and a note-book for the whole period of observations.
In the initial research design, the data gathering period - or observations - was to extend from March, 1992 to June, 1994, over 5 university Semesters. As stated on p. 147 the planned way for the 5 Semesters involved critiques over the three year levels, critiques involving the same students in critiques over the three years of their study, critiques carried out by Departmental staff and outsiders, critiques involving large and small groups and critiques from informal one-on-one at the drawing board to formal juries and "whole-of-class" critiques. As the research progressed I limited the data gathering to 4 Semesters - March 1992 to December, 1993 - realising that, within the three years allocated to PhD research projects by the Australian Postgraduate Research Award - the Scholarship body - I would not have enough time to carry out the analysis and critique of all the material gathered over two years if I continued to gather data into the third year. Therefore there were minor changes to the research design in that whilst I could observe the same students over only two years, I could nevertheless observe critiques conducted over the three year levels. The compositions and differences of the planned critique "types" listed did not alter.

In situations such as the corridor exchange with Rhianna, I then went to my office, further along the corridor leading to the studios, and opening onto the first year and third year studios, and wrote a detailed description of the exchange, usually in my A4 day-to-a-page diary. I found that I used the notebooks for lengthier notations, such as recording the observations of a critique I observed. I drew the lengthier observations from detailed quantitative notes I had made in the diary concerning turn-taking, time of each critique, sequence of questions, facial and body language expressions of the tutors, critics and students. As I had almost an hour every evening on the train, followed by a 50km drive to my home, I used that time as an opportunity to get everything down on paper. I then almost immediately, usually that night, made a first draft of a narrative about that critique to present to participating teachers the next day. The process of negotiation of "meanings" about happenings in the critiques commenced whilst the critique sessions was still fresh in everyone's minds.
I carried out all the tape transcriptions myself - although I am not a particularly competent typist, and I railed against the fact that for two years all university non-teaching breaks were crammed with transcription time, I believed that the benefits of poring over the tapes, and creating a first-hand transcript - and the detailed knowledge that this imparted to me - far outweighed the time benefits of having the tapes professionally transcribed, and then having to read and reread them. Anyone who has transcribed interviews will know what it means about getting close to your data through the process of transcribing it.

Section 2: Validating Interview Transcripts for Negotiated Understandings

In this section some of the methodological constraints inherent in adopting an ethnographic process with the researcher as observer are considered.

The insistence on negotiated understandings of observations (Le Compte and Goetz, 1982; Lather, 1986) has resulted, in my own work, in what I consider to be a certain amount of understatement of key issues. This has arisen because I have been prevailed upon in the negotiation phase to modify the text in order to present a narrative that was more reflective of the view of the teacher involved. I found it difficult to deal with the issues of power and hierarchy, and ownership of the textual 'truth' that arose when negotiating understandings in the asymmetrical power relationship which sometimes existed between senior academic and researcher. The poststructuralist view of subjectivity was not embraced by all teacher participants in the research process, and there was sometimes an uncomfortable sense of their perception and mine being so at odds that I was unsure about my own perceptions. Some clearly thought I was meddling with the 'truth'. Frequently there was no-one else in attendance save the teacher and the student with whom I could discuss my emerging understandings; to discuss them with the teacher/student was re-entering the cycle of negotiation and modification. Stake (1985) comments that the "demands of case study research are sometimes incompatible with the demands of dissertation research" (p.287) whilst Davies (Seminar, 1994) believes that the reproof "Yes, but it is only one point of
view" can be answered by the researcher by incorporating multiple readings of the text, and asking herself the question "What is it that is being silenced here?"

In order to represent the plurality of meaning-making in any situation, a different presentation of the text may have been designed. The narrative of the researcher could have stood alone, together with the critique of the participating teacher, the critique of the participating students and finally the responsive critique of the researcher. The feminist view of the Other is all but lost in the politics of negotiation. If negotiation of the narrative is rejected as a process, all meaning rests with the researcher's disclosed subjectivity and there is a major break with the methodological rules laid down by the early ethnographers in respect of validity and reliability checks. This break was not one I adopted at the outset of the data gathering, preferring to negotiate narratives with teachers and students, although if I had the understanding of poststructuralism and validity that I have now I would have conducted the negotiation phase differently, preferring to seek multiple readings of my text, and incorporate them in the final text.

It is important to note the decision to negotiate the narratives with teachers, not students until the 'second cycle' of the research process. This decision was taken based not only on an understanding of the methodology but of poststructuralist theory, confirming that teachers and students are frequently situated in two different discourses of power in relation to educational research. My experience is that students may become more vulnerable and destabilised as a result of their positioning in relation to emerging research understandings than teachers, who, possibly being more powerful than the researcher, may openly reject interpretations. This decision reflects a certain 'power' of the researcher to release or withhold emerging understandings, and I do not deny that I have exercised judgement in relation to 'negotiation' decisions, as I have in decisions about which events to record to exemplify hegemonic practices. Bronwyn Davies throws light on the nature of selectivity of inclusion by suggesting that researchers ask, "What effects does saying this have?" (Seminar, University of South Australia, 25-11-1994). I suggest that the effects for teachers and students are quite different. Further compounding the possibilities for negotiation with
students was a clear direction from the Head of the Department to me as a researcher not to "influence" students with emerging theories from the research before the posting of their marks for that part of the Semester I was viewing either as their teacher or as an observer in their studio were posted. The Head believed that if students' confidence in their ability to succeed academically was for any reason diminished as a result of my research, he could be placed in an unfortunate position as Head of the School in any grievance procedure for not keeping a tight control over the equity prospects of all students by sanctioning negotiation with students.

In the 'second cycle' of the research process I shared narratives negotiated with teachers with the student 'informant' group. I refer to the 'second cycle' in deference to the strength of the methodology in recycling understandings in an iterative and reiterative way. This 'second cycle' strategy was carried out with the full knowledge and permission of the Head of the School. At this time I was attempting to understand what meanings participants were making of situations I had observed over the previous eighteen months. Without breaking with the anonymity of the 'first cycle' participants, through this process of discussing emerging understandings with students, I gained a deeper understanding of the research outcomes and of the research process than through solely negotiating with teachers, as the understandings of the 'informant' group were those of learners.

Taft suggests (Taft, 1988, 62) that although negotiation may result in a final product which is more likely to represent the situation as participants see it, there is always the risk of "covering-up" or "distortion", or the researcher may find it impossible to gain consensus. In openly ideological research there are two important reasons for resting on the researcher's subjectivity:

i. Openly ideological research does not seek to represent or present 'knowledge' or 'truth' - it is a particular kind of knowledge production (Simon and Dippo, 1986, 196) - contextual, partial and bounded, which is concerned with whose interests are served by the hegemonic
practices recorded by a narrator who draws the reader's attention to the narrative stance adopted and to the researcher's conceptual 'vantage point' (Brodkey, 1987, 1).

ii. The discourse of poststructuralism holds meanings for 'subjectivity' and 'language' which make a non-sense of negotiation in that if language does not label a 'real' world, and discourses represent political interests, vying for status and power and the site for this battle for power is the subjectivity of the individual (Weedon, 1987, 40-1). The very attempt to 'negotiate' any text attempts to deny that the strongest, most powerful and controlling 'voice' will usually be the one represented. As Saussure said "[n]either social reality nor the 'natural' world has fixed intrinsic meanings which language reflects or expresses" (Weedon, 1987, 22), which suggests that no amount of negotiation will get any closer to a representation of 'truth'. A rigid reliance on 'negotiation' as a methodological tool not only denies the essence of subjectivity as "precarious, contradictory and in process" but also suggests that there is an apolitical 'truth' which could be established in any circumstance if the narrative was negotiated with enough of the 'actors'.

Conclusion

The dilemmas I have presented concerning negotiation have resulted in this research in understatement rather than multiple readings. However, in future research, rather than seek negotiation in order to modify the text, I would present multiple readings of the same text. This decision would also deal with the dilemma of negotiating with the teachers differently from the students. Multiple readings would not compromise students in the same way that seeking a negotiated understanding may.

Section 3: Critical analysis

Critical analysis is a contested site for critical ethnographers. It is useful to turn to Thomas (1983) Toward a Critical Ethnography to consider, from the perspective of critical ethnography's roots in the legacy of the Chicago School (originating at the University of
Chicago) what the "epistemological, ontological and axiological characteristics of Chicago ethnography" (Thomas, 1983, 480) were, in order to reconsider current critical analytic practice. I quote at some length from Thomas in order to represent his main arguments in relation to critical analysis:

(1) **Ontology.** At the *ontological* level, Chicago sociology presupposed a world in which social structure is created and maintained by the behaviours of humans *acting upon* (rather than primarily acted on by) their world. ... Although human agents create their social world, they nonetheless remain constrained and influenced by external social factors that disrupt, prevent, or shape social behaviour. This implicit dialectical tension between social structure and human behaviour was only marginally developed by the Chicagoans ... and is virtually ignored by current ethnographers.

Original Chicago research also implied ontological realism...Especially since the late 1960s, ethnographers seem to have shifted from a realist to a nominalist ontology in which the social world is embodied in apparently rational categories, and the task of research thus becomes one of generating such categories from which to impute meanings to social behaviours. (p. 480)

(2) **Epistemology.** Epistemologically, Chicago sociology promoted a form of naturalism "that represented a commitment to remain true to the nature of the phenomenon under study or scrutiny" (Matza, 1969, 5 cited by Thomas, 1983, 481).... The epistemology of the Chicago School was implicitly grounded in empiricism in which (a) knowledge is obtained through direct observation, in which (b) useful concepts were generated from the data, which (c) allowed for the possibility of modification of the social conditions that spawned the social disorganization.(p. 480-481)

The epistemology that characterizes contemporary ethnography has presumed the adequacy of the researcher's cognitive and conceptual orientation, despite contrary textual warnings...and has promoted an unreflective, taken-for-granted acceptance, even dominance, of the researcher's perspective.(p. 482)

As a consequence, analytic categories, although assumed to reflect actual objects perceived, are closer to heuristic categories by which the researcher rationally recreates the subject's meanings and motivations from generalized typologies, often without sufficient data. This subtle, yet crucial shift in emphasis has required contemporary ethnographers to adopt an interpretive epistemology, one closer to native hermeneutics than empiricism.(p. 482)

(3) **Axiology.** The Chicagoans naturalistic emphasis focused especially on...social problems among Chicago's underclass. Nonetheless the fundamental moral view and value assumption (or axiology) was an implicit belief in the viability (and desirability) of existing social arrangements as the foundation of social and behavioural values. (p. 482)

This led to a social reformism, in which "disorganized" cultures and corresponding deviant behaviours could be "corrected" with proper application of research-informed social policy...(p. 483)
Thomas was highly critical of the then (1983) contemporary practitioners of ethnography whom he claimed had lost the knowledges of the Chicago School. He further claimed that the "critical potential of Chicago sociology [to challenge the then dominant positivism and social determinism] is often ignored, especially by contemporary practitioners, who have reduced the perspective to what might be described...as mindless description and "laundry-list" categories that tell us more about the researcher than the researched" (p. 478).

Smith writes that critical codes for analysis must "recognise the ideological, political and historical constructedness of social realities" (Smith, 1993a, 224). Smith cites Thomas (1983) who "provocatively asserted" that:

All too often, [ethnographic] research becomes an exercise in the generation of simplistic, inappropriate and mundane categories lacking both in intelligence and imaginative craft. This results in an abysmal failure to provide insights into, or allow apprehension of, the processes by which the social world is constructed, giving us instead aconceptual, atheoretical, and ahistorical nouns that pass for analytic categories and concepts. (Thomas, 1983, 486, cited by Smith, 1993a, 224)

Smith (1993a) further writes about the selection of suitable codes that:

Conventionally...codes are commonly employed by ethnographers to categorise and portray their own data. It seems unproblematic that the preferred codes of the researcher are prominently employed...For the critical ethnographer the codes employed must be 'critical'.(p. 224)

Smith confirms in this clear statement about the researcher "unproblematically" selecting preferred codes that "critical ethnographers acknowledges that they make knowledge... In openly ideological research, therefore, the task is to produce knowledge, for in knowledge production 'the issue is not whether one is "biased"; but rather, whose interests are served by one's work'" (Smith, 1993a, 224 citing Simon and Dippo, 1986, 196). The critical tools employed in the critical analysis of studio life in Chapter 4 are
- the forces of social reproduction and resistance;
- resituating the micro in the macro situation of raced, classed and gendered relations; and
- identifying the values and interests identified as being served by such understandings (Smith, 1993b, 13).
There is a body of argument (Fleet and Cambourne, 1989; Richards and Richards, 1987; Le Compte and Goetz, 1982) in favour of coding naturalistic data in a way which subsumes subjectivity to the "meanings" buried in the data, and accessible only, it is claimed, through the painstaking use of counting devices which log the use of particular words and phrases. Apart from the irrelevance of conducting frequency counts in a study which aims to show how critique discriminates, events which may have happened only once in the study may be both interesting and useful. Stake (1985) discusses the use of vignettes "to illustrate key issues or moments" (p.283) and refers to Kemmis' (1980) consideration of the usefulness of considering atypicality to alert the researcher "to variables and happenings that we regularly overlook" (p. 280).

This 'coding of naturalistic data' concept seems at odds with the declared value system of the critical researcher driving the construction of critical codes; nevertheless a brief description of the main features of coding in this way follows in order to contrast with the alternative employed in this research. Naturalistic coding, the legacy of Le Compte and Goetz (1982), a work contemporary with Thomas (1983) is first examined. The work extensively describes the checks which must be incorporated into ethnographic data collection and data analysis in order to attain anywhere near the level of validity and reliability Le Compte and Goetz demand. Whilst their major focus is on the attainment of validity and reliability in the data collection phase of ethnographic research, they extrapolate from the value of these practices in this phase to their value in the selection of analytic codes. They caution:

...disciplinary biases may appear, however implicitly, in the categories the investigator chooses as salient for analysis and coding of ethnographic data...Researchers with different theoretical backgrounds may choose to focus on quite different aspects of the data. The strategies discussed above [to guard against researchers' own ethnocentrism and perceptual biases] for enhancing the reliability of analytic constructs and premises and for ensuring the internal reliability of ethnographic studies also contribute to controlling observer analytic biases. (Le Compte and Goetz, 1982, 48)
Clearly Le Compte and Goetz preferred the notion of an ethnographer as having a "primary commitment...to a faithful and accurate rendition of the participant's lifeways" (p. 54) which must have been the type of study to which Thomas referred in his acid comments that:

One irony of contemporary ethnographic research is that while guided by an apparently "liberal" orientation that remains sympathetic to deviants, it has lost any semblance of a critical or even reformist program, substituting an almost cynical, apolitical, and amoral description in which glib titles, "pop" topics, and methodological techniques have become the primary characteristics. (Thomas, 1983, 484, my italics.)

Richards and Richards (1987) in developing the coding tool Non Numerical Unstructured Data Indexing Searching Theorising (NUDIST) followed in the scholarly tradition espoused by Le Compte and Goetz. The "speed, power and memory" of the computer are held to be a value free research assistant permitting the "computer-aided indexing, searching and analysis of unstructured data. Designed to replicate and go beyond methods special to qualitative data analysis" the programme enables text and indexing information to be stored, retrieved, explored, examined and synthesised (p. 23). The claims made for this programme are so extensive that they almost overwhelm the research scholar presuming to attempt the same process aided only by a good memory and a critical approach. In arguing the benefits for the assistance of the programme effectively permitting the recording and later analysis of large amounts of qualitative data, Richards and Richards argue again the essentially positivist line promoted by Le Compte and Goetz, that if everything is not recorded, analysed and considered, a research project is of little eventual utility. Their claims about traditional manually manipulated data bring fear and foreboding about the acceptance of their research outcomes to the researcher:

Constraint on complexity of analysis means that qualitative methodology is associated with episodic and truncated research, exploratory projects, 'signposts for future work', cosmetic touches to 'real' quantitative results. Theses and project proposals having it both ways result; the small-sample in-depth study central to the research design is overtaken by a statistical insurance policy. Lovingly collected but crudely analysed, the unstructured material is used for juicy quotes or case studies. (Richards and Richards, 1987, 27)
Their claims seek to legitimate and reify in an unacceptable way a process of data manipulation through computer assistance. The anecdotal accounts of fellow researchers using NUDIST are that the complexities inherent in the operation of the program at anything more than the most simple level as a device for ascertaining the frequency of given words and phrases places its usefulness beyond the realm of many researchers. Furthermore, more serious concerns are related to the Richards' claims about the value neutrality of the computer programme analysis. There is convincing evidence that NUDIST will produce trends and statistical analysis but it will not, nor can any programme, produce something for which it was not programmed. This is at the basis of their claims for the programme: "synthesis of new concepts abstracted from index and data file" is possible (p. 23).

In concluding their article *Can Computers Do It?* Richards and Richards (1987) make one of the more astounding of their claims. They are writing about the potential for NUDIST in the analysing process:

> The process of qualitative analysis is always an apparently endless succession of unfolding questions...[Through NUDIST] the researcher is in effect brought face to face with the data, without the comfortable buffer of methodological constraints. The data, and the theoretical context, can now dictate the index system; the data can determine the degree of categorisation; the data, not a truncated model of it, can decide when (and if!) analysis is concluded. (Richards and Richards, 1987, 34)

The Richards' claims suffer from the belief that the researcher is merely the value-free operator of a machine, the computer, and a value-free programme, NUDIST, which can "dictate" certain outcomes from the data. I believe that in their failure to state explicitly that the codes of the researcher are entered into the index control, and what is searched for amongst the data is driven by those codes, constitutes no lesser infliction of the researcher's value system than that which takes place in the coding of any qualitative data - the use of hunches, of common sense and of knowledge grown out of familiarity with the data. The Richards promote the NUDIST program as something it is not - a "synthesiser".
Richards and Richards have drawn heavily on the work of Miles and Huberman (1984) in their argument. Miles and Huberman's text *Qualitative Data Analysis, a sourcebook of new methods* explores at length the methods for coding and data analysis which borrow strongly from the positivist tradition and translate them to the qualitative tradition. Fleet and Cambourne (1989) attempt a similar project, on a smaller scale. They believe that "a code is a means of arranging a large amorphous quantity of data according to some rules of order" (p. 4). Whether the phenomenon under study is "fish, people, or behaviour", they argue, the coding process is similar and the precision of the inferences about the phenomenon depends a great deal on the precision of the code used to arrange it. They say little about the researcher ultimately controlling the research outcomes though a value-system driven selection of codes, but are insightful about this process ultimately driving code selection, albeit in an unstated way, in their comments that:

> the process [of proposing possible categories of analysis] is very much one of 'getting a feel for' the data and of clarifying the questions which are the study's guiding purpose, playing with tapes and concepts, and making notes on ideas which emerge. If there is a sympathetic person around, toss the ideas about, clarify thinking by explaining the study and the possible categories of analysis. (Fleet and Cambourne, 1989, 7)

In a more recent text on educational research, Le Compte, Millroy and Preissle (formerly Goetz-Preissle) (1992) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education* considers the ethnographic method at length but does not reveal new insights about coding and developing categories of analysis.

In conclusion, Thomas (1983) explains how a critical ethnography differs from conventional (Chicago School) ethnography in its means of data analysis:

> ...ethnography does provide a means of analysing social structure. Critical ethnography, by examining the fabric in which behaviours are embedded, allows display of those systematic and integral sets of social relations based on a model or logical pattern that orders or "stands behind" the empirical relations. The models are based on codes, conventions, or even "traditions" that make possible the reading or interpreting of surface features of behavior in terms of some underlying system...Unlike conventional structuralist approaches, which deemphasize the affective and subjective components of daily life, a structuralist ethnography allows for the examination of how social structure is built up out of human subjectivity and interaction. Where structuralism focuses on meanings as pregiven, however, a critical ethnography offers an opportunity to examine how participants in a given social setting actively create meanings that generate the human practices out of
which structures emerge. In this sense, the gap between micro- and macro-analysis dissolves, in that ethnography is necessarily a means of examining how social structure and interaction are connected. (Thomas, 1982, 487)

It is the consideration of the active role of the research participants in "creat[ing] meanings that generate the human practices out of which structures emerge" that is the substance of Chapter 4 of this thesis. Notions of poststructuralism and postmodernism now inform critical analysis. Leading the proponents of this current analytic repertoire are Lather (1991) and Davies (1994). I now turn to their analytic framework and to notions of feminism and poststructuralism which have provided the "tools" I have used in critical analysis.

The poststructuralist critical analyst

Despite demonstrating a theoretical knowledge of the means engaged in conventional critical ethnographic analysis I have adopted a method for critical analysis in this research from a position within two emerging and developing paradigms: feminism and poststructuralism.

The analysis is informed by Davies (1994) Poststructuralist Theory and Classroom Practice. Davies, whilst not wanting to prescribe an analysis methodology for every occasion, calls instead for context specificity, and an understanding of the subject positions available to authors of text at any time. She calls upon the poststructuralist researcher to bring everything - all reading, all prior experiences, all subjective lived experiences - to the task of deconstruction. Davies lists the following questions used as an aid to classroom analysis:

- What kind of context are the participants creating for one another?
- How are they positioning each other in that context?
  a. what positions or subject positions are available?
  b. how are those positions created and maintained?
- Where does the authority lie? Where there is a text being used, what is the relationship between the teacher and the textual authority?
- How is experience made relevant?
- What binary or dualistic thinking is evident in their discursive practices?
- Are gender relations visible in the text of this classroom? What forms of masculinity and femininity are being made available here?
- What storylines are being made relevant?
- What discourses are mobilised:
a. in the content of the teacher’s talk?
b. in the teacher’s choice of pedagogic and interactive practices?
- Whose interests are being served by each of these discourses?
(Davies, 1994, 45)

In the task of analysing the collection of ethnographic observations gathered over three years, I have adopted the notion of a problematic derived from critical theory (Simon and Dippo, 1986) defining the data and the analytic procedures in a way consistent with the data (p. 197). Smith (1993a) says that "being ideological, the purpose of analysis has a clear purpose: not to discover 'truth', not to 'tell it like it is' (the hallmark of a conventional ethnography), 'but to interrupt those social practices they believe oppress certain designated classes inside educational institutions, namely, students, teachers, minorities and women', to take an educational example from Brodkey" (p. 226). The data, as will be seen in Chapter 4: Narratives, Interviews, Critical Analysis and Research Results comprises a number of bounded observations of critique sessions - essentially case studies which are called narratives in adopting the language of critical ethnography - and a larger number of other day-to-day observations and interviews. The analytic procedures are those advocated by Davies (1994). In relation to a particular situation she describes "my desire, my subjectivity, my life history" as "relevant to what I saw" (p. 48). From my subject position, as researcher-participant, and sometimes as observer only, I have observed and recorded happenings in critique sessions through my subjective gaze, constituted through my life history, experience and subjectivity.

The first level of analysis had already taken place in observing the critiques and recording the critiques as narrative. To this process of observing/recording I brought my experience as an architect, my experience as a teacher, my prejudices (pre-judgements), my reading, and my lived experiences. What was recorded is already a subjective account by this understanding of constituted subjectivity. The same event recorded by another ethnographer through her/his subjectivity would have yielded different narratives.

As Weedon says about the constructed nature of understandings implicit in language:
Different languages and different discourse within the same language divide up the world and give it meaning in different ways which cannot be reduced to one another through translation or by an appeal to universally shared concepts reflecting a fixed reality...

All forms of poststructuralism assume that meaning is constituted within language and is not guaranteed by the subject which speaks it. (Weedon, 1987, 22)

The second level of analysis happens far away from the "fieldwork" of gathering observations. In this stage of the analysis, the researcher considers the range of data through the organising problematic. To do this I listened to the text - to the nuances of the voice, to the pauses, to the nervous giggles - I let the text talk to me. I did not approach the text applying a pre-formed feminist lens, knowing somehow therefore what the 'data coding categories' might be. Instead, in acknowledging my feminist beliefs I support Stanley and Wise's (1990) understandings of what 'feminism' might present in the behaviour and analysis of the research process. Stanley and Wise suggest what a feminist orientation might mean in the research process saying:

"Feminism"...should be present in positive ways within the research process, as feminist epistemological principles underpinning behaviour and analysis both; and we outlined five related sites of these:

- in the researcher-researched relationship
- in emotion as a research experience
- in the intellectual autobiography of the researchers; therefore
- in how to manage the differing 'realities' and understandings of researchers and researched; and thus
- in the complex question of power in research and writing. (Stanley and Wise, 1990, 23 in Stanley, 1990)

The themes I finally adopted as an organising tool in Chapter 4 were suggested to me by listening to the narratives, to the interviews, to the text, and to the silences through the organising problematic of the means by which discrimination took place.

The thesis points to the use of the means by which discrimination takes place as the organising problematic. Smith (1993b) has suggested that a problematic may be further divided through a consideration of the "critical tools" of "social reproduction and resistance; resituating the micro- in the macro socio-cultural setting of 'raced', classed and
gendered relations"; and through considering the "values and interests identified as being served by such understandings" (p. 13).

Lather (1991a) *Getting Smart: Feminist Research in education within/against* asks the question which is central to my decision making about data analysis:

What do you do with data once you have met poststructuralism? (Lather, 1991a, 29)

The contribution that post-structural/discursive thinking has made to the theory and practice of conducting a feminist research project in an educational setting comes in the acknowledgement that, in critical research, the research outcomes do not uncover truths, but are rather, as Simon and Dippo (1986, 196) assert, *a particular kind of knowledge production* concerned with seeking transformative outcomes through political awareness, and political action as a result of that awareness. There is a complex relationship of a research methodology concerned with knowledge production, and the invitation of poststructuralism into the constructed world of the 'actors' who constitute meaning through their language. Weedon writes about feminist poststructuralism:

The analysis of the patriarchal structures of society and the positions that we occupy within them requires a theory which can address forms of social organization and social meanings and values which guarantee or contest them. Yet it must also be able to theorize individual consciousness. *We need a theory of the relation between language, subjectivity, social organization and power*. We need to understand why women tolerate social relations which subordinate their interests to those of men and the mechanisms whereby women and men adopt particular discursive positions as representative of their interests. *This is the agenda which a feminist poststructuralism might consider.* (Weedon, 1987, 12, my italics)

As Weedon says, there are many poststructuralisms, not all of which are necessarily productive to feminism, but they all share in fundamental assumptions about *language, meaning and subjectivity* (p. 20).

For poststructuralist theory the common factor in the analysis of social organization, social meanings, power and individual consciousness is *language* (p. 21).
Weedon says that language is the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed.

[Like all theories, poststructuralism makes certain assumptions about language, subjectivity, knowledge and truth. Its founding insight, taken from Ferdinand de Saussure, is that language, far from reflecting an already given social reality, constitutes social reality for us. Neither social reality nor the 'natural' world has fixed intrinsic meanings which language reflects or expresses. (Weedon, 1987, 22, my italics)]

Weedon expresses a view about subjectivity in relation to poststructuralism which differentiates between the poststructuralist view of human agency as "precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak" (p. 33), and the view presumed by humanist discourses which "presuppose an essence at the heart of the individual which is unique, fixed and coherent and which makes her what she is" (p. 32). Lather (1991b) rejects the essentialist view of gender differentiation in presenting a view of the feminist researcher. Simply stated, Lather says that "feminist researchers see gender as a basic organizing principle which profoundly shapes and mediates the conditions of our lives" (p. 71). She states that:

The overt ideological goal of feminist research in the human sciences is to correct both the invisibility and the distortion of female experience in ways relevant to ending women's unequal social position. This entails the substantive task of making gender a fundamental category for our understanding of the social order. (Lather, 1991b, 71-2, my italics)

34. Other texts informing the notion of the feminist researcher are:

Bannerji, Himani; Carty, Linda; Dehli, Kari; Heald, Susan and McKenna, Kate (1991) Unsettling Relations: the university as a site of feminist struggles Toronto: Women's Press.


Luke and Gore (1992) argue that, from the stand-point of poststructuralist feminisms, "in relation to pedagogical discourse, a poststructuralist feminist position suggests we cannot claim single-strategy pedagogies of empowerment, emancipation, and liberation" (p. 7).

In this project of critical analysis, my understandings of process are informed by feminist and poststructuralist discourses, and my understandings will rest on the meanings I subscribe to language and my subjectivity, which is "precarious, contradictory and in process" (Weedon, 1987, 33).

Feminist poststructuralism, then, is a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to understand existing power relations and to identify areas and strategies for change. Through a concept of discourse, which is seen as a structuring principle of society, in social institutions, modes of thought and individual subjectivity, feminist poststructuralism is able, in detailed, historically specific analysis, to explain the working of power on behalf of specific interests and to analyse the opportunities for resistance to it. It is a theory which decentres the rational, self-present subject of humanism, seeing subjectivity and consciousness, as socially produced in language, as a site of struggle and potential change. Language is not transparent as in humanist discourse, it is not expressive and does not label a 'real' world. Meanings do not exist prior to their articulation in language and language is not an abstract system, but is socially and historically located in discourses. Discourses represent political interests and in consequence are constantly vying for status and power. The site of this battle for power is the subjectivity of the individual...

At the level of the individual, this theory is able to offer an explanation of where our experience comes from, why it is contradictory or incoherent and why and how it can change. (Weedon, 1987,40-1, my italics).

Section 4: The production of the critical narrative

Earlier in the chapter the history of conventional ethnographic text as a form of cultural reportage, declaring nothing of the researcher's ideology to the reader, has been discussed.

An example of such an ethnographic narrative which is situated in this seemingly value-free paradigm is Janesick (1982) Constructing grounded theory: Reflections on a case study of a professor of architectural design, which, particularly when read together with Janesick (1983) Reflections on Teaching Ethnographic Methods, proposes a narrative textual format, predicated on an apolitical world view. Janesick's data analysis and textual construction

35. For a self-statement about my subjectivity see pp.182-187
methodology included "selection of categories based on statements and actions; finding recurring incidents; checking indices of conflict, tension, frustration; developing interviews based on observations; checking frequency and distribution of statements and actions by category; constructing hypotheses and testing them; constructing a model of the above; rechecking and rebuilding the model as the data warranted" (Janesick, 1982, 19). All the focus is on the professor, Joshua Kane. We learn very little about what Janesick brought to the experience of sixteen months of observation and fieldwork. She says that

[ethnographic research requires that the researcher become a participant observer, stay in the social setting over time, and recount what is found in terms of the subject's definitions of situations, not the researcher's...]

Participant observation was used to get at the meanings in Kane's world as a professor of architectural design. This method provided information about events and beliefs that might otherwise have escaped my notice. If I saw an event occur, and saw what preceded and followed that event, and interviewed Kane about it, I then had reasonable data from which to make statements about that event. I learned about curriculum construction in architectural design by learning about the person who designed that curriculum. (Janesick, 1982, 22)

Poststructuralism, aided by critical theory, has disrupted this apolitical world view declaring that "there is no innocent space" such as the one Janesick occupied for sixteen months as an observer in a School of Architecture.

In her text *Writing critical ethnographic narrative* Brodkey (1987) argues against the separation of narrative and critique in the textual construction of *critical ethnographies*. This departure contrasts with the critical ethnographic tradition of separation of narrative and critique. This separation arose seemingly in emulation of positivist research which demanded that 'data' and 'results' be separated from the 'discussion' so that (positivist) researchers following on could independently examine experimental outcomes without their understandings being influenced by any bias of the original experimenter.

Brodkey was concerned with the difficulty of the project of 'negative critique' as she defines the critical ethnographic project as "at once the story of cultural hegemony and an argument for social change" if "researchers must satisfy the expectation of systematic protest against cultural hegemony in a narrative written to meet the conventional
expectation that scholarship is, by definition, an unbiased account of events told by a disinterested researcher" (p. 68). She continues that "it is, of course, the explicit use of research to advocate for change that makes critical research academically suspect, for it is widely believed that scholarship and advocacy either are or should be kept distinct (p. 68-69). "Fortunately", Brodkey says, "it is not necessary that all readers be persuaded by critical ethnographies, only that they accept them as a viable form of scholarship" (p. 69, my italics). She believes that readers who have become accustomed to reading and writing ethnographic narratives in which the author's value system was implied, rather than stated, "will need to be shown how explicit cultural critique is possible inside academic discourse" (p. 69). Brodkey says:

Critical narrators, then, are narrators whose self consciousness about ideology makes it necessary for them to point out that all stories, including their own, are told from a vantage point, and to call attention to the voice in which the story is told. In critical narratives, it is from the narrative stance or conceptual vantage point of critical theory that a story of cultural hegemony is generated. That means that the events related have been conceptualized by a narrator who sees, organizes, interprets, and narrates social events in terms of critical theory. Where another ethnographer might "see" a particular social event as worth relating because it illustrates how conflict was resolved or provides an interesting case for discourse analysis of language interaction in the classroom, the critical ethnographer will consider an event worth recording and reporting because it exemplifies a hegemonic practice. (Brodkey, 1987, 71)

Brodkey argues that "uninterrupted, third person narratives" "effectively revert to perceptual instead of conceptual narrative stances" (p. 71, my italics) in which the "eyewitness narrator" is seen as the "instrument rather than the agent of the narrative" (p. 72). However, Brodkey cautions that the mere adoption of a conceptual narrative stance does not ensure any more than "that the story generated from critical theory will concern cultural hegemony" (p. 73). Therefore, she argues:

...some narrative voices are more audible than others, and a narrative voice is made most audible by interrupting the flow of the story and calling attention to the fact of narration. In other words...critical ethnographic narrators would interrupt their own stories. (Brodkey, 1987, 73)

We can only hope to transform a hegemonic practice with a narrative that insists on interrupting a story told in a classroom or in the academy that has acquired the status of lived experience, reality, logic, science, or any of the other seemingly unassailable stories that have acquired the status of authoritative discourse. (Brodkey, 1987, 74-75, my italics)
In my research project I adopt the methodology propounded by Brodkey (1987) of writing conceptual narrative. The ethnography as the "written product of research activity" 
(Atkinson, 1990, 3) is further informed through the writings of Dorothy Smith (1990a, 1990b, 1987) and the insight into textual construction provided by Atkinson (1990) in The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual constructions of reality in which he says about Whyte's (1981) ethnographic monograph Street Corner Society that:

When we read an ethnographic monograph - say, Street Corner Society (Whyte, 1981) - we are implicated in complex processes of reality construction and reconstruction. That book, with all its vivid and realistic descriptive writing, is not a literal representation of the social situation of Italian-American street-corner gang members. Whyte's craft resides not just in the conscientious and careful collection of data, and their arrangement into a factual report. The monograph itself is, in the best sense, an artful product. The narratives and descriptions, the examples, the characters and the interpretive commentary are woven together in a highly contrived product. The world we enter into, as readers, is not a direct experience of 'street corner society'; we are engaged in the interpretation of society-as-reconstructed, and that reconstruction is coded or inscribed in Whyte's text. Moreover, the book does not - cannot - totally determine how we as readers will interpret it. We read, and read into, the text, based on our own background knowledge and assumptions. Those latter include our competence as readers of sociological works. We bring to the work our sympathy (or lack of it) for the ethnographic style of writing, as well as a host of barely articulated cultural capacities.

The role of explicit sociological 'theory' is a relatively minor part in the overall act of communication between Whyte and his readers. What is conveyed is dependent upon implicit textual phenomena: the textual formats, the rhetorical figures, the choice of descriptive vocabulary, the selection of illustrative materials. These are all elements in a context of persuasion.

Over and above any propositional content and the 'conclusions' or 'findings' to be presented, the ethnographic text depends on the plausibility of its account. (Atkinson, 1990, 2)

In conclusion, Atkinson (1990) makes at least two important points about the textual construction of the narrative. The first is that rather than "conscientious and careful collection of data, and their arrangement into a factual report" the skill of the ethnographer, in the example of Whyte lies in arranging the narratives, descriptions and commentary in such a way that the reader is invited, and drawn into, an active interpretation of the reconstruction, due not only to the ethnographer's coding and inscription - his critical interpretation - but also as a result of what the reader herself brings to the reading. The second is that the ethnographer's textual skill derives from implicit rather than explicit
textual statements. There is no place in this argument for the separation of the narrative, as a textual representation of "truth" from the researcher's interpretations.

Section 5: Researcher self-reflection

This is an undertheorised area of the ethnographic project. I believe that this may be because this self-reflective phase of the research design has been generally overlooked by two groups: 'the fieldwork ethnographers' and the 'reflection-on-action' or 'armchair ethnographers' in the rare intersection of their work. Just how much the two groups inform the understandings of the other group is questionable. Consequently, the consideration of the ethnographer's self-reflection have been somewhat neglected by mainstream ethnographic texts. This may be a further example of the positivist "hangover" affecting textual construction of critical research in that researcher self-reflection changing the researcher and the research would be irrelevant to positivist research predicated upon a value neutral stance.

The notion of researcher self-reflection on the research process and the theories which inform it is perhaps best illuminated by two feminist researchers, Stacey and Lather, who have themselves engaged in critical ethnographic projects. Feminist ethnographies, reliant for their theoretical base on the presumption of a driving ideology of the researchers' bias organising the framework for the research, nevertheless try to break down the dualism of the 'researcher and the researched' (Stacey, 1988). Lather (1991b, 56) repeats calls for both the 'researcher and the researched' to become the "the changer and the changed" whereas traditional critical ethnographies, according to Smith (1993a, 227) separate the notion of participant reflection and transformation from researcher self-reflection.

Lather (1991b) considers the concept of self-reflexivity at length in her text. She believes that as "current paradigmatic uncertainty in the human sciences is leading to the re-

36. The notion of "researcher self-reflection" used by Smith (1993a, 227), "self-reflexivity" used by Lather (1991b, 79) and "reflexive considerations" of Simon and Dippo (1986) do not differ substantially except in their naming. I have generally used the expression self-
conceptualizing of validity" (p. 66) "a systematized reflexivity which reveals how a priori theory has been changed by the logic of the data seems essential in establishing construct validity in ways that will contribute to the growth of illuminating and change-enhancing social theory" (p. 67). However, whilst Lather agrees with Bowers' (1984) arguments that "reflexivity and critique are the two essential skills we want our students to develop in their journey toward cultural demystification" (Lather, p. 80, citing Bowers (1984)) she believes that

as feminist teachers and scholars, we have obviously developed critical skills as evidenced by a body of scholarship which critiques patriarchal mis-shapings in all areas of knowledge...developing the skills of self-critique, of a reflexivity which will keep us from becoming impositional and reifiers ourselves remains to be done." (Lather, 1991b, 80, my italics).

Lather extracts herself from the trap of becoming "an armchair philosopher of research" (p. 69) by writing of students' resistance to liberatory curriculum in an introductory women's studies course as a means of examining self-reflexivity.

Self-reflexivity becomes increasingly central as I attempt to make sense of my interaction with the data and the politics of creating meaning. (Lather, 1991b, 79)

However, she acknowledges that this is not an easy, or well theorised process. Lather cites an example of attempted emancipatory educational research (Johnston, 1990) in which Johnston says of her own changing attitudes which she did not discuss with the teachers: "I didn't know how to do it nor even how to talk about it very clearly" (Johnston, 1990, 176 cited by Lather, 1991b, 98).

Stacey (1988), an active ethnographer and author of papers on ethnographic methodologies, provides an insight about the self-informing nature of feminist/ethnographic research which is central to her Can there be a Feminist Ethnography?

But now after two and a half years of fieldwork experience, I am less sanguine and more focused on the difficult contradictions between feminist principles and ethnographic method I have encountered than on their compatibility...I find myself

reflexive except where referring to a particular writer's understandings in which case I have adopted their nomenclature.
wondering whether the appearance of greater respect for and equality with research subjects in the ethnographic approach masks a deeper, more dangerous form of exploitation. (Stacey, 1988, 22)

Unlike Johnston, Stacey has found a voice in which to express her growing concerns about engaging in critical ethnographic work from an ideology of feminism. Her self-reflective approach is born out of, I believe, the inevitable disjunction experienced between theory and practice she uncovered in her fieldwork. Her short text is an exemplar of researcher self-reflection and a good example of what Lather (1991b) terms "systematized reflexivity" (p. 67). Stanley (1988) provides a significant critique of Stacey's work (p.92) in her text which itself is a self-reflection about her own ethnographic project in Rochdale. Bell (1993) reviews the tradition of self-reflection in the work of feminist ethnographers in the Introduction to Gendered fields: Women, men and ethnography recalling that:

> There is a long and honorable tradition of ethnographic writing in which the voice of the ethnographer pondering her situation, the impact of her presence on the people with whom she is working, and the problematic nature of being both observer and participant is audible. In short, there is a reflexive tradition in which the voices of women are critical. (Bell, 1993, 4, my italics)

In this research project I find a voice in which to reflect on theory and practice in critical ethnographic research. My voice locates itself amongst the data and in the thick description, as well as in self-reflection about the process of researcher transformation. Furthermore, in locating my voice in the data, I acknowledge the limitations on addressing such a topic as critique - any written record must be highly selective and partial in recognition that the whole critique event is only partly a verbalised process in that the designs and their graphic representation are an integral part of the critique. Yet they are knowingly excluded from consideration in this thesis which is concerned with critique as a mode of delivery and as a process, not as commentary on the design per se.

Participant Reflections and Transformative actions

The Epilogue: Concluding the Process of Educational Research reflects on the necessity for self-reflection amongst readers as a means of seeking political consciousness raising
transformative outcomes for teachers, students and administrators. In place of the traditional conclusion, with its range of generalisable recommendations (Weis, 1985; Carnoy and Levin, 1985; Holland and Eisenhart, 1990) this chapter reflects that it is in the engagement of the process that the relationship between researcher and researched is promoted, and that through the self-reflection of all parties on the narrative and critique, transformative action, as a long-term outcome of political consciousness raising, may follow. This transformative process, which is by no means a guaranteed outcome of conducting a critical ethnographic research project (Kemmis, 1991, 60 as cited by Smith, 1993b, 3) is made problematic by Simon and Dippo (1986, 201); Lather (1986a, 1991b) and Acker (1983, 431 as cited by Smith, 1993b, 3) who all caution that, for complex reasons, the best intent of the researcher does not necessarily result in transformed actions of the reader. For as Smith says

[i]The critical ethnographer contracts to undertake research and to produce a report. Thereafter, it is the participants who are sufficiently mobilised or not by the report who determine whether the research process continues or not.

To continue requires the participants to have access to the report...After gaining access, however, the report needs to promote sufficient self-searching on the part of the participants so that they realise their capacity to take a self-formative path towards rational autonomy (as social/political amelioration). Such a path can take many forms in relation to emancipatory praxis...

(Smith, 1993a, 227)

Here Smith refers to the "circled" actions of participant reflection, and transformative actions, which I illustrated on p. 117, as a possible continuation of the research process as a result of reflection by stakeholders on the report.

Hammersley (1992) considers at length the problems of the transformative potentials of critical ethnography - or emancipation, as he calls it - in Chapter 6 'Critical Theory as a Model for Ethnography' of his book What's Wrong with Ethnography. He says about the prospect of critical theories being tested by their success or otherwise in bringing about emancipation that:

I have already argued that the concept of emancipation is deeply problematic. But even putting this aside, there is the fact that the emancipation test seems to presuppose that a critical theory is the only or main contributor to emancipation. I have suggested that this involves an exaggerated estimate of the role of theory in practice. Theories are not simply applied but used in association with practical
knowledge. And, if this is the case, the achievement of emancipation depends on much more than the truth of the theory, and so failure to achieve emancipation does not tell us that the theory is false. (Hammersley, 1992, 115)

This is the very basis for feminist ethnography as propounded by Lather (1986a, 1986b), Stanley (1988), Stacey (1988) and Bell (1992) - that theory must resonate with the lived experiences of women and be changed by them, as well as change them. Stanley (1988, 93) concludes about the current emphasis in ethnography on textual politics and textual analysis which has displaced the debate on "scientist claims on behalf of ethnographic practice" that, to create a "moral/feminist ethnography" something more than ethnography as a "thing in itself...the creation-in-writing of a paper world which can be examined and discussed effectively without reference to truth-claims about its relationship to the actual social setting it (presumably) emanates from" is necessary. She says

...ethnographic practice still needs to be conducted with as much scruple, sensitivity and so forth as the conduct of other social relationships. The 'reason' for moral ethnographic practice, however, ought not to be so as to produce a 'better' (in textual terms) ethnographic product, but rather to ensure that researcher and researched alike find its process mutually enjoyable and interesting.

...Ethnography-writing is certainly artful; but its artfulness, its textual cleverness, is not an adequate indicator of whether it is to be taken as 'good ethnography writing': we need to be very clear about how 'good' is being defined and used. For me at least, a good ethnography is one which actively seeks to empower readers, to even up the imbalance of knowledge that exists between the ethnography-writer and the ethnography-reader. (Stanley, 1988, 93)

The focus moves, Stanley (1988) says, in moral feminist ethnography writing, to the textual product, and the process by which it was derived, away from Hammersley's (1992, 111) call for critical ethnographers to demonstrate why critical theory should be any more effective than any other at removing the blinkers of false consciousness from the oppressed.

Conclusion

What exactly could a feminist ethnography look like? How would it differ from the ethnographies which are not driven by an understanding that "gender is a phenomenon that helps to shape our society...[where] women are located unequally in that social formation, often devalued, exploited and oppressed" (Kenway and Modra, 1992, 139).
Stacey posits that there are several features to a feminist ethnography. First she bemoans the fact that as there has been very little dialogue between feminist scholarship and "postmodern" or "poststructural" ethnography there has been a failure to recognise that "postmodern ethnography is concerned with quite similar issues as those that concern feminist scholars" (p. 24). The "new" ethnographers "like feminist scholars... tear the veil from scientific pretensions of neutral observation or description. They attempt to bring to their research an awareness that ethnographic writing is not cultural reportage, but cultural construction, and always of self as well as of the other". However, Stacey argues that only "at rare moments do critical ethnographers incorporate feminist insights into their reflexive critiques" (p. 24, my italics). She repeats the calls from feminists for "an egalitarian research process, full collaboration, and even multiple authorship..." which give rise, she believes, to the possibility for a "fruitful dialogue between feminism and critical ethnography [which] might address their complementary sensitivities and naivetes about the inherent inequalities and the possibilities for relationships in the definition, study, and representation of the Other" (p.26).

Stacey concludes her paper in the same way that I shall conclude this Chapter, leaving the dialogue open:

...believing that an uneasy fusion of feminist and critical ethnographic consciousness may allow us to construct cultural accounts that, however partial and idiosyncratic, can achieve the contextuality, depth, and nuance I consider to be unattainable through less dangerous, but more remote research methods."(p.26)
CHAPTER 4

NARRATIVES, INTERVIEWS, CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

In Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY the process of "collect[ing] participants' interpretations of reality" (Smith, 1993b,13), and the production of critical narrative and critical analysis within the research genre critical ethnography is described. Furthermore, the process of engaging a feminist, poststructuralist analysis as a means of deconstructing events and interviews, is described.

In this Chapter, the students' voices and the narratives which situate their voices in relation to their architectural education provide a view of the world of the architectural studio, and necessarily a view of architectural critique, which is at the centre of architectural education (Dinham, 1986).

The critical analysis and discussion which follow reflect on the voices and narratives. The critical analysis of participants' interpretations and reinterpretations of reality are considered through the critical tools of:
- considering the forces of social reproduction and resistance;
- re situating the micro in the macro situation of raced, classed and gendered relations; and
- identifying the values and interests identified as being served by such understandings (Smith, 1993b,13). Gary Anderson (1989) asserts that this "critical thrust would raise serious questions about the role of schools in the social and cultural reproduction of social classes, gender roles, and racial and ethnic prejudice" (p. 251).

Critical Analysis

The critical analysis is driven by the notion of an organising problematic derived from critical theory (Simon and Dippo, 1986,197) which directs the analysis through a number of
questions posed. In this research project the organising problematic is that of the means by which discrimination takes place. As Smith says, "being openly ideological, the process of analysis has as a clear purpose: not to discover 'truth', not to 'tell it like it is' (the hallmark of conventional ethnography) 'but to interrupt those social practices they believe oppress certain designated classes inside educational institutions, namely students, teachers, minorities and women'" (Smith, 1993a, 226, citing Brodkey, 1987, 67).

This conventional task for critical analysis in critical research intersects in this research with notions of analysis within poststructural feminism, so that the role for the critical analysis includes identifying the subject positions from which the 'actors' speak, and disrupting the binaries (man/woman; student/teacher; assessor/assessed; competitor/co-operator; conformer/individualist) into which the actors 'speak' themselves as a result of historical, social and educational practices. Furthermore, the role for the critical analysis extends to that of leading the reader from the students' voices and the narratives, as vignettes of studio life portraying critique in many contexts, through to the raison d'etre of the methodology - chosen as it is for its ability to shift the core assumptions of the reader through a finely tuned focus on the 'everyday made problematic' by asking "How do the practices of critique discriminate against some students?"

In this chapter my focus is on the "interruptions" to social practice which must occur before students and teachers in Schools of Architecture can begin to recognise enabling and disabling practices for themselves, and from this basis explore the possibilities of critique as a process central to the development of students' self-judgement. Some themes in the social practices of the studio have been identified. The themes include silencing, exclusion, marginalisation, conforming, competing, and accepting/rejecting hierarchy which together, and separately, help to form and assert the practices of discrimination.

1. The focus on students recognising disabling practices for themselves relates to the learner-centred focus for this research.
2. This process is explored in Chapter 5.
These themes are not the definitive themes as an outcome of this finely focused two year research project in a School: they are some themes chosen for their ability to expose the workings of power and the sites where discrimination is evident in the studio. The themes do not, as do themes which arise in deductivism, "treat[s] experience as a 'test' of previously specified theoretical hypotheses [so that within deductivism] theory precede[s] both experience and research". Nor do the themes, as they would in inductivism, specify "a model of research in which theory is derived from research experience" as 'grounded theory' arises from the data (Stanley and Wise, 1990, 22).

Subjectivities addressed

In order to give privilege to the students' voices, I seek to present their thoughts gleaned from interview material on each of the themes, with a preamble situating their narrative in the specific and historic context in which it was spoken. Sometimes I provide further narrative examples from the fieldwork observations of critique practices which inform the theme. In so doing I attempt to situate myself in relation to the narrative through an introduction in which I speak of my own position in the making of the narrative. I attempt to "position myself as author, in the text" (Davies, 1994,46) to speak about my constitutive power in the narrative, and to further alert the reader to the subject position(s) I occupied on each occasion of writing narrative. Furthermore, I attempt to give the reader an account of the chronology of each narrative in comparison with those which precede and succeed it in the text, to draw upon the effluxion of time as a further resource in the empowerment potentials of the critical research process. In this regard I am critical of the acontextuality of the accounts of Weis (1985), Carnoy and Levin (1985) and Holland and Eisenhart (1990).

The narratives are excerpts from the work that has engaged me since 1992 in researcher-participant observations of studio life in a School of Architecture. For two years, 1992-3, I observed activities in the School from the position of a tutor in architectural design. In this time I observed many critiques, formally and informally, hundreds of which I engaged in myself in the course of tutoring. In a three hour studio session the expectation was that a
tutor would see everyone in the class; to do this, three tutors would speak to about twelve
students each. Therefore, in a year of studio teaching, tutoring three sessions a week, I
engaged in almost one thousand desk crits "one-on-one" over the drawing board. As well as
the "desk crits" there were preliminary and final critiques involving groups of students
ranging in size from several up to the whole class.

At the same time I was engaged with tutoring, I also observed, and where possible
participated in, critiques in many other classes throughout the School. The process of
negotiating access to classes has been explained in Chapter 3. The range of classes to which
I negotiated access covered four years of the School, from the final year of the generalist
Architectural Studies degree, a year immediately preceding the professional degree,
Bachelor of Architecture, to all three years of the professional degree.

Simultaneously with this researcher-participant and researcher-observer activity I
maintained weekly contact with the "Qualifying" students who were intending to commence
their studies of architecture at the second degree level, through completing a bridging year.
Through my role as the tutor for this bridging year, I was familiar with the range of
teaching which comprised the general degree, and the assessment and critique which was
engaged in that teaching. Therefore my knowledge of curriculum and teaching modes
covered all six years of the School in some depth.

Further informing my knowledge of the assessment and critique practices throughout the
School were the problems students brought to the lunch-time Drop-in sessions I organised
and ran in 1992 and 1993. In these sessions students from any year in the School could
bring work in progress to a Drop-in Centre. In the course of conducting this student support
work I became more familiar with the coursework and assessment requirements for the six
levels of the School.
Whilst these teaching and researcher-participant observation activities were on-going I also carried out interviews with a group of students who became, in hindsight, my 'informant', group. The first interviews with them were conducted at the end of their first year in the professional degree, and the last as they were about to graduate from the School two years later.

Giving further breadth to my understandings of teaching and learning for architecture students was knowledge gleaned from two years of engagement, prior to 1992, on grant-funded Teaching Development projects within the School of Architecture. As part of this work I had surveyed students in the third year of the general architectural degree and the first year of the professional degree about a range of matters relating to teaching and learning. I followed this quantitative and qualitative research, conducted in 1991, with a whole of School survey carried out in the first teaching session of the year in 1992. The purpose of this survey was to ascertain a "base-line" for student learning attitudes: in short, to ask the students, before any teaching had taken place, how confident they felt about learning a range of generic and specific skills and knowledges which the teaching in the school addressed. What the results revealed, in summary, was that students in the first year of the first degree, generally straight from school, appeared to be more confident than

---

3. Although the term 'informant' often has the negative connotations of the criminal/legal system wrongly suggesting that the 'informant' group was 'informing on' other students and staff without their knowledge in return for some privilege, this term is but one expression for a group who engage in the in-depth interviewing stage which is carried out by the critical ethnographer towards establishing 'reliability'. Taft (1988) says about this process:

In the case of literate participants such as are found in educational research, the research workers may submit to the members [of the group] drafts of sections of their reports as well as oral accounts of their impressions. If necessary, the interpretations can be "negotiated" with the participants so that the final product is more likely to represent the situation as they see it, but there is always a danger in this procedure that the participants may exercise distortion and cover-up for their own reasons or that the researcher finds it impossible to obtain consensus. Different members of the group may hold different perceptions of the events, for example teachers and students, or boys and girls. Some researchers have attempted to overcome these problems by setting up small groups of about four participants to engage in discussions towards establishing their shared meanings by acting as "checks, balances, and prompts" for each other, but in practice there are distinct limitations to the possible application of this practice. (Taft, 1988, 62, my italics)

The 'informant' group, as I called them, were such a group in this research.
students at any other point in the School. In adopting a critical approach, and particularly that of critical ethnography, I have elected to focus on the 'everyday' and the 'taken for granted' which necessarily draws the focus away from the findings of the other earlier research findings, much of it quantitative, which informs my knowledge about teaching and learning in the School.

Further informing my knowledge, and also situating me as an "insider" in relation to the students and the staff, are the five years, 1987-1991, spent teaching in the studios of the School as an architectural design tutor prior to commencing the current research. Informing my view of the nature of architectural practice are the years 1977-1995 spent in architectural practice, both in a large firm with a hierarchical structure, and in an equal partnership.

I note this length and breadth of involvement in the School, and in architectural practice, to explain that whilst Chapter 4 draws on interviews, formal and informal, and myriad notebook and studio observations over the intensive data gathering period 1992-1993, these observations are embedded in a much deeper and broader knowledge both of the School and of practice. Therefore the subjectivities I bring to the critical analysis are those of a practising architect, a teacher, a researcher and a student, engaged daily during the research process in understanding the subjectivities of the students.

In presenting "my story" within the research I want to make a comment, along the lines of Lather (1994) about the present inability of textual formats to at once emphasise the participants' stories whilst de-emphasising that of the researcher. Lather (p. 18) used a change in font size and type, and a division of the page to separate and tear apart the seeming pretension of her story presuming to be on the same page as, and running parallel with, the stories of the women with HIV/AIDS. I do not want my story to compete with, to

4. Hirschfeld, Moore and Brown (1995, 9-10, cited by Ingleton, 1995) say that "it appears that women systematically lose confidence over the course of their college years, while men maintain or strengthen their confidence".
upstage or compare in any way with the stories I will tell. I write it in an attempt to disclose
my subjectivity, whilst simultaneously recognising the near impossibility of so doing.

Peshkin (1988) *In Search of Subjectivity - One's Own* provides some personal experience
about the pursuit of his own subjectivity, in the course of year-long fieldwork in a multi-
ethnic high school. The focus of his paper is on demonstrating how and why a researcher
should be meaningfully attentive to her own subjectivity (p. 17) rather than on how one
recognises and defines one's own subjectivity, although Peshkin writes that it is in one's
response to situations that one's subjectivity can be recognised and defined.

How did I know when my subjectivity was engaged? I looked for the warm and cool
spots, the emergence of positive and negative feelings, the experiences I wanted
more of or wanted to avoid, and when I felt moved to act in roles beyond those
necessary to fulfil my research needs. In short, I felt that to identify my subjectivity,
I had to monitor myself to sense how I was feeling. (Peshkin, 1988, 18)

Peshkin, in characterising the parts of himself discretely as "I's" (for example, Peshkin
notes his "Ethnic-Maintenance I" - approving of his own retention of Jewish ethnicity), also
suggests that "although we bring all of ourselves - our full complement of subjective I's - to
each new research site, a site and its particular conditions will elicit only a subset of our
I's" (p. 18). In an attempt to characterise my "I's" I tell *Susan's Story*. Another purpose for
the telling is Lather's conveyance of her own "struggles with voyeurism" (1994, 18). I have
been privy to others' stories - let others now be privy to my own.

---

**Some of Susan's Story**

I was born and spent my early childhood in a remote part of Australia, where my
memories are of our bright and manicured garden, which remarkably was full of
gladiolus, the endless scrub surrounding the garden, and the long Land Rover trips
through swishing bush to the school bus to collect my sister.

We moved to the city before I started Kindergarten. By then there were 4 girls in our
family, each two years apart in age. We were educated at the local Primary School, 6
houses away from our suburban home. Schooling in the fifties and sixties for the "Baby
Boomers" was absolutely gender segregated despite "mixed" classes. Boys played in one
playground, and girls in another; terrible consequences ensued in the form of a smack on

---

5. Subjectivity is defined by Peshkin as "the quality of an investigator that affects the
results of observational investigation" (quoting from the Webster's third New International
Dictionary), and described variously as "like a garment that cannot be removed" and an
"amalgam of the persuasions that stem from the circumstances of one's class, statuses, and
values interacting with the particulars of one's object of investigation" (p. 17).
the legs from the Headmistress if caught in the "wrong" playground.

Girls in primary school learnt to knit and sew. By the time I was eight or nine, I was knitting turned fingers on gloves, bands on jumpers, and gathering lace onto handkerchief borders. In increasing complexity, this curricular activity evolved until, by twelve, we were stitching and knitting skilfully. But the "we" was the girls of the class. The boys, on the other hand, by the time they were twelve, caught the bus unchaperoned to the local technical high school where they used woodworking tools to produce pieces of furniture, boxes and lampstands. I still remember the envy at the term end when they would triumphantly carry their completed projects back into the classroom. You could not get quite the same effect from parading a flawlessly knitted mohair jumper.

We were a "Baby Boomer" family - our father was a professional, our mother reared us. In our home life, possible due to the lack of a brother, but, I think, more likely due to the tremendous ructions to traditional role-playing during World War 2 which had seen my mother leave the farm where she was brought up and join the AWAS for two years, there was little opportunity for gender bias. Even though it was a feature of daily life outside the home the upbringing we received did not predispose us towards considering that there were some things women did, and other things men did. When I look back on this it is remarkable achievement by our parents who themselves were doing what everyone else did in the fifties and sixties - Dad worked and Mum stayed home - and her days were full with a housework, childcare and community work - with no car and no labour saving devices. Even now, when people ask her: "Do you work?", she replies, "Yes, full time". It was not so much that they were not themselves in traditionally ascribed gender roles, it was that their approach to their roles and to the possibility for our roles as adults so differed from the prevailing viewpoint of the time.

Our parents, probably quite unwittingly, steered us into an organisation - the Girl Guide movement - which also dispelled stereotypical role-playing. There my older sister and I learnt to hike and camp, to throw ropes, chop wood, build things and live out-of-doors with a group of girls on our own and all without the input of any males. Whilst I was at High School I spent a lot of time as a teenager in the company of my Guide Patrol in the bush camping whilst other girls were honing their skills at "getting their man" with modelling courses and make-up schools.

Another assumption from our girlhood - by then I might add we had a little brother, who, being ten years younger than me did not impinge greatly on my sensibilities as when I started University he was only 7 years old - was that we would go to University and become professionals. With the benefit of hindsight I cannot believe the naivety of my understanding that I would go to University at a time when less than 5% of the nation's school population continued onto any higher education. However, that was what I believed happened as naturally as little children believe that Year 5 follows Year 4. I thought it was the next step in education and that everyone did it. It was not until I was about 15 that I began to realise not everyone held this ambition. A girl moved to our district from another suburb where no-one from her former high school had ever been to University. I was flabbergasted. Everyone - 20 boys and 20 girls - in my class at my suburban High School won a Commonwealth Scholarship to University as a result of their Matriculation results. I could not conceive of a School where no-one had ever attained this achievement. The whole focus of the final two years of schooling at our High School in the academically elite class was to do well enough in the Matriculation exams to win a Commonwealth University Scholarship so that your University fees were covered by the Commonwealth. This was a pragmatic necessity as well in families like ours with one salary and five children.

I graduated from High School and took my place in a Bachelor of Architecture Course at Adelaide University. At the last minute I had chosen to study architecture, instead of law, as, having learned drawing out-of-school for five years, I could not imagine a day without drawing. My university entrance subjects were Maths I, Maths II, Physics, Chemistry and English. At that time the architecture course was biased towards technical considerations, so along with the drawing skills I had acquired out-of-school (as there was no possibility whatsoever of students in the "A" stream taking Art, or Drawing -
these subjects were reserved for the lower streams) I felt capable and confident as a University entrant.

Once again, with the benefit of hindsight, I do not know where this confidence came from, as, in the 1972 intake to the Architecture degree, of 63 students, 13 only were women and that number was very quickly whittled down so that in 1976, in my final year, there was only one other woman. Despite the gender imbalance, I had a very happy time at University, and a strong friendship group in my year with whom I enjoyed my term-time and holidays. I never thought that I could not succeed on the same terms as everyone else which is indeed a strong testimony to my non-sexist "have-a-go" upbringing. I was a very successful student - from the first year onwards I won prizes and awards including an overseas exchange studentship.

I graduated at the top of the class, with first class honours and a year of industry experience including twenty weeks on a building site gained simultaneously with the course. I thought that I was graduating into a world that would want my skills and knowledge. I was interviewed on television about the rarity of being a woman and winning the graduand's prize, and I had my photograph in the newspaper for the same reason. I remember I spent the prize money on a dress to wear on television. I can now view this situation with the irony it deserves, as I could not get a job when I graduated, with or without the publicity and with or without the new dress! I watched with dismay whilst many of my class mates "pulled strings" to secure positions in the tight job market. I soon discovered that an armful of qualifications, and youthful enthusiasm were not sufficient to win a graduand's position.

My experiences in the building site office the year before had alerted me to the generic discrimination against women in the building industry and somewhat prepared me for the discrimination I now experienced in my job-seeking quest. On the site of the shopping centre, I spent most of my time in the site hut as it was considered "bad luck" for a "shella" to be on site. (Probably the riggers would drop something when "perving" on the "broad".) I resorted to craftiness, signing my job application letters simply "S.J.", instead of "Susan" so that I would be granted an interview, at which time I felt sure any right-thinking employer would be swayed by my experience and talents. (Even then I still ascribed to most people an inherent goodness and sense of fair play - nothing in my upbringing had prepared me for the knowledge that the world was full of people who were not good, or fair.)

Eventually I secured a position as an architectural assistant in a small practice and was engaged on a range of projects. The pay was awful, and I was desperately lonely after the company of the architectural studio, drafting away in an office by myself with only the principal's infrequent visits to mark the time. After a few months of a very ordinary life, I was offered a job by a large firm in another city. The job would involve moving to that city for several months, and then relocating with the whole office to Adelaide. The level of responsibility was much higher, and so was the pay. When I told my boss about my intention to resign, he called me into his office and told me that I wouldn't make it in the big league, that I'd be back desperate to have my old job back.

I never went back.

My political awareness of the struggles of women in architecture to succeed, born in the architecture studio at University where the promising young women who enrolled with me one-by-one dropped out; nurtured in my early employment where I was seen as "less than a man" in competency and ability to succeed made me realise, and constantly wonder at, the grim determination I must have exhibited to get to the position where I am now a
practitioner of almost twenty years standing. My story causes me to ask myself what the factors were which made such a major influence on my life that I had the confidence to succeed against considerable odds.

It all goes back to my childhood, and upbringing, I believe, and to the knowledge I now have about the strong forces to feminine socialisation which were present in most girls’ upbringing, but which were relatively absent from mine. I grew up believing that I could do anything. I was very confident that I would succeed at University and I had emotional and financial family support to achieve my goals. My father clearly provided a role model for academic achievement, but importantly, my mother did nothing to negate intellectualism as a worthwhile goal and to set being feminine, and being intellectual, in opposition. She herself had been a good scholar, winning the Intermediate Exhibition at her girls' boarding school but unable to take full advantage of this because of the outbreak of war, and the paucity of teachers in the hard sciences at her school. The absence of a brother in our home until I was quite independent meant that the frequently seen gender battles concerning displays of femininity, and masculinity, and favouritism were not present in our upbringing.

More problematic was the world outside University - a world over which I exerted no control: a world unlike the worlds I had known of School and University in which if you worked harder, you were rewarded. Due to good luck and persistence, I managed to get myself a job that I liked, and where my contributions were valued, and I worked there for several years until my partner and I established a practice.

Many would argue that I came from a background of great privilege - and I do not deny it. Certainly I am white and middle class, but I did not have a childhood of economic privilege. However, I am "Other" to male, but in other aspects of my make-up, a conventional middle-class woman. I could concur at one level that striving for success from this background has possibly been easier for me than for many other women in architecture because I am mainstream. Is my own story disconfirmation of the veracity of the
forthcoming stories of the struggles of many women in the studio? I believe not. Every step of the way I have known that I have had to be twice as good to be taken half as seriously as any male architect.

I am married to, and practise with, a male architect, so I have frequent, first-hand opportunities to consider the pervasiveness of gender bias in the world of design and building in which we practise, and to observe the authority with which my husband is seen to speak. Even today, after many years in practice, when I go onto site and meet new builders or subcontractors for the first time - I should add that I have never had the opportunity to work with a female builder or subcontractor - I am aware of my need to dazzle with my technical proficiency to be taken seriously. Little tests of my skills are set up in the first five minutes to see whether I "know my stuff". I do, but it is remarkable that it would not happen in this same way with a middle-aged male architect.

In every story there are contradictions - events cannot be explained from a "cause and effect" framework. From my upbringing and family life I carried a view of the world as peopled by those who were good, and fair. Even when events shook my faith in this construction, I still clung to the inherent goodness in people, and a sense of fair play. This is what drives me now: what constitutes one of my so-called subjectivities. I am simply enraged when I see instances of injustice, of discrimination, and of meanness and unkindness. I have a desire to champion the cause of justice in situations where I see discrimination in all its forms. I am now sufficiently politically aware to see that my "cool spots" relate to circumstances of perceived injustice and my "warm spots" are reserved for those thoughtful people and the situations they facilitate which I believe are fair and non-discriminatory. In line with Peshkin's "I's" I could propose that I call this aspect of my subjectivity the "Justice I".

There are many other constituting factors of my subjectivity - my other "I's" to use Peshkin's framework. There is that relating to "Nature-loving I": I live on a farm in the country surrounded by denuded countryside which was stripped bare for the copper mines'
boilers last century - together our family are attempting a partial reafforestation of our immediate environment. There is the "Family I": having been brought up in a large family I now treasure my own three children and our family life - I view much of the richness which is possible in life as possible through living in a family. This does not conflict with the "Feminist I": my consciousness-raising places me firmly within the feminist sisterhood, seeking through legislative reform an end to structural inequality and through social reform and consciousness-raising a different world where exploitation in all its forms is ended. This view impinges on and informs my view of how my children are raised, as does my heterosexuality and mothering role to two boys and a girl in a nuclear family impinge on my view of radical and separatist feminisms.

**Code of Ethics: anonymity and participation**

In Chapter 3 I have described the process by which students and teachers became participants in the research project. I considered that the ethical stance of the researcher was paramount as participants in educational research rely on the researcher not to divulge their identity to others, to disguise them in the text, and to prevent the release of the interview material to which they contribute to others. Strict anonymity enables those interviewed to divulge information in confidence. At the conclusion of the interview and data gathering process, when an informant group emerged and were weekly engaged in discussing emerging findings, the identity of neither student, nor tutors was revealed. This became problematic as the students themselves, through the "thick data", recognised themselves, and others. Similarly tutors, in negotiating accounts of studios, were frequently able to identify themselves, their fellow tutors and certain students, although interestingly not all tutors could identify students readily. The existence of a formal Code of Ethics as an agreed position I would take in relation to the anonymity of participants and the confidentiality of their data was helpful inasmuch as I could point to its existence in the early days of conducting the research. Later, though, it was my ethical stance as translated into personal practices such as maintaining the anonymity of participants in the negotiating phase which enabled the research to proceed.
At the end of the research process I made a decision related to ethics and anonymity: that public access to the thesis should be barred until students participating in the research were no longer enrolled in the School. This decision reflects my concerns that some students, and some tutors, are recognisable, at least to each other, despite my best attempts at disguise.

The Arrangement of the Chapter

In order to reflect in chronological order on students of architecture as they encounter the studio as the learning environment, and within the studio, critique, the chapter is arranged in three parts:

Part 1: Beginning Architecture Studies
Part 2: Continuing Architecture Studies
Part 3: Completing Architecture Studies

Each of the three parts considers several themes. They are not the only themes which could have been adopted - the themes are chosen to reveal those activities, thought processes, and practices which comprise the hegemonic, practices which in concert maintain the status quo, or habitus, which, it is hypothesised, are the means by which discrimination takes

6. Readers will be interested to know whether Rhianna and Muriel, as two of the more prominently quoted participants in this project, graduated and entered architectural practice. They both work in major practices in a city; their self-knowledges derived partially from their participation in this project has directed them in different ways. Rhianna is now a team leader, confidently directing six staff on a major project eighteen months after graduation; Muriel continues to be heavily involved in further education as one means of confidence building.
7. Davies (1994, 84) defines hegemony in Fraser's terms.

'Hegemony' is the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci's term for the discursive face of power. It is the power to establish the 'common sense' or 'doxa' of a society, the fund of self-evident descriptions of social reality that go without saying. This includes the power to establish authoritative definitions of social situations and social needs, the power to define the universe of legitimate disagreement, and the power to shape the political agenda. Hegemony, then, expresses the advantaged position of dominant social groups with respect to discourse. (Fraser, 1992, 179)
place. The discussion of the themes is drawn from examples of studio life which are foregrounded as the unproblematic 'everyday'. The discussion then forms the background, describing through critical analysis the 'everyday made problematic'. A further discussion of the process of selecting the themes employed appears in Chapter 3 on p. 163.

The themes are:

**Part 1: Beginning Architecture Studies**
Silence
Isolation
Inclusion/exclusion
Marginalisation

**Part 2: Continuing Architecture Studies**
Conforming
Competing
Confidence

**Part 3: Completing Architecture Studies**
Models for success
Hierarchy

Interviews, as one means of giving privilege to the students' voices, are preferred to notebook examples or narrative. The narrative excerpt, where it is used, is taken from six,

8. Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977 (in Churchman, 1992, 27) describe *habitus* as the distinctive "modes of perception, of thinking, of appreciation and of action" associated with any given collectivity. The habitus defines the 'taste' of a group - its characteristic, taken for granted view of the world. In the world of education the habitus which defines successful education remains implicit, Bourdieu considers. The education system assumes that its students are possessed of the necessary cultural competence, the character of which is never made manifest. The qualities needed for success are never clearly defined, but the upper middle-class child appears 'naturally' gifted because she/he is already versed in the mysteries. Therefore, what is really a social distribution of cultural capital appears to be a natural distribution of individual talent.

9. The narratives are:
May, 199_ Reflections on the AD2S Critique.
long, negotiated narratives, written over a period of two years. Any decision to showcase one interview, or selections from one narrative, necessarily averts the gaze from another interview or narrative. The selections, whilst always the subjective selection of the researcher, are therefore those which permit the reader to gain insight into the construction of cultural hegemony in the studio through feminist poststructuralist concepts to demonstrate how critique sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessing and socialising students into the profession. The thesis considers that by relating studio-based critique to developing students' sound self-judgement, a more effective use of critique by educators and students may be promoted.

In Chapter 5 the thesis explores the link between the above two theses with the aim of proposing that all students may potentially be empowered when there are certain changes in the critique experience.
PART 1

Beginning Architecture studies

The First Day: A Narrative and Critical Analysis

*Students coming into the School do so from different first degree pathways. The following notebook example concerns desk allocation in the first year studio.*

At the beginning of each year the students vie for the most advantageous desk and drawing board location in the studio. There is no staff intervention in this process.

In the first year studio of the professional B.Arch degree, some students stake their claim at the end of their third year studying the undergraduate degree, Bachelor of Architectural Studies, confident that they will be selected for the professional Degree on the basis of their good results and their Application for enrolment. They post notes on the drawing boards and the corrals: "Reserved for Jamie in 1994"; "This is Rebecca's desk in 1994." This practice of reserving a favoured corral position in the Studio, along with a drawing board (supplied at nominal rental by the Institution) is accepted unquestioningly by the class.

The class is formed of a group of about thirty-six students selected on the basis of the merit of their Applications for enrolment made early in the year.

Students applying for the course from a background of the undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies with less than a Credit average will necessarily be lower in the rank order than those applying from a background of high academic achievement. The quota for places is generally substantially oversubscribed at the Application stage. Those with valid Applications include not only recent and past graduates from the Bachelor of Architectural studies undergraduate degree, but also students from other first degree backgrounds who have successfully completed a bridging year in Architectural Studies. In recent years the Application oversubscription has resulted in a number of Applications being rejected as the Applicants were ranked lower than the cut-off ranking based on the available number of enrolment places.

The studio is a large space on one level with a window wall facing south. The most highly regarded positions in the desk reservation scramble are those desks centrally located in the studio and adjacent to the window: affording good natural light for drafting, a window ledge for storage, and the all important view. The least regarded locations are on the edges of the studio, fronting onto either a public corridor used by all other students in the School; or backing onto walls at either end of the studio. The arrangement of the study corrals themselves with a 900mm high screen pin-board on three sides effectively cuts off a student from any studio discussion or activity if the corral is not backing onto another corral. This makes the 'edge' locations even less desirable.

The acceptance by the lower ranked students (who do not receive notification that they have a place in the first year studio until as late as the February preceding the March commencement of the first year studio) that all the desirable corral positions have been "bagged" by those more highly ranked and therefore more confident of securing a place in the studio is unquestioned. They accept that is the way it is: there is a taken-for-granted understanding, a discourse. If Jamie or
Rebecca has the good sense and foresight to reserve a position at the end of the previous year, secure in the knowledge that their enrolment application would be accepted, who are the less confident, lower ranked students (who already know that they are commencing formal BArch studies from a position lower in the rankings), to question the distribution of studio study locations and the practices which have led to their apportionment. This practice reflects the "take it, you worked for it" and the "don't wait until you're asked" and the "winning isn't everything - it's the only thing" attitudes of confident professionals.

Not all commencing students must be accepting of their few available studio corral locations, and yet year after year I saw a geographic distribution of students in the studio which positioned the already confident students at the centre of the studio, and the students who received their acceptances later into the Course on the periphery. There was never an occasion when a new-comer challenged the status quo; that those who had reserved desks months before were entitled to first pick of desirable locations.

An associated practice which occurred every year was that strong friendship groups from the previous year of study would cluster together in the studio, providing the all important social aspect to learning; and innumerable informal peer critique opportunities. Students "bagged" corrals adjacent to theirs for their friends. Furthermore, those students on the periphery were further disadvantaged, by their isolation from the informal discussion which flows constantly in the Studio about all manner of things unrelated to the studio project but indicative of the developing value system of the 'core' group: where to buy the cheapest Doc Martens, which pub that Friday night, which concerts to queue for... the emerging value systems of the young professional are honed and exposed in the studio through being spoken into existence.

Dutton (1987) refers to the hidden curriculum as "those unstated values, attributes and norms stem tacitly from the social relations of the school and the classroom as well as the content of the course" (p. 16). Dutton (1991b) claims that "the hidden curriculum becomes

12. Whilst 'curriculum' suggests something 'organised and understood to exist' (Antony Radford pers. corr. 7-11-1994) and Giroux and Dutton have used the phrase "hidden curriculum" to relate to "unstated values, attributes and norms" (Dutton, 1987, 16, my italics) I contend that the hidden curriculum is no less organised or understood to exist than the official curriculum. Churchman (1992, 32-34), Ward (1990) and Giroux (1983) expand on the theory of the hidden curriculum. Radford further suggests (pers. corr. 15-1-1995) "that "hidden curriculum" like "hidden agenda" suggests something that some part of an organisation is aware of and hiding from another part." If that is the case, the notion of discourse as "taken-for-granted understandings" and the "hidden curriculum" are allied.
a vital mechanism through which critical analysis reveals the dialectical relationships between knowledge, culture, social relations and forms of power within society and within the process of education" (Churchman, 1992, 34). Furthermore, Giroux (1983) claims that "the hidden curriculum" comprises one of the major socialisation forces used to produce personality types willing to accept social relationships characteristic of the governance structures of the workplace" (Churchman, 1992, 35).

I contend that the 'everyday' practice of desk allocation, or appropriation, comprises an example of the hidden curriculum in the School. Through assenting to the perceived status quo, the 'fringe' students become even more marginal to the expression of the architecture student as an emerging professional.

The notebook example continues:

Occasionally students move desks part way through the year. This is a occurrence which signifies their dissatisfaction with their present location and their new friendship alliances, and often a desire to align themselves with the 'core' group through a closer geographic location. However, when the studio quota is fully subscribed, this move can only happen if another student withdraws from study. This may happen in the first month, as withdrawal by the end of March does not constitute failure and HECS fees are refundable. By the end of March, students new to the studio - that is who have not moved through the School in a cohort with many of their fellow students, may have realised that they wish to sit adjacent to a group of other students with whom they have become friendly. The opportunity to relocate within the studio is limited to taking a desk of a student who has withdrawn, or swapping. Neither of these occurrences generally yields a desk in a desirable part of the studio, as the likelihood of a highly ranked, academically successful student withdrawing is slender, although not unknown; whilst the usual contenders for withdrawal are those already located somewhat peripherally to the studio action.

Therefore the existing status quo prevails throughout first year with minor amendments.

This I take as assent to the inherent rightness of prevailing practices through silence. In my participant-researcher role, and in my teacher observations for five years before that, I

13. There may be some confusion arising from the expression 'fringe' in the narrative to refer to students marginal to the 'main stream' experience of the studio although seated geographically centrally - for example Veronica, whose story follows. The expression is as much metaphoric as geographic.
rarely_14 observed students making available to themselves the role of rejector of the status quo in this regard. I believe that may have been because the 'fringe' students did not have a confident, organised or hegemonic voice: they were fragmented and silent as a group; and because the difference between the confident, assertive core group who had the academic success to confidently reserve a desk the year before, set-up a "them" and "me" dualism from the outset.

This dualism was then maintained and developed by the marks of ownership of the desks and corrals.

| 'Core' dwellers frequently decorated their corrals with photographs of last summer in Europe, prints and illustrations from imported architectural magazines, quotations from Derrida and Foucault_15 and other architectural philosophers, postcards from all over and invitations to twenty-first birthday parties, techno-dance parties and stickers from environmental causes and the women's movement. 'Fringe' dwellers frequently did not decorate their corrals, their stance possibly informed by their planning not to spend too much time there. In some circumstances they went through a year with just a torn piece of foolscap lined paper with their name written on it in biro. 'Core' dwellers don't use biro, or lined paper, or punched, lined paper. They have bound, white, cartridge paper journals lying on the piles of library books and magazines on their desk. 'Fringe' dwellers might have a photo of their car - the lovingly polished Commodore, proudly displayed parked on the lawn in front of their parents' cream brick house. And perhaps 'fringe' dwellers have a photo of a family gathering, with brothers and sisters and nieces and nephews. 'Fringe' dwellers don't seem to socialise with 'core' dwellers out of the studio: they have part-time jobs at Sizzler, or in a Service Station. 'Core' dwellers work as waiters in Jolley's Boathouse, or in Department stores on Friday nights and Saturdays, or in architect's offices part-time. |
| One female 'fringe' dweller had a boyfriend who wouldn't "let" her attend the end of year class party. |

Through their pre-given 'fringe' location in the studio, I claim that some students are then thrust further and further out of the studio culture and the attendant dress code, speech code, conduct, conversation topics, activities, interests, and reading guide-lines which in

---

14. Later I narrate the story of Rhianna and her friends Jason, Reginald and Nick, who started off in a 'fringe' location both physically in the studio and in relation to their classmates' dominant discourse. However, they were successful at rejecting the marginalised position made available to them. I attempt to describe the features of their success in so doing.

15. Whilst Derrida and Foucault are philosophers of the continental tradition not exclusively writing on matters architectural, their writing has been of interest to architects and is discussed in architectural literature.
concert comprise the hidden curriculum until ultimately this 'fringe' location is correlated negatively with 'high culture' values expounded by 'core' dwellers. Whether or not they came into the studio with pre-existing currency of 'high culture' values, a 'core' location will ensure that exposure to the values will be constant. Through assenting to a peripheral location (geographically or metaphorically), and the isolation of a 'fringe' dweller, that student assents to more than just a slightly less desirable seating location. As 'fringe' dwellers do not derive the benefits of 'core' dwellers from "the studio experience" they absent themselves from the studio far more than 'core' dwellers. Thus a dialectical relationship between who they are and where they are is established and the one continues to inform the other. Their location on the periphery is even further developed through absenteeism from the studio culture so that 'fringe' dwellers, when they are in the studio, 'fringe' dwellers have even less reason to be there than many of their peers in the sense that if the focus of 'the studio' in architectural education - discussed at length by Dinham (1986a, 1986b), Macleod (1992) and Anthony (1991) - as the site for education and socialisation is denied them through lack of integration to the peer group, then their time in the studio is not productive.

Through the seemingly unproblematic device of "who sits where" the status quo of who is already perceived to be a "good" student is established before the tutor has even looked at the work in progress. Surely "good" students are those who are in the studio daily, who use it as a "home from home" in the traditional manner and who appear to derive enormous benefit from the critique of their peers informally? Bourdieu's concept of the tacit knowledge comprising the habitus is relevant here.

I am certainly not suggesting that an activity as simple as a ballot for desks on the first day of the term would overturn notions of pre-existing currency\textsuperscript{16}; however, it could be argued that any increase in situational discomfort such as that knowledge of a student that s/he is

\textsuperscript{16} Whilst I am not restraining myself from advocating that it may improve existing practices to have a lottery for all desks on the first day, what I am saying is that such a simple determinist tool does not overturn notions amongst the student group that some students possess a pre-existing educational and cultural "currency" in the studio which the present allocation method sustains.
not integrated into 'the studio experience' will hinder learning. If 'fringe' dwellers know that the tutor always has her eye on them, is always concerned about their absenteeism and failure to "use the studio experience", anxiety could increase and the sense of the power differential between them and the studio tutor may increase. Such a 'gap' also exacerbates the impossibility of a dialogue between tutor and student which it is argued (Ch. 4, p. 294) is fundamental to questioning the authority of hierarchy in order to develop a self-judgement model.

I will consider the themes of silence, isolation, inclusion/exclusion and marginalisation in relation to this narrative.

How can students disrupt a powerful hegemonic structure when they unquestioningly accept its inherent rightness? For those coming from a family background not possessed of 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) their goal in education may be to 'better themselves' - involving acquiring the modes of speech, of behaviour and conduct which emulate the patterns they discern are those of the profession. In this situation silence is a form of assenting to the practices which comprise the habitus to which they aspire. A consideration of the student as acceptor/rejector is relevant. Has the role of rejector of these high culture values been made available to the student? Has the student taken on the role of acceptor, unquestioning of the forces which have wrought these values, and of the rejection by the profession of those who do not aspire to these values?

Shrouded in their silence the 'fringe' dwellers suffer isolation, and exclusion from the activities of the 'core' dwellers. Whilst socialising together outside the studio may be a feature of architecture students' behaviour, it is the importance of the lost opportunities for peer critique inside the studio which is of greatest concern.

In order to explore the nature of inclusion and exclusion in relation to the studio culture I have selected three interviews and narratives concerning first year students. The first two, with Max and Veronica, reflect on the location of these students on the 'fringe'. The third,
with a group of students, reflects on their 'core' location which they developed in first year, and maintained to the end of their studies.

Max: An Interview and Critical Analysis

In an interview with Max, a first year student, after he had received the sole Fail grade in the year for his scheme, I tried to draw out from him his thoughts on whether his location on the fringe of the studio might have contributed to his fail grade.

Max, a young man from working class origins, had entered the year from a background of poor achievement in the Bachelor of Architectural Studies Degree. He lived a long way from the studio in an outer suburb, commuting daily. He had one friend in the studio, George, a European-Australian, next to whom he had his corral. George did not speak English at home, and was a very quiet student. Max and George were "other than" in many ways. Max was "other than" culturally, economically and sexually to the dominant heterosexual middle class discourse of the studio. He was gay, but I came to know of his relationship with George quite by chance, and outside of the studio context. They did not conduct their relationship within the studio.

My role in relation to the project which Max had failed was to develop and co-ordinate the project, co-ordinate the teaching, propose and develop the peer and staff assessment and critique procedures, as well as to tutor in the studio.

I recorded the events in the studio in a narrative about that project, which I negotiated with Andy, another participating tutor.

Excerpt from the narrative:

I do not believe Max is deriving any intrinsic enjoyment yet from the study of architecture; along with one classmate, George, he is on the fringe of the Studio culture (where he actively seeks to keep himself - booking with his classmate a double room on the class field trip whereas the rest of the class shared a thirty bed dormitory); sitting quite apart at the end of the studio and participating in a bare minimum of class meetings and additional sessions arranged by the Department. I noticed that Max and George failed to return to the Crit sessions after the afternoon tea break for the Final Cits for
the design project immediately preceding this one; in so doing they missed out on the
class discussion at the end of the Crit Session and the explanation of how the skills and
knowledges acquired in that two week project were to be expanded on in the current
project.

From the narrative, after the grades had been posted.

The section reproduced here concerns the opportunity any student had to make an
appointment to see me on the day after the marks were posted.

So often these post-assessment interviews are marred by the students' obsession with
vague - or explicit - feelings of aggrievement about people and processes - and yet the
interviews do not focus on this alleged aggrievement in the context of the work. I sought
to make the sessions a valuable learning experience for the students and the staff by
having the students write about their difficulties and bring this writing with them.

Max had received the sole Fail grade in the year for the summative assessment, and in a
piece of revealing autobiographical reflective writing framing his question for the
discussion he said that:

"Not only do I have to deal (as the only Fail student in the class) with the fear of failure,
but that this fear suppresses my creativity, and I feel that I cannot take risks."

The interview with Max was really hard for me because I did not know how to counsel
him academically as I felt that I had already said everything at the desk-crits and in
response to his earlier questions about why he had failed the preliminary Hand-in.

In the end I struck on the thing, which, whilst undisclosed by Max, (in his reflective
writing), is the most problematic thing in our relationship - that I think he is lazy.17

Max led me into the conversation in this way: I had said that there was a lot more design
development that could have been undertaken on his submitted scheme, but the fact that I
had never seen it before the final pin-up prevented me from proffering any critique at a
formative stage. Max agreed that "perhaps this should have been what I handed in for
the preliminary Sketch Design" (which he had failed). I concurred because I am always
so frustrated with him in the studio and because he never has anything much to show and
therefore I feel I am wasting my time and critiquing (vague) ideas instead of preliminary
designs - and also because there is never a dialogue because his ideas are either in his
head so only he can talk about them, or so unformed that I am developing the design
instead of facilitating his reflection on what he has designed already. And so I said:

Susan: Would you stay up until, say, 1 o'clock in the morning working on something
for studio on Wednesday in the first week of a design project?

17. Many teachers would not admit this, and if admitting it would say that the student
exhibited many 'at risk' attributes: for example low motivation, no intrinsic or strategic
learning approach, or that he had many learning difficulties. All of this is probably true for
Max, but this does not alter my self-disclosure that I was frequently anxious to see evidence
of his level of commitment. I had observed that he had difficulty demonstrating response to
critique received. Whereas some students would attend the next scheduled studio session
with many sheets of attempts to design their way out of their self-imposed design problems,
Max would come to the studio without any new attempts at design. Sometimes he would
show me other tutor's suggestions for his designs, in place of his own attempts; and he
certainly showed my coaching attempts to other tutors. Whilst not unsympathetic to the
reasons for his difficulties, I disclose something about my bias as a researcher by saying
that I think he is lazy.
Max: No, maybe that is the problem.

He said that he thought he didn't develop his ideas early enough.

I asked him how much part-time work he did, as I know just how much this prevents some students from getting on with their designs early.

He said that he worked at a Service Station on Tuesday nights (the night before the Studio session) and that was "part of the problem".

I suggested that as there was no scheduled contact time on Tuesday, despite this difficulty, he should still be able to get something organised for Wednesday in response to the critique he had received on Monday.

I further suggested to him that his location in the studio, right in one corner away from the class, was, I thought, a contributory factor to his poor grades - that he was not looking enough at other students' work and considering enough their response to the problem, and talking enough to them.

Max completely disagreed. He felt that there were students with whom he shared and that he could not see my argument.

If we think about knowledge as Chi et al. (1988) do, as having a number of key features - one of which is the ability to link into a larger and more generalised body of knowledge and to see where the knowledge you are acquiring "fits", then Max is actively complicit in keeping himself "non expert".

18. I have been criticised for suggesting that my interpretation of the situation here is the "correct" one. As a post-structuralist there is no "truth" - we operate through language and that language names a world which is our own. (See Weedon's comments Ch.3, p. 164.) However, and importantly, concerning Max's remonstration that he had students with whom he shared - notably George - and that he disagreed with my interpretation that his isolation geographically on the fringe of the studio may be a factor in his inability to demonstrate a response to critique, the Gramscian notion of false consciousness (that "most people to some extent identify with and/or accept ideologies which do not serve their best interests" Lather, 1991b, 68) may be an aid to further deconstruction of Max's situation. Lather (1991b, 59-61) provides an account of false consciousness as "the denial of how our common sense ways of looking at the world are permeated with meanings that sustain our disempowerment" (Gramsci, 1971 as cited by Lather, 1991b, 59) and a critique of imposition research strategies which fail to "encourage negotiation of meaning beyond the descriptive level" (p. 59). In this situation I cannot easily advance the discussion on this topic. Having commenced the negotiation with Max about what his location on the fringe might mean, his response that it does not account for/contribute to his failure to meet the School's expectations stymies my further exploration about the modes that this exclusion may take. Once again Lather's experience is invaluable in that she suggests that "[i]n order to address this issue, Fay (1977) argues that we must develop criteria/theory to distinguish between people's reasoned objections and theoretical arguments and false consciousness" (Lather, 1991b, 59). As I say, Max's desire to conclude this part of the interview prevented me from ascertaining his "reasoned objections". In fact Max said that he could not see my argument. Lather (p. 61) says that "[t]here is a dialectic between people's self-understandings and efforts to create an enabling context to question taken-for-granted beliefs and the authority culture has over us (Bowers, 1984). There, in the nexus of that dialectic, lies the opportunity to create reciprocal research designs which both lead to self-reflection and provide a forum in which to test the usefulness, the resonance, of conceptual and theoretical formulations".
Max is silent about his 'fringe' location\textsuperscript{19}. He does not feel it contributes to his poor grades. He believes that the spectre of failure is suppressing his creativity, and that he cannot take risks. He disagrees with my view that he is not actively participating in the studio, and with my perception that his lack of participation is disadvantaging him. I believe that he is isolated from most of his peers and excluded from many opportunities for informal critique with tutors and peers by his poor attendance, his poor organisation, and his active complicity in keeping himself "out". Not only is he marginalised through where he sits but through his inability to produce response to critique. In most instances he has little to discuss, so he falls behind his peers in the ability to share any thoughts with them. This contributes to his marginalisation becoming isolation through his silence about the process of design, and the design itself.

\textbf{Veronica: A Narrative and Critical Analysis.}

Veronica is in the same year as Max, and both are commencing architecture studies from a non-traditional background, but I would doubt that they have ever spoken to each other about anything, and almost certainly not their work.

Veronica, a young first generation Greek-Australian woman is a 'fringe' dweller despite her desk being situated in the middle of the studio. She had entered the Studio along with many of her first degree classmates from a background of academic success in the first degree. She has a small group of friends in the Studio, but prefers to work at home. Her absences from the studio include informal and formal critique sessions, and the thrice weekly desk crits.

\textsuperscript{19} As noted in Footnote 13, the expression 'fringe' is as much metaphoric as geographic. Max has certain subjectivities which may marginalise him, and furthermore he may reject the validity of the dominant studio discourse. I would like to add that there have been several gay students in the studio over the years who have "come out" in the senior years of their education in the school, or who had already "come out". Max's concealment of his emerging sexuality may further marginalise him - as he acts out the discourse of the dominant sexuality of the studio from a position within another discourse.
At the beginning of the year, in the preliminary Crit for the first project, Veronica set the pattern that was to continue to the end of the year. The narrative recalls Veronica’s involvement in the process of self and peer assessment. In this studio I was the tutor assigned to a group of ten students, including Veronica.

A narrative about the first formal critique for the year.

Veronica, a usually chatty, happy, rather loud student - a first generation Australian - was the sixth student to have her work presented to the group (of eight students and me as the tutor). She was surprisingly nervous given her seemingly outgoing personality and spoke very rapidly when describing her scheme; no sooner had she finished than she said "Well, if there aren’t any questions I think I’ll sit down." She sought with her very complete drawings, her rapid presentation and her barrier to questioning to obviate criticism20. I believed that this nervousness and barrier primarily arose because she had failed to participate in any desk-crits through non attendance at the studio sessions so that the first feed back of any kind she would have received - from tutors or peers - would have been delivered in a very public sphere. Veronica had jumped a step! Whereas all her peers had at least one if not two sessions at the drawing board with the tutor Veronica had not; moreover her absence from the studio had meant that she had not had any opportunities for informal exchange with her peers either.

In the peer assessment which followed her presentation and critique by peers and the tutor, whereas Veronica graded her work as Pass+ /Credit, her peer assessors both graded it as a Credit/Credit+. I graded it as a Pass for evidence of both process and product21.

Her peers over-rating her work reflected a little Veronica’s overwhelming presentation in which she presented her building as complete; she did not see it as "work in progress" but as a finished and satisfactory product which her peers did not challenge. The other problem her peers may have had is that of appearing "ungrateful" - Veronica had been instrumental in collecting trade information for every student in the class - she is a very able and entrepreneurial person in this sphere - there is a small question about to what extent gratefulness became a dominant consideration22.

20. Vicki Byard (1989) writes "Often the writer must deliberately invite criticism in order to receive it" and then quotes a case study by Mary Francine Danis (1982) which further revealed that:

writers have a variety of strategies for discouraging their group members from offering evaluations; they may prematurely halt feedback by agreeing to recommendations before the reader fully articulates them or may fail to ask for further explanation when they don’t understand a group member’s comments.(p. 3)

21. I realise that it is possibly problematic using only one tutor’s judgement to establish an assessment criterion against which to judge peer assessment, but it was unavoidable in this situation as Veronica’s work had not been presented formally or informally previously for consideration, and therefore it was not possible to confer with other tutors about their judgement of her work.

22. There is also a point to be made here about gender and grade expectation. Schnorr, Westin and Ward (1988) noted that beginning female architecture students at the University of Arizona had considerably lower grade expectations for the project than did males; but found that there were no significant gender differences on actual project grades or final
A Narrative excerpt about the last project in first year. In this project her absence from the studio had continued, and she had absented herself from earlier crits for the scheme.

Veronica neither attended nor participated in the preliminary crit nor subsequently attended the studio for any individual critiques. The consequences of her decision in this regard were quite marked during the final critique with peers and visitors to the School when she became very ill during the afternoon.

The whole class and two groups of four critics were assembled in the Crit Room. It was very crowded, with screens of students' work, tables for models, and two circles of chairs for the critics. The students perched on the tables to listen to the expert critique.

Veronica kept pushing through the crit group closest to the door. After she had done this four or five times I became angry at the constant interruptions occasioned, as every time people had to move to let her through. I asked her why she couldn't stay in her group at the other end of the room. "Do you want me to be sick in here?" she asked.

Later, Andy, the other tutor, told me that Veronica started to cry when it was time to present her scheme. Andy helped her from the room. Veronica was grey, and shaky. Andy took her straight to the University Health Service, who diagnosed colic, from gulping massive amounts of air during the afternoon while she waited for her Crit.

Her emotional response, presenting to her peers and critics for 100% of the marks, was overwhelming fear leading to very real physical symptoms. Andy, in organising the assessment scenario, had not allowed any contribution from formative assessment towards the final grade.

Andy was surprised that after treatment, Veronica returned to the Crit Room and presented her scheme. She made an able presentation which belied her earlier illness.

Veronica's situation is different from that of Max, but she has some of the same concerns. She is fearful about the consequences of her lack of studio attendance, she worries about the critique she will receive both from her peers and the tutor, and then, at the end of the year, is most worried, to the point of becoming ill, about the critique she may receive from the "experts". Veronica seeks inclusion in the peer group through her central desk location and her willingness to acquire information for everybody in the class. (Even here, though, there was evidence of Veronica's unease in a competitive classroom environment as Veronica absolutely refused to give any information to the two very able women in the year who had gained a place in the class from a different first degree.)

course grades. Looking at Veronica's self assessment she had accorded herself a Pass +/- Credit whereas her peers awarded her a Credit/Credit + grade. Every one of the six women in the group of eight under-assessed their work in comparison with their peer assessment whereas the two males awarded themselves the same grading as their peers. This sample of eight is certainly too small from which to derive statistical inference but it is interesting to note the corroboration with Schnorr et al.'s results.
Her tertiary education is embedded in the expectation of achievement for women in a traditional southern European family. Veronica is outwardly very happy and is well able to assert herself publicly in the studio, on the infrequent occasions she is present, but when the critique is formal and constituted for assessment purposes or informal but directed at her work alone, Veronica's display of confidence crumbles. She then seeks ways to obviate criticism - and the higher the stakes, the more extreme her response.

She does not 'fit the mould' of the Australian architect in many discernible ways. She is a first generation Australian woman, without much confidence in a public sphere, without any confidence to have her design critiqued either by peers or assessors, who maintains relationships in the studio through brokerage of information. However, she is selective in this and uses what little power she has to withhold information from those she perceives are already successful. She is reluctant to the point of refusal to receive criticism and contributes little to the group in the studio through her repeated absence, and preference for working alone.

Veronica may have considerable problems adapting to the demands of current architectural practice, with its move towards collaboration and a co-operative team approach. Jacquelin Robertson, a panellist in Architectural Record's 1991 Education Roundtable (Kliment, 1991) reflected that:

> Best on teams are those with the most design confidence. Those without it get very nervous because they're worried their contribution will get lost in the mix. They are also very combative. Good people are relaxed about working with other people. (Kliment, 1991).

Veronica must make available to herself other subject positions than 'compliant student'.
Tina, her classmate, also from a European family, asserts herself in the studio in an

23. Nor in a way does any woman as in 1995 9.5% of registered architects in Australia are women, 6% of architects employed in academic positions in Schools of Architecture are women, and 5% of active corporate members of the RAIA are women despite forming 40.5% of enrolments in Schools of Architecture in 1995. (RAIA Statistical Summary, 1995)
individualist way, always questioning authority and hierarchy, and 'daring' the tutors to challenge her 'way-out' ideas. Perhaps Tina does fit the 'eccentric individualist' mode of creativity portrayed by Rand (1947), whereas Veronica appears to want to be included, for example, through her willingness to source and supply trade literature to the class. Veronica is complicit in being excluded, as with Max, but for different reasons. She is silent both about her self-imposed exclusion, and the reasons for it. She never talks about home, and whether it is stressful to work at home. For many students it is not easy to work at home, given the conflicting demands made on their time by parents, and sometimes children and spouse, who do not understand that beginning architecture students can spend hours on a tiny detail, or days drafting for a preliminary presentation as they are learning so many new skills at once. Furthermore Veronica, and other students who are "different" constantly struggle to reconcile their socialisation - for example in Veronica’s ethnic group to be compliant with male and older authority figures - with the demands to be a "good" student which requires attendance at the studio and critique for formative assessment thrice a week.

Veronica, having established early a pattern of staying away, is marginalised, and is isolated from debate and peer critique. She receives little or no input from others to her designs at a formative stage, and when she does receive critique in the more public final critiques, the stakes are so high.

What of the understandings of the students in the 'core' group, about their own privilege and their location within the core group?

**Rhianna: An Interview and Critical Analysis.**

---

24. Unsurprisingly I have no interviews with Veronica. She actively avoids eye contact, and being near me in the studio, and does not seek me out to talk to me as do many of her class mates. Some would question the ethics of Veronica's inclusion, even anonymously, in the thesis. I believe that excluding the "Veronicas" of the study would fail to recognise a situation that should be recognised.
Excerpt from an interview with a group of six female first year students at the end of their first year in the Bachelor of Architecture degree on 1-11-199_. This excerpt focuses on Rhianna's responses.

**Susan Shannon:** Talk to me first about how you first came into contact with the culture of architecture, and whether you've got any role models.

**Rhianna:** My dad's a builder - he's an Electrical Engineer and he does consulting work and I've grown up on building sites. Quite honestly that's how I got interested in architecture. And we've got family friends who are architects. I've wanted to be an architect since I was about six.

**Susan:** And you've never wavered?

**Rhianna:** No - I did waver a bit when I took time off between the degrees and I thought about it - but anyway I'm still here and that [time off] reinforced the fact that I did want to do architecture.

**Susan:** You just said that your dad was a builder and I wondered did you get a lot of encouragement at home not to pitch yourself at building but to pitch yourself at architecture? Could you have gone into your family business if you'd wanted to?

**Rhianna:** Yeah.

**Susan:** Straight from school?

**Rhianna:** I could have if I'd wanted to - as a forewoman. But I wouldn't want to do that - but I could have. *I wouldn't want to do that - but I could have.* I know dad very much wants me to go into business with him and I very much don't want to but there'll be no pressure. I do a lot of building with him now.

Rhianna's success in the Bachelor of Architecture degree, if not already assured by her background, replete with 'cultural capital' and a sound knowledge of the field of study and the mode of the professional architect, was enhanced even more through the friendships she established in the first year with Jason and Reginald, in particular, and to a lesser extent, Nick, whom she once confided irritated her as one who wavered, always sitting on the fence. They were to become very strong peer critics over the next two years of her study.

*Excerpt from an interview with Rhianna, Jason, Nick and Reginald on 6-8-199_ about how they saw themselves as first year students.*

**Susan Shannon:** But going on Rhianna, you were saying that there were people that you didn't want to open your journal or work to everyone.
Rhianna: But there were people who I did want to...

Susan: So you selected them out pretty early on.

Rhianna: To be frank, yes.

Susan: So talk about that?

Rhianna: I don’t really want to. (laughs)

Jason: But geography was a big part

Rhianna: Yes geography

Jason: We actually sat next to each other in first year and the three of us knew each other.

Susan: But how did you do that?

Rhianna: The other students were all coming into a class where they knew each other...

Jason: They all knew each other and we got the desks that were left over.

Reginald: Nick and Jason and I ended up with desks that were fairly close to each other.

Rhianna: But I was around the corner and...

Jason: I was next to him

Rhianna: Next to Reginald

Nick: I was hardly there because I was working too. I was more like the Phantom, I'd come in and out.

Jason: But when we were working together you were in our group.

Although these students were coming into the first year without any established friendship and peer group, they quickly met through their proximity in the studio - all being on the edge of the studio, in one location - and their mutually taken decision to share their work and to proffer peer critique to each other. They sought inclusion in the studio life and refused the marginalised subject position available to them as mature age students returning to study. They were not silent about the expectations of the rest of the year and the tutor; they spoke out against the expectations they found impractical and oppressive. They suited themselves to a greater extent than many other members of the class.

For example, Rhianna recounted that she felt no obligation to share her journal, in which she made many design decisions, with everyone.
Interview excerpt from Interview of 6-8-199_

**Rhianna:** But I distinctly remember Charles - I didn't know Charles then - and I probably thought - Who is this abrasive...I mean I love Charles now, we're very close...but I distinctly remember closing my journal once when he was looking at it...like...Don't look at that! I don't want you to see that, and he was ...like...Oh! Rah! Snob! This, that.

Jason recalled the poor welcome he received when he sought to look at, and comment on his peer's work.

Interview excerpt from Interview of 6-8-199_

**Jason:** The thing I went through was commenting on other people's work. "My God, how dare you say that about my work". So defensive about it.

Soon they realised that as a group they could support each other, and provide each other with meaningful peer critique as well as have fun while learning, lessen the sense of isolation they felt amongst a class of students who knew many others in the year, and be included in the studio culture. Unsurprisingly, their 'fringe' location in the studio became the 'core' of the studio that year. There was always so much energy there, different designs being developed and peer critique happening.

**Conclusion**

It is useful to consider the differences between the 'studio experience' for Max, or Veronica, or Rhianna and her peers.

Max and Veronica were excluded from many studio activities by their absenteeism and their unwillingness to participate in class activities. Neither of them fared well with the public aspects of critique, nor even with the activity of sharing their work-in-progress with the tutor at a desk crit. They had not developed a facility with critique through gaining confidence in small critique settings informally in the studio with peers. They both avoided
desk crits which formalise the exchange of information and ideas in the studio between teacher and student, and were thence poorly prepared to defend their schemes in final critique situations.

Their exclusion from the studio meant that they did not socialise with the rest of the class. Max had one special friend and Veronica a handful of female friends with whom she chatted in the studio. They were both silent about their seeming exclusion from the studio life, and the reasons why this might have happened. Max said that he did not believe that his marginalisation in the studio either happened, nor had any effect on him; Veronica established a pattern early in the year of staying away from everything except critiques carrying an assessment outcome.

Conversely, from a background of not knowing the other students in the year, the group of Rhianna, Jason, Reginald and Nick, through their willingness to share their design ideas with each other, and to critique each other's schemes, sought a means of inclusion within the studio life. They spoke out against patterns of behaviour, and practices which they found unhelpful, against being silenced, against being excluded, against being marginalised.

But even here something else was happening. When Jason and Reginald were at the end of their first year, and were interviewed about critique in a group of other men, Reginald said that Jason was the "only one" with whom he thought he received adequate peer critique. And yet Rhianna, at the same time, appeared to be an integral member of their group.

_Interview excerpt from 25-10-199_

<p>| Susan Shannon: Do you feel that it's confidence increasing or confidence decreasing to have crits with your peers only whether it's in a Studio situation, or a formal situation? |
| Reginald: I found this Semester probably more than in the first one, that I'm interacting more with my peers and I'm learning a lot in being able to go to someone else's work and criticise it and I'm learning quite a lot in that I'm becoming more discerning in trying to pick up a feeling for a building or picking up from the plan what's going to work and what's not, so I'm learning a lot from that and I'm getting confidence from being able to do that. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan: Can you say what about this Semester that's been a particularising thing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reginald:</strong> I made choices. I made a decision that I was going to be more revelatory about my own thought processes and as a result I've talked more with people; a few I suppose, a small group - not all the class - are sharing ideas with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> Positively, but as much falsely, as realistically, because students don't tend to criticise other students' work properly, hardly, realistically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong> Haven't you by now picked out the people who will give you...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reginald:</strong> Jason is the only one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> Yes, but there are some people who have a certain lean and that's all they'll see as being good. And there are those who just won't say anything bad and also if you really want to present your work you really have to go into it, you can't just look at it. They'll say, &quot;Oh that looks nice&quot;. That's <em>nothing</em> - it's done nothing really - it's usually false confidence!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reginald:</strong> I think it works better rather than marking a piece of paper, it best works when someone goes to someone else's board and they start talking about their concept, and ideas are thrown about. That's the best way of learning and the best way of criticising someone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section of this interview in which Reginald states that "Jason is the only one" helps to explain Rhianna's reluctance to discuss with whom she shares in the studio. Perhaps it was not totally without her knowledge that she had been somewhat marginalised by Reginald, be it in a minor way by simply not being nominated as a studio peer with whom to be "revelatory about my own thought processes".

Rhianna knows that she has a certain "lean" that is ridiculed by some men in the class.

*Excerpt from an interview with a group of first year student women on 1-11-199*

| Rhianna: Syd said a classic thing the other day. I did a child's area in one of my earlier Sketch Designs, and Syd said, "God, you always do things like that, Rhianna" and I didn't think about it at the time but I've thought about it since and... Yes! These funny little things like children - I always put children in my drawings... I thought about it afterwards and I thought: Well, there's a fundamental difference that I'm more likely to do that. |

Rhianna says in the same interview, that after taking years off from her studies, and working in an Architects' office, that she recognised that it was a man's world "out there".
Rhianna: It's a man's world - amazingly a man's world - it's a man's world in that studio.

Susan: You still think that - you still get that strong impression?

Rhianna: I do, I do. And that's when I was working in _____ going out and visiting building sites as a professional as part of the architectural team and all the people I know in building are mostly men - but I am very prepared to struggle against that.

She then returned to the "fundamental difference" she perceived when addressing the question of giving and receiving critique from her peers in the same interview.

Susan Shannon: Can you comment how confident you feel first as a designer and then as an adviser participating in dialogue related to the design task as a means of making the project explicit?

Rhianna: It all depends who you're giving the advice to. If you're giving it to someone whom you believe can really benefit from your advice, maybe so; but if you're trying to advise someone where you're really out of your depth you have less confidence, and I think that could be - part of it could come back to the male/female roles in here I think.

If you're at the end of a project with something you're basically not happy with but you've got to go for it - as Mervyn says - you've got to have good genes to start with - but if you're getting to the end and just don't feel you have... you've got to cover it because you've still got to try - you seriously do - you've got to make it sound good even if you don't believe it.

Rhianna articulates, at the end of her first year in the School what it means to be a woman studying in the School: the sense of exclusion from the "real debate", the knowledge of the struggles she will encounter as a professional woman in the building construction industry, her silence about being marginalised in her peer critique, her isolation in trying to "make it sound good" instead of honestly speaking up about her design's shortcomings happen despite her location in the 'core' group. This passage also points to the further dilemmas Rhianna engages in concealing her shortcomings as a designer which are further discussed in Part 2.

Jason, Reginald and even Nick, who, "like the Phantom" is never there, but is open and honest about the reason why, knowing that working in an architects' office is the key to the acceptability of his absences, do not reflect on their studies commencing other than very positively. By the beginning of Semester 2 Reginald realised that what was needed was to become more revelatory. This decision stands in stark contrast to the silence of Max, and
Veronica, and the self-stated decision of Rhianna to conceal her designs' weaknesses from her critics.

The student 'actors' resist change to different degrees. Max and Veronica believe they are 'on track' to their goal, a degree, but through the means of disallowing the 'changes' offered through the studio experience: the chance to give, and to get, expert critique from peers and tutors leading to a level of facility with presenting designs and responding to critique they place themselves at risk. Rhianna is prepared to "struggle against" the "male/female roles" she has identified but has not suggested, throughout our long friendship, the upheavals that would be necessary for women to be at the fore-front of the profession. As a student it is unlikely that this is a part of her main agenda. She states openly that it is, for her as a student, important to conceal her designs' short-comings to project a confident and competent image of the architect-as-problem-solver. Jason can see the need to be critiqued "properly, hardly, realistically" but recognises that many of his peers are defensive about sharing peer critique, and consider that he has no right to critique their designs. He does continue to seek the therefore necessarily limited opportunities to proffer and receive peer critique. Reginald wants changes in critique - he is willing to be more revelatory, to give his critic an opportunity to provide substantial input.

How much do race, class and gender situate Max, Veronica, Rhianna and her peers in relation to success in beginning architecture studies?

Rhianna has spoken about gender and architecture studies; she is "very prepared to struggle against that...". Later in the narratives the struggles Rhianna engages to reconcile her gender socialisation to include everyone, to prevent anyone from feeling on the outer - in short the female socialisation to "maintain relationships" is exposed. Ingleton (1995, 5) quotes Gilligan (1982) as describing knowing for women as a process of human relationship. Ingleton said that Gilligan found that "women judge themselves in terms of their assumption of responsibility for others and their ability to care, a discourse that begins early in girls' lives, creating tension between moral responsibility and competitiveness"
(Ingleton, 1995, 5). Ingleton believes that it is this tension which inclines women to be "more oriented toward preserving and fostering relationships than to winning" (Chodorow 1974, 19).

From her silence and isolation Veronica's situation is not discernible other than to consider the conflicting demands that must exist for students from ethnic backgrounds where there is a traditional socialisation to obedience, to stereotypically subservient women's roles, and to the importance of marriage and family life when they study architecture in a studio situation where critique is the main method for teaching. Regarding Veronica's crumbling display of confidence when confronted with a summative critique in a situation with half the class and external critics, her lack of preparation for public speaking resonates with Faludi's (1992) statements about the fear of public speaking. Female architecture students struggle with the difficult public aspect of critique which requires them to present their work to the class and critics, and to receive critique publicly.

Women, I believe, are silenced frequently in critique situations because the terrifying public aspect of critique overwhelms them. Few women are comfortable with public speaking - indeed Susan Faludi says it is the public's greatest fear - rivalling even death, and she goes on to say that it is far worse for women because

women - particularly women challenging the status quo - seem to be more afraid, and with good reason. We do have more at stake. Men risk a loss of face; women a loss of femininity. Men are chagrined if they blunder at the podium, women face humiliation either way. If we come across as commanding our womanhood is called into question. If we reveal emotion, we are too hormonally driven to be taken seriously. (Faludi, 1992, 5)

Ingleton's (1995) work throws light onto how Veronica might be "challenging the status quo". After interviewing "Kaye", an economics student who rejected other less traditional careers for women although they were available to her through her high school assessment grades, Ingleton writes:

Her 'large range of career options' is also limited by her being the first [in her family] to enter university. In addition, she must negotiate her independence whilst not alienating her father. Kaye seeks to keep the relationship with her father secure
by maintaining his approval; she manages the contradictory discourses of feminism and patriarchy by pleasing her father in choosing a career that is practical in his eyes as well as hers. Crawford et al. (1992) believe that for girls independence and autonomy are achieved through recognition by others. Autonomy without recognition carries with it the threat of loss of love and praise. Such loss and subsequent alienation is a source of shame for women (Giddens 1991), whereas men are encouraged to break from dependence, and find pride in acting autonomously... (Ingleton, 1995, 6)

I can only surmise from Veronica's regular absence from the studio and her very real physical symptoms at the end of year critique that she faces considerable difficulty reconciling her role as an architecture student, with all the expectation that carries, with her traditionally socialised expectations of self.

Max, a young man from the outer suburbs, and on the fringe of the studio, knows that he is isolated in his failure to succeed academically - and that the key part of his ability as a student of architecture, his creativity, has been suppressed. Ward (1991) considers the different arguments proposed by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) which account for the transmission of cultural and social reproduction in schools. "The traditional role of the university has been to canonize (to use Bachelard's term) particular forms of culture and knowledge (high culture, science, rationality, intellectualism) over others" (Ward, 1991, 90). Basil Bernstein's arguments are relevant to Max's situation.

Unlike Bourdieu, who isolates structural aspects of reproduction, Bernstein confronts the actual process of transmission. Reproducing communication to a series of classified codes, Bernstein demonstrates how these codes generate certain forms of social relationships that then shape mental structures. He argues that school knowledge and language are a sophisticated middle-class language code, whereas the more restricted code of working class children sets them at a disadvantage in a formal schooling situation, since knowledge is transmitted in a language that is foreign. These children must learn a foreign language as well as the formalized knowledge that it is intended to transmit. (Ward, 1991, 91, my italics)

Max is marginalised for many reasons, spoken and unspoken. His class origins exacerbate his problems in any oral or aural context, Bernstein argues. Furthermore, if the choices of formal architectural expression "inescapably reveal the political and cultural leanings and prejudices of the designer" (Ward, 1991, 94) Max's origins in the working class also militate against his success if his designs are judged against the dominant aesthetic criteria of the middle class.
Veronica exhibits her creativity unmediated by critique, and Rhianna, who knew she wanted to be an architect since she was six, is enthusiastically creative.

Max, certainly, is never brought into the richness and wholeness of studio life through critique. He is somewhat complicit in this. He has not revealed his view of himself as an architect, addressing for himself how his lack of collaboration and his poor interpersonal skills will equip him for practice. His self-stated poor confidence in his creativity may ultimately affect his ability to contribute fully in architectural practice. Conversely Reginald’s willingness to share his work, to be revelatory, and Jason’s desire to dispel "false confidence" through critiquing "properly, hardly, realistically" will have their rewards in these students’ preparation for practice through their in-School practices.

Max returns us to the beginning of this Part 1 - to the first day of the studio and the self- allocation of desks. Max was complicit in the assignation of a fringe location. He accepted with that location the "teacher's gaze". Part of the reason he accepted this location was that he suffered from low confidence which became even lower when his ability to take 'risks' plummeted after the assignation of poor grades. He could see this happening to himself at one level, but denied that his lack of involvement in the studio life contributed in any way. He does not recognise his exclusion as a disabling practice. However it is this exclusion which contributes to answering the question about why Max is not achieving the School’s expectations of him, achieving Fail grades. Whilst these practices contribute to his Fail grades, they are not the only reason for this failure. His academic weaknesses are considerable, and by the School’s standards, he is not a 'good' student. He can accept the role of rejector of his marginalised status if he wants to. This role, this opportunity, has been made available to him. So far he rejects it. The broader problem for Max, and Veronica, is whether they should have to fit themselves into a pre-existing image of the 'studio culture' to achieve. Whilst other students have rejected some impractical and oppressive requirements of the studio, Max and Veronica are silent in their acceptance/rejection of the way things are structured. There is no easy solution to Max and
Veronica's marginalisation except through their self-recognition of their marginalisation as partly historic, partly tradition, and partly prejudice or discrimination. Through such naming they may have the means to speak out, and to seek the support they need from their teachers to achieve by the School's pre-existing standards, or alternatively, using Ward's inclusive model (1991) of the constitution of a critical pedagogy, modify the school's expectations of them. Ward wrote:

Architectural education, like architecture, is a socially mediated phenomenon. Just as there are dominant and subordinate cultures and forms of knowledge, so also are there dominant and subordinate theories of architecture, and these theories cannot be separated from issues of power and class. A transformative architectural education will therefore seek to make and understand these connections between the power structures in the larger society and the form of architectural theory. Yet there are powerful, mystified structures of socialized experience at work within the professional paradigms of architecture and architectural education that operate to prevent the demystification of both the theoretical content of architecture and the process whereby it is mystified.

The task set for beginning architecture students like Max and Veronica who are "other than" in many aspects, to learn by "the techniques and knowledge forms that are embedded in the dominant culture" (Ward, 1991, 94) raises many equity questions about critique, both over-the-drawing board and in the more public sphere.
PART 2


Students learning to participate in, and respond to critique do so by situating themselves in relation to the dominant discourse about what it is that an architecture student "does". The following interview with my 'informants' highlights their different views about critique.

Conforming

Excerpt from an interview on 6-8-199_ with a group of final year students reflecting on responses to the tutor at over-the-drawing-board critiques. This interview sought to draw out their views on the nature of self-judgement.

| Reginald: Part of the thing Nick is that you tend to do a fair bit of your work at home so often... so I think that... and maybe it's because of the way you work you prefer not to get a whole lot of critique because you know that you... if you work on your own you know that you'll do it well... ummm... but if you get criticism you might decide, "No! I'm going to go in a different direction", which could slow you down. Is that part of your reason for tending to work on your own more? |
| Nick: Sometimes. Because whenever someone does give me a critique I listen to them. I don't disregard them. |
| Reginald: That's right. |
| Nick: Because I always have the opinion that other people's opinions have some merit, either good or bad. |
| Reginald: Which would be pretty frustrating if you're working along and someone says "Go this way" and you feel you've got to do something about it whereas when you're working on your own you could come up with a good solution anyway. |
| Nick: Yeah, along those sort of lines. |
| Rhianna: I think that it seems to me that you are saying, and that is probably where I have changed over the last few years, that you are saying "Oh yes, I do respect other people's opinions" and you're saying "They've got some merit regardless" whereas I probably have changed now to think "Sure I'll let them talk about my work, but, I don't think X is going to have much input on my work in this project at this stage" and even, I'm probably quite naughty, I can listen without any of it going in and it just goes out. And it was like Peter was tutoring on the ______ project and we really do want to see him and we tend to, and us, as a group, we tend to get as much studio time from people as we can and just so that they know what we're doing even if we don't feel we can get something out of them which is...Well, I was sitting there with Peter that day and I was just explaining my work, and that was probably right as I hadn't known him, and I was...
just explaining my work so that he would know come the presentation what it was about rather than looking for direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Shannon: But isn't that saying to me... another way that I could, if I was telling someone else what you have just told me, another way I could say is that: &quot;Rhianna has developed her self-judgement to such an extent now that she's not seeking input from...&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhianna:</strong> (Whispers) People she doesn't particularly like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong> &quot;Not seeking input from anyone who's opinion she doesn't particularly value and trust.&quot; I suppose the downside of that is how do you know as Nick has so rightly said, that they won't have some absolute little gem in there. You've got a confidence in developed self-judgement that you don't feel that you need to rush around like first year students do trying to get the consensus so that you know what you are doing is &quot;right&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhianna:</strong> That's right. Yes. What Nick said, it is a gut feeling. The projects that I have tended to do best in are the ones where I have got onto something early and gone out on a limb with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> But if that feeling's not there you tend to lose the motivation and you tend to lose the whole appeal of the project. And I think that it's something that can't be taught, especially in a design sense. Getting that feeling, getting that motivation. And usually you grow up with or something that you develop through inspirations around you no matter what they are. It's something that can't be taught on a one to one basis. It's such a difficult problem to put your finger on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhianna has taken the subject position available to her of listening without learning - "silence as boredom" - in the drawing board critique, whereas Nick has a more positive outlook typified by his declaration that there may be "some merit, either good or bad" in other people's opinions and thereby assumes the position of "student" in relation to the dominant discourse about what it is that students "do": "good" students seek critique, and on receiving it, respond to it in the way that their critic suggested. Clearly, Nick thinks they listen and respond.

In order to conform to this discourse, Nick is a fence sitter.

He can "go either way."

*Excerpt from Interview on 6-8-199_*

| Nick: That's the classic situation that Rhianna always applies to me. "Why is Nick always sitting on the fence?" The reason why I am sitting on the fence is because I can go either way and adapt to the situation. |
He admits this about himself unselfconsciously - that he can make anything work and that he values all inputs. (He is a highly creative student in many spheres.) His peers challenge him that he limits the amount of critical input he receives by working at home and removing himself from the critical sphere of the studio, but he is ambivalent about the proposition that he does this to guard against being forced to respond to critique when he could come up with something worthy on his own.

Rhianna lets the critique flow over her; she wants to see the tutor only so that when it comes time for the assessment critique Peter will know about her scheme. She does not want his critique (or as she calls it "direction"); she doesn't value his viewpoint. She doesn't even "particularly like him." She can be engaged in the explanation of her scheme at the drawing-board critique session without any intention of listening to his viewpoint. She is confident in her own self-judgement. And yet there are other tutors whose opinions she values and whom she seeks out. At the same time she acknowledges the disruption to the dominant discourse of not accepting the critique of an "expert": the tutor. In the following section of the interview she again restates her view that to be less than fully intending to respond to tutor's critique of her work is "naughty".

Excerpt from the Interview on 6-8-199_: The interviewees are talking about their preliminary success in a national architectural competition which they had entered, along with other groups of students from their year, as a part of the studio requirement. It was particularly notable that they were one of the five finalists as the competition was open to architects as well as students: they were the only students amongst the finalists. After being selected as finalists they had some weeks of concentrated effort in which to refine their scheme and represent it for final judging. In this interview they are discussing the critique they sought and received during that process.

| Susan Shannon: | That thing about self-judgement - how quickly can you enclose someone else into an existing group because it involves you immediately agreeing with and taking on board their agenda and value system? |
| Rhianna: | Very difficult, it's very difficult. I think as a really good example we had Sally Black [married name], Sally White [maiden name], come in as a Tutor. We all respected her, she's excellent. And we had Bryan Snow come in as a Tutor who we had through Sally Black and Reginald knows him personally and Reginald said he was really |
keen to get involved and we wanted to give him a chance. He came in and we were being negative.

**Jason:** Defensive, really defensive.

**Rhianna:** Well, it was naughty.

**Jason:** Well, it wasn't naughty but it was particularly... if we could have done it another way... we weren't doing it on purpose... we just did it.

**Rhianna:** But it was a bit of an uncomfortable situation, wasn't it?

**Reginald:** Yeah, because of the way that Bryan approached it. It was the way he approaches most things. He comes in and tries to look at it from a completely different perspective and throws in red herrings all over the place... ermm... and then you think: "Well, we've done nothing right. Everything's wrong."

**Jason:** The comments that he made would have been good when we were starting off rather than "Right oh, we're here. We're one of the finalists because of this. Now take it from there." And that's why we were defensive as well.

**Reginald:** And then he did make suggestions...

**Jason:** Yeah, he did actually make suggestions and we all sort of...

**Rhianna:** I think we were all a bit frustrated. I came out of that session and there was that one point about the homogeneity thing; that was quite good that point. I was quite frustrated coming out of that session. Does that answer that sort of question?

**Susan:** So that's an example, a parallel example, of how difficult it is to enclose someone else. So you were saying with Sally there was trust there, there was knowledge of her work and her teaching. These were some of the things...

**Rhianna:** There was a bit of sort of "sympathy to our concept" that I think... We became very defensive of our concept and I think that was a really good thing. We were told that we had got into the second stage [of the competition] because of it and we set out to be defensive about it. We weren't going to let people change our concept.

**Jason:** Well, we were told not to by the Competition organisers.

**Rhianna:** Sally had this real enthusiasm and we valued her as a design tutor from the past. We felt that she would and did make an assessment under the context of the project as we were saying before. She was going with our concept.

**Jason:** *Improving* our concept.

**Rhianna:** Improving *our* concept, yeah.

Rhianna, as in many other instances, disrupts the *status quo* in her non-conforming stance. She compliantly listens, and admits that there is some assessment benefit in the tutor having an in-depth knowledge of her scheme, but she does not intend to demonstrate a response to Peter's critique in her work. She recognises, in so naming her own practice as "naughty" in relation to the critique proffered by Bryan and Peter that she has created a space for herself outside the dominant discourse which calls for architecture students to show response to
critique in their work. Furthermore in proving their ability as competition finalists their judgement has been rewarded - and therefore they exhibit the confidence that derives from this rewarded judgement model in their dealings with critics.

Rhianna's self-naming of her non-conforming behaviour as "naughty" itself hints at the gendered nature of her behaviour. The very selection of the expression "naughty" recalls mother's admonition to young children in her control, or sexually suggestive behaviour. It is not an expression encountered elsewhere in the studio, and not an expression which would be part of a critical, architectural vocabulary.

Connell (1987) recalls that women are frequently caught in a conflict between their desire to act out behaviours which are non-conforming, whilst at the same time asserting their femininity. For school age girls, these gender conflicts are explored in recent British education ethnographies (Woods and Hammersley, 1993). Connell wrote that "the dominance structure which the construction of femininity cannot avoid is the global dominance of heterosexual men" and that the option of compliance is central to the pattern of femininity which is given most cultural and ideological support at present, called here 'emphasized femininity.' This is the translation to the large scale of patterns already discussed in particular institutions and milieux, such as the display of sociability rather than technical competence, fragility in mating scenes, compliance with men's desire for titillation and ego-stroking in office relationships, acceptance of marriage and childcare as a response to labour-market discrimination against women. At the mass level these are organized around themes of sexual receptivity in relation to younger women and motherhood in relation to older women. (Connell, 1987, 187, my italics).

Rhianna is conscious of the social pressures for her to conform more strongly to the feminized view than the technocrat architect subject position she is qualified to occupy. She states part of her dilemma about conforming in this interview.

*Interview excerpt 1-11-199*

Rhianna: I do find that a lot of people, a lot of my friends, don't realise what architecture is to me; don't realise there is a a deep technical side to it...
She rails against the subject positions made available to her in the field of architecture and the form of femininity made available to her.

Nick adopts another subject position - that of compliant adopter of critical views - and has developed a facility unparalleled amongst his class-mates for making anything work. He can maintain cordial status with all critics through this ability to adapt his scheme to their criticism.

*Excerpt from Interview on 6-8-199_

**Nick:** Well, for me there are two ways that I work. If I've got a gut feeling... it's a feeling - you feel good about your work, you get excited about it, you get motivated, you work harder on them. And if someone comes and gives you a bad critique about it that makes you even stronger in some respects and you work even more to make it work. Now if you've spent so much time and it doesn't work and you realise there is a mistake so you either put it aside, start again or take the merits of that project and incorporate them.

Not so Rhianna who knows that her mode of working to produce her best work relies heavily on her own self-judgement. She responded to Nick:

*Excerpt from Interview on 6-8-199_

**Rhianna:** That's right. Yes. What Nick said, it is a gut feeling. The projects that I have tended to do best in are the ones where I have got onto something early and gone out on a limb with.

In this passage she expresses the irony which she daily faces in the studio and in receiving critique. She believes that her self-judgement - "it is a gut feeling" - is paramount, but further to the previous discussion about her self-expressed "naughtiness" must find that there is a conflict between relying on her "gut feeling", and knowing when she has "got onto something early" and her desire to maintain a congruent form of femininity in the studio which requires her to be submissive, defer to male and older authority figures.
As Lewis (1992, 183) said, in contrasting 'speaking out' with 'silence as assent' that women know that "over and over again culture tells her that men abandon women who speak too loudly, or are too present". She said:

For women in professional schools specifically, compliance with particular displays of femininity can mean the difference between having and not having a job (p. 183).

Nick's behaviour in relation to critique is congruent, conforming behaviour for an architecture student, behaviour which reflects the standing of a student within the dominant discourse. Rhianna exhibits, and knows she exhibits, disruptive behaviour which challenges the dominant discourse. And yet she is acutely aware of what happens when everyone exhibits non-conforming behaviour which disrupts the dominant discourse.

*Interview excerpt from 18-8-199 concerning a public critique and exhibition session on the same day that they had handed-in the work - they were very tired.*

| Rhianna: [The session] It was quite good. Actually I was just going to say and I think that I am going to discredit my own argument...Can I just say that I am rarely as tired as every one else and I am looking at it from my own opinion because I rarely stay up as late as anyone else and I do things in half the time. Would you agree with that [Jason]?
| Jason: Generally
| Rhianna: I rarely... I mean I've had one all-nighter in this Degree... and that's not fair [for me to be the one saying that tiredness wasn't a major factor] ... and the other thing that I do that maybe discounts or puts me in a different position from most of the students who don't... is that I can't *stand* it when someone's arranged to get consultants there and no-one is doing anything... I just like... I get this rage inside me... I just feel awful, I feel that its all my fault...I've got to be the one who instigates the conversation... and I do this all the time...in the Studio...when people are saying there is a problem but no-one's prepared to say it... I say it because I sit there seething and I think that we can't let this opportunity pass.
| Susan Shannon: So that you're a fairly impatient person and you don't tolerate that level of failing to engage with the situation that other people do...?
| Rhianna: But I am just *embarrassed* fairly easily...absolutely embarrassed...That's what I was saying. If I'm in a situation even socially and I feel that someone is on the outer or someone is uncomfortable I just cringe because I feel embarrassed for that person. That is something, to me, I can overcome my tiredness for that by just getting so enraged that I do something whether I'm tired or not.

The reason, I believe, that she still seeks out Peter and makes a show of listening to him is because she has been socialised and educated to a level of acceptance of behavioural
patterns which show deference to male authority figures; represented in the studio by Peter (Shannon 1993c). Only when she talks about the input from Sally does she reveal that in Sally's critique she found a useful critique which helped her to move on. Certainly with Sally she was also deferential to an authority figure, as she was with Peter and Bryan. But so strong are the demands of her gender socialisation to politeness (as can be seen from the last interview), her deference to authority, and a strategic need to please those with assessment control, that she does not tell Peter that his critique is not useful to her. In a circumstance with Bryan where, together with her class-mates she had more equal standing - they invited Bryan in, he was already a friend of Reginald, and the group had been nominated competition finalists, they told him that it was not useful critique but she knew that this was "naughty", and thought the whole situation "uncomfortable".

Silence here is the means by which Rhianna conforms to the dominant discourse - and I consider this to be silence as conforming behaviour - in some circumstances she has the confidence to speak out; in other situations where assessment is involved she is deferential and bored, letting the critique "wash over her". But, disrupting silence, and disrupting the dominant discourse, she also says that she is the one who speaks out to save a situation. The feminine cringing and embarrassment is the socialised part of her make-up; she could choose silence always but she rebels. Lewis (1992) further comments about silence as a means of conforming that there are risks attendant on students speaking out "...especially in professional schools, where students' aspirations for future employment often govern their willingness to challenge the existing status quo, [there are] pressures to conform to the dominant social text ([which are] shared by lesbians and heterosexual women alike)"(p. 175).

Rhianna assumes a location outwardly within the dominant discourse but inwardly outside the dominant discourse. The conflict is seen in the feelings she expresses. Her gender socialisation and desire to maintain relationships is usually given priority over her desire to situate herself outside the dominant discourse. Ingleton's (1993) work considers the struggle of women in their conflicting desire to conform to a dominant discourse whilst highly
valuing other traits not central to the dominant discourse, and their support for which will inevitably subject them to emotional conflict. She reports that "women's success gained at the expense of another's failure generates considerable anxiety about competitive behaviour (p. 43). A further insight is that this is not because "fear of success is due to fear of loss of femininity; rather the emotional cost of success through competition is too great for most women to sustain" (Ingleton, p. 43) She reports that Chodorow (1974) states that "women are more oriented towards fostering and preserving relationships than towards winning" and that this is "supported by Lever's description (1976) of differences between girls' and boys' play: girls subordinate the continuation of the game to the continuation of relationships" (p. 43).

Rhianna is very revealing about her lack of concern for the dominant discourse in the following passage.

*Interview excerpt from 18-8-199_.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhianna: Well Val, just this morning, he's always one who said, I just want to graduate, my girlfriend's a doctor, she works in Adelaide, just graduate, get a degree, get a job, get married, all that sort of stuff ... Well he said to me today: &quot;A year ago I would have never said this but do you know what I am going to do? I'm going to go overseas at the end of the year. Samantha's going to quit her job and we're just going to go overseas.&quot; I nearly fell off my chair. I just thought &quot;fantastic.&quot; Val's a product of a very conservative background...who_25_ you do go to university and get a Degree... he has had a revolutionary ... that is revolutionary. That bit that he is not going to just go straight to the workforce.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Shannon: The highest percentage of any graduates in Australia who are living, working and studying overseas - like 10.3% compared with like about 3% from a lot of other Faculties is Architecture in the Graduate Surveys 1991. We know that young architects want to go overseas to work and study ... and that you just can't enrich yourself as a professional without it well... But some of our best graduates haven't done it. Colleen Page still seems to be here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: I just don't see why she is one of our best graduates. I have a real problem with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: I mean in terms of her outcomes. In terms of her outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: Well I saw that exhibition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Very occasionally, as in this selection of the wrong personal pronoun, or her misuse of "medically" for "ethically" in another interview, or in not being able to find the "right" word to express herself, does Rhianna give any indication of her fluency in another European language as it relates to her non-English speaking background (NESB) status where English is not her parents' first language.
Jason: I quite liked it, it’s not ... there’s no vehicle, it’s not iffy, or Morphosis, it’s contextual.

Rhianna: Well, I suppose I started the Degree with her in those first three years, and I always knew what she was like. I suppose she was always so rigorous. She limited herself so much that I suppose I find it hard to...

Susan: But remember they’re not necessarily... that won’t get you good assessment grades. From everything we’ve just said about the habitus of the profession people want, it seems to me, and one of things I am writing a lot about, it seems to me that the final jury performs in a much larger role than the final assessment - it actually is about, especially in its closed form, it’s about - we want you in, you’re not quite right but you know, yes full marks, in, no this one’s not quite right but I think that Colleen’s work, her whole demeanour, her dress, her speech pattern, I think all that stuff adds up to someone we want "in".

In this passage Rhianna reveals the core matter: that she recognises what the dominant discourse is - the demeanour, the speech, the dress, the mode of behaviour - and actively rejects it on one level, whilst maintaining a complicity with its dominance on another level through her failure to speak out against the dominance of one particular discourse. In the interview she confirms the dominant discourse in at least two ways. She confirms that regardless of her willingness to privately criticise those outward trappings of the dominant discourse, she will not "go on record" as having presumed to question the habitus of the

26. This is an interview with the "informant" group in which I am sharing emerging findings about the research project with the students to cycle to the second stage of the research - the critical analysis leading to the critical reports/narratives (see p. 180). Criticism that I am demonstrating the kinds of perspectives that I prefer, and openly subscribe to, do not indicate to the students the kinds of answers that I prefer to hear; rather I am sharing reciprocally with them some of my knowledge construction about "final jury crits" just as they have shared with me. The criticism of positivist researchers that critical, post-positivist researchers "go native" by discussing the research process and emerging understandings is unfounded here, as, not only am I using the informant group to get a viewpoint on the emerging research understandings, but I am also deeply committed to reciprocation as two of the foundation understandings of feminist ethnographic research. Stanley (1988, 58; 63-64) makes a scathing rebuttal of the notion of the researcher staying outside/remaining in ignorance of the social context being studied through a failure to become a participant in these processes. She writes:

For various reasons, I have strong political and moral objections to social science research done by researchers ignorant about the social contexts they study...Thus by 'ignorant' here I don’t mean 'without knowledge about', but rather 'without knowing what insiders know', for only by seeing their social world as they do can we adequately understand what people do and say. (Stanley, 1988, 58)

Lather (1991b) devotes considerable attention to the need for reciprocation in feminist research, concluding that to do other than set up processes for reciprocation constitutes "rape research". She says that

[I]nterviews conducted in an interactive, dialogic manner that requires self-disclosure on the part of the researcher encourage reciprocity. (Lather, 1991b, 60)
profession to which she actively aspires; and secondly that she seeks to maintain relationships as her previous statements about embarrassment reveal. She would not have it that she was seen to be criticising either Colleen, or the judgement of the School, in promoting her as a successful student and young practitioner. Whilst Rhianna praises Val for his bold and contradictory expression of "bucking the system" she nevertheless will not criticise Colleen for failing to take the opportunity, taken by so many other promising young graduates, to travel, in the same way that she will not "go on the record" criticising Colleen's other successes. She merely wonders at the accolades that have been heaped on Colleen, and brings together the notions of Colleen's conforming behaviour in almost every sphere, and her personal rejection of these same conforming behaviours.

There is a question that through participating in a range of in-School activities which included advocacy for the least empowered students in the year and her representation politically of her class as the class representative to enrich and broaden her horizons, Rhianna's focus was not always on conforming - which meant competing for the highest grade. She says elsewhere about herself that she believes she has been well rewarded for her efforts in the studio: efforts which were not as time consuming as those of Jason and Reginald. She admits that "I think I get a lot in my final product for the effort I put in" and "I know that the way that I get through this course is on output, not effort and I don't particularly like that but I know that is reflected in my marks".

When I presented a paper (Shannon, 1993c) presenting Rhianna's complicity27 as a means of survival in the School, and her adoption of the dominant (male) discourse as a likely occurrence after five years, I was questioned about the use of Rhianna as an exemplar of anything, especially gendered issues. Surely, the questions were composed, Rhianna was an example of the most empowered student, certainly not discriminated against in any way because of her gender. My argument was contrary: that Rhianna has outwardly adopted the dominant discourse as a means of survival, but that it does not fit comfortably with many of

27. It is unfair to represent Rhianna's (or Max's and Veronica's) complicity with the way things are as a 'failure' on her behalf to engage effective rebellion which is in itself hard to achieve, and almost certainly was not her main agenda despite her political representation of the class.
her other personal and learning attributes. My further argument was that the selection of one assertive female student in an attempt to argue that critique does not inherently discriminate against women through a failure to recognise the struggles they engage between their gender socialisation and desire to promote harmony and maintain relationships and the underlying demand for competitive behaviour conforming to the dominant discourse, shows nothing more than that a student like Rhianna recognises what she needs to do to "conform" to survive.

The following concluding passage in this section on "conforming" confirms, from an interview carried out with Rhianna two years earlier, that she sees herself "turning around" unacceptable male behaviours to her own end. She revealed her views of this potential in a women's interview group, amongst her peers, after Muriel told the group about a form of sexual harassment she had recently experienced.

_Interview Excerpt from 1-11-199_

**Muriel:** Could I just say something? I suppose it's basically on this male/female thing but I was up in the studio on Wednesday night when I was working; it was really stupid but I wore a skirt - the second time I haven't worn jeans. One guy said "You're a woman - tell me what colour I should paint this?" It's three o'clock in the morning. I wasn't feeling that confident at all. To be dragged away from my work to do that stuff.

**Susan Shannon:** But also that trivialising thing that "women are only good for choosing colours" seems to have been the most offensive thing. You tend to get to the stage in the studio where you can give as good as you get.

**Rhianna:** There's also the stage where you turn around that sort of thing and actually enjoy it. Not to lessen the fact that you're a woman, but the ratio [of women to men] is so low here and when you're working in here at night. I haven't worked in here at night on a project but, as Muriel says - they say "We missed you last night" - it's horrible being in here with all those boys saying all those stupid absolutely _Michael Daws_ statements out there at 4 a.m. in the morning. It was Michael - he said to me that the only way to get through medicine was to be really brilliant or to be female and I really yelled at him and I said "How dare you say that? It's really offensive to me!" and there are things like that said _all the time._

**Susan:** The trouble is, what you fear is that they will be perpetuated in practice - out there - that this is even slightly a padded world.

**Rhianna:** But if, as you said, you can turn it around, you can get a job from being female.

**Susan:** Well, I wouldn't say that, but what I would say is that the sorts of skills women have are, in the end, great attributes.
In this recalled retort to the unwanted harassment of Michael Daws, Rhianna reveals that she is *not* silent where there is no hierarchical power differential, encouraging her strategic silence, as with Peter, and that she takes risks with her immediate peers to make her point. Although others (Ahrentzen and Anthony, 1993) would point to the physical danger into which Rhianna, or any other woman working alone at night amongst a studio of men places herself in speaking out against offensive and discriminatory statements, she is fearless in her retorts. Nevertheless, the thread of confirming the dominant discourse is present in Rhianna’s behaviour even on this occasion. Michael makes an offensive and gratuitous statement and she, just as they expected she would, responds. Her silence may be her only weapon here in dismissing his commentary as being the trivial piffle that it is. It could be argued that Rhianna confirms the dominant discourse and through it maintains the *status quo* that men are dominant in the studio as they are in practice through her essentially congruent response of “yelling” at him. At four in the morning, in the studio, the men can get an easy laugh from the furious response of students like Rhianna responding on cue to their insulting remarks. However, an argument can be mounted that Rhianna conforms with the dominant discourse of patriarchy, through either silence or response in this situation. If the dominant discourse is considered to include the notion that men have a right to trivialise the efforts of women there is as little difference in a retort as in silence. Rhianna, by her own admission would never disrupt the dominant discourse in the sense of, for example, initiating an equally trivialising conversation with Michael Daws as the butt of her put-down as she has already said about herself that she is embarrassed if someone is "on the outer" or "uncomfortable".

**Competing**

Competition is a central, but often unspoken feature of the studio life in the School.

---

28. Ingleton (pers. corr. 31-12-1994) suggests that the demonstration of the hierarchical power differential between men and women in the studio at 4a.m. is that Rhianna has to yell to make her point.
Although competition for the best mark is an ever present back-drop to the activities in the studio partly as the design projects are graded from high Distinction to a very low Fail, and the marks are publicly posted, the students rarely talk directly about it. Their comments are masked in other ways. There are many points in the School at which competition between students is the overwhelming determinant of student response to the situation. The competing begins with getting a place in the Bachelor of Architecture degree, getting a physical place in the studio, and extends from rivalry between students for the best assessment grades and outcomes, to competing for the tutor’s limited time and ultimately to competing for the available jobs.

Students who are unsure of their abilities may behave in a more competitive fashion - for example concealing their preliminary work from their peers, withholding vital pieces of research information and technical knowledge, and failing to disclose their true intent in relation to the final design at preliminary pin-ups - than confident, assertive students who somehow have the ability to tell everyone else what they know and still produce a better design in the end. In this there is a sense of the hegemonic practices which pervade the studio. 'Good' students are 'good' partly because they do "give away all their unknowns" unselfconsciously which allows the critic an opening to come in and "properly, hardly, realistically" critique the work. Conversely, 'poor' students may remain 'poor' as "less able students are terrified of making themselves look less able" in a competitive learning environment, thereby concealing their needs from the tutor and their peers.

*Excerpt from an interview with a group of mature age male students on 25-10-199_.*

*The competition between students to get a place in the professional degree is a factor in establishing friendship and peer critique groups. Jason, a former Qualifying student is speaking with Mick and Garry, who came through the first degree.*

| Jason: Do you have any idea of how many students enrol for the first degree who have no intention of going on? |
| Garry: If I may elucidate [sic] that a little bit because I had no intention of going on when I enrolled but I'm here because I got inspired by the first degree. |
Jason: I would imagine that the vast majority intend to go on.

Susan: Well, we've got a lot of information on that because [the University] has just recently carried out a Survey of all people who commenced the first degree, finished the first degree, and did not proceed to the second degree...

Jason: After three years you think: "I need a break".

Susan: ...going back for ten years. But certainly we haven't thought of surveying that... From my interviews yesterday with B.Arch.St. [students] one thing that came out really strongly which is even a bit peripheral to what you've asked - there are still forty of them - they know there are only twenty-four places - they are so concerned about whether they will get into the professional degree, Bachelor of Architecture. In an unfavourable climate for employment they feel that there will be reasons to apply for the second degree next year which perhaps didn't even apply five years ago - it isn't a buoyant economy; people won't find other employment; and remember [in this regard] that people graduating from that first degree are doing everything from being a merchant banker to a school teacher to an evangelist in America - there are just so many of them [graduates]. And what is interesting, coming back to you three [Qualifying students who have gained a place in the Bachelor of Architecture from another first degree background] was the feeling that the six Qualifying Studies students are going to take "our" places and that was a strongly held belief in the group I interviewed yesterday. When you were talking before about how you had just been so welcomed into the year...

Mick: Let me clarify that. We didn't like them last year [when they were Qualifying Studies students] but we like them now that they are part of the group.

Susan: That's right: you're talking about a group of people who are your peers now - if we were interviewing a group of people who had failed to gain places in the second degree, the response would have been somewhat different.

Once they are "in" the competition for "good" critiques and consequent "good" assessment grades becomes the focus. One of the manifestations of this competition is the primacy of the central design subject in the architecture course. Despite the considerable exhortations of staff to broaden students' focus in this respect, generations of architecture students have found the studio based subject "architectural design" the central vehicle for the expression of their creative urge, and that they "skip" other classes to focus on architectural design.

29. Subsequently in Week 1, 1993 I did. I asked every Bachelor of Architectural Studies student entering the first degree: Do you intend, in the future, to practice as a professional registered architect? The results were that, in a Class of 63 students, 37 men and 26 women, 70% of the men, and 65% of the women answered "yes", whilst another 16% of the men and 31% of the women answered "maybe". 13.5% of the men and 4% of the women answered "no". My argument from these survey results would be that the most significant group are the 31% of "undecided" women. The activities, the role models with whom they come into contact, the critique and the variety of models for practice they experience in their in-School education will have a very great role to play in their eventual decision about whether or not to proceed to the BArch degree although it must be strongly confirmed that it is not the aim of the B Arch St degree to persuade anyone into the architecture profession.
Regardless of which institution a student attends, however, they learn that the most important part of their education and the core of the architectural curriculum will be the studio. All courses are secondary to the studio assignment, both in the terms of the number of units and hours devoted by students in this atelier-like setting. (Cuff, 1991, 121)

Cuff describes "students [who] put a tremendous amount of time into their studios: their commitment to the design task is best demonstrated by the charrettes [all-nighters] that precede each group crit":

This is a competitive arena, for not only is everyone racing against the clock but students compete with each other: for the most complete set of drawings, the most precise model, the most elegant presentation. (p. 128)

In the following interview Jason and Reginald discuss the time commitment that they are prepared to make to their studies.

Excerpt from an interview with a group of mature age male students on 25-10-199__

Mervyn [A visiting studio tutor]: Can I just add something on top of what Reginald just mentioned? An important point and something that I've been aware of since I've come here - it's to do with a relationship of students to external and visiting lecturers. By that I don't mean me but the other people who've been talking. I've been appalled by the general level of attendance at Visiting Lectures. It's unbelievably bad when people come here from all over the world and there are five people at the lecture.

You may feel that you're too pressured to do that. Staff who are constructing courses want to give you a lot of experiences and keep you busy but there's also got to be time within a University just to reflect. And really you should all be doing a different course. There has to be room within the course framework for you to develop a personal agenda which takes on board the structure that staff give you, but also develop some particular directions.

Going to these lectures is vital in helping you to develop these directions - you must take every opportunity to hear these people. I think the course should be structured so that an hour preceding the lunch-time twice a week...

Jason: The reason that most of us don't attend the lunchtime lectures is that we have contact time 9-5 with an hour off for lunch and if you add in a lunchtime lecture as well... Some of us nevertheless do.
Reginald: The fact that it's voluntary makes it even more special.

If there's any other comment I want to make it's about having to sign the roll in Legal Studies. The whole thing as treating people as mature adults - especially in the second degree and they're paying $2000 [HECS fees] to come here. They don't need the roll taken, and if they choose to miss something that is really their loss.

Admittedly [the visiting lecturers] are also detracting from the studio time but all I'm saying we shouldn't then have a visiting lecture time scheduled into the studio time. I think it should be voluntary.

Jason and Reginald differ from their tutor Mervyn in that they take the role of mature, independent learners for themselves. They suggest to Mervyn that students choose their own activities in full knowledge of the consequences, and furthermore that there is no necessity for the staff to police students' attendance: "that is really their loss". The students reject Mervyn's view of a "good" student. To Reginald and Jason, a "good" student is not necessarily a model student, attending all classes and contributing in all spheres. In adopting this stance, they may reject the competitive model for achievement in some ways: through their steadfast belief that not all staff demands are reasonable ("we have contact time 9-5 with an hour off for lunch"), and that their achievement in the School will not be at the cost of making an absolute commitment of all their time to the School. Conversely, as focused and hitherto successful students, they may be too busy competing for success to do something that is not assessed, although this is not their particular situation as they do, in fact, attend at least some of the lectures - "Some of us nevertheless do". As older students, Reginald and Jason resisted the tutor's urge for them to dedicate all their time to the enriching pursuit of architecture. Although they are among the best students in their year on assessment grades, they are unwilling to commit any more time to their studies than they already do. Possibly, from their mature student status, they view architectural studies as an important, but not the only, part of their lives and they wish to keep a balance between their studies and other things. Reginald, for example, had a family of several young children. Competing for grades, in his case, was kept in check by the need for balance with other important parts of his life.

Cuff (1991) tells a story in relation to architecture students' competitive urge and acceptance of what it is that architecture students "do" to become, and then remain,
competitive in the studio. The story which she says is "a common story with many versions illustrating the dedication, the sacrifices, and difficulties of the architecture student" highlights the struggles of mature age students when opting for a balance. Often younger students do not have these conflicts, simply because they do not have such complicated lives.

It was midnight, there were only twelve more hours before the project was due, and the studio was packed. It was the end of the first semester of architecture grad school. After a solid week of charretting this friend of my friend was nearly burnt out on beer, then coffee, and too many cigarettes. He had almost finished inking in his drawings, which were really beautiful, when his wife walked in. He hadn't been home for days, and he was so bleary eyed that he hardly recognised her. But she looked so mad, and before he could say a word, she took his coffee cup and poured its remains over his drawing, and then she dumped the ashtray in the same place and ground the cigarette butts into the paper with her fist. All she said was, "I want a divorce." (Cuff, 1991, 128)

Students from a lower year level than Jason and Reginald agree that being competitive is not always their primary consideration. In the following interview they are speaking in the context of whether students would seek out opportunities to present their design work to the class when they did not feel confident about their presentation skills - both graphically and orally - just to promote themselves and their scheme before the assessor.

Excerpt from an interview 29-10-199 with a group of third year B Arch St students talking about whether they would volunteer to stand up in front of the class and present their work.

| Ron: | It's the way they're run [critiques in his subject]; it's not arranged as a set thing - you turn up at your own will and also, because you don't feel confident with these skills there's no way I'm going to stand up in there and exercise something I'm not terribly confident about doing. It should be forced on you I think: if you have to do it you have to do it - if you're given the choice no-one will do it. |
| Susan Shannon: | So there are two prongs to this. One is that they're not compulsory... |
| Ron: | Or it hasn't been stressed as being compulsory... |
| Susan: | And the other one is that it doesn't happen in the growing context of gathering skills - you didn't start at the beginning of the year doing it [presenting work to the class] in some extremely elementary way so that now you've worked yourself up to a great level of proficiency with it. |
| Ron: | There's none of that. |
**Abel:** With any kind of presentation it's got some oral to it. I personally just can't separate the two and if I had known that [there was] an oral presentation after the design hand-in I would have been there to actually give a talk about it with some of the group; it's an essential ... I just don't think you can just pin it [designs] up.

**Angela:** But you feel comfortable about that. Some of us don't. [I'm] I've... been subjected to it before so I can cope.

Angela raises an important issue. Either through previous experience with having to address an audience about her own work, as was her case, or through natural and learned confidence with language, as was Abel's case, some students exhibit a different degree of "comfort" with the necessity to address a large audience. This "comfort" enables them to be more competitive as self-promoters.

The interview reveals that the fear of humiliation in front of the class outweighs the possibility of 'shining' as a student and thereby possibly gaining higher assessment grades. What is so surprising about Ron's comments, is that he had, prior to undertaking a Degree in Architectural Studies, qualified and practised in another professional field where advocacy was highly valued. His previous experience in advocacy has not been made relevant here - he never mentions these skills which he continues to practise to finance his studies and they are never drawn on by the tutor to enable his presentation. Rhianna, at another time, commented on this split of confidence of "self" and confidence of "work (designs)" with which Ron is struggling as he learns how to promote himself and become competitive in the class. If one is not confident of the work, self-confidence is affected. The use to which critique is put is relevant here. If the critique is promoted as an opportunity to ask for help rather than present finished, highly competent work, more students may be willing to speak about their work in these sessions.

*Interview excerpt 1-11-199_ with a group of women discussing the concept that "there is no competence without confidence" so that therefore a confidence scale has been used to measure their responses instead of a competence scale.*
Rhianna: That's so personal though, I think. *Confidence of the person... not confidence of the knowledge.* That's "believing in yourself", not "believing in what you know". You can make up whatever you like.

There are several interrelated points to make about competing for "good" critiques and "good" assessment grades as seen through the students' eyes. Ron will not put himself in a position where he may suffer humiliation in front of his peers, and this reluctance to accompany his graphic presentation with an oral presentation in a critique situation, sets him apart from his class-mate, Abel, who is a gifted speaker, with the additional benefit of a first degree in a language-rich field. Abel bemoans the fact that the poor organisation after the hand-in for the scheme prevented him from taking the opportunity, which he saw as "essential", to talk about his scheme. Angela pointed out to him that whilst she, from earlier tertiary experiences was equipped to address a large group about her work, some of the class do not feel "comfortable" in that situation. Competing for grades is mediated, in Ron's case and for "some" of the rest of the class, by balancing his unwillingness to "stand up there and exercise something I'm not terribly confident about doing."

At the simplest level, the anxiety that students experience during critique is related to the public nature of critique, and linked to the competitive nature of the studio, and not showing any weakness in front of their peers. The subject positions made available for students in a competitive studio are as a Credit student or a Distinction student. A degree of "comfort" with self-promotion is an almost essential requirement for attaining these goals. Ron, along with "some" of his class, finds that his confidence is too poor for him to consider adopting Abel's proposals. This may be because he wants to "save face". Certainly Garry revealed that this was of real concern to him.

*Interview Excerpt 25-10-199*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan: What about where you have one-on-one critique with the staff member as opposed to with the whole class being there?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garry: It just doesn't hurt as much if it's just you and the staff - if your peers aren't around. If it's bad, well there's no-one else to hear it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garry reveals that, in dealing with critique of poor work, it is his peers' presence that makes the situation so bad. His sensitivity is about showing a positive face in the studio, about "being on top of things". And yet Garry realises that it is his different learning background which has ill-equipped him with critical architectural vocabulary for speaking about his designs.

*Interview Excerpt 25-10-199_

| Susan | How confident do you feel that you've developed a critical vocabulary for discussing design problems and ways of designing? |
| Garry | Not very confident. I realise what I don't know. I didn't do History and Theories of Architecture after the first year and a lot of that [the confidence to express yourself] was developed in History and Theories. I've noticed that people who did History and Theories feel a lot more confident with the ability to express themselves in the proper terms. I can understand what they're talking about even if I haven't heard that word before because I know enough to understand it but I can't actually come out with it and that's why I'm not confident to say it and that frustrates me because I wish I had a little more knowledge in that area. |

Garry therefore remains silent, rather than proffering critical suggestions. He has neither the confidence nor the background in textual deconstruction (Giroux, 1991) which builds the critical vocabulary to do so. He does not risk ridicule by what he perceives are his more learned peers if he is silent. Whilst he can understand what they mean, through his inability to speak the same words (Ward, 1991, 91) he feels he cannot promote his design schemes, or be competitive. For Garry it is the presence of his peers which "hurts" most when he receives negative critique. This pain is related to loss of face.

Tilbury (1992) has written of face-threatening acts and face-saving techniques in architectural critique. She said that:

> Face threatening acts are a common feature of the discourse of architectural critiques. The most face threatening are those associated with lecturers' criticism of topic A, which involves evaluating student design concepts. Less face threatening is criticism by lecturers of student presentation (graphic) skills and informing and advising of alternative techniques. Potential face threatening acts performed by students involve rejection of the lecturers' criticism or advice, justifying design choices and self disclosive acts where students admit short comings and seek sympathy or help.
When performing face threatening acts lecturers need to consider not only the negative face of the recipients but their own positive face needs. They want to be seen as understanding supportive educators as well as caring individuals. They want to avoid destructive criticism or coercion. Similarly the students need to consider the lecturers' negative face so that in disagreeing they do not challenge the lecturers' expertise. Threats to their own positive face need to be addressed so that they do not appear inflexible while still maintaining independence of thought. (Tilbury, 1992, 7)

The complex and subtle demands on students in critique to maintain the pragmatics of politeness unfold in Tilbury's quotation. The quest for self-promotion which, it is claimed, is integral with becoming and remaining competitive, conflicts with the pragmatics of politeness in the critique situation for all but the most verbally confident and "comfortable" students. Garry is not one of them.

Annie, a Chinese Malaysian student, stated so naively her problem about critique, that it summarises with absolute clarity the dilemma that critique presents for students who are not confident with their verbal, designing and presentation skills - that you "shouldn't ask for critical comment".

*Interview excerpt 12-11-199_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Shannon: What about [your ability to participate in dialogue related to the design task] as an adviser? When other people in the studio want you to comment on their work - how confident do you feel about that? Do you go around to other people's drawing boards and comment on their work as an adviser?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annie: Yeah, I did help Dao a little bit and she was really pleased. About her entrance - but I didn’t get advice from other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Did you feel confident about your advice that you were offering her?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie: Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: (Turning to Sarah) And you just don’t do it, Sarah?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah: No, I don’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie: <em>You shouldn't ask for critical comment!</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem for Annie is further exacerbated by her cultural background which positions students in a discourse of dependency or respect: she does not want to question the authority of the revered teacher, and does not want to ask for criticism. She is silenced in
asking for critique, which might aid her in becoming competitive, because she avoids face threatening acts with her teachers. This positions Annie as always having to put on a confident face, never admitting the short comings of her designs which would allow both her peers and her teachers to provide criticism which would allow her to move on.

As well as discriminating between those in the class who are, and are not prepared to risk loss of face through seeking criticism from the teacher as a means of self-promotion, competition also forces intra-group activities which probably strengthen the peer group as a working unit. Nevertheless, as Marty says in the following interview excerpt, the responsibility he feels for the whole group to work hard and co-operatively to achieve well in comparison with other groups forces him into some roles he would prefer not to have.

*Excerpt from an interview with third year B Arch St. students on 24-10-199_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Shannon: Do you have the ability to participate effectively in a group? By that I mean you feel your voice is being heard and you feel your criticism and criticism of you can be used constructively?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce: Yes, I feel reasonably confident about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty: I feel confident about my ability to work in a group but if you get someone in the group who doesn't want to do anything it's knowing how far you can press them - I mean you don't want to lean on them. In one of the projects we've just done, we had one person who didn't want to do any work and we really had to lean on him and it's very hard because you're put in a position of being like a parent or something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: And you feel it's not an appropriate role for you to have with one of your colleagues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty: Then again, you probably have to in the real world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marty later reveals what he thinks a University education is about. His views are about self-efficacy, not about competitive gain. He clearly found it at odds with his world view to have to motivate his group member "who didn't want to do any work" "like a parent or something" using coercive threats. He is uncomfortable with the role of 'policing' he has taken for himself to get the results for the group that he wants for himself.
Marty: In my mind that's the essential function of education. I mean there's only so much that you can teach and the idea that you go to University and get knowledge and skills off a shelf like a Supermarket - that's wrong. You go there and through talking to people, talking to lecturers, and writing essays and tutes, you find out what you're strong at and what you're weak at and what's more important you find out how you can improve your skills, use the library, you find out how to make use of the resources you've got, where our deficiencies are and exactly what to do.

Marty's classmate Mark is philosophical about his chances of success in the Bachelor of Architecture Degree due to his perceptions about where the authority lies.

Mark: I'm not talking for myself but for the group - but group dynamics and those sort of skills - other people said they felt like parents. I've heard of students say in their Honours year - who contribute nothing to their Honours group - and yet who pull out a first class Honours degree because the stuff they do one-on-one is it - that's all that counts in the big picture and there, say in the Forum [a teaching space], all that counts is what you hand up - it's just irrelevant what you say all year.

There is some collective "wisdom" amongst the students about how to succeed which suggests that individual competitive effort is all that "counts" in the end. There is an inherent conflict here that these students have identified between the espoused goals of cooperation through group work, and their belief that "all that counts is what you hand up" - essentially individual effort being rewarded in front of any contribution to the group or the class.

However, as students move through the School, and their individual talents become more refined and therefore differentiated, they realise that their individual competitive strength is partly a result of what they bring to the group, as well as what the group brings to them. In order to compete in the professional competition in which they became finalists, Rhianna, Jason, Nick and Reginald found that co-operation between themselves was essential in order to be competitive.

Excerpt from an Interview on 6-8-199_

In this interview the informant group talk about their strategies for co-operation, about competition and what processes of critique have contributed to their abilities with self-judgement.
Rhianna: Regardless of what everyone did, particularly when we went home - we had these sessions when we'd go home overnight and do stuff and we had these sessions when we'd meet after the weekend or when we'd meet after five minutes and they were quite formalised, and where you had to produce something by Monday and I think we all did and regardless of whether Jason spent three hours on it because Jason is really good like that and Reginald spent or I spent five minutes on it, (air expelled by Jason) that's just an example, for example, I think - we really looked at everything that was produced by everybody as having real positive potential not just saying "Oh well, we'll have a look at that but it's not really valid."

Reginald: But you have to...

Rhianna: We really looked at everything that people, I mean, produced regardless of how far off 'the line' it was. And that's another thing, we had a [ ] 'line' and everybody else's 'lines' within that and I think we all respected each other enough to try see merit in everything.

Susan Shannon: That's actually the definition of a small group working properly: that you listen, and hear, and value.

Rhianna: We did.

Susan: That's a really functional small group.

Rhianna: That sounds really nice and everything.

Jason: Yeah, sounds like a warm and fuzzy.

Susan: It sounds like rhetoric until I hear it back from you!

Rhianna: Yeah

Susan: And that thing about whether it took five minutes or three hours: that's just this thing about students continuously want to be rewarded for effort instead of output. By the time you get to being almost professional the effort that was required is completely irrelevant: it's the idea, whether it took five minutes or three hours, so, yeah, you do have to get past that point that it is effort that you want to be regarded for.

Rhianna: Yes. I know that the way that I get through this course is on output, not effort and I don't particularly like that but I know that is reflected in my marks. I think that all of us find things sort of easy to understand...

Jason: I wouldn't agree with you there Rhianna, about the effort.

Rhianna: About me?

Jason: Your output is not short, but I don't think...

Rhianna: No, no, no. I think that I get a lot in my final product for the effort I put in.

Reginald: Miles beyond. (laughs)

Rhianna: Far more output than what I put into it.

Jason: Oh, sorry, I thought that you were saying the opposite.

Rhianna: No, no, no. I think I get more output for what I put in than most people do. Maybe it comes easily. And I'm confident. I'll start inking up before I've put it in pencil. Now I don't like that about myself. But I know because I could develop my ideas further, but I know that it's a way that I produce a lot.
Reginald: I think that confidence thing, just a final thing, that like even in this project now [the students were engaged in another project], for one group, which is Nick, Rhianna, I, and five others, well... three of us tend to be taking a lead in the group work and I think that is primarily because we’re seeing the nature of the project, we’re grasping a broader range of issues and being able to keep them in our head and maybe it’s also because we’re able to speak louder and faster but I think we tend to...

Rhianna: We are standing up in front of the class and saying "Do this, do that"...to the extent that Reginald came to me yesterday and said maybe we should physically...

Reginald: ...withdraw...

Rhianna: ...sit down and let other people get it going or ask the rest of the group if we’re being too...

Reginald:... domineering...

Rhianna: Domineering, but I don’t think ... we weren’t...

Reginald: But there are other people who would take more of a lead if we did sit down and shut up, I suspect...and Jason was saying that if he doesn’t stand up, and [they] shut up, they’ll get it wrong.(laughs) Stand-up and say his mind or they’ll get it wrong!

The group is reflective about the processes which contributed to their co-operation in making them competitive at a national level, including really valuing everybody’s input. They nevertheless recognise that when these same processes are trialled outside their competition group, they appear "domineering" and "taking the lead." They are sensitive to the reluctance of their class-mates whom they realise will not challenge their seeming competitive advantage despite their recognition that as a class they had many untapped talents. In laughing about Jason’s behaviour in his new group for the next project, they reveal a lot about themselves: that they "know" what is "right" and their class mates may "get it wrong" if they don’t show the lead.

They go on to talk about how they developed their skills to the level that they are nationally competitive, and also about the nature of competition itself.

*Interview excerpt 6-8-199*

Reginald: We had to do a fair bit of analysis initially and try to synthesize the ideas that are coming out of that analysis but it wasn’t a first step, second step type of thing; it was a continual testing of the ideas that we’re seeing against...
Rhianna: Is it against each other? That's the point that I'm looking for here. Is it against each other? Had we been working alone would we have just been going back and testing it against the brief but working in a group, were we testing it against each other? Because I know that when I go away to bring something back to the group I approach it differently than if I would approach it if I was, you know, just scribbling on my own at home.

Jason: It's funny, there's two things. In a way you've got more responsibility for the group; but then...

Rhianna: You've sort of got more responsibility for your own.

Jason: Yeah...well, both, two things. In some ways you've got more responsibility with the group because you can't...

Reginald: Can't "get out of it"...

Jason: "get out of it", you can't "let the group down" in a sense...

Rhianna: And we were all quite...

Jason: You can also be absorbed into the group...

Rhianna: I didn't think...I thought you could be really conscious of that in our group. If at times I felt that I was being slack and I'd gone out to a dinner party the night before and had a hangover the next day and I was hopeless...I think we'd make up for it the next day. I think we all did that in the end...if you were grumpy and couldn't stand the sight of the other group members and went home in a tizzle I think you...the respect for each other might have made up for that.

Jason: We had real troughs and lows.

Nick: But I think that's just normal.

Rhianna: There was only one day that...there was one stage that was the end of that week when we had just realised that concept had failed and I was just "stuff this" and I mean I never get like that but I left in disgust, remember? I said "Nup! I can't stand it".

Susan Shannon: You said to me, though, it must have been just then in the corridor that it was harder to leave and then come back like that as you did. You didn't leave and obviously go away and say "I don't want to be involved any more" - you came back. Because your stake was so high? When you get that really low thing with a group, what takes you back?

Nick: I think it's vengeance. You take the other concept with such vengeance.

Jason: If it is...

Rhianna: ...it's easier to come back to a group...

---

30. It is obvious throughout the interviews with the informant group that it was not always a harmonious relationship within the group even of these close friends who had attained much in group work through setting aside their differences. A motivation for this ability to overlook the personal tensions may have been that in order to be competitive they will set aside their differences. Their confidence as individuals contributes much to this ability to maintain a 'winning' focus, and to overlook causes for conflict. While they are winning the motivation remains. For many other groups who have not tasted winning they do not share this motivation.
Jason: It's easier to come back to a group when you feel like that than to actually have to face it yourself. It's like you with your own work you can think: it's awful, horrid, I don't want to do it. At least with a group you can think maybe someone else is going to have an idea and I won't have to do it. Whereas when you do it yourself you just think "I just can't. I cannot face this".

Nick: [interjects] That's right, it's always just coping!

Rhianna: But I just hate to be beaten. That's my... I think. Actually I'm very competitive and I think we probably all are. You don't like to start something and not finish it? Do you?

Susan: That's not exactly competitive though, that's a sort of self... That's saying to yourself I won't let myself down, I won't be beaten. Competitive means, we won't let another group beat us, or in the Studio I won't let my project be bettered by someone else.

Jason: I'd rather just say that we all want to do well. A more generic...

Nick: I think it's just trying to keep up your standard. You know what your standard is, you know what your norm is, you're trying to better that rather than someone else in the class. You know what you're capable of doing. Now if the end product doesn't match to what you know you're capable of doing then you've...

Rhianna: Stuffed up...

Nick: That's right and you're always trying to better that. From the first year we're hearing that they're intensely competitive...

Rhianna: That's what we're hearing too.

Susan: It arrived out of the fact that eighteen people didn't get places and that it's "kill or be killed"...

Rhianna: Eighteen people?

Susan: Mmmm... eighteen unmet places...that's why they won't work in the studio because they might disclose their work to others...

Nick: Jeepers.

Susan: There is just so much difference between what I perceive happened two years ago when you were in first year and you all wanted to work in first year...

Jason: No, we had a bit of that though.

Rhianna: I remember that, not wanting to open my journal to everybody.

Jason: The thing I went through was commenting about other people's work "My God, how dare you say that about my work?" So defensive about it.

Susan: I've got a wonderful quote from another student about you saying "It was creepy, always looking over my shoulder. Could you tell him that, it was creepy." 31

---

31. I include this reference to passing on information between students to show my vulnerability as a researcher towards the end of the project. (See also Hammersley, 1992, 199 on "over-rapport" or "going native"). The students seek to have an input into the research design, to have an opportunity to comment on the emerging findings and to gain benefit from the findings. In the same way I seek to apprise them of the findings, and to make them aware that the research process itself is a vehicle for students to communicate
Nick: Maybe it was just the height. Jason is a very high person, maybe when you’re sitting down...

Susan and Nick: looking over my shoulder...

Later in the interview they talk more about how they used each other and the opportunities the School presented for critique, both at the drawing board and formally, to develop their self-judgement.

Susan: What about getting back to the first years and their incredibly overt competitiveness - I mean they are there now [in the year], they shouldn’t worry about being so competitive but they are. Thinking about journalling and reflection and group work... What sorts of things do you think promote self judgement as opposed to competition? They are not poles apart but let’s just say one is becoming sure yourself and the other one is always thinking that you’ve got some normative standards which someone else represents which you’ve got to try to reach. What sorts of things have been good for each of you in the three years that you’ve been here and the six months that you’ve worked out, for promoting self-judgement?

Rhianna: One thing for me would be having, once, I think that it might have been as early as the [first project], which was a really good start for me, done something that people were saying "Rhianna, you can't control yourself! Barcelona Night Club!" and then getting the best mark in it. And thinking: "Hey! Everyone told me not to do that! But I did it." And I think I was very lucky because that happened really early to me.

Reginald: So you think that rewarding first years with a good mark?

Rhianna: No, but I think that rewarding daring behaviour goes a long way...

Reginald: Daring designs, not daring behaviour.

Susan: Daring design behaviour.

Jason: I'd put a rider on that: as long as it's relevant, as long as it's good and as long as it's...

Rhianna: Yeah, it's got to be out of the brief.

Jason: It has still got to be good. I mean daring itself is nothing.

---

with each other, as they can be seen doing here. This is a research dilemma. Whilst anonymity is retained for the person who made the comment, Jason becomes aware, perhaps for the first time, that other students in the studio are talking to me about his practices. He says in the previous line that he is aware that they do not want his commentary, in fact that he has no right to be making a commentary on their work. The dilemma of whether to make this comment to Jason was dealt with in this way - that he already had stated that he knew of this opposition from other students. What he may not have known was that as a researcher I was being asked to become the conduit for passing on a message to him. The woman who made the comment must have felt that she could not do so.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan: They said in their first Semester evaluations that they don't see that there is enough reward for what they concept as &quot;not just meeting the brief&quot; but actually... Well, I suppose it is that concept of daring or design challenge. They can see that. But Jason what would you say about that? What sorts of things have promoted self-judgement for you as opposed to just that out and out competitiveness?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason: I think I've always been self-judgemental, but the process of critique. Formal critique I think has made me able to do that better in an architectural sense, of myself. And that was just going through the course. Because I've never been in that situation before where you're critiquing something, like that. But I have always been self aware.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: So it's picking up in your critics eloquent, analytic behaviour, or whatever, a part of it you liked. So it was actually picking it up, reflecting on it and promoting it in your self-judgement: is that how it happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: Ummm...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Was it modelled I mean, was it modelled behaviour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: If it was it wasn't consciously modelled. It's just...it's just critique. You talk about it, other people talk about your work, ummm, you listen and you try and get something out of it. I suppose it's formal in a sense but I don't think of it, I think that's what you do for it to be valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: From that I will get to a point now where I feel I am starved for critique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: I will now get to a point where I feel I can go no further. And then I look to these guys. And what was quite interesting was that when we were all having trouble getting stuff [feedback, critique] in our Honours it was like &quot;let's all get together and talk about it&quot;. And this is on an individual project. And just before we came in here I had said to Jason that I'd like to get drafts of our Honours together and Jason said Reginald said we want to get together next week and do this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can almost remember when this started. It was sometime in first year when there was a turnover to &quot;I need someone else's input.&quot; But still, back then I probably couldn't dismiss it like I do now. And do you know that was probably part of the reason that I was so incensed that Wayne was going to be a tutor [in final year] because why even bother to sit down and listen to someone critique you if when... maybe that's wrong...maybe he's come up with some really valid stuff...on the occasions...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: Past experience...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: He helped me once on the [ ] project, he really did. He was the one who encouraged me to really go for it. So in defence of Wayne he did that. But I happened to be someone along his line of the sexy sort of... what he sees as interesting, but I don't see him as responding to the various different schools of approach and ways of.... about getting critique that you don't value. I get really hyped up and want to fast track everything and having someone critique you who you know is just going to be... It's fine to have someone throw a spanner in the works, that's fine...but to have someone who's going to be really nihilistic and not really come out with anything and someone if you feel...if Wayne says &quot;put a turret there&quot; you put a turret there otherwise, if you had another way of responding, he won't be able to see that you just didn't listen to him if you didn't put a turret there. So that's probably part of the reason, really needing this critique made me so angry that I get imposed with someone who I felt couldn't provide that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhianna and her peers have already expressed a need to let the tutor know what they are doing, even if it is only so that at the critique the tutor is able to understand their work. She takes her argument one step further in this part of the interview. When she is "really needing" critique, it makes her "so angry that I get imposed with someone [Wayne] who I felt couldn't provide that". Rhianna and her peers reinforce the level of critical support they receive from one another in this interview. They rely on this support not only in group projects but also in individual projects like the Honours project where they are all working on different topics. Rhianna recalls that whilst this started in first year "a turnover to "I need someone else's input"", she "probably couldn't dismiss it [negative critique] like I do now". Her self-judgement has been developed over the years to the point where she seeks her peers input, but can separate their negative criticism from what she needs. Rhianna and her peers in participating so much in peer critique overturn the notion of intergroup competition to some extent in that they are not secretive with each other about their schemes, or their Honours work, preferring the benefits to be gained from peers' critique.

In her efforts to be critiqued, and through the response to the critique to refine and develop her scheme, to comply with her personal view of competition - "I just hate to be beaten" - Rhianna is not referring to her class mates, but to a concept of an unresolved design - "You don't like to start something and not finish it? Do you?" Architecture students often cast "the design" as "the enemy" and the expressions they use in describing their struggles with the design portray it as an entity itself with which they compete, or struggle.

There are many other forms of competition in the studio. There is much competition for the tutor's limited time, and consequent upon the need for the tutor to be seen to be equitable with the amount of time spent with each student, considerable complaint arises about instances where students think someone else is 'grabbing' the tutor's time. This is particularly prevalent in the first year where students are still very unsure of their own judgement and do not trust the judgement of their peers.
Looking at the evaluations of teaching from the first Semester in a first year design class gives an impression of the rivalry which exists for the tutor's limited time.

*Excerpts from first year student evaluations of studio teaching in Semester 1, 199_

*Question: Do you have any comments on the method of teaching?*

- Studio time not quite enough - especially when students book up with more than one tutor in the afternoon - limiting the time availability for others.

- Some people get much more attention (through their own persistence) but this tends to leave other students with less attention. Studios can go by with some students receiving the majority of tutor assistance.

- More organisation in studio time - allocated appointment times and preventing one student from booking all three tutors in one afternoon, thereby preventing others from getting appointments.

Many students believe that the safest way to proceed through the School is to check each decision with the tutor at desk crits. It is not only an insurance policy against things going "wrong" in the more public critiques - "Susan said I could do it" - and the final assessment - "The critic should have been more forthright at the desk crits" - but it enables the student to respond to the tutor's critique in the next stage of design development. Understandably then there is strong competition for the tutor's limited time in the studio. Some students in particular manipulate the tutor through many devices to encourage the tutor to spend additional time at their drawing board. "Having a crisis in the design" which cannot be resolved in the allocated fifteen minutes will often encourage the tutor to overstay and then cut short the desk crit of a student proceeding well, but when this happens studio after studio, and the same student has three crises in one afternoon to coincide with the three visits of the tutors there is a cynicism born in the other students' minds about their real

32. For the range of studio times available to students in each year of architecture courses in Schools of Architecture in Australia refer to Olley, Heather (1992) *Studio Based Teaching in Architecture Schools in Australia, 1992:* A report to the RAIA National Education Committee (1992) Canberra: RAIA. In the School under discussion, the studio time when I first started teaching in 1987 was 20 hours per week. During the period of the observations it was 12 hours per week, and is under threat of further erosion. This comment is not meant as a definitive statement on the number of studio hours per student available per week as the number of tutors in each studio varies as does the number of tutors per studio at each year level.
intent. The tutors, rushing between desks, with twelve or more students to engage in critical
discussion in one afternoon, spend little time talking to the other tutors to compare notes
about the progress of each student. Therefore the ruse can continue unabated, alienating
other class mates and short changing steady students in favour of "persistent" students, who
may be highly competitive students, on the traditional model of competition, who do not
stop to consider the needs of other students when engaging the tutor in discussion at the
drawing board.

This in-School competitiveness of secrecy and disregard for one's class mates manifested in
"grabbing the tutor's time" extends to the process of finding a job. Not too many "leads"
are shared amongst the group. A beautifully presented portfolio of Distinction work and an
outstanding academic transcript is what many students would like to present to employers.

Interview excerpt 6-8-199

In the following interview, the informant group reflect on their knowledge that, by final
year, they have other personal and co-operative skills which would be valuable to an
employer but sense that these skills would be viewed as "irrelevant".

Susan: So thinking about this next [final] project and beyond that into professional
work... How do you feel about the statement that next year your self-judgement will just
have to be there as it will be for all the students?

Jason: I feel quite good about that, what I fear is that where I might end up is where it
[self-judgement] won't be used...

Rhianna: Irrelevant.

Jason: ..irrelevant and I sort of think "Oh I just don't want to get into it" which is
just...

Rhianna: That's exactly what I think. If I get into a small firm, and get to do some
design, or if I go to work for my Dad and I get to do some design...If I work for my
father, my self-judgement is paramount because my father is the sort of person who
would say, "No, don't do that, do this as it is cheaper, or because it is easier to
engineer", or something like that and then my self-judgement is paramount because I'm
the only one. But if I go to work for [ ]...

Jason: A large firm, just say "a large firm"...(laughs)
Rhianna: (laughs) because maybe we are confident and this is where it can be negative, I mean I'd find that... difficult. I mean this is where there would be a lot of merit in us getting together and doing something together.

Jason: We all feel we're doing something, we're contributing something when we're working in a group together...

Rhianna: Worthwhile...

Jason: The thing to me is going somewhere where you think, "Well, this is just a job."

Rhianna: I mean I'd love to scrimp and scrounge and maybe go to the West End and get some subsidised space... BUT...the economic climate is really so bad to try to do it. We've toyed with it but we've never really committed ourselves to it I suppose.

Rhianna and her class mates recognise that there are many disadvantages in working for large established architectural practices. They realise that the full range of their non-competitive abilities may not be recognised. The alternative, of establishing their own practice, is briefly canvassed, but they believe that the economic times are not right.

As a group of very close friends and working peers, it was surprising to see the competitive secrecy with which they eventually conducted their job-hunting. Nevertheless, they collectively recognised poor practices, and warned each other about "what not to do" when being apprenticed for a position in an office. Nick commented from his experiences in several offices about why some young graduates of architecture are not competitive in gaining a position when taken on for 'work experience'.

*Interview excerpt 6-8-199_

Nick: But that is where a lot of people fail. Relating to the question asked [about] how they promote their self-confidence within a firm, and as I say that is where a lot of people fail. They don't take the initiative to take on the work and to take charge and if a task is given they always want to turn to ask other people within the office, say "Is this right? Do you want to do it that way?" That doesn't tend to be appreciated within the office. To some aspects it does, but if they see that you do take the initiative and go ahead and do it, and you've done so much and you go back and they say that you've done this slightly wrong or whatever, they tend to like that more than someone who is moping around trying to get confirmation of every step they do.

Rhianna: It depends on the office again.

Jason: At [...] don't take a blank page up to the principal, take anything but just don't take a blank page.

33. In his speech patterns, in composing phrases, Nick sometimes gives a hint that he comes from an NESB background, where he does not speak English at home at all.
Nick: But because I've worked in so many office situations, yes that's right. They give you a task, try and do the task.

Jason: You've got to get an idea of what they actually want.

Nick: They give you a task, try to do the task as full on your own, as much as what you can. Try and take it as far as you can instead of so many people that I've seen working with me that have come fresh into the Office, they always go to their colleagues or the people working within the office and say "Umm, can I do this?"

Rhianna: Or, "Did I do this right?"

Nick: So they're always moping around a lot more asking questions about the work instead of just doing it.

Underlying all of Nick's abilities was a great confidence with his own abilities, not only to make anything work, but to respond to critique received at any stage of the design process. Arguably, given these personal qualities and professional skills, Nick does not need to be as secretive and jealous of the success of his class-mates as some of his peers. He is generous with his job-seeking advice based on his experience "in so many office situations".

Not all students share Nick's confidence to make designs "work", to respond to critique received at any stage of the design development, and to get a job on graduation, as the next section of the narrative reveals.

*Excerpt from interview 6-8-199_

Susan Shannon: Can I just ask you about something I was reading yesterday. About architecture students in New Zealand, actually. Looking at whether they came from homes that were "possessed of cultural capital"; which meant that their parents were probably professionals, at least one of them had probably had a tertiary education; that in the home cultural things were valued like reading, music. Can you just talk a bit about that if you are happy to do it? You mightn't...this was all questionnaire material, it wasn't from interviews...so you mightn't feel happy talking about it. Then again these people [Reginald, Jason, Rhianna] know you pretty well so maybe you are [happy to talk about it].

Nick: Not at all. Funny you mention it because my Dad was a musician and since I was five I remember he used to bring musicians over to the house and just the musical instruments were laying around the house and it was just a matter of time picking things up. Both myself and my brother were musical in that sense. Dad was also a furniture maker and designer. Now I didn't get to see much of his drawing, as such, because he did that mainly in his days of study which were his hey-days, so I saw more of the hands-on product but he actually made [it] and [it] was about the house and he enjoyed that work and I obviously got that aspect filtered to me and that rubbed off. So yeah, a

---

lot of the strong ethical things in the family did rub off one way or the other, be it consciously or subconsciously. So that obviously helped direct my way of thinking and doing things as well. So it's just a good starting point.

**Susan:** You value those things and those things were valued in the home.

Nick's creativity in many spheres contributes to his confidence: a confidence which has been nurtured in his home.

**Confidence**

Nick said about his background and upbringing that there were many opportunities to experiment with creativity, and that he was still "keeping his options open" about in which field he might eventually practice. His level of confidence in himself allows him to take the risks required to be creative. In the following interview Nick speaks very openly about his skills in several fields. Afterwards, Rhianna said that Nick was always saying he was creative. Not only was Nick confident as a creator, he was also confident to say that he "was creative". His brash self-naming did not sit well with Rhianna's socialisation to modesty.

*Interview excerpt 6-8-1994*

**Susan Shannon:** Can you talk about creation in another sphere than architecture, and critique of that work, is it the same?

**Nick:** Ummm... For me it is basically... it is the same... because I do some painting on the side and sculpture as well...so it's basically the same process. You're always analysing what you've done or going through the process of trying to produce something but you're always on the look-out and on the open to try and incorporate other things into it as you go along. You always have a goal to reach, for sure, but it's always this analysing, going back and stripping back your original idea and trying to find the essence of what you're doing and I basically apply that throughout my work. Obviously a lot of people do a lot of things differently. But ermmm...

**Susan:** Could I just take you back to something you said last week. You're the only person I've interviewed who's said that you basically think you can make a fist of it regardless of the way things started out... we were talking about how really intense and vital that beginning time is in a design when you need to make a number of decisions which are really going to impact later on and at this stage they are very related to your self-judgement. And you said to you that it didn't matter as much to you. I've been thinking a lot about that during this week and you saying that you can make anything work. Is that the same in the other spheres? Like, the other spheres of creativity?

**Nick:** I'm always finding a challenge no matter what sphere it is. If you find something that's not working and you know that it's workable you always strive to make it work.
Susan: So I suppose the core question is here - if you're creative in a number of spheres...mostly visual but not all, does the confidence to "let things just go" in architectural design and know that you can just develop them at any stage you're presented with, does the confidence to do that derive from the fact that you make other things work? Like you know making a piece of music, or clay, or marble or whatever you sculpt in? How do those concepts relate, or not at all?

Nick: No, they do relate. It just builds your confidence in other areas. Being design, you incorporate so many things in relation to your work - not only if you're not creative, but just working - say if you're designing a restaurant, obviously if you've worked in one you know what basically goes into the operations of a restaurant. So no matter what you do, being creative or not creative, just working and experiencing a lot of things in life, when you design you incorporate all these things in your work so they are sure to improve it no matter what happens really. So the more you've done things outside the drawing board the better off as a designer you're going to be to just make it a part of your work. So sure all these other aspects that I've got on the side just filter in one way or the other and just enriches your work one way.

Susan: Are they "on the side"? What's central to your focus?

Nick: I'm keeping everything open, and whatever takes off, takes off and whatever doesn't, doesn't.

Overwhelmingly Nick articulates that his confidence to "make anything work" comes not only from his home, and his education (he has formal qualification in other design areas), but from his lived experience. His confidence also permits him the opportunities of breadth of address. He is not letting himself be channelled into a narrow vision of what his future might hold.

Rhianna became more aware of her own confidence during the course of the research. When Rhianna had taken home and read one of the narratives, she pondered her responses to her critics informed by my observations and those of her tutor, James North. Suddenly she felt that she had more insight into her own position as a student, and to her class-mate Muriel's difficulties in the critique sessions. She had chosen not to show the narrative to Muriel, thinking that it would be too difficult for Muriel to consider whilst undertaking her final project in the School.

Excerpt from an Interview on 18-8-199. In this interview Rhianna attempts to explain how she builds on critique to boost her confidence by 'giving away' the unknowns she has.
Susan Shannon: ...I suggested to Corey [the tutor for the final project], that for people within your group who are unable to explicate and make transparent the way they’re thinking which I think was a really big issue yesterday [in a preliminary critique], that he encourages you to keep self-reflective journals, especially if they’re prepared to share them with him, or even if they’re not, that it will encourage that process internally with them that I claim you do externally with others.

Rhianna: That we do?

Susan: That you reflect to other people all the time.

Rhianna: But I think that it would be beyond their... not capabilities, but beyond their... expectations of self to even write a self-reflective journal about their work.

Jason: Keeping a journal it’s a real...er...

Rhianna: It's a real exposing thing...

Jason: It's not just that, it's also a very hard thing to ...force yourself to do...in a religious manner... I must keep a journal going.. to discipline yourself...

Susan: But if people in your studio aren't sharing with other members of their group, not discussing process with them, like I think you probably would, with almost every step you would discuss it with your peers...I would think...the person in your group that ... and perhaps even with someone from the other group...

Rhianna: I do, because I look for...what's the word?...When someone says "yes you're doing the right thing?"

Susan: Approval?

Rhianna: Not approval, there's another word... I do it with you (laughs, looks at Jason) all the time...When I am just fishing for...

Susan: Compliments?

Rhianna: Not compliments...but fishing for...

Jason: Bouncing ideas off...

Rhianna: A reinforcement...of my track... whether it's worthwhile or not... there's a word..

Susan: Yes, yes, sure... so what I am worried about is people who are clearly not interacting with their peers in the group, haven't got any means of promoting that self-knowledge... like is that really a key issue in your promotion of self-knowledge if you get that approval or agreement or whatever for your ideas? See like first of all you're making them all completely transparent, you're making your thinking transparent which is quite scary, I agree, but when you're doing that and you're telling other people and you're trusting them with this most innermost thing, this process and then you're getting back agreement or disagreement or why haven't you thought about it this way, or whatever, you've made a confirmation ready to go onto the next bit - is it ... are less able students less able because they're not going through that process?
**Rhianna:** Well, I know when I read that (pointing to the Dana Cuff Case Study) business about my Crit downstairs when I gave away all those negatives about my own scheme I sort of read that and I thought "That's fascinating" ... because I sort of saw that, that giving away your self-doubt, which I do, gives other people the opportunity to come in and build you back up again ... It's this confidence thing ... for me it's a forwards moving thing ... but yes, I think that less able students are terrified of making themselves look less able.

**Susan:** Any sort of self-disclosure about their work which is any other than affirmative...

**Rhianna:** Or check Muriel, in that...

**Susan:** ... or affirming - that was very, very problematic ... that she ... (We're both thinking of the same episode about Muriel in the Dana Cuff Case Study)...

**Rhianna:** You know how Muriel will get up and say "I hate this and I can't talk about it and I'd rather people asked me questions..."

**Susan:** "I've got nothing to say about it and the only thing I've got to say about it is that I wish I hadn't changed from those curved portal frames to these straight ones..."

Muriel's lack of confidence is contrasted with Rhianna's confidence in this passage.

Rhianna requested that she be permitted to view the narrative after it was negotiated with James North, and then commented on my construction of her in the narrative. At the same time she believed that Muriel, her class-mate would not have been able to deal with her own portrayal in the narrative although Rhianna showed the narrative to several other students in the year. She extracted a key piece of the discourse for her self-understanding of her own developing confidence - how she "gives away her self-doubt" to "give other people the opportunity to come in and build you back up again". This was a key issue in that

35. This understanding of Rhianna's is problematic but understandable given Rhianna's construction of herself as someone who is easily embarrassed and who would seek to save others from embarrassment. She expresses a certain type of power in making this comment and undertaking these actions - she wants to protect Muriel, whom she believes would not be able to deal with her portrayal. This may be seen as condescending, and a way of wielding power. However, given Muriel's self-statement about her "lack of confidence" Rhianna's judgement again speaks of her wish to maintain relationships and support her class-mate rather than to reap any competitive advantage - not that I would suggest she would ever have used the negotiated narrative to unsettle Muriel, with whom she had a friendship, and to whom she offered support. Muriel is spoken into powerlessness by Rhianna's judgements in relation to her portrayal in the narrative, not by her own understandings.

As a researcher, I was guided by what Rhianna felt she wanted to do - together with the knowledge that the boundaries of my negotiated involvement in the studio had been set such that I would not disrupt student learning by making insights from the research available to students prior to their marks being posted for the studios I observed. Whilst the negotiated narrative to which I refer here was in this category, the same students from that narrative were now working towards their final projects in the School.
Rhianna recognised for the first time the *process* she engaged in critique to promote her self-confidence. Cuff, in saying about critiques:

> [a]s a ritual, the crit teaches students that their work should be able to stand the test of harsh professional criticism, doled out by those with greater experience. It offers a model of professional behaviour, implying that full-fledged architects hold positions that can be challenged only by other full-fledged architects ...and not by the public, other professionals, or clients. It sets students in relation to their seniors, who publicly judge the strengths and weaknesses of their early works (Cuff, 1991, 126)

reminds students that they are *not* times when promoting the confidence of the student is on the agenda. Rhianna, in her critiques as observed, rejects the conforming position of 'defender of designs' made available to her in critiques within the dominant discourse in favour of demonstrating vulnerability. Ironically, she actually exhibits great confidence in rejecting the dominant discourse to adopt confidence in her self-judgement.

Muriel had spoken in a previous interview about her own lack of confidence as a first year student. She had also, in that interview, talked about how she came to study architecture.

*Interview excerpts from an interview on 1-11-199_

**Muriel:** My Aunt did architecture... and I've got a few family friends who are architects. I just remember about the time of the SATAB forms the rest of my family did science and I didn't want to and I'm really glad I chose it even though it was a very spur of the moment decision.

From this chance enrolment in Architecture, based on a poor knowledge of the field of architecture and of the expectations of the School and of the practice of architecture, she continues about what other influences there were in making the decision to continue on from the Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree to the Bachelor of Architecture.

**Muriel:** Well, a lot of my friends who I went through the first degree with - there were six girls and I'm the only one who has gone on but three of them did Honours and the other two were working and have gone overseas to get wider experience like Rhianna, and one I think is thinking of coming back here and one is thinking of continuing in a related field - Planning or interior Design or something like that. Even though they haven't gone on they're intending to.
In this passage she reveals that she alone proceeded amongst the "girls" who were her friends in the first degree. She considers many times in this interview the effect of the gender imbalance in the Studio. One such former example concerned working in the studio at night and the harassment she received. She blamed herself, putting together in the same statement the fact that "it was really stupid but I wore a a skirt - the second time I haven't worn jeans" - in short the oft heard response rapists make about rape victims - the "she asked for it" argument - and the fact that she was thought, by her male peers, to be only useful as a colour consultant. They force Muriel to confront their expectations of her future - that she is only good for choosing colours - and pick the very night when she was wearing a skirt to bring forth their "You're a woman..." argument, reducing further Muriel's already low confidence by inviting her to adopt the blame for their response to her feminine dress.

In confirmation of the widespread nature of harassment in the studio, which Ahrentzen and Anthony (1993) say is "pervasive" (in reference to a 1990 survey of chairpersons and female faculty in U.S. Architecture Departments which revealed that 25% of chairpersons had received complaints about sexual harassment in their departments, and 44% had received complaints about sexual discrimination) I cite two further notebook examples. Ahrentzen and Anthony (1993) enlarge on the type and frequency of harassment and discrimination experienced. I am concerned with the everyday struggle female students engage to overcome negative stereotyping, sexual objectification and sexual behaviour in the studio, and the detrimental effect the pervasive nature of harassment has on women's confidence.

Excerpt from Notebook August 18, 199 _ concerning harassment.

In this studio I was a studio tutor.
Studio was very volatile with Greg, Peter and Sam erecting explicit sex-movie posters over their desks. This apparently followed Sue ripping down a poster on the pin-board the day before. As Sam explained it to me he was making a statement purposely to offend Rae (another tutor) as Rae had so offended him. She had for four years "shoved feminism down their necks". He had had enough and wanted to fight back. I spent about an hour talking to them about what affirmative action means, what value system [in this regard] the University honours, and engages, and about the inestimable damage he would do himself by pursuing his poster posting. He is very bitter about what he calls the "reign of terror" - by which he means that he feels he can't open his mouth to say anything without Rae determined to criticise. He believes that he is being discriminated against because he is male; and that although he feels he has something to offer and good points to make he is being passed over. I tried to point out, not too successfully, [that by their increasing absenteeism] Peter and Sam were 'removing themselves from the culture of architecture, and the University too' which is very significant risk taking, and one of the consequences then, when they submit inadequate work, is that they view the critique and assessment as discrimination, not critique of poor work.

The Notebook records on the next day

Annie and Sarah very upset and concerned about what happened in their group with Hank, Peter and Sam working on developing the brief for the project. As a result of the group dynamics Annie has moved her desk in the studio - they were rude to her, swearing and offensive - she couldn't handle their comments in or out of the studio. Sarah said that she had spent ages talking to them about their "attitudes" - they had pinned up a film poster of a naked woman "just to be offensive" - but that she couldn't make any headway with them. I also had a long discussion with the "perpetrators" yesterday so I know what they mean.

The second example concerns discrimination and harassment.

Excerpt from Notebook 6-10-1994

On this day I had to arrange an affirmative action site visit to the using some grant money which had been received to raise the profile of women working in architecture. The visit, for women students/staff was to be guided by the senior female public architect who had managed the project.

There were complaints of 'discrimination' from some of the male students who were not invited to participate.

I suggested that I arrange an alternative programme on the day and offered to take suggestions for the programme on a list I posted on my office door. The only suggestion I received was "strip tease".

I consider that this undercurrent of harassment and discrimination in the studio plays a very considerable role in reducing the confidence of female students. Furthermore in this passage
there is an element of harassment of a female teacher by a male student. My colleagues in
the Higher Education Research Development Society of Australasia tell me that this type of
harassment, particularly of avowedly feminist teachers by 'macho' male students, is
becoming more prevalent. For me this incident was unsettling, rather than harassing, but it
brought into sharp focus that underlying the asexual mode of studio life is a sexual mode,
which some students would promote through their personal relationships with their peers
and teachers.

A Notebook example concerning Sarah's dress mode and its unwanted consequences
underlines Muriel's concerns about her dress and how it was perceived, as well as how
close to the surface sexual aspects are in the studio. Sarah was frequently the butt of sexual
jokes in the studio.

Unlike most of her female peers, who preferred the androgynous dress code of
the nineties, Sarah wore tight jumpers, short skirts, sheer black stockings and
stilettos in the studio - reinforcing an emphasized sexual femininity (Connell,
1985). Her naive expectation that this code was as acceptable as those of her
peers conflicted on occasions with the aggressively sexual response of some of
the men in the year.

Holland and Eisenhart (1990, 47-48) also refer to students they observed in their study
unwantingly and unwittingly exacerbating sexual conflict which otherwise tends to be latent
in Universities where there are clearly defined approaches to sexual harassment. The clothes
Sarah chose should have been irrelevant to her social treatment but this was not the case -
they elicited frequent sexual comments which were unwelcome harassment to Sarah.
However, through the years of her studies she did not modify her dress.

On one memorable occasion Sarah revealed tearfully to me, as her studio tutor,
that she had been out with Peter, a student in her year, and that "nothing had
happened" but that Peter was now talking his non-existent exploits around the
studio. Sarah's confidence, and the very tenability of her studies were threatened
by Peter's and Hank's offensiveness in and out of the studio.

Is Sarah a victim of her socialisation to emphasized femininity? Why did she agree to go
out with Peter? Was the importance of "having a date" and feeling desirable the
overwhelming concern for her although she already knew how offensive Peter could be from the poster he erected in the studio? Sarah was a country girl who had completed her education at a country high school. She did not know any architects before she came to the city to study. From this somewhat trusting background she is struggling daily in the studio to reconcile the limitations her socialisation has instilled in her with the confidence exhibited by many of her class. She said that she never offers critique to her peers -and this inability severely restricts her opportunities to develop critical architectural skills.

Students, like Muriel and Sarah, with an already low confidence as a product of many social and situational forces, and with a certain knowledge of the antipathy of some male students towards their legitimate presence in the studio, and their striving for competitive success, find the process of public critique very difficult. Faludi (1992) (discussed in Chapter 4, p. 212) has alluded to some of the generic reasons why this might be so. The following interview, in which Muriel spoke of her decision to study architecture, had as its focus a questionnaire about rating a number of critique contexts in terms of whether they contributed to increasing or decreasing students' confidence. The speakers Muriel and Rhianna confirm from their own subject positions this generalisation.

*Interview excerpt from 1-11-199_ with a group of female students at the end of their first year of BArch studies.*

| Susan Shannon: Muriel, do you think that you could go through and comment like Trina did [on different critique contexts] - the studio tutor and you [alone]?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muriel: Yes, that increases my confidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan: What about when there's a critique situation and you've got the class and the staff assessor focusing on your work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muriel: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rhianna: No, in front of the whole class you just crawl. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan: I don't want to put words into your mouth, but is this related to something you said about it being a &quot;man's world out there&quot; in here? Is that a situation where you feel this happening?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Muriel: They're supposedly authoritative, though; like we have our opinions and there's authority there. I get the feeling sometimes that they just don't understand it.

Susan: What about when you've got small groups and the staff assessor focusing on your work?

Muriel: Probably no change.

Susan: What about with your peers only, Muriel?

Muriel: Probably confident, increasing confidence.

At the end of the interview, Muriel reflects on her level of competence with the core activities of the Bachelor of Architecture course.

Susan: For the last five minutes, let's look at the professional communication skills with which we're equipping you: oral/ written/ graphic/ model making/ CAD.

Muriel: I'm not very confident of my oral and written but I seem to contradict myself by saying that I'll go first!

Susan: But that's ironic. [Perhaps] it means that in some spheres you're not, but today you are!

Muriel: I don't mind five or six people [women].

She admitted in the early part of the interview that her level of confidence was higher when she started the Bachelor of Architectural Studies course than when she started the professional course, but she highlights that, through the process of losing her peer group, and the relentless and covert gender discrimination ("there's authority there"), she now feels, after a considerable amount of teaching had taken place, less confident in many areas.

Her presentations in critique situations reflect this unease with exposing her lack of knowledge in many areas for public scrutiny, or male scrutiny, as it is in her final year with a considerable majority of male students. Muriel reflected in her Professional Development Journal, kept during the five week project in her final year that:

My lack of confidence extends from designing to public speaking, both are dependent on each other, confidence in one will lead to confidence in the other. I need to develop my confidence, speaking in front of a group of five or six people is fine, but standing in front of twenty-five is a completely different matter. It is

36. Less than a quarter of the students were women.
something that I must overcome.

It is easy for me to be negative about my own work when I am unprepared, or even prepared. What I need to develop is my confidence, but this will not happen overnight.

This journal entry, made eighteen months after the interview in which Muriel reflected on her lack of confidence speaking about her work to a larger group, confirms that she still struggles with presenting her work to the class, and staff assessors, and the public aspects of critique. Muriel says herself that she needs time to feel confident with a number of the expectations the School makes of her. She also recognises that in group work there is the opportunity to learn from others, to debate and clarify, and to realise that "the loudest, strongest member may not always have the best ideas". Here she may be speaking of her own subject position. She must feel that her contribution - quiet, weak, and conditional - is often overlooked.

Another area that I have developed in over the past five weeks is in group projects. Working in groups can be very stressful, but also very educational. I am not absolutely sure that one group of five architects is a true indication of the real world. Usually these groups would include people from a variety of professions, not all the same. It was a good exercise in understanding how important it is that a group function to its fullest capacity and how a hierarchy can form in a group. The problem is that the loudest, strongest member may not always have the best ideas. Hearing others' opinions, and debating points, having to justify your ideas was all very helpful.

(Student Professional Development Portfolio 5-4-199 )

Conclusion

There may be a conflict inherent in conforming and accepting the dominant discourse about what it is that an architecture student "is" and "does" and the culture of competition which pervades every aspect of in-School education and the gendered socialisation to passivity many women bring with them to their tertiary studies. Conforming and complicity with "accepting things the way they are" - that there is a culture of competition in the School disregarded by only a very few rebels - may disadvantage some students, particularly women, whose gendered socialisation prompts them to promote harmony through co-operation and maintaining relationships instead of competing.
How critique fits into this central period of architecture students' in-School education is described by Cuff (1991) in detail in this way:

From the students' perspective, the crit is probably the most gruelling and potentially humiliating experience of their education, akin to hazing. A student publicly presents his or her project by describing the drawings and models on view, then remains before the group to accept criticism. The best critics find avenues for constructive instruction that focuses on the crux of the problem and the students' present solution, but this is a difficult art. Criticism is sometimes levelled without much apparent regard for the student's growth, as educators and renowned practitioners parade their own talents verbally. In other circumstances students are frustrated by critics who, rather than address the work displayed, discuss (in seminar fashion) the broader issues and theories that the projects raise. Critics, for their part argue that such discussion is an important part of the students' education, and that the quality of the work on the walls determines the specificity of the criticism.

Juries, depending on the jurors, provide contexts for listening to heroes and assimilating values as well as for learning to design. Nevertheless, many students complain that they "never got a good crit" during their education, generally meaning a crit that was positive, specific, and perhaps showed a way to improve the scheme. As the terminology indicates, crits are not two-way discussions: for the most part, students are passive recipients of the juror's opinions. As a ritual, the crit teaches students that their work should be able to stand the test of harsh professional criticism, doled out by those with greater experience. It offers a model of professional behaviour, implying that full-fledged architects hold positions that can be challenged only by other full-fledged architects (other jurors) and not by the public, other professionals, or clients. It sets students in relation to their seniors, who publicly judge the strengths and weaknesses of their early works. (Cuff, 1991, 126)

Critique, in its traditional form as described, with the master "teacher as teller" actively encourages a competitive learning environment over a co-operative one. Only when Rhianna starts to define what competition can be for women do we get a sense of the difference for which she strives. She believes that competition is not being beaten by the design, rather than not being beaten by the person at the next drawing board. In order to make this statement she draws heavily on her knowledge of her developing self-judgement. She relies on it to weigh up her decision making against the brief, and to develop her design further. She cries out for the expert critique she needs in this context by making herself vulnerable in critique situations - by making her short-comings transparent, and by giving away her unknowns so that the critic can come in and build her back up again.
This hitherto undocumented process is at the centre of a reconsideration of the competitive nature of critique and what may define "conforming" behaviour. If the discourse about conforming is widened to embrace critique in which it became the norm to declare one's uncertainties and unknowns, students like Muriel would benefit in that way. Public critique, engaging her peers, tutors and critics, can become a part of her co-operative process of considering the compromises which may be necessary in any design or built form process honestly and openly. However, as Rhianna said: "less able students are terrified of making themselves look less able". Therefore, an integral part of bringing forth uncertainty is clearly related to promoting confidence, even the confidence to seem uncertain. Muriel, in a group of her female peers, surprises even herself by saying that she will volunteer to "go first" to talk about her confidence. She reflected that: "I don't mind five or six people" but that the fear of public humiliation, of speaking in front of a large group is "paralysing".

Her class mate Dao reflected about public critiques:

Dao: When I get up there and stand in front of them I just forget everything I was going to say.

In these "paralysing" situations Muriel refrains from proffering any critique of her own work, as in the Dana Cuff Studio, even when given the opportunity. In this regard she accepts and conforms to the dominant discourse that women find public speaking very difficult (Faludi, 1992). How then to promote confidence in the critique situations architecture students encounter?

Trina, a student from a European cultural background, who is very quietly spoken in public critique situations, and in the studio, and engages in absolutely no self-promotion which is a notable feature of the presentation of many schemes, gives a hint of what may promote her confidence in response to this question:

Interview Excerpt 1-11-199
Susan Shannon: Trina, what about with peers only and no staff assessor, how does that rate with you?

Trina: Well, just a few weeks ago we did that and I felt really quite confident because I am at ease with my class members so you don't feel so much you're being tested - you just explain.

It is notable that Trina disregards the internal competition within the year for grades when making this statement - in particular in saying "I am at ease with my class members" she disrupts the discourse of conforming to a competitive model of achievement which would lead some students to conceal aspects of their design from their peers until the important public critique session which contributes to assessment grades. "You just explain" disrupts the discourse about conforming by concealing short-comings and difficulties, and opens up possibilities for the critics to come in with helpful suggestions.

As a commencing student Rhianna was passionate about the necessity to conceal such shortcomings from the assessor:

*Interview excerpt 1-11-199*

Rhianna: I think, I get to the end [of a project] and I think "Oh my God, I've just got to present something" and I lose that self-criticism which I know is so important. But I do think that afterwards I am more aware of my work again.

By the end of the course she had learnt to make her short-comings transparent.

Competing, conforming and confidence are all enmeshed in the dominant discourse of architectural education through the critique in a complex and ever-changing way.

Redefining 'success' may contribute to challenging the understanding of competition held by many students - that the rewards for success are few and their fellow students are plentiful,37 - the "best" grades for the "best" schemes is the goal of their education. A

37. Gutman (1988, 24-29) explains competitiveness in the architectural profession as an outcome of the over supply of firms and architects. Gutman suggests that there are over enrolments in architecture schools in comparison with the positions available for graduates, and that enrolment places should be linked to future industry demand. I contend that this over supply of graduates has been partly responsible for fierce competition within Schools as students vie for the best grades to secure one of the available jobs on graduation, and is then carried over into the profession where there is equally fierce competition for job
broadening of the goal to include different models for achievement and success - other then the dominant, competitive "malestream" model - would encourage Trina and Muriel to look again at their own strengths instead of trying to fit into the socially dominant model of architectural practice as modelled within the School in critiques - that only bold, confident architects conform sufficiently to compete for the grades, and, in practice, for the jobs.

going, accompanied by fee cutting to remain competitive. Gutman believes that as well as positive aspects to this professional competition, it also may ultimately undermine the professional standards of the field.
PART 3

Completing Architecture Studies

In this chapter I have already discussed the themes silence, isolation, inclusion/exclusion and marginalisation in relation to beginning architecture studies before considering the themes conforming, competing and confidence in relation to continuing architecture studies. In this final section of the chapter the themes of accepting/rejecting models for success and the notion of hierarchy are considered in relation to students completing architecture studies.

Accepting/Rejecting Models for Success.

Through critique, models for professionalism are made available to students. Both the mechanism for critique, which seems to reward confident, articulate students, and the content of critique, which is not being considered in this thesis, but to which Garry alluded in his statement about his perceived shortcomings, reinforce a hegemonic view of the profession - as comprising confident, articulate, theory-knowledgeable designers. The expectations of self of a range of other architecture students who do not exhibit these personal attributes, and who envisage themselves in other than mainstream design practice, are possibly overlooked in the dominant, traditional critique paradigm which asks students to describe their design, and receive critique, frequently publicly.

When architecture students were enrolled from middle class homes, the sons of professionals, brought up with the expectation of attending University, attaining a "good" degree, and then joining the ranks of the professionals with whom they had been in contact all their lives, the University did not need to consider at any length the needs of students enrolling from other backgrounds - students for whom the tacit knowledge of what it is that a professional "is" and "does" is not inculcated from birth.
Interviewing a group of male BArch students aged 20-23 years confirmed this view in the answers to the questions: *How did you first come into contact with the culture of architecture?* and *To what extent did you consider other options on completion of your B Arch St degree?* The answers to the first question ranged over: "My Dad had a pretty big influence" and "A friend of mine, his Dad was an architect and I did work experience in Year 11 there". To the second question: "I did. Before I wanted to do architecture I was very interested in biology" and "I considered other options - not necessarily coming back and being an Architect - I've always been interested in [other] design" showed up a possibly surprising consideration of other professional careers and real tenacity in those interviewees who did not get a place at their first attempt. "I wanted to go straight into the second degree but I didn't get accepted and I had a sideline job so I worked my way overseas for a year and worked with relatives of mine who were architects and interior designers" and "I didn't finish it. I had to do a bit of work in January - the three topics - effectively a Supp.[Supplementary examination]".

Gutman (1988) considers why so many young people want to study architecture. He says that it cannot be because they are attracted to the pay levels in the profession. Unlike other professions where there is a clustering of positive attributes so that a profession which ranks high in prestige also pays well, there is not a high pay level in architecture, but students may be unaware how poorly paid architects are in comparison with other professionals. He believes that the field may be appealing because there are few other professional fields where one can qualify after five years, and that architecture is regarded as a profession with good opportunities for self expression and individual creativity. I would concur with him on this last suggestion. When interviewing the Qualifying students coming into the architecture graduate programme after successfully completing another degree, (frequently a professional degree including medicine and law, and working for several years), I asked the students why they were studying architecture. A common response was that they had not done one creative thing since their school days. Lamb (1994) conjectures further about the

---

38. To register as an architect in Australia the minimum in-School educational component is five years which along with two years of professional experience and fulfilment of other criteria enables eligibility for the professional examinations of the various state-based Architects Boards.
psychological type of first year architecture students to suggest that they have certain attributes. I will return to Lamb's hypothesis later.

Not all students are enrolled from homes where there is an easy familiarity with the notion of professional fields of practice, or with an understanding of what an architect "is" or "does". Mick is such a student. This section of the research understandings deals specifically with the question of "difference" in the design studio, and whether the personal and educational histories of students have been sufficiently engaged in proposing various models for what it is that an architect "is", and "does", or as post-structuralists say, making various subject positions available to them. The struggles of women as an "other than" to male group often throw into relief the struggles of other "other than" groups - the struggles of students who are other than school leavers with their "fresh" knowledge and peer support for learning, other than middle class, other than white, other than replete with the cultural competence, other than children of professionals, other than... the list is endless.

Ward writes about the notion of hegemony, and the radical pedagogies that may disrupt the view of the dominant class in society.

Gramsci's theory [of hegemony] revolves around the social production and dissemination of knowledge and culture, arguing that the dominant class in society creates a social reality that is taken to be the only reality, so that subordinate culture acquiesces to its own control (domination by consent). Gramsci suggests that domination is never complete, that there always exists the possibility of reflective, critical human consciousness: "the starting point of critical elaboration is the consciousness of what one really is and in knowing thyself as a product of historical process to date which has deposited in you an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory" Recent analysts argue that Gramsci's notion of hegemony may be interpreted as a dialectic of contested meanings, so that the corpus of legitimized knowledge of the dominant class contains within itself the seeds of resistance of the subordinate culture...

...Extending Freire's notion of dialogue, coupled with the concept of resistance, Giroux has more recently suggested that ideology operates not just at a general, social level, but also at a personal, psychological level, and that the personal histories of the students (as well as their social histories) must be given voice, suggesting that radical pedagogies must change "subjectivity as it is constituted in the individual's needs, drives, passions and intelligence, as well as changing the political, economic and social foundation of the wider society.

(Ward, 1991, 91-92)
Excerpt from an Interview with a group of male students at the end of their first year of the professional degree. The excerpt focuses on the responses of Mick, who had spent sixteen years in the work force, before commencing architectural studies.

**Susan Shannon:** How did you come into contact with the culture of architecture? Do you have any role models?

**Mick:** Well, I don't really see it as a culture. No, I see it as a means to an end in my own personal case and I don't have any role models. I don't follow anyone.

**Susan:** There are no aboriginal [architect] role models anyway are there?

**Mick:** No.

**Susan:** There are no aboriginal architects? Is that true?

**Mick:** We suspect that there might be one in Melbourne but he's a coconut.

**Susan:** What does that mean?

**Mick:** Brown on the outside, white on the inside.

Later

**Susan:** To what extent, Mick, did you consider other options on completion of your Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree?

**Mick:** Well, I approached it from a different angle actually. I looked at the problem I really wanted to attack which is aboriginal housing and I assessed which is the most effective way to go about it and it's very much a political question so I said I had to be in a position where I could influence Government policy and in my particular area of interest the architectural qualification would be the most relevant. But I have to be a graduate or else no-one will really listen to you.

**Susan:** So it's a means to an end.

**Mick:** Yes. I don't really intend to be working on the drawing board much after say 2 or 3 years after graduation. I'll be up in the management area.
Susan: Now, Mick, the next three items are the items from our Mission Statement. We say that when you are a graduate from the Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree we will deliver these three items:

- be able to form and express deep criticism of architectural objects from a broad perspective;
- be able to generate and present relevant proposals for intervention in situations in the built environment; and
- be able to combine criticism and proposal generation into a working process of design.

So what we’re asking in this next question is: Did you feel confident with those three things? Have you had time to think about those three things and have you got any comments to make about them?

Mick: I’ve only thought about it for a short time. It’s my criticism of the course. I was disappointed in the B.Arch. St. that it failed to answer the questions that I had. I dealt with it at arm’s length - I never really got fully involved with my whole heart and soul into the course: once again if you think where I’m coming from and I want to work in that very specific area and I felt it quite painful to have to spend time on, say, Mazuko’s anti-dwelling box up in Japan...

Susan: You didn’t see this as just a method of learning about strategies?

Mick: In my presentation on him - my "show and tell" on it - I called him a wanker - a bloody idiot - and that’s my honest opinion. I just saw it as something that’s totally ridiculous - it just failed to answer the things that I wanted to learn.

Susan: So what about: Being able to form and express deep criticism of architectural objects?

Mick: Well, when you’re talking about architectural objects they have to be culturally relevant to what your expectations are.

Susan: So you couldn’t take a step back and think about this as a University education - about how at University we aim to teach you how to think - how at University we have a whole lot of concepts that are relevant to just a post-secondary education that are not about a professional education about architecture in Australia? You felt the hum-bug of the whole thing?

Mick: I felt like I was running around like a chook with its head cut off - just totally involved in those items and you don’t really have time to reflect on alternatives. I went through the course.

Susan: So what about when it came to: Being able to generate and present relevant proposals for intervention in situations in the built environment. How much did you address that? What I’m trying to get at here is how confident you felt with that first degree?

Mick: Not at all.

Susan: And then how confident you felt with: Being able to combine criticism and proposal generation into a working process of design?

39. The students were being interviewed about their responses to a questionnaire on the skills they had acquired in the Bachelor of Architectural Studies Degree.
Mick: Once again I don’t think the course taught us that at all and I graduated from the course thinking "What in the Hell have we bloody learnt?" And I ran around like a headless chook for three years and I didn’t really do anything useful.

This excerpt shows how the discourse of architecture, precious to many academics and students as their currency, is a cultural artefact of the existing white, Eurocentric architectural culture. Mick actively rejects the models for success which he has observed - which have been made available to him through his studies. He is unable to replace traditional models for success as an architect with a model from his own culture, or a model which has any meaning for him. He has taken the role of "rejector" for himself. The outcomes of this rejection were significant: Mick chose not to continue his architectural studies after the first year of the professional course.40

His close friend during his studies, Garry, who hailed from a working class background, also did not continue his studies. Although proficient in some areas, Mick and Garry exemplified students who did not come into the course "possessed of the necessary cultural competence" (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977 in Churchman, 1992). Garry, like Mick, was a mature age student, with many years in a technical capacity in the work-force. As revealed in earlier interviews, he also feels that his ability to express himself orally in critique situations is severely limited by decisions he made himself about subject choices, although he says in this interview that his oral abilities are "fine". The contradiction in his story line is that he fails to consider that the competencies he needs are the oral competency with a critical architectural vocabulary.

Garry talked about the attitudinal changes he needed to make to study architecture.

Excerpts from an Interview on 25-10-199-

Susan Shannon: Can you perhaps talk in those areas [graphic skills, written communication skills and oral skills] about how confident you felt [at the end of the first degree]?

40. He was subsequently highly successful in pursuing/achieving his aims in another field after transferring to another post-graduate course.
**Garry:** Oral - fine; written - fine, because it was a very academic course... but as for the ability to present things graphically... I had no ability to start with. I never did art at school... because I worked as a technician for [ ] for basically the next ten years or so I had no artistic background.

I have probably visited an Art Gallery three times in my life, and they've been since I started this course. I never did Art History and Theories because I did Architecture History and Theories - I thought I'd better start somewhere as I had no artistic background.

I didn't even know what complementary colours were until we had a lecture at the beginning of first year. We had some really basic [graphic] stuff in first year - we had about six weeks from Ivan in first year and then it stopped and that was it!

There were also very real physical constraints for Garry - matters which raise access and equity questions in relation to Garry's failure to continue his studies. Perhaps it was all too hard.

**Susan Shannon:** I'd like to hear about how you feel about the lack of a studio environment in the first degree?

**Garry:** Storage space was very important in the first degree - you needed to be able to keep things you were working on here, but you couldn't. There was nowhere you could put things. There was plenty of room out there and plenty of free drawers and yet we didn't have our own space. This year is the first year we've had our own space to store material and riding a push bike in and out every day meant I had to carry my work in and out every day; my books in and out every day; things got tatty and torn and nothing ever looked really good because it was always rolled up and tied up on my back.

Later

**Garry:** I think it's been a case of we've [he was married] had to adjust our life-style at home to accommodate the course. I had to shift house. We only had a three roomed house before - a tiny little place. Even in third year it was starting to get to the stage where I couldn't study at home so I shifted.

Mick and Garry talked on about the expectations of them in terms of their graphic skills in their first year in the Bachelor of Architecture, raising issues of access and equity for students, many years in the work force, who did not have the same schooling as their classmates.

**Mick:** I thought that the tutor:student ratio was very inadequate if you wanted to bring somebody up from a very basic level like Garry and myself.
Garry: I think they presumed the basic level was a lot higher than it was - in our case at least when we’re mature aged students - it’s been a long time since we’ve been in any teaching institution let alone something to do with art and neither of us has an artistic background. We were behind the eight ball all the time - you’ve only got to look at our presentation now.

Mick: The sad part about the whole thing is that if you weren’t at the level of, say, Matriculation Art, there was no facility to bring you up to that level.

However, it is when Mick and Garry talk about how they proffer peer critique that the chasm between them and students like Rhianna, Jason and Reginald is reinforced, and their lack of critical architectural vocabulary with which to proffer peer critique is exposed.

Susan: What about then [critique] amongst you peers with no staff assessor - does that increase or decrease your confidence?

Garry: Probably a zero [no change] I’m not sure either way. Informally it probably increases confidence but formally, when you actually sit there in a formal sense and you both have to criticise each other’s work it was difficult.

Susan: Do you feel you hold back in the studio when you look at Mick’s work everyday - don’t you really address it?

Garry: Oh no! I’ve told him when he’s done shit and he said the same to me but when you actually have a piece of paper that you’ve got to mark and you’ve got to give an exact score - it hurts more when you see it on the piece of paper than when you say "that’s shit".

Susan: Mick, what about you? Do you feel it is confidence increasing or confidence decreasing with your peers only whether it’s in a studio situation or in a formal situation?

Mick: Probably much the same idea as the last one. Once I get an idea in my head I just stick with it and I just ignore other people’s opinions.

It was Garry who made the poignant statement in the same interview about receiving critique, and how it hurt more if your peers are around to hear it. This self-disclosure about the difficult "public" aspect of receiving critique sets Garry apart from some of his peers. Although he revealed that he coped less well with the public aspects of critique, he expressed clearly the benefits for him from one-on-one at the drawing board critiques.

Susan Shannon: What about when you’re just there by yourself? How confident do you feel about your ability to develop and test ideas in a self-reflective mode?
Garry: Can I just add something to this one? I've been thinking that this self-reflective mode and actually being criticised. I'm better at the self-reflection now than I was at the beginning of the year because all the criticism that you take makes you hardened to the fact that not every idea you have is perfect so it's easier to be reflective about it.

I never have a shortage of ideas that pop in my head but I used to think that everything I thought of was terrific and when you get criticised a few times you think...well...maybe it's not a great idea and you find there's some flaws in it. If I come up with an idea I thought it's terrific - first project especially - Wayne squashed my first four projects [schemes]. I got so frustrated. I used to swear at him and curse and at the end it was great. He taught me a lot but I only got reflective after that through being squashed a few times.

You can't be reflective if you're pig headed - that's what I'm saying. At first I was very pig headed and I couldn't see what was wrong with it but at the end of the design process I could be self reflective and I could see what was wrong with it. In the year at first I couldn't be but now I feel very able to be self reflective.

Susan: And that is related to, going back, to those drawing board one-on-one tutorials and you said that they were strongly increasing in confidence?

Garry: That's right, although at the time they were negative and although I cursed and swore at him I ended up doing quite well at that project and I thought...Hell! I wouldn't have if I'd handed in my first ideas and I could see what was wrong with my first idea by the end of the process.

Garry's comments are very interesting. For him, simply increasing his confidence was not what he needed from critique - he said that he needed to learn that his first idea "wasn't terrific" - and that it was through a process of self-reflection aided by Wayne's "squashing" that he came to realise what was wrong with his first ideas. By then he was differentiating "self" from "ideas" through a process of self-reflection. In the following interview younger students in a lower year talk about the difficult aspect of separating criticism of 'self' from criticism of one's 'work'. Garry claimed that he could do this, and his previous comments showed this process as it develops.

Garry: "Being able to form and express deep criticism of architectural objects from a broad perspective"? That was fine because you can become detached from what your own point of view is because criticism is just criticism.

The views of his younger peers were mixed about the public aspects of critique, and about the theoretical notion that "self" and "work" could ever be separated for the purposes of critique.

*Excerpt from an interview on 24-10-199_


Marty: As soon as you put yourself on show like that and say something you open yourself up to all the objections - it's moments of exposition of yourself; it's not as though when you write an essay for instance... you're concealed; you've got that word processor between you and Rae and you haven't got that immediate asking a lot of questions and you're sunk.

Susan Shannon: So then we go onto another thing in the Bachelor of Architecture degree where we really try to teach people to take advantage of every situation constructively - to be able to derive benefit and build on all those dialogues in a constructive way and to be able to separate "person" from the piece of "work".

Marty: Well, up to a point I think it is very difficult to separate them. The idea that you can separate your work from yourself implies that there's no personal involvement in it, and of course there is because you bring meaning to the things you read and your interpretation to it is a very personal thing.

Alan: As soon as it's removed from you it's a separate...that's the thing... it has your personal input into it...but then it doesn't.

Lea: It's your interpretation...then you do feel you've been criticised because you've interpreted it the wrong way.

Marty: I think the problem is we don't accept being criticised negatively.

Susan: That's a very good point: criticism to be really useful has to be something that you can build on.

Marty, who subsequently left the course part way through his studies, slips into the frequently observed pattern of describing his critique of his scheme as "as soon as you put yourself on show like that and say something you open yourself up to all the objections - it's moments of exposition of yourself" as a critique of himself. He believes they cannot be separated.

Young students are understandably ambivalent about whether it is even possible to separate criticism of "self" and "work" although they seem to understand that this is the discourse of success within the profession; that the "work" will be critiqued out of context of the architect who designed the project being critiqued, as happens in their School. In their ambivalence they neither accept nor reject the discourse of the professional architect - they are still learning about what it is that an architect "is " and "does".

Garry, with his ten years in the work force as a technician in a field where he would have frequently been amongst architects working, feels more sure that "criticism is just criticism"
and that "you can become detached from what your own point of view is because criticism is just criticism". Although this was not the position he adopted at the beginning of his studies, he now sees that his initial confidence was actually a barrier to further development. Through this self-reflection he makes different subject positions available to himself than Marty makes available to himself. Garry seems to reject the view that he is on show himself with his work. He suggests that he can critique work without criticising the designer. When critiquing Mick's work, "I've told him when he's done shit", he disregards his own advice to some extent. For Mick to be told "That's shit" Garry feels hurts less than when he was asked, in a formal peer critique, to "have a piece of paper that you've got to mark."

In this discourse about what "hurts", Garry suggests that the informal bar-room banter carried over into the studio is less hurtful to his mate Mick than Garry's formal peer appraisal. Without the vocabulary, or the demeanour of the middle classes, it is doubtful whether they can define meaningful existing professional models to take for themselves for success in the existing architectural profession.

Returning to Garry's view of completing the architecture course, and which models for success he will adopt, he speaks in an interview about how he sees himself in practice.

*Excerpt from an Interview on 25-10-199*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Susan Shannon:</strong> What about graphic skills?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garry:</strong> I'll start off with my CAD [Computer Aided Drafting] knowledge - that was my highest one [score]... but I wasn't really equipped in <em>this</em> course. It was the <em>last</em> course Bachelor of Architectural Studies. I did CAD all the way through and majored in it and so I did half a year in third year that was just all CAD. Since then I've done work experience with the [ ] programming their CAD and all sorts of things. That's why I'm doing CAD for my final project - I've tried to learn drawing until now but because I feel so inadequate with my drawing skills...I thought this is 25% of our marks... I'm going to use my CAD. I'll present my final design in CAD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Susan:** Going back to what you said about other people who have majored in different things...History and Theories of Architecture... you didn't comment at that time that you'd majored in CAD but in this context you are saying that it is valuable to you. |
Garry: Very valuable. It will get me a job out there. That’s why I took it. It was tough going and while I was doing it I hated every minute of it but I’m glad I did it because it’s got more employment. I actually did my second year of CAD in first year and this year CAD in second year because I had some subjects from 10 years before so that meant in my holidays I worked for [ ] copying plans onto CAD and then last year I worked for the [ ] and I was writing software for them.

Despite six further years of tertiary education, four of which he had undertaken prior to this interview, Garry may find himself in a little changed situation as a technician, skilled in CAD instead of skilled in his previous technical capacity. He accepts this as an inevitable, even a welcome prospect, praising his foresight in selecting a field of specialisation which leads to "more employment."

His acceptance of the role available to him can be set against that of rejection of models for success which Rhianna and Jason have chosen for themselves. They understand that, whilst they reject the current models for success of the profession as being restrictive to their self-stated mode of working creatively, and "contributing something worthwhile", they may need to be employed in this field at least as commencing professionals. They were unable to commit themselves to any other proposition as the "economic climate is really so bad."

Wendy, their class-mate, is a completing architecture student wondering about her future as an architect. In the following note-book example, she is caught up in a dilemma about whether to accept or reject the models for success which are being made available to her as an outcome of her final in-School assessment. If she accepts the subject position of "trouble-maker" - that is questioning hierarchy and due process - she believes success in conventional terms - getting a job - may elude her.

The situation in this particular narrative was that through a long process of reflection over several years, the students had requested that their final critique session, which traditionally had been a "closed jury" session with the students presenting their final project before a panel of experts comprising senior academic staff members of the School and practising experts with whom they had discussed the project over several months, be opened for the

41. Eighteen months after graduation Jason is carrying out defects liabilities inspections; Rhianna is working in a creative team as team leader.
attendance of their peers and other interested people. However, as it was the first year that this change had been proposed in the School, it was decided by the students and the staff directly involved, that the students presenting their work could have the option of so doing either in the "open" jury format or in a "closed" session at which the only attendants would be the presenting student and the jury members.

As I had been following this cohort of students for three years I had requested very early in the year, before this change was mooted, the opportunity to be present for critique and jury sessions given the consent of staff and each individual student to my presence. Approval was given by the lecturer in charge, the tutor and the majority of the students and I respected absolutely the wishes of those who elected to have, what was in effect, their final assessment, conducted privately.

**Wendy's Story**

Wendy elected to make her presentation to a "closed jury" but she would tolerate my presence as a researcher. Yes, she said, she understood that it was for my PhD research. She had been very, very nervous on previous occasions when making presentations to peers, staff and consultants - to the point of making herself physically ill with anxiety, so her classmates were not surprised when she nominated for a closed jury. She was one of four students in a total of ten undertaking the same study topic who elected closed juries and she was in the company of one other woman and two men amongst those four.

There was no difference obvious initially in the two groups - those choosing "open" and "closed" juries - but there was a great deal of difference I felt in the demeanour of some of the students during their presentation and subsequent question-time. In particular I felt that the presentations in the "closed" sessions were more "professional" - Wendy specifically used the language of the market-place referring to 'net lettable floor areas', 'profit margins' and 'marketability' and other economic factors driving her design thinking instead of focussing on form-making and image as did many of her classmates. Her presentation would have been very commercially oriented for them and displayed an underlying personal ideology which valued capitalism and the lure of the market-place, which once again would have been foreign, and perhaps at odds, with her classmates' expressed position no matter that as graduates they would possibly soon be called on to adopt exactly these same values in order to get a job as an architect. Wendy does not "fit" with the slightly bohemian design oriented culture of the majority of the architecture students who are her peers - she is positioning herself as a commencing professional and her ideas may not have a fit with theirs. Wendy was in fact the first student to have a "closed jury" in the jury sessions and she said, when her peers got up and went out of the room from the previous student's "open" jury: "We're better off without them ". So apart from me there was no-one else there except her examiners. All the examiners were men.

Wendy made a very professional presentation of a design scheme. She was measured and self-assured in her descriptions - an assurance which was derived,
in part, by her four months of solid effort on the project and her formative assessments which had been very positive and affirming of her design direction and her design decision making. The quality of Wendy’s presentation which most stood out was her professionalism and her expectation of the jurors’ reciprocated professionalism - "I am [almost] a professional and so are you" was said in her script, her dress and her demeanour.

The preliminary marks were posted a few days later. Wendy received a Pass. This assessment from the School reflects an accord that the scheme is somewhat competent but expresses considerable assessor concern about many parts of the project.

Wendy sought me out as the only person, other than the examiners, present at her presentation and critique. She said that she had simply no idea that she would receive a Pass only; her impression had been that she would receive a Distinction. This was her impression, she said, not only from her jury presentation and the way she felt her design scheme had been received, but also related back to the affirmation she had received of her scheme during the design development process - it was very positive affirmation, she felt.

All the time she was crying and talking to me she was conditional: "I really don’t care about the mark but I thought it was my best work - I had gone into things in a lot of detail that other people didn’t even consider"; "I don’t want to put Andrew (a Distinction student) down - he’s a nice guy and a good friend - but didn’t the jury realise that his model and his drawings were of two different schemes and he had built over the easement? If I don’t get at least a Credit I won’t get Honours".

When Wendy rang me later that afternoon after ringing the Chairman of the jury she said that when she explained the nature of her problem - in short that she had received no indication that she was doing anything other than very well during the Semester - she was invited to make an appointment to see the Chairman of the jury, in his Office later that week.

"Why wasn’t I getting a fair deal?" was all she wanted to know.

"My mark doesn’t reflect the level of work I undertook", she reported she said.

"Don’t take it personally; don’t take it as a blow to your confidence. The best architects don’t always get the best marks", she reported he said.

It wasn’t until she got home that the Chairman’s comments "Remember, the best architects don’t always get the best marks" sounded hollow. At the interview in his Office, that had sounded O.K.. At home it didn’t. She wanted to know: "Why the hell don’t they?"

"What are the possible repercussions of writing a letter to the Chairman, and stating my case"? she wanted to know.

"This is your right", I said. "You can ask for a reconsideration. You have nothing to lose and everything to gain."

[Was I sure about this? No.]42

42. Magda Lewis (1992) says that compliance with particular displays of femininity can mean the difference between having and not having a job (Lewis, 1992, 183) and that aspirations for future employment govern students willingness to challenge the existing status quo especially in professional courses (p. 175) so understandably I was worried about the consequences of Wendy’s challenge as I could see that submission to male expert judgement was possibly the particular display of femininity which would have been
"Do you have a job?" I asked her.

"No", she replied.

"Well, I don't think your marks will go down, put it that way", I replied.

"That's what I wanted to hear", she responded.

"Read me the letter", I asked.

Formal request for consideration for re-examination... the grounds are

1. the consultative process was entered into;

2. there was a failure on the part of the examiners to recognise my parameters for assessment;

3. a number of the jurors' comments are subjective in nature.

"No, Wendy, you can't say that. You don't know what went on in individual juror's minds. You only know what the outcome was. You have to give them room to move - to be able to call for a re-assessment. Don't paint them into a corner."

"I can't see what you mean."

"That they are the judgements of a mature professional - to you they may seem subjective but the juror could claim to have been in practice for many years and to be making that judgement of "ordinary" or "dated" based on his long professional career."

"That it is perhaps better is to say that the comments were unhelpful; that you were unable to relate them to the established assessment criteria which you worked hard to fulfil. You are only a graduate. They can claim that your professional self-judgement is not as finely tuned as theirs is - in short that they had not told you during the year that you were on track for a Distinction, but rather that is what you heard."

"I understand. I'll finish the letter and hand deliver it so I know he has it."

End of Notebook Excerpt: Wendy's Story

Critique practices which occur behind closed doors, and, due to their structure, allow for no feedback to students at the time, but only for questions of clarification, reinforce the preferred from Wendy. Once again the judgement I was required to demonstrate in this passage points to the vulnerability of the researcher.

43. To avoid misrepresentation by omission I include the following notes on the jury process engaged received from one of the jurors (who does not like this juror title) after reading my description of events:

1. An open meeting was held with the students to discuss the format of these presentations and the reason why they were organised as they were, and to entertain questions and proposals for change.
mister/master/mystery cycle where the male assessor has the mastery and the outcome is a mystery to the student. In Wendy’s case, the notion was further of an institutional powerlessness expressed by Wendy in relation to her dealings with the hierarchy over her concerns, and her belief that the odds were stacked against her to the extent that she surmised that there could be unfortunate repercussions if she “rocked the boat”. Not only did Wendy feel “sold-out” in the assessment process, she felt powerless to question the premiss suggested to her that “the best students don’t always get the best marks”. This frequently cited claim, which I am assured is research based, relating to a U.K. study which found that successful U.K. architects were shown to have a lower, rather than a higher, proportional representation of “high” Honours degrees as graduates, is usually accompanied by the names of various eminent male architects who either received low marks in Architecture School before ‘blitzing’ the competition in their practice and acquiring a vast fortune in so doing; or follow more closely the Rand (1947) The Fountainhead story of Howard Roark, the misunderstood genius, reviled by his peers, eeking out a living in a garret whilst arguably producing work the world would celebrate for its genius only posthumously.

2. At the meeting it was explained that the students would be received courteously but that they would not get feedback [during the juries], because assessors marked separately and confidentially, and criticism from one assessor can influence another assessor.

3. There was feedback available to the students after the results were known (but not public feedback), and that written notes on the basis for marking were kept for that purpose. (pers. corr. 7-11-199)

44. Wendy’s feedback included the descriptions "ordinary" and "dated" in relation to her design.
45. Lamb (1994) also refers to this point. He says that the existence of an implicit curriculum in Architecture School not only effectively discriminates against the natural capabilities of some students, but also probably ensures the loss of students of particular types from the architecture profession. He says that:

While this is probably not unique to architecture, it is also likely that the students lost would include...students who are skilled in logical and analytical procedures and are especially capable of fulfilling the contemporary demands for project management, computer aided design and quality assurance...(Lamb, 1994, 162)

My argument is that students, like Wendy, with these "logical" and "analytical" skills, as demonstrated in Wendy’s presentation, if they stay, are likely to do quite poorly when assessment is driven by other criteria. I think this is what Wendy was trying to say - that her work had not been judged using her espoused criteria which differed from those of other students.
Neither of these images is helpful to Wendy. Neither of them provide any role model for where to go from here. Neither of them disrupt the dominant discourse that architecture is for real men and that any show of weakness or emotion is totally undesirable, or that women, and those outside that dominant discourse, can legitimately question those "common sense" understandings of "how things are the way they are", which is constituted as hegemony.

Lewis (1992) defines hegemony in Jaggar's terms, and in so doing throws light on the notion of common sense understandings:

Gramsci's notion of hegemony; a concept "designed to explain how a dominant class maintains control by projecting its own particular way of seeing social reality so successfully that its view is accepted as common sense and as part of the natural order by those who in fact are subordinated to it."

It is fanciful, and Wendy knows it, for her to enter the already tight job market with a final project awarded a Pass and the retort that it was really worth a Distinction; it was just that the male jury, of well-regarded practitioners and senior academics, overlooked its assessment value. The subject positions she has available are "trouble-maker" or "acceptor". The story shows that she vacillates between knowing that she may make more trouble for herself "rocking the boat" as a "trouble-maker" than accepting her allotted assessment with the knowledge that she is powerless to change the mark because it could only happen after a drawn out grievance procedure which would cause her story to be pitted against the story of the assessors and her indignant feeling that she has possibly been treated unfairly. She knew what choices she had available to her, and what positions in relation to the discourse about who holds the power in assessments. Wendy ultimately made the decision for herself, aided by the University student counsellor about what subject position she would occupy, and for how long. Disrupting the status quo is not an action embarked upon lightly as the repercussions can be considerable, Wendy believed.

46. Wendy is now working as an architect in another state.
Her story further illuminates the struggles of women in Schools to define appropriate models for success. These struggles are not helped by the knowledge that only 6% of employed in Schools of Architecture in Australia are women (down from 7% in 1989) and 9.5% of registered architects are women (up from 6.5% in 1989) and therefore she is unlikely to come into contact with a range of role models for practice as practised by women. This dearth of role models may affect her both during her schooling and through contact with the profession from within the School through the RAIA mentorship scheme for senior students, and in the early part of her professional career on graduation whilst being supervised for two years prior to being eligible for her Australian Practice Examination for registration.

The following example from a professional critique carries forward this theme - that any attempt to situate oneself professionally outside the dominant discourse about what models for professional success are available, may be considered ill-mannered, disruptive, and may ultimately be censured.

_Narrative from 199_Notebook._

---

Early in April, 199 I attended the _ABC Project: A Professional Critique_, a seminar convened by professional bodies in ___ to critique the Environmental Impact Statement for the ABC Proposal. I had been really looking forward to the opportunity to see a critique session involving eminent professionals in their fields. The advertising flyer promised that the occasion would provide an opportunity for each of the participating professional bodies to "provide you with an objective and professional critique" of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the ABC proposal, and that there would be question time available at the completion of each of the five presentations, as well as at the completion of all of the five presentations.

This all seemed very well proposed, a democratic structure which allowed maximum audience participation as well as an opportunity to hear the considered concerns of each critic about the EIS, released to the public some five weeks earlier. Certainly the timing of the public critique allowed for submissions to benefit from the concerns of the audience.

I was therefore surprised at the activity I witnessed. Socially, I thought that those being critiqued, that is the authors of different sections of the report, and their critics, differed little from the situations with which I was familiar in the School. Their experience and professionalism was not reflected in their argument construction, in particular.

The first two presenters, who were male, (representing ABC, and the Consulting Engineers, as the EIS Study Manager), speaking about the EIS study on which they had worked for five months, were in their presentations overwhelmingly
factual, slightly defensive, slick, congratulatory of the audience for their very presence (at either $20-00 or $30-00 each it was standing room only), keen to distance themselves from the criteria for assessment of the EIS: "We only did our what we were told", and finally congratulatory of themselves for the effort they had put into it. The three critics, who were also male, proceeded to use different ploys in their critique but they could be summarised as good humoured critique, provocative in the sense of raising issues, but drawing back sharply from apportioning fault; and overwhelmingly well mannered and congruently polite.

Surely, in the audience there had to be people with dissenting views, I thought. This opportunity to have their concerns about issues unaddressed in the EIS would be a magnet to the disaffected.

In the question time at the conclusion of all the speakers, just as the Chairman was about to wind up the proceedings, so that the conviviality of the evening could be continued over light refreshments, from the rear of the Hall, a diminutive young woman stood and addressed the Chair. She voiced concerns about the figures for fishery impact quoted in the EIS statement. Clearly the Chair thought she was wasting his time. She did not know the rules. "We are all friends here", was the demeanour of the whole session to the time.

No other speaker from the audience posing a question had been asked for his or her identification. The chair asked the young woman who she was. (In other words, "With what authority do you pose this question?") Dr Kathleen Raymond, Department of Fisheries, she replied. Everything started going wrong for the Chair. So he did what men frequently do when a woman assumes a position in the hierarchy previously controlled solely by them. He ridiculed her. This is not an appropriate time to discuss these concerns, perhaps you can direct your detailed questions to the appropriate person.

And he closed the meeting.

I do not believe that the Chair would have taken that action if the question came from a man; nor if the question from Dr Raymond was framed in a way which let the self-congratulatory nature of the evening's presentation be maintained right up until the close of the session. Dr Raymond had taken a position for herself of disrupting the status quo and the Chairman did not like her tactics. He not only publicly challenged her right to ask the question, by asking her to identify herself, but he also denied her a response from the panel of experts.

The claim that is sometimes made (e.g. Maitland, 1991, Macleod, 1992) in proposing "jury" critique for advanced students (where a "jury" comprises senior academics and eminent members of the profession) is that it will prepare those students for practice, where such juries are empanelled to judge competition entries, or to select an architect from several suitable candidates for a project on the basis of their preliminary scheme. My argument is that both from the modified jury experience in which Wendy participated, and the ABC Critique, not only is the construction of gender a major player in men critiquing the work, or even the comments of women; moreover that the women, if they do not conform, find themselves in a position where they can see no acceptable roles for themselves within the dominant discourse. I claim that dominant discursive position made
available is to act like a man, not be emotional (Wendy had become ill at more than one preliminary critique so great was her anxiety), not to "rock the boat" like Dr Raymond did, and to "play by the established rules". This was not really the seemingly open opportunity for informed debate with members of the audience but was a choreographed occasion which did not allow for un-scheduled questions critiquing the status quo. There is a conflict between the context participants like Dr Raymond are creating for themselves and the context being created by the participating professional bodies.

These foregoing stories about rejecting available discourses about models for success, and how that rejection often sets up considerable emotional conflict in women who are socialised to conform and to maintain relationships instead of seeking competitive gain illustrate the difficulties women may have in confronting the dilemmas between defining the professional role as sexless, and conforming to a gendered stereotype of femininity.

The School places great emphasis in the professional BArch degree in preparing graduates for the nature of current architectural practice. However, there is considerable difference in beliefs within the student group about what constitutes current practice, and how the School should prepare students for this assumption of homogeneity.

The following interview excerpt concerns students' reflections on the place of the School in preparing them for professional practice, and the roles they could play within it. Reginald believes it is an unnecessary focus for the School. However, Jason believes that as long as the School purports to prepare students for the nature of current practice on graduation, and thereby for current models of what constitutes success, then they fulfil this self-stated obligation only in emulating professional critique during in-School critique sessions.

*Interview excerpt talking with final year students on 13-8-199 about the advantages and disadvantages of either an "open" or "closed" jury for their final in-school critique. The proposal being considered was for the traditionally "closed" final jury to become a public*
critique, with the presence of peers permitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Shannon: I think that the jury system as presented here for the final jury is an exact replica of the Beaux Arts jury system, exact replica, the closed door, no accountability, you either emerged weeping or triumphant...that in fact there is no written or verbal communication afterwards, the prizes are awarded and no correspondence will be entered into.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: It's a bit unfair [talking about the process, not my representation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: It's absolutely a replica of the Beaux Arts jury system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: What about real life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: We've knocked that out everywhere else in our education but it remains the final hurdle to jump in the School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: But if our School, the aims of this course are to get you to the stage where you are capable of going for a job in practice; and given that in practice you're going to be there when the client... you're not going to have all your buddies there going yes, yes...isn't it a practice for that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Sure. Well...yes and no. The whole position of critique, review and the jury system can be predicated on the fact that: &quot;This is what practice is like&quot;. But what a lot of people are saying now is that practice is a collective, social experience. Right? Practising is usually happening in group work, except of course for sole practitioners (and even then they are co-operatively working with consultants). And presentation to the client might mean that sure, one or two of you go and do it and you haven't got the other seven members of your group there, but you are still representing the democracy of views of the group. Right? So one of the things that we are really aiming for in the School, and that is on Hal's agenda, is playing down the competitive, learning thing and the definite rewards that come out of that in favour of the corporate, collegiate, corresponding nature of social practice. Sure, that mightn't jell with some of your experiences on the [professional competition] for which you were finalists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhianna: It doesn't jell with a lot of our experiences here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Yeah, sure because this is something...[new]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason: I think it jells perfectly our experiences in the [competition]. I'm just not sure how it jells with... what I said before about...because when you're presenting your work to the jury you're not presenting the group's work, you're presenting your own work...and when you are... my analogy might be that when you're in private practice and you're going to be presenting... you may be presenting the group's work but it is your work as well and when you're presenting you don't have your friendly peers around to watch you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan: Yeah, sure. I think that is an extremely important point. So what I'd go back to then is &quot;because this sometimes happens in practice is this a reasonable passing out parade for this School?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald: I would say that there doesn't have to be any connection between the so-called &quot;real&quot; world, and the jury. They are two completely separate worlds and there is...the educational process is an end in itself - I don't know whether that is the term... I think that the jury as an end point should be reflective of the whole educational process... and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. I have subsequently (Ch. 4, p. 279) been advised that there was written feedback. I conducted this interview prior to the juries - clearly I did not know exactly what would eventually happen.
I don't know whether it is actually preparing us for the outside world. In the first six months we're going to learn more in practice than we have learnt in five years/six years of University education. What we have learnt from education is developed skills, developed self-confidence, personal skills, a range of things that can be applied to practice. But as to learning practice skills I think that they are separate. I don't know. I think that it is an interesting problem. When we try to set up projects to be as close to "real life", and things like that, as they can, does it really matter? Umm... Because what are we trying to do?

**Rhianna:** Take advantage of the educational opportunities now...

**Reginald:** So rather than having five great big projects all set up to pretend that we've got "real" clients and "real" sites, maybe we could do different things and intersperse design work with analysis of design, more educational things.

**Jason:** My only point there would be, that is a bit unfair, I think there has been a jump there. The School has its policy... I am sure I have heard Susan saying that the School aims to get us to be architects so that they can throw us out into practice and that we can work under supervision. So that if you want to say what you were just saying I think you have to first say "the Schools' aims should change, too" and I think there is a sort of an umbrella there and I think that you have to recognise that and say: "Well, change all that umbrella, and not stay the same." I think you have to say all that.

The students' understandings indicate that they are well aware of the pretence of the issues being any different whether the final juries are "open" or "closed". What the discussants believe in part is that all in-School critique situations never mirror 'real world' experiences, and yet they believe that one of the agendas of the School is in mirroring 'real world' experience in order to prepare them for the nature of current practice. What makes the experiences in the School essentially different, I argue, is the power differential between critic and critiqued, and the assessor and the assessed which is different in practice where there is frequently a more equal power relationship, and where the repercussions of dissent from the prevailing critical view are possibly less extreme. One of the accepted hallmarks of the professional is the ability to think critically. Certainly in modelling critique practices within the School there is a recognition that a professional architect must be able to think critically and demonstrate a response to critique, and this ability constitutes a current model for success in the profession which the School accepts and promotes.

**Hierarchy**

I have hinted at the difference in the perception of criticism coming from a colleague in practice in comparison with criticism from an awards panel, or the partner; and paralleled
this difference with receiving in-School peer criticism in comparison with critique from the assessor in a public sphere. The existence of hierarchy in the School is a forerunner to the existence of hierarchy in the office. How graduating students respond to the demands for deference to authority figures in the School, through critique, establishes one aspect of their likely intentions when commencing practice.

The following narrative example concerning completing students' views of hierarchy in the School comes out of a long narrative, negotiated both with James North, and a sub-group of the final year students. What it reveals, in part, is that James North's attempts to disrupt the prevailing hierarchy in the School in his studio are met with dismay by some of the students. Their responses recall Collier's statement about how hard the teacher has to work to change the teacher's perceived role:

Most teachers in higher education have been taught on traditional lines, where the habitual assumption of both teachers and students is that the teacher has the authority to define the subject matter to be acquired and to reinforce this definition by his function as an examiner... Students expect the teacher to act as an instructor and their attitude is one of dependence. Thus, when a teacher tries to change his role he finds powerful resistances at work both in himself and in the students. (Collier, 1985, 8, my italics)

The first section of the narrative is particularly concerned with an important aspect of the research process - negotiating access to the studios as the site for research. In this instance North was prepared to welcome me into the studio as long as I adopted a subject position of "observer only". Whilst disrupting the discourse about hierarchy with his own students, in some ways he reinforces his position in the hierarchy in relation to me and the conduct of my educational research.

Narrative Excerpt

James, knowing that my prior knowledge of the students might encourage them (or me) to relate to each other in other than a tutor-student role, asked that, on these occasions, where there were the other agendas of review by consultants and peers that I remained in the background as opposed to participating in the studio sessions. James had spent five weeks with the students working on notions of the students as independent learners able to facilitate their own learning particularly through the use of consultants and peer review. His diary records:
I am emphasizing 'process' in this subject, and we generally are all able to understand what this means in the current context. For some students, the news that I have given them that next year they will be away from the University, on their own, in a professional context, and having to rely on their personal professional judgement and confidence, comes as something of a surprise. I emphasise that I am here as a facilitator, not as a teacher with punitive powers, and for some this message takes some getting across.

(James North Pers. Diary 20-3-199)

At this rather late stage in the project where the students had prepared project work to present to the consultants and their peers for review and feedback, James believed that it was inappropriate for me to have any 'voice' in the proceedings. This concern (about my possibly interruptive presence) was related to the students' growing confidence in their own abilities. James summarised his beliefs that the students were moving towards a more confident stance:

There seems to be a general air of enlightenment about this week in relation to the way in which we have been encouraging the students to be involved in the teaching/learning process for this subject. I have felt a more confident response from these very nice young people as they come to understand that soon they leave the protective 'School' of Architecture and will be standing squarely on their own feet in a professional sense.

(James North Pers. Diary 27-3-199)

He asked that I "did nothing at this stage to remove or diminish their [the students'] confidence." (pers. comment 30-3-199) I felt very welcome in the review sessions - I was well known in my former role as a staff member to the students and they were aware of my research work and my interest in attending review and critique sessions within the School.

Before I arrived for the first session, James had introduced me to the students as a researcher who had an interest in the teaching and learning programme developed for his studio. I remained in the background, making no notes or recordings, and relying on my memory for a representation of what transpired. Immediately at the conclusion of the sessions, I had the opportunity for brief discussions about the session with James; I then made extensive notes about the observations I had made during the sessions. Whist relying on memory is less than ideal for transcripts, I guarded against mis-reporting by referring to James' hand-outs for background information and exact wordings and submitted an early draft of the writing to him for his commentary.

Later in the narrative I reflected on the extent to which the students felt empowered to deny me access to their studio for observations if that was their wish, as despite the knowledge that I had no formal role in their class, undergraduate students nevertheless would normally consider themselves to be lesser in the hierarchy of the School than teachers and postgraduate students. This location in the hierarchy, I felt, may have meant that not only would the students feel they had to abide by the decisions of staff and a more senior student
to conduct educational research, but also that they could not individually demur from the class decision about whether or not to have educational research taking place in the classroom with them as they learnt.

An exchange with Rhianna (Ch 3, p. 149) made it clear to me that the final year students considered their own situation as one of power in some instances. When faced with the possibility that the tutor may deny me access to their studio she said:

```
We wouldn't stand for it. As a class we just wouldn't let that happen. No-one can tell us that you cannot be there if we want you to be.
```

Rhianna, as the class representative, on behalf of her classmates, rejected their conventional role in the hierarchy of the School and suggested that their collective self-efficacy is what really counted. However, there are many other already cited instances in this text where Rhianna has been silent about certain matters as she has considered that in challenging the status quo of the in-School hierarchy, there is much to lose. This instance reflects again on her conflict between rejecting the discourse of success through choosing other subject positions for herself - such as 'defier of rules' - and maintaining cordial relations with James North (who was not the tutor in question), and the other highly placed academics in the School, and members of the profession she aspires to join.

In James North’s studio there was also the opportunity to observe the interaction of final year students and professional consultants in an "exhibition" format when several professional consultants came in the School to interact informally with the students in a critique situation.

*Narrative Excerpt*
Some of the students were very well equipped with critical architectural vocabulary and confidence in their ability to discuss their scheme to approach consultants themselves; others, whilst not as confident about approaching consultants, were nevertheless well able to discuss their work in a facilitated meeting; yet another group of students were not confident about the opportunities provided by the consultants and did not avail themselves of their critique opportunity. They hung back, were not confident about initiating contact and remained passive in any facilitated exchange, answering questions instead of questioning, asserting or querying. This group of students were perhaps reticent in their group discussion with consultants as well. When I asked James about this reluctance on the part of some students he replied:

They're adults. I won't ask them to do anything they're not comfortable with. If by now they haven't developed these skills [of being able to speak publicly about their work] you can't do much in six weeks. (pers. comment 30-3-199)

James recognised that the opportunity for students to meet consultants in the Studio and the review of their work was appropriate at this point in their formal education whilst acknowledging that it may have been more difficult for the less able, less confident students who were "not comfortable" with speaking about their work.

Muriel, in particular, found it very difficult to adapt to the new expectations James North’s studio made of her. She felt more comfortable with the traditional leadership role of the teachers in the studio, and felt, for example, in North’s studio, that the expectation that she would independently use the telephone to seek advice from consultants, would be outside her expectations of self.

Narrative excerpt

James North had recorded in his Diary of 20-3-199 that:

I have to remind myself to keep a tag on the weaker, less confident students. In one of our discussions this week, one of these people [Muriel] expressed the view that she didn't feel able to get on the phone, as a student, and call up consultants, considering this to be 'the institution's' role.

Muriel accepted the prevailing status quo for students in the School's hierarchy. When James North disrupted it she obliged him to consider that she felt it was he who was "breaking the rules" by expecting more from her than she reasonably expected from herself in the School. Collier said:

Students also have built in assumptions about their hierarchical relations with their teachers, and the authority-dependency relationship is reflected in the expectation that the teacher will give such instruction, whether in lectures or discussions, as will
ensure a pass in their examinations... It requires skill and self-restraint on the teacher's part to establish a habit of student/student interaction. (Collier, 1985, 8)

Students in the class had been asked to keep a reflective journal as a Student Professional Development Portfolio. They had many insights into the new expectations of them as North maintained a facilitative role described by Collier as an "enabling" role as a tutor (Collier, 1985, 10).

Several students accepted, and welcomed the new non-hierarchical expectations where James North acted in the role of facilitator as he guided students into useful mentoring with members of the profession. One student wrote:

...I can now see what [James North] is trying to achieve in our education this year as a transition year from education to professionalism. Developing a means of self assessment I now acknowledge is vital along with a courtesy and integration to and with the associated members of our profession and working team.

(Student Professional Development Portfolio 5-4-199)

The student particularly comments on the way that North has facilitated self-assessment as an essential skill for making the link between School and the profession. North believes that skill with self, and peer-assessment equips students to diminish the 'leap' at graduation to a 'step'. Central to this belief is his confidence that students are in the best position to judge their own work against the criteria by which they have been designing. The students' comments indicate that until this time developing a means of self-assessment had not been a priority in their schooling. In order to uphold the importance of self-assessment North necessarily must hand over his assessment authority; an authority which is a part of his location in the School's hierarchy. Although North is willing to do so, only some students wanted that responsibility. The next student was appreciative of North's belief system which had treated the students with "respect and trust", recording strong support for the new expectations.
I have truly appreciated the self-directed nature of the course. Self-guidance implies respect and trust, and this has been one of the few instances where the distinctions between student and lecturer have been abandoned.

Real projects with real clients and consequent real briefs have provided us all with a sense of purpose and more importantly a source of answers to questions! This has encouraged confident and professional client relations and helped in outlining business communications and diplomacy!

Along with the real projects have appeared real "consultants" and informed visitors who have provided structured and current information as well as offering further professional relation practice.

Juggling two concurrent design projects has been a first but it reflects the working reality and has helped us to streamline thought processes, identify immediate priorities and speed up presentation.

(Student Professional Development Portfolio 5-4-199_)

However, Muriel found it hard to adapt to the new expectations as was noted in her statement in this Chapter on p. 260. She was not confident about the expectations of her which conflicted with her expectations of self. Muriel seemed to have much at risk from the new expectations James brought to the class. The narrative continues about her presentation to the class in the peer review session James had introduced.

**Narrative excerpt**

Dao and Muriel from the second group next presented their work to the class. They were part of an "Office" group comprising three women, two of whom were from non-English speaking backgrounds, and four men, two of whom were from non-English speaking backgrounds, and both of whom were repeating the year for academic reasons, a local student and an exchange student who was absent from the class - the only student so to be. Both Dao and Muriel were very hesitant about the process of bringing criticism into the peer sphere. She told everyone that she did not want to offer any commentary or critique of, her own work and that she would prefer to respond to questions. Muriel did however concede to the class that the request for costings and information on building economics had caused her to "panic" and she had discarded her curved framed structure in favour of a standard truss. She had sought little information before making this decision. Her decision to change the framing was not based on the same information basis as Rhianna's decision. Muriel told the class that she preferred her earlier scheme with the curved elements so that she was proffering a critique of sorts that she should have sought more information before "panicking".

In contrast with her lack of confidence in front of her peers - a group of twenty-five - I had been present when Muriel discussed her scheme alone with the Quantity Surveyor two days previously. She had been able to answer his questions about her scheme and to discuss the cost cuttings she had made - standard frame and truss; no ceiling; cladding inside and outside with corrugated galvanised iron. The Quantity Surveyor assured her

48. In this year 199 there were 25% Language other than English (LOTE) students in the BArch degree, of whom 56% were male. Amongst the English speaking background students 55% were male. In this year level there were 77% men from ESB and LOTE backgrounds. (Shannon, 1993)
that this would be the cheapest possible structure to build and Muriel was very pleased. She needed this sort of affirmation that her decision making was worthy; that even with her limited ability to apply costings she had made strategic decisions to keep the cost down.

Even by presenting the Quantity Surveyor's support for her scheme Muriel could have demonstrated a knowledge of the economic constraints that she understood to be at work in industrial design - through her unwillingness to articulate a point of view, including that of a professional consultant, to the class, in that context of a whole of class peer critique, she missed this opportunity.

The narrative concludes:

The confident, more able students were able to derive full benefit from the opportunities presented to them by the professional orientation of the Studio; not so the less confident, less able students who were challenged by the new professional expectations. In part, the students' poor abilities may be traced to gender expectations, ethnicity, and cultural expectations which then may contribute to passive, dependent learning styles or approaches.

If a lengthy professional education suddenly changes direction away from traditional education roles dependent learners may have the most at stake as their dependency causes them to rely heavily on instruction and direction. In this context it is arguable that independent learning outcomes should be encouraged right from the start of the professional architectural education in order to challenge students away from their traditional expectations of the learning task, and to 'start the way you want to finish'. Student learning styles in the professional degree are largely established, as they are everywhere, by the assessment task. If the assessment task involves peer and self critique and evaluation, dependent learning styles which thrive on a willingness to meet the assessors' expectations will become less and less relevant and tenable.

Muriel accepts her place in the hierarchy, a place with which by tradition and former in-School practice she is familiar and comfortable. In the role of student she adopts, the teacher is "the expert", and the teacher's job is to "teach". When this direction suddenly changes, Muriel, and other less confident students have much at risk, as their previous measure of success was in meeting the teacher's assessment expectations and not in their developed self judgement. There was a certain safety available in this role of "student" in relation to the previous assignation of "teacher". James North has a whole new set of expectations pitched at introducing the students in the final year into professional practice from within the School. In order to do this he breaks down pre-existing expectations of

49. Not all students have the same learning background as a partial determinant of their learning approach. Although the majority of students undertaking the BArch have graduated in a first degree B.Arch. St. which emphasizes student centredness and student directed learning in some subjects, there are enrolments from students with other first degrees, some of whom are accustomed to a more rigidly structured learning environment, largely didactic instruction and frequent assessment.
hierarchy. Some of these expectations relate to assessment power, which he hands to the students despite their very considerable reluctance to accept it. In deciding which consultants to engage, and who should engage them, through extending a modest budget to the students for their own expenditure, he asked them to decide who could best provide the "structured and current information" they require. He relinquished both the "real" power in the hierarchy he holds as a senior academic, through controlling assessment outcome, and also the token of power, the School's money, which he encouraged them to budget carefully.

The students in James North's class had little previous experience in their Bachelor of Architecture course of self-directed learning and the expectation that they would be involved in self and peer-critique. They had successfully completed two thirds of the course without any requirement to demonstrate abilities at making explicit their self-judgement. As was argued in the narrative about this studio, when a course changes direction, as did the B Arch course in incorporating aspects of self-directed and self-assessed learning, those perhaps most at risk are the less confident students who rely on their teacher supplying direction and assessment outcomes. However, these students are perhaps even less able to develop their self-judgement in traditional, hierarchical teaching situations where the teacher sees the job of University teaching as "distilling information down into something which can be handed on to students" (pers. comment 3-12-199). Baum in Dutton (1987) says about the presence of hierarchy in the studio organization effectively precluding dialogue, that:

[t]here is no dialogue across the boundary between masters and servants, for the master will listen only as long as his power remains intact and the servant will limit his communication to utterances for which he cannot be punished. In fact, to recommend dialogue in a situation of inequality of power is a deceptive ideology of the powerful, who wish to persuade the powerless that harmony and mutual understanding are possible in a society without any change in the status quo power. (Dutton, 1987, 43-44)

James North's studio was one in which he demonstrated that a steadfast belief in the students' ability to direct their own learning through abandoning his role in the hierarchy was not welcomed by every student. In dismantling the traditional expectations of students
in favour of the facilitation role he rejected the conventional hierarchical teaching role except in that he did not consult with the students about whether it was their wish that their learning was self directed. This is where Baum's commentary on the "deceptive ideology of the powerful" is relevant. In disallowing a variety of learning approaches and assessment, North asserted the power which is vested in him as a senior academic. If he chose to redirect the students' efforts, albeit towards greater self-efficacy, his position and the attendant power it carries, were sufficient to change the focus of the studio. His management style for the studio is non-participatory, and there are many references in his Diary to an expanded focus on self-directed learning for a new cohort of final year students in the following year. He anticipated the criticisms he might receive, but believed that the professional focus for the studio outweighed the lack of support from some students.

In reconsidering the values and interests served by North's stand on self-directed learning in the face of considerable student opposition, his role as a senior staff member is underlined. The power and authority which accompany his title are emphasised in the following narrative excerpt.

Narrative excerpt

*Associate Professor James North* is a pseudonym I have adopted for the academic who was involved with this studio. He would have preferred to be addressed with his actual name and title; as he put it he is proud of his teaching and has nothing he wishes to conceal - he believes that what he is doing is innovative and is delighted to find that it has a theoretical underpinning.

Whilst I acknowledge that this is his wish I believe that the anonymity of all parties involved in this studio - staff, students and consultants - is best served by the rigorous adoption of pseudonyms throughout my writing.

A further point that James made in our discussion about his title for address when I had originally referred to him in the text as Dr. North was that "even a very junior member of staff may have a PhD." but that he has a title conferred by the institution, which speaks of the high level status of his teaching and research. He thought that, in their final year, it was important for the students to have an appreciation of the standing in the University community of their year co-ordinator.

I have suggested in this chapter that teachers and students are frequently situated in different discourses of power in relation to educational research being carried out. I would further
suggest that teachers and students are situated in different discourses of power in relation to
dismantling the hierarchies which formulate and deliver their architectural education. In
dismantling existing power structures in favour of more egalitarian modes of teaching and
assessment, teachers may be doing nothing more than reasserting the authority and control
claimed in more autocratic teaching/learning structures.

Conclusion

How do race, class and gender situate students in relation to success in their architectural
education, and ultimately in the profession?

In this chapter the fine grained features of studio life have been brought forward. From the
time architecture students enter the School powerful forces situate them in relation to
success in their studies. In this Chapter I have invited the reader, through the stories of
several students, to consider the relationship between race, class and gender and the
constitution of "success" in the School and the profession. There are no binding conclusions
which can be brought forward as a result of the observations and reflections of this critical
ethnography. The intent of the critical ethnographic methodology - to produce a fine
grained account, "thick" data, rich with the narrative of the participants, allows the
participants in the research, the reader and the researcher alike to reflect on the
understandings of the students and teachers in the School, and from this position of
privilege, to consider the political actions, or transformative outcomes which could be
forthcoming in their own lives as a result of the praxis opportunities afforded through their
reading of the text and their self-reflection.

Further, I would argue that there is a dialectical, rather than a causal relationship between
the constitutive forces of race, class and gender. There is a sense in this critical analysis that
the participant researcher produces the knowledge upon which the reader is invited to
reflect, and that the knowledge is about how race, class and gender speak hegemony into
existence (Gramsci, 1977 cited by Ward, 1991) and how "the ideological and hegemonic
underpinnings of the classroom [are]... an extension of power relationships existing within the larger society" (Ward, 1991, 91). Weedon (1987) makes the point that

...a feminist poststructuralism must pay full attention to the social and institutional context of textuality in order to address the power relations of everyday life. Social meanings are produced within social institutions and practices, in which individuals, who are shaped by these institutions, are agents of change, rather than its authors, change which may either serve hegemonic interests or challenge existing power relationships. (p. 23)

How we live our lives as conscious thinking subjects, and how we give meaning to the material social relations under which we live and which structure our everyday lives, depends on the range and social power of existing discourses, our access to them and the political strength of the interests which they represent. (p. 26)

Before suggesting some actions arising from researcher self-reflection, I will summarise the themes considered in Chapter 4.

Part 1: Beginning Architecture Studies
Silence, Isolation, Inclusion/Exclusion, Marginalisation.

In Part 1: Beginning Architecture Studies, the stories of Max and Veronica illustrate the marginalising potential of class and ethnic difference. The critical analysis argued that there was a status quo which preceded the enrolment of any students, and that the practices which were 'taken for granted' in the first year of studies reinforced the hegemonic structure of the School and of the profession for which the School educates students. In contrast, the story about Rhianna, Jason, Reginald and Nick begins to unfold in Part 1. Rejecting the marginalised subject positions made available to them, they chose to reject silence as a means of accepting the status quo, and spoke out against expectations they found impractical and oppressive. This 'informant' group sought inclusion in the class despite their initial 'fringe' status.

Part 2: Continuing Architecture Studies

Conforming, Competing, Confidence.

In Part 2: *Continuing Architecture Studies*, the reader is exposed to the thinking of the informant group in much greater depth. The dilemmas Rhianna experiences as a female student, who nevertheless rejects a feminized subject position whilst wanting to remain included, are unfolded. This contrasts with the lack of concern which Reginald and Jason experience in regard to accepting or rejecting a position which conforms with the dominant discourse about what it is that architecture students "do" highlights the "struggle" for women in the School.

The unfolding view of student life as studies continue necessarily points to the conflicts implicit in students participating in a competitive course, where individual achievement is valorised whilst they conform to a view of architectural education as a co-operative group work endeavour, where the studio, and critiques, are a site for sharing knowledge and stating uncertainties.

The confidence of the student is at the centre of all of these abilities to privately and publicly proffer and respond to critique. Through Rhianna's and Muriel's eyes we have two different views of confidence and we explore Muriel's lack of confidence which often situates her in one discourse, and Rhianna's confidence, which often situates her in another discourse. Rhianna is so confident that she has developed a facility of "giving away her unknowns" in a critique situation so that the critic can come back in and build her up again. She has redefined for herself what the role of critique could be, and in doing so, what success is as an architecture student. This is significant - she has mastered the oppressive through redefining what the role of critique could be, and in so doing, what a new model of success and competition could be for her as an architecture student.

Part 3: Completing Architecture Studies
Models for Success, Hierarchy.
In Part 3: *Completing Architecture Studies*, Mick and Garry give us a view of their struggles to succeed in a course which was not structured to their learning needs and in which the skills and knowledges they brought were not valued and built on. The lack of availability of models for success in the profession which relate to them is highlighted in their inability to define what success would be for them on graduation in terms different from the concepts they brought into the course years previously. The School had not changed their relationship with the structures of the profession. The students themselves do not choose subject positions which empower them in the profession - they reject the 'high culture' values of the profession. The positions made available to them continue to focus on their technical input; their lack of middle class values, speech patterns and demeanour make other positions unavailable to them. However, Garry was not rejected by the profession, but drafted into a technical support position, whilst Mick found a different route to achieve what he sought.

Gender as well as class is a powerful force in positioning students in relation to accepting or rejecting current models for success. Wendy and Dr Raymond illustrate the difficulties women may have in confronting the dilemmas between the ideal definition of the professional role as sexless, and conforming to a gendered stereotype of femininity.

The section on hierarchy introduces new dilemmas Rhianna and her class-mates confront as, at the end of their course, the "rules" are changed and they are asked to demonstrate a proficiency with self-directed learning. The power of hierarchical position in the School to direct student learning is emphasized, and the struggle of students to comply with the expectations on them as imminent professionals from within the School is explored. The challenges both for staff and students to make different subject positions available for themselves, and to reject the status quo is considered. The suggestion is raised that students cling more to the familiar practices than do the teachers.

Through a consideration of the themes - the "interruptions" to social practice which must occur before students and teachers in Schools of Architecture can begin to recognise
disabling critique practices for themselves - proposals can be made about alternative practices which may strengthen students' self-judgement. Through practice based on self-reflection, students and teachers are invited to reflect on the foregoing interviews, narratives, critical analysis and discussion which situate the text historically, contextually and specifically within one School in a traditional tertiary education system. The relationship between the research I have undertaken, and reported through the above means, and change for a wider readership is stated by Fay (1977, 232 cited by Lather 1991b, 60) who says that

[c]oming to a radical new self-conception is hardly ever a process that occurs simply by reading some theoretical work; rather, it requires an environment of trust, openness, and support in which one's own perceptions and feelings can be made properly conscious to oneself, in which one can think through one's experience in terms of a radically new vocabulary which expresses a fundamentally different conceptualization of the world, in which one can see the particular and concrete ways that one unwittingly collaborates in producing one's own misery, and in which one can gain the emotional strength to accept and act on one's new insights

whilst Lather comments on the relationship between the research outcomes for a wider readership and the "researched"

[f]ollowing Fay, I propose that the goal of emancipatory research is to encourage self-reflection and deeper understanding on the part of the researched at least as much as it is to generate empirically grounded theoretical knowledge (Lather, 1991b, 60, my italics).

Lather and Fay suggest that the role of the reporting in emancipatory research should engage with both groups. Chapter 4 has the most potential for engaging with the "researched" through the fine grained accounts presented, whilst Chapter 5 is particularly concerned with engaging with the wider readership because, as has been previously stated, there are no universal recommendations evolving from site-specific, time-specific, context-specific feminist critical ethnography. However, not unreasonably, readers will want to know how teaching practices can be changed by/change researcher self-reflection.

Given that the students in this School are aspirants to a profession with a history of male Eurocentric achievement, my argument is that by questioning the veracity of the existing
"star" system (Scott Brown, 1990) which is at the crux of the hegemony of the existing profession (PA, 1989) from within the School, students and teachers may be in a better position to disrupt the taken-for-granted power structures of the profession. If students are able to judge their own work, the prominence of seniority in power structures may be overturned, and with this overturning may emerge a range of more egalitarian roles for practice and practitioners. This possible transformative outcome is outside the scope of this research project - as was extensively argued in Chapters 1 and 3 for reasons related to the limitations of the empowerment potentials of the critical research methodolgy engaged. Furthermore, change, when it comes, is slow and is contextualised to the needs of those seeking political change (Smith, 1993b).

The next Chapter: Researcher Reflection and Transformative Action in Teaching describes some models I have tried for critique practices which are enabling for students in their ability to promote models for self-judgement from the commencement of architectural education. In the preceding narratives and interviews the strengths and weaknesses of educational practice have been touched on; the next chapter considers at greater length the changes to teaching practices I engaged as a result of self-reflection on the everyday-made-problematic together with knowledge of current theories on adult learning.
CHAPTER 5

RESEARCHER REFLECTION AND TRANSFORMATIVE ACTION IN TEACHING

Introduction

The conclusion of CHAPTER 4: NARRATIVES, INTERVIEWS, CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION considers that the praxis opportunities for critical ethnographic research projects derive not only from the participation of the 'actors', but also from the reflection of the reader on the interviews, narratives, critical analysis and discussion which form the "critical report" (Smith, 1993b, 14) which is the textual outcome of the research project.

The relationship between conducting critical ethnographic research and the potential for political consciousness raising is discussed in Chapter 3, drawing on the literature of praxis research to argue that the subjectivities of the reader create 'meaning' for the text. The situation of the reader, within a specific social and political context, partially determines the potential action, transformative or political, which may be undertaken as a result of the understandings gained from the researcher's focus together with the reader's construction. Chapter 3 details the argument that critical ethnography as a non-participatory and non-interventionist methodology (Smith, 1993a, 218) contains an empowerment potential to political consciousness raising, and, as such, has as its goal the production of a finely detailed narrative which transports the reader first hand (in this instance) into the world of the studio, and the critique. Smith (1993b, 4;14) cautions that the potential for transformative outcomes from reflection on critical reports is not guaranteed, either by the engagement of a critical method or by the will of the researcher, for change is long-term and subject to many political processes over which the researcher exerts no control.

Therefore, he illustrates the containment of the empowerment potentials of critical ethnography diagrammatically (reproduced Ch 3, p 116) with "a 'gap' [which] is evident between the production of a critical report (i.e. the critical re-interpretation in the form of a narrative) and the possibility that stakeholders will read that report, reflect on its cogency
and consequences, and proceed to initiate change (or transformative action)". The demonstration of transformative actions as a result of participant reflections on the critical report is unnecessary in the conduct of the methodology. The (potential) actions are long-term in that readers need time to reflect on the cogency of the fore-going to their own situation, non-universal in that they are deeply contextualised to individual teachers', students' and Schools' needs, and they are premised in a deep respect for all stakeholders in education to effect changes which they judge to be appropriate without imposition.

Borrowing from John Heron's basic argument in this respect, as cited by Reason (1988, 4), "that orthodox research methods are inadequate for a science of persons, quite simply because they undermine the self-determination of their 'subjects'", the case for autonomy and self-direction are strengthened.

He [Heron] argues that what above all distinguishes the human person is the ability to choose how they will act, and the capacity to give meaning to their experience and to their actions. This self-directing ability is at least latent in all human beings..." (Reason, 1988, 4)

Tennant and Pogson (1995) in Learning and Change in the Adult Years focus on current theories for promoting autonomy and self-direction amongst adult learners. Their comments are relevant at this stage of the thesis for, if teachers are to uphold the underlying premise of this Chapter of developing sound judgement through critique as a means to effecting change, they are "committed to developing autonomy amongst their students" (Tennant and Pogson, 1995, 138). The relationship between autonomy, and the potential for change arising from an understanding of the constraints to change is unpacked by Mezirow (1981):

Helping adults construe experience in a way in which they may more clearly understand the reasons for their problems and understand the options open to them so that they may assume responsibility for decision making is the essence of education. Bringing psycho-cultural assumptions into critical consciousness to help a person understand how he or she has come into possession of conceptual categories, rules, tactics and criteria for judging implicit in habits of perception thought and behavior involves perhaps the most significant kind of learning. It increases the crucial sense of agency over ourselves and our lives. To help a learner to become more aware of alternative meaning perspectives relevant to his situation, to become acquainted with them, to become open to them and to make use of them to more clearly understand does not prescribe the correct action to be taken. The meaning perspective does not tell the learner what to do; it presents a set of rules, tactics and criteria for judging. The decision to assume a new meaning perspective clearly implies action, but the behavior that results will depend on situational factors, the knowledge and skills for taking effective action and personality variables... (p. 153)
To show someone a new set of rules, tactics and criteria for judging which clarify the situation in which he or she must act is significantly different from trying to engineer learner consent to take the actions favored by the educator within the new perspective. (Mezirow, 1981, 154)

Tennant and Pogson review three tools in particular for enhancing adult education practice - Freire's "culture circle" (1974), Deshler's "metaphor analysis" (1991) and Peters's "action-reason-thematic" technique (1991) (p. 138) despite their warning that "technique alone will not guarantee that students always develop the type of autonomy we have been discussing" (p. 138).

The self in a self directed learning project is not an autonomous, innocent self, contentedly floating free from cultural influences. It has not sprung fully formed out of a political vacuum. It is, rather, an embedded self, a self whose instincts, values, needs and beliefs have been shaped by the surrounding culture. As such it is a self that reflects the constraints and contradictions, as well as the liberatory possibilities, of that culture. (Tennant and Pogson, 1995, 138 citing Usher, 1993, 236)

The critical and feminist ethnographic research process I engaged to construct the critical narrative which forms Chapter 4 formally ends on this note - inviting the reader to consider appropriate personal action as an outcome of her/his textual understandings. My own changes to teaching practice were made through the process of cycling the research understandings I gained through self-reflection back into transformative and political action. This process of research as one means of transforming the researcher's actions is fully described by Reason (1988, 7-8) quoting Rowan (1981, 97-100).

Rowan (1981) in reviewing Esterson (1972) unpacks notions of self-reflection, and in so doing argues that the "dialectical researcher [as] a participant within the social field of observation" cannot abandon her findings as "merely abstract theories, they are essentially seen as practical, as to be realised in use" (p. 169, my italics). Rowan reports Esterson as saying:

If we are to do reflexivity justice...we must recognise that it requires a new mental stance, an altered state of consciousness. This new mental approach has three stages or moments to it.

First, a reciprocity between observer and the rest of the social field... Next, a temporary nihilating withdrawal from active participation...Third, a
negation of the withdrawal and a return to the reciprocity with the rest of the social field. (Rowan, 1981, 168)

Rowan concludes:

On this account then, research becomes a process of discovery not only of the other, but also of oneself; and of course this is the implication of reflexivity. Each time one goes around the cycle, from reciprocity to this kind of withdrawal and back to reciprocity, one comes back to the social relationship 'on a higher level' - that is with increased insight and ability to act. (Rowan, 1981, 168, my italics)

It is this increased insight, and ability to act, which is the outcome from the process of conducting a feminist critical ethnography for me, and it is insight and ability to act which sets apart my actions as a teacher-as-researcher acting after the reflexive phases of such a project, from the entirely theory-based actions of another conscientious teacher - despite the knowledge that those actions may have been the same actions.

Reason and Rowan (1981, 248), in differentiating between the cycles of interview, theorize, feedback, interview, theorize, feedback, try out, of the researcher Madison and the single round cycle of the journalist Sheehy, suggest that "the validity of research is much enhanced by the systematic use of feedback loops, and by going around the research cycle several times" (Reason and Rowan, 1981, 247). They acknowledge that whilst Madison and Sheehy published differently "this is an accidental difference" (p. 248, my italics).

Reason (1988) further argues in this respect, presenting post-positivist co-operative inquiry research as a paradigmatic shift from the previous positivist world-view and methods, that co-operative inquirers are interested in holistic knowing.

...[W]e are not interested in either fragmented knowing, or theoretical knowing that is separated from practice and experience. We seek a knowing-in-action which encompasses as much of our experience as possible. This means that aspects of a phenomenon are understood deeply because we know them in the context of our participation in the whole system, not as the isolated dependent and independent variables of experimental science. (Reason, 1988, 11)

Mezirow (1994) considers, in Understanding Transformation Theory, how meaning perspectives and meaning schemes, for adult learners are altered. His explanations are

1. Mezirow (1994) defines meaning perspectives as "broad sets of predispositions resulting from psycho-cultural assumptions which determine the horizons of our expectations", and
helpful to understand the relationship between researcher, reflection, and personal action.

Mezirow states that:

Our meaning structures are transformed through reflection, defined here as attending to the grounds (justification) for one's beliefs. We reflect on the unexplained assumptions of our beliefs when the beliefs are not working well for us, or when the old ways of thinking are no longer functional. We are confronted with a disorienting dilemma which serves as a trigger for reflection. Reflection involves a critique of assumptions...

Most reflection takes place within the context of problem-solving...Reflecting on the content and process of our problems is the way we change our minds and transform our meaning schemes, an everyday phenomenon.

Reflecting on the premise of our problem might cause us to ask why we have posed the problem...in the first place. Premise reflection can transform meaning perspectives, a less common and more significant learning experience. Perspective transformation, may be the result of a major event in one's life or the accumulative result of related transformations in meaning schemes.

The most significant learning involves critical premise reflection of premises about oneself. (Mezirow, 1994, 222-224)

The changed practices described in this Chapter are the result of particular understandings of particular practices in a context of one School in a traditional University setting and in this context they reflect my critical and feminist subjectivities - as a teacher, a researcher and a practising architect. As a feminist post-structuralist I hold that there are no universal "truths" and therefore there can never be any universal "solutions". Therefore, as I do not seek to universalise from the practices I describe, this has led me to the use of extensive excerpts from the original negotiated narratives to describe events on the occasions when the teaching/learning situation took place. I have linked these narratives to the themes in Chapter 4 to describe my response to particular occurrences in the studio.

---

meaning schemes as "the constellation of concept, belief, judgment, and feeling which shape a particular interpretation" (p. 224).

2. Mezirow (1981) A critical theory of adult learning, and education defines perspective transformation as filling "an important role in adult learning theory by acknowledging the central role played by the function of critical reflectivity." (p. 148)

Perspective transformation involves not only becoming critically aware of habits of perception, thought and action but of the cultural assumptions governing the rules, roles, conventions and social expectations which dictate the way we see, think, feel and act. (p. 149)
The decision not to conclude this feminist critical ethnography with a statement of recommendations and prescriptive solutions to "universal" problems underlines the difference between a feminist critical ethnography, which employs feminist post-structuralist deconstruction as a means of textual analysis and ethnographies which conclude their narrative with prescriptive recommendations which the authors claim to derive either inductively or deductively from the data they present (for example those of Holland and Eisenhart (1990), Carnoy and Levin (1985) and Weis (1985)). Atkinson's (1990) comments on the subject of reading an ethnography are relevant: he suggests that the construction of meaning is as much on the part of the reader, as it is on the part of the writer.

When we read an ethnographic monograph...we are implicated in complex processes of reality construction and reconstruction...We bring to the work our knowledge and sympathy (or lack of it) for the ethnographic style of writing, as well as a host of barely articulated cultural capacities. (Atkinson, 1990, 2)

Furthermore, he concerns himself with the means by which texts, researchers and readers interact.

Contemporary critical theory and contemporary sociological perspectives are parallel in a self-conscious awareness of reflexivity, with special reference to the work of texts. In principle, the notion of reflexivity recognises that texts do not simply and transparently report an independent order of reality. Rather the texts themselves are implicated in the work of reality-construction...From this point of view, therefore, there is no possibility of a neutral text. (Atkinson, 1990, 7)

Atkinson's view of the possibilities for persuasion of the ethnographic text, relying on its mixture of "authenticity, plausibility and significance of representation of social scenes or

3. This is not, however, the only research framework which would describe universalising as problematic. Hart, Taylor and Robottom (1994), who describe their critical research methodology as participatory, collaborative and emancipatory say:

The idea that an educational program is transferable from one site to another may be linked with a number of assumptions about the universality of curriculum: for example, the assumption that different instructors will use a given set of materials in similar ways despite their different histories; that cultural homogeneity transcends cultural heterogeneity; that specific curriculum development is in some sense independent of the social and cultural context in which it is formulated; and, that a proper role for teachers is the technical one of materials implementation. On the other hand, the idea that the curriculum should be responsive to its cultural context is based on a different set of assumptions concerning the necessary idiosyncrasy of the curriculum. (p. 209-210)
settings" (p. 57) often positions ethnographies as "persuasive fictions" (Geertz, 1973; Strathearn, 1987 cited by Atkinson, 1990, 26). If that is the case, and Atkinson emphasizes that "the ethnographic text conveys the authority of its account very largely through its persuasive force" (p. 57), it is all the more surprising when ethnographers make major, generalised claims from their bounded studies instead of relying on their reflexive readers' reality-construction. For example, Carnoy and Levin (1985) conclude after 4 months' case study observation in two schools that "[s]chools differentiate the socialisation of the young for work along lines that conform to parents' occupational roles" although their detailed case study description of the activities in Mrs Jones' classroom at Smith, or Mrs Newman's classroom at Huntingdon, had already imparted this knowledge to those readers whose typification of the outcome of certain in-class behaviours, and whose cause and effect framework leads them to think this way. Carnoy and Levin's middle class assumptions are thus (correctly) implicated in the typifications arising from the selection of data which led to their conclusions.

Typification is the process of categorizing our perceptions. Typifying always proceeds on the basis of a highly selective sample of information about objects or persons. The cultural ideologies or belief systems we have acquired through socialization provide our 'background expectancies' directing the intentionality which influences how we perceive and governs how we typify what we see. (Mezirow, 1981, 150)

Case studies, which form the bases of the following narratives, were described in Chapter 3 as essentially conservative and interventionist endeavours, providing a biased view, and a distorted picture of the way things are (Walker, 1983, 156). I do not deny that the narratives I have selected for inclusion to describe teaching and learning transformations are a result of my own typification: they are those which best illustrate the potential of certain changes in the critique situation to promote access to architectural education, and equity within that education for all students. Nor is my bias as a feminist teacher undisclosed. Furthermore, in writing the narratives, I seek not to generalise from particular instances which then can be claimed to present a conservative picture as the narrative captures only one moment in time and does not account for the inevitable changes and transformations for students and teachers as an outcome of their self reflections. As to being interventionist, as
described in Chapter 3, the notion of the observer as ever being value free is not tenable. Whether the narrator, as observer, remains in the role of observer only, or participates in the teaching, or fulfils another role as researcher-participant, there is an interaction between the 'researcher' and the 'researched', which whilst I would not describe it as an "uncontrolled intervention in the lives of others" (Walker, 1983, 156), is not the value free activity that educational research sometimes is presumed to be. However, in this regard, research which is based on an ethical relationship with the students and teachers who participate, research which seeks to inform students and teachers of emerging hypotheses from the research which is specific, bounded, and contextual is hardly an "uncontrolled intervention".

...one of the most characteristic things about good research at the non-alienating end of the spectrum is that it goes back to the subjects with the tentative results, and refines them in the light of the subjects' reactions" (Reason and Rowan, 1981, 248)

Case studies are useful for narration. They are not intended to be exemplars for good practice, nor do they describe a fixed situation which is therefore replicable.

The Chapter is arranged in several themes which are pointers to the range of other activities which critique could embrace: 
Small group critiques
Peer and self critique
Problem Based Learning and Learning Contracts

They thematically describe some of the approaches undertaken to encourage architecture students' ability to achieve self-judgement. The themes further provide a structure within which to consider other researchers' texts as a background literature. None of the other texts which I have considered in this section are the outcome of ethnographic research - nor of critical research of any kind.

Some, for example, Peterson (1976, 1981) are the product of scientific and positivist research, and require a close reading to discern the generalisations the researcher has made.
It is arguable that, supporting critical research methodologies as I do, this type of research which purports to be value-free should not be considered as a source of reference. The difficulty with this approach is that there is a very small body of published educational research which considers certain aspects of architectural education - for example self and peer-review. Therefore any decision of omitting this type of research on the grounds that the researcher's methodologies have been questioned elsewhere in this thesis must be weighed against the knowledge that this methodologically questionable research is sometimes the only research which considers a certain aspect of architectural education.

Furthermore, as a researcher I never discard my feminist and critical sensibilities because, as I revealed in Susan's Story they are a "garment that cannot be removed" (Peshkin, 1988, 17). As I carry these disclosed biases everywhere, I clearly read others' research claims through these biases. Within the feminist critical ethnography research tradition I embrace the work of other researchers, and in selecting their research to illustrate one aspect of my argument I am being just as selective as I am in selecting some incidents in the studio to portray various themes as in excluding others. The focus for what is included/excluded rests very much, as it always does in critical research, with the question "Whose interests are being served/silenced by inclusion/exclusion of this material?"

Reason and Rowan (1981) underline this point in Issues of validity in new paradigm research when they are arguing that we often want to transcend the consideration of validity of an interpretation as "being right" to a consideration of "not only 'is it right?', but also 'is it useful?' and 'is it illuminating?'" (p. 243). This argument, in reverse, also works for the inclusion of positivist research conducted with undisclosed bias, as if it were "neutral research". There are more considerations for inclusion than simply methodological validity.

Rather, validity in new paradigm research lies in the skills and sensitivities of the researcher, in how he or she uses herself as a knower, as an inquirer. Validity is more personal and interpersonal, rather than methodological. (Reason and Rowan, 1981, 244)

Continuing with Peterson's case, the results were propounded as relating to "architecture students", whereas a close reading revealed that only male architecture students had been
involved in the reported studies. Whilst suggesting the problem of generalisation from "male" to "all" to the reader, I have nevertheless included Peterson's flawed positivist research findings as they are some of the very small body of research writing on self- and peer-review for architecture students. The same types of problems apply to much of the literature reviewed in this chapter. I had to make a choice between excluding much of it on the basis of the positivist research methodology engaged, and its subsequent claims to "truth" and unassailable "fact" about the processes, behaviours and outcomes described, and including it within a context of consideration that it forms the existing literature in the field. I chose the latter path.

This chapter considers the statement that if students are able to judge their own work, the prominence of seniority structures both within the School and the profession may be overturned. This chapter particularly addresses the thesis statement that by relating studio-based critique to developing students' sound self-judgement, a more effective use of critique by educators and students may be promoted. It further explores the link between the hypothesis which formed the subject matter of Chapter 3 interpreting critique through feminist poststructuralist concepts to demonstrate how critique sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessing and socialising students into the profession and this hypothesis, to propose that all students may be potentially be empowered when there are certain changes in the critique experience.

Small Group Critiques
Introduction

In Chapter 4 the difficulties of beginning architecture students gaining confidence and competence in large group critiques is discussed through the notion of silencing which accompanies the "paralysing" fear of presenting and defending one's work publicly.

Furthermore the sense of exclusion from the "real" debate is exacerbated for women in particular who struggle to promote themselves, and their design schemes, in a competitive learning environment whilst conforming to the notion of an architectural education as a cooperative endeavour.

*Interview Excerpt 1-11-199*

**Susan Shannon:** What about when there's the whole class and the staff assessor focussing on your work - how do you feel about it?

**Trina:** I still feel uncomfortable in that sort of a situation.

**Rhianna:** I think we all cringe.

**All(women):** Yeah.

*later*

**Susan:** What about you, Muriel, when there's a critique situation and when you've got the class and the staff assessor focusing on your work?

**Muriel:** No [it does not increase my confidence]

**Rhianna:** No. In front of the whole class you just crawl.

Reflecting on the stories of the students about their responses to whole-of-class critiques, or other public critique occasions, I changed my teaching practices to give students the opportunity to develop the necessary skills and understandings and with them confidence and self-judgement in small critique situations to diminish the potential for 'paralysing' fear. By removing the public aspect of the critique for commencing students I believed that students would be able to present and explain their schemes, and receive critique in a situation which encouraged confidence building. At the same time, what I sought to do was to give back to students the authority to critique their own and their peers' designs - authority which traditional public critique practices had removed. Once again, the ability to
develop confidence in providing critique was seen to be best situated in a small group of students, perhaps initially with the students with whom the designer shared informal critique in the studio setting, where clear criteria for evaluating the design could be proposed and discussed.

I considered that there was a dialectical link between 'giving' and 'getting' critique. My reasoning was that students' ability to respond to critique was a form of expertise developed over many iterations of design, and over many design schemes. The expertise to proffer meaningful critique, most important to developing professional self-judgement models of one's own design work, is then an iterative process of proffering critique, responding to critique proffered, and then going through this cycle again and again. What I believed happened when students were not formally encouraged to proffer critique of their peers' work was that students lacked experience and the opportunity to practise the skills of establishing multiple criteria upon which a design could be critiqued, as well as lacking the experience in analysing and commenting upon the relevance and relationship between the multiple criteria as they related to a design from a location as a novice. This lack of opportunity to gain expertise caused students to remain in the location I have described in Chapter 4, and in Shannon (1993c), of the student as a dependent learner in relation to the teacher.

In Shannon (1992b) *In Defence of Small Group Critique: Developing Confidence and the Ability to make Judgements in Architecture Students in a Teaching/Learning Situation* I introduced and developed the argument for developing the skills and understandings, and with that the confidence, of commencing architecture students in critique situations through small group critique.

The core argument put forward in this paper is that whilst no amount of situational improvement in the alteration of group sizes for critiques will alter the student's knowledge, the demonstration of the knowledge may well be inhibited by a situational increase in anxiety resultant from "whole of class" critiques. To understand why this a particular
problem for women, although not uncommon for men as well (consider Garry’s comments in Ch. 4, pp. 235-236) a consideration of the research at the University of Arizona (Schnorr et al., 1988) with beginning architecture students, comparing the expectations of men and women, illustrates the perceptual problems which constrain women from confidently promoting their design schemes in "whole of class" critiques.

In the University of Arizona study two hundred beginning architecture students, after completing a Semester of design projects, were given a survey to assess gender influences and project effectiveness. Schnorr et al. concluded that "females reported significantly less experience in architecture and had significantly lower grade expectations for the project than did males" but that "there were no significant gender differences on actual project grades or final course grades". The female students think that they will do less well, and the researchers believed that "although beginning female architecture students lacked experience and had lower expectations for subject success when compared to their male counterparts, their final achievement and performance was consistent with males" which led the researchers to report that "these findings suggest that females may have a more accurate perception of performance and achievement while males have a distorted perception of achievement" (Schnorr et al., 1988, my italics).

Whilst Schnorr et al. make conclusions about the accuracy of students’ expectations and predictions of their outcomes based on one Semester’s study, what is more important for my argument is the lack of confidence in their abilities which was exhibited by the females, despite the outcomes demonstrating that their abilities were on a par with those of the more experienced male students.

A consideration of gendered socialisation and education practices throws light on the construction of gender women bring with them to University. This has been explored in Shannon (1993c). In summary, what this paper argues is that, despite the lack of consistent

4. In the School under study 81% of the students commence their studies at 16-18 years of age straight from school. When they commence their professional architecture studies three years later, they then may be as young as 19 years old. SATAC (1992) 15th Annual Report to 30 June 1992 Adelaide: SATAC
significant difference between men and women in a range of traits including timidity, competitiveness, dominance, compliance and nurturance (Connell, 1987, 169), women from an early age are constructed, and then construct themselves as the "other" to the dominant male pattern of behaviour. By the time they reach University, quietness, passivity, and separation of the expectations of home and school from their 'breaking out' of their leisure time (when the dominant discourse about appropriate behaviour for young women may be flaunted) may have been "adopted as a strategy of apparent retreat" (Woods and Hammersley, 1993, 3) from the dominant culture of boys.

This "retreat" may be one reason for the poor confidence with which beginning female architecture students present and explain their design proposals before receiving significant critique before a class comprised of thirty-six men and women as well as two or three staff assessors.

Herein lies a dilemma for a commencing architecture student: the critique and assessment requirements may demand that the student commences with the range of understandings and skills of the expert but the only way presented to gain these skills is through the anxiety-inducing whole-of-class critique where the expertise with graphic presentation and oral communication can be honed and tested through receiving critique from experts. This traditional format breaches a sound educational principle, described by Chi et al. (1988), by asking a student to assume the stance of a mature professional from the location of a novice. In The Nature of Expertise Chi et al. argue that the critical difference between individuals who display more and less ability in particular domains of knowledge and skill primarily reflect the expert's possession of an organised body of perceptual and procedural knowledge that can be readily accessed and used with superior monitoring and self-regulation skills. Novices and experts differ substantially in that experts see and represent a problem in their domain at a deeper (more principled) level than novices, who tend to represent a problem at a superficial level.

5. Davies (1994) writes on the notion of the "other" and "marked" and "unmarked" in expressing the potential of poststructuralism "to disrupt and deconstruct the binarisms through which we structure our knowledge of ourselves and the social world" (p.8).
I proposed and made as a trial small group critiques together with formal peer and self-critique as alternate practices which could strengthen students' self-judgement through enabling novice students to gain expertise in 'giving' and 'getting' critique, and with the complex task of grading designs. The benefit of this procedure was not primarily to allow students to receive feedback about their design, although this was undoubtedly beneficial to students, but to encourage students to consider the self-critique and self-assessment of their own designs from the authority vested in them to critique and assess their peers' designs. Schnorr et al. reflect that:

It appears that many beginning architecture students...did not have realistic expectations concerning the grading of their own projects, with many students expecting higher grades than those actually awarded. It is important to note that this occurred even though the professor presented full written and oral explanations of grading criteria as well as graded examples of past semester projects. This might reflect the professional expectations of the professor in encouraging the students, or it might simply reflect poor student self-evaluation skills. (p. 7, my italics)

which, although arguably characteristic of beginning students' perceptions in general, and not exclusively a problem for architecture students, points to a need to develop and refine student self-evaluation skills for architecture students, whose grading and feedback frequently takes place in a public sphere.

**Example 1: Small Group Critique for First Year Students in Semester 1**

Small group critique, and peer and self-assessment have been used in studios in which I have taught in an attempt to develop self-judgement skills. Furthermore, in addressing the concerns I raised in Chapter 4 concerning the potential for beginning students to be isolated, silenced, and eventually excluded through gradually becoming more and more marginalised in the studio, the following case study describes one attempt to include all students in discussion of their own designs through a small group critique in which the students developed their own criteria for discussion in the critique. The description of the small group critique itself is followed by one idea for how the different groups can report back to the rest of the class.
Lack of knowledge about what criticism was directed towards designs by students in other groups is a complaint sometimes raised by both students and teachers about small group critique. The students are concerned that they will not have the opportunity to hear all the critiques for all the students' designs in the year and that this will disadvantage them. Teachers may be concerned that through inability to reiterate previous critique at the drawing boards at desk crits their authority and legitimate 'teacher role' may be reduced. I suggest that developing a means of reporting back to a session of the whole class obviates some of these criticisms of small group critiques, as well as reminding students that the range of issues discussed across the class varied in probably relatively minor ways so that their concern about missing out on vital criticism relevant to the development of their own scheme is possibly unfounded. Certainly I would claim that this small group critique, with the focus on the students' explanations of their designs, draws the focus away from the teacher's hierarchical control in the critiques. Where this hierarchy is maintained, as in the case of the group with Enid as convenor, the context the teacher creates for herself - as "teacher as teller" - is evident to the students who can contrast the subject positions made available through this style of teaching with that experienced in other groups with a less hierarchical structure.

In this studio I was a studio teacher in a team with three other women. I was in a position to influence the choice of critique protocols.

*Early in their first year students for their first design critique participated in a whole-of-class critique which extended over three days and contributed 10% of their assessment as formative assessment. The experiences of the public critique as their first critique caused the students to express dissatisfaction. I then looked for new ways to use critique for beginning students.*

*Excerpt from Narrative about Small Group Critique: Critique for ADI*

The whole of class meeting raised many concerns. The students acknowledged that they were poorly prepared for a "whole-of-class" critique. They believed that their poor understanding of the staffs' expectation of student preparation for the critique and input
into the critique, their uninformed expectation of the nature of the critical analysis and feedback, and their subsequent poor assessment outcomes reflected general dissatisfaction with the whole-of-class critique. More than half the class achieved a mark of 55% or less for the 10% formative assessment attributed to this assessment.

The class were keen to support a different protocol for the next critique to be held at the end of the project. In discussion as a class group it was proposed (by a student) and well received by her peers that small group critique be adopted for the next critique.

A subsequent whole of class meeting immediately after the final hand-in in the eighth week of the project allowed for random selection of the four groups (the students voted for random selection as opposed to, for example, groups of friends within the studio forming a group) and random allocation of a studio tutor as staff assessor to each group. Coming from the earlier meeting, the students expressed a strong interest in participating in the derivation of design objectives on which their work would be critiqued, and thereafter the staff using these criteria for assessment.

This task became the focus of the first of the small group meetings. The group members spent a two hour session generating a list of design objectives for consideration in the critiques. This was a very interesting process for the staff assessors to observe as groups prioritised functional and technical compliance with a rigid brief more highly than form-making, site contextuality and innovation with steel (the brief called for a BHP sponsored steel structure). What was essentially frustrating for me at this stage was the knowledge that these priorities ruled the students' designs and that the enunciation of them so late empowered neither the student nor the staff member in any meaningful dialogue about the process of design as their statement earlier would have done.

The afternoon of the critiques was absolutely enjoyable from my point of view as I "let the students do the work" by:
-maintaining a role as a group member (not one of interventionist) (Collier, 1985, 7);
-appointing a student "chair" for each discussion/critique to keep the process going.

The group of eight supported a protocol similar to the previous "whole-of-class" critique - that is with the student designer introducing her work for five minutes, followed by questions, discussion and critique for a further fifteen minutes. The group interaction and dialogue between students indicated that the students found the small group critique experience to be a valuable teaching/learning format which contributed to their learning. A full range of student competencies was represented in the group and yet there was no opportunity for the more competent students to be dismissive of the work of the less competent; the group dynamics forced a critical analysis of everyone's work by all group members. It is interesting that Collier reports that not the least of the advantages of the syndicate system where assignments are carried out by syndicates working as a team is "that one finds a greater willingness of students to attend to one another" (Collier, 1985, 9). Whilst the small group convened to carry out one assignment during an eight week project in no way approximates a syndicate-based course, the same willingness was a feature of the afternoon.

The group reconvened the next day to consider how best to report back their group experiences to the class. Several options were considered including presenting a summary sheet for each scheme relating group discussion on how adequately each scheme had satisfied the group derived design objectives, or presenting to the whole class the best example from the group relating to each of the design objectives. Both of these options were rejected in favour of the more playful proposal to present a piece of "role playing". It was decided to repeat one of the group member's critiques:

6. It has been suggested by another teacher not involved in the project as an assessor that students, in prioritising functional and technical compliance with a rigid brief over form-making, site contextuality and innovation with steel are reflecting a desire for certainties in their assessment, and are opting for a lower assessment risk strategy than inviting the assessor to judge their skills at the less quantifiable form-making, site contextuality and innovation with steel.
- as an exemplar of group interactivity;
- to demonstrate the criteria for the critique discussion (the design objectives) in the context of a piece of work;
- to gain perhaps a wider contribution from the whole of the class on their critique criteria.

As there was a two hour session for four groups to report back it was accepted that each group should assume half an hour; Group 3 volunteered to commence the process. (They felt very confident about their presentation to the class as they had just "rehearsed" it.) Sarah stood to address the whole class on her work and the remainder of Group 3 expected to prompt her, question her and analyse her strategies. However, the role playing in the context of the whole class lost its momentum for three main reasons.

1. Sarah's presentation was not the same - not even in the expected way that certain points were emphasized more, or less, or some items forgotten or others raised in the normal expectation of presenting an impromptu speech twice - but in that she had responded positively to the critique of the day previous from her group and when representing had made such an excellent presentation incorporating the comments of her peers that she pre-empted many of the discussion points by her preparedness. She had also, in reflecting on her critique of the day before, developed more refined ways of saying the same thing.

This presents another consideration - students may benefit greatly in their preparation for larger group or "whole-of-class" critiques by having a "crit before the crit". The normal sequence of events - the final design coalescing on the drawing board or in the model shop in an all night session before hand-in effectively prevents the meaningful, final, one-on-one drawing board critique prior to commencement of final presentation drawings or models. At that time the rigorous questioning of the studio tutor and the equally rigorous defence by the student, should approximate a group or even a "whole-of-class" critique in its ability to pin-point the critical issues. So frequently is this rigorous interaction denied by the student's inability to assemble all the information to communicate her/his design intention prior to the final hand-in. The process of observing design development from the initial stages is often strangely truncated at this point - students will absent themselves from the studio in order to discourage interaction with peers and tutors close to hand-in time to allow themselves the opportunity to "present a scheme" free of the concerns arising out of the critical comment and the need to respond to it in further design development.

2. Group 3's response to Sarah's presentation within the context of the assemblage of the whole class was not the same. The group dynamic had altered completely in the concept of a "group within a group". In the new situation where thirty people outside Group 3 were present as well as the members of Group 3 the "trusting" nature of the small group interaction evaporated; previously vocal group members did not participate in any critiquing in the whole class context even though the 'risk' was minimal as they had effectively rehearsed their question and heard the response only the day before. Sarah also seemed more nervous.

3. The other studio tutors' response to the presentation was not the same as my "let the group do the work" policy with Group 3. The other studio tutors wanted to participate in Sarah's critique immediately. This led to a certain bewilderment or "double-take" from Sarah who could not instantly relate to this "outside" intervention in her small group context. Sarah had adequately reframed her role as a student relating to the tutor in the small group interaction (Collier, 1985,8). She had come to rely on her peers for comment. When on this second occasion the hierarchical nature of her relationship with the tutors was reinforced by the tutors and an authority-dependency mode was being sought by the tutor she could not instantly reframe her own position. The premature intervention of the tutor effectively interrupted the role play - it took over.

The feedback from the students participating in the three other small group critiques supported its worthiness as a learning mode; many spoke enthusiastically of their
increased sense of ease speaking within a small group.

One class member commented, such was the extended time available per student (20-30 minutes for her group), that for once, even though she hadn’t received feedback from three of the four staff tutors, she felt that she really knew exactly what her group tutor, Enid, thought of her design. A second female group member commented that it was a very thorough critique from the group’s tutor whereas she had found the presence of three tutors on the previous occasion "confusing". Nevertheless she commented that she couldn’t see how this small group critique with a tutor differed from a one-on-one drawing board critique. This led me to surmise that it was possible that this small group, with Enid as their tutor, maintained an interactive group work model of a different kind - with the emergence of the studio tutor as the dominant group member the critique was generally of the student’s work by the tutor. The tutor responded to this student by saying, in defence of the three tutors interactively critiquing a student’s work in the context of the "whole-of-class" critique, that it "was nicer to have juicier interaction" between the tutors. This comment may indicate that the tutor was more concerned with the needs of teaching - representing a pluralist architectural culture, - than with the needs of the learners - who wanted to receive detailed feedback on their designs.

Another student reported that they had adopted a presentation protocol in their group in which each presenter took the group members on a walk through their building describing factors influencing its design and the weighting that the views and opinions of the client would have. He volunteered that although he finds one-on-one drawing board critiques to be a confidence increasing situation personally, he felt that he had a "contract" with his group to share what he was doing - and to show how his design could be traced back to the parti.

A student from the third group providing feedback to the class recalled that she thought it was "amazing when you see the good designs - you can see how having a strong parti and theory informs your design - it makes it easier, not harder." She went on to say that she felt the programme for the small group critiques was enabling to this process, and that as a class from their first pin-up to the small group critique "they had learnt a lot about how to talk about their designs." A mature age student reported back that the process aided self-reflective analysis.

In retrospect I regret that neither self-assessment nor peer-assessment was trialled at the conclusion of the small group critiques to further ascertain the sense of realistic self-judgement and appraisal of peer’s work. This could be claimed as one of the outcomes of small group critiques, along with the increase in student opportunity to engage in discourse related to the design problem and ways of designing as a means of developing critical vocabulary, which is a key communication skill in an architectural education and in architectural practice.

The aim for the critiques (from the staff point of view) were the same in the "whole-of-class" and in the "small group" critique: to facilitate a teaching/learning situation in which the student could show what she/he knew about their design and about the thinking which had led to its production. Furthermore one of the valued roles for critique, particularly at the earlier stages of design development, is that of performing in the role of formative assessment - reflecting back to students a critical analysis of their own design development to enable them to become more effective in their learning. This crucial role seems most at risk when critique takes place in an atmosphere which increases student anxiety.

The key to the whole issue may be found, I believe, in the students’ response to the two

7. The interest of teachers in wanting to suggest to students through a range of feedback about any one design that there is no "right" answer in design, and that there are always a plurality of ways in which any scheme can be critiqued, as well as designed, must be set against the needs of beginning students who state that "confusion" is the outcome of hearing many points of view from many critics when they are struggling to learn how to present and defend a scheme in a public sphere.
varying situations. As Boud (1990) says "it is not what teachers believe assessment to be testing which governs student behaviour, but their own perceptions" (p. 107). When assessment is seen as serving the needs of learning, as it can be in small group critiques, it is perceived in an altogether different way than when it is seen to be serving the needs of the teaching as observed in the "whole-of-class critique."

The following year, as a response to the positive comments about students' learning in these small group critiques, I made a trial of another two variations of the structured small group critique. The emphasis was on:

- students developing a critical vocabulary for critique both as a critic and a presenter in a small group situation;
- students developing a check-list of criteria for evaluation of a design as a means of encouraging self-reflection;
- students proposing self and peer-assessment as a means of encouraging self and peer-evaluation of designs against the co-developed assessment criteria.

The critique situation in which these educational objectives were made into a trial is described in the following excerpt which relates one small group concept, "The Fishbowl", proposed for use in tutorial situations by Graham Gibbs and the team developing the Teaching More Students series (1992). What I did was to transfer their principles of modelling good practice to an architectural critique situation. The Fishbowl critique presents a "critique within a fishbowl". In order to do this a number of illustrative student design proposals are critiqued as exemplars of various criteria under discussion, with the students whose work is being critiqued forming a small group within a larger group to discuss the issues and critique their work and that of their peers. This is also a method of providing a substantial critique of three or four schemes in one hour. Gibbs' team's efforts are directed primarily at developing teaching approaches effective in teaching more students using less resources without forfeiting strategies instrumental in developing deep learning approaches.

This type of critique can address the issue of competitiveness in the studio through modelling good process in design development to the class in a co-operative critique situation.
Example 2: Small Group Critique for First Year Students in Semester 2

Narrative excerpt from the Reflective Studio Project

After consideration of the focus for the discussion I selected four schemes for the Fishbowl Critique which were all quite different and in which the student designers were focusing on different areas for specialisation as well as approaching the design with different parti and different emphasis from the brief. Additionally, as I wished the works to be exemplars of good practice, it seemed important that the work under discussion was at least competent and in which the representation (Topic B issues) informed the discussion of the design (Topic A issues).

As I had been unsuccessful in my call for student volunteers for participation in the Fishbowl I asked the four students whose work I had selected to participate as discussants in the critique on the basis that they would have a 'voice' in the discussion of their work. In a new situation with which the students were totally unfamiliar, despite an explanation of the process, it is not surprising that there were no volunteers as students were possibly lacking the confidence to volunteer for what was effectively a public critique. The four student discussants were joined by Andy, Louis, the other tutor for the year, and me in a "Fishbowl" in front of the rest of the class with the four designs on the board in front of us.

The formula for the critique was highly successful. With the list of the issues identified for discussion (Brief, Parti, Scale, Volume and Function) up on the wall of the Crit Room there was a focus for the discussion which constantly returned the discussion to Topic A issues and deflected little from the intent of the critique which was to have the chosen designs explicated by their designers in terms of the class-identified issues. All that was required in the way of facilitation was to move the discussion on from each of the identified issues and to move the discussion around the group so that each designer could comment on each issue identified. Despite my repeated requests for students in the class to propose other issues requiring discussion it seemed that those already identified covered the range of considerations they wished to discuss on the day.

The assessment for the preliminary Sketch Design was 15% of final mark, and I had posted the marks using the students' enrolment numbers as the sole means of identification. There was little negative commentary to me about the marks. I believe that it may be because most of the anxiety and therefore negative commentary about marking arises not from students who do not accept that their own mark is a fair response to their submitted work; but is in fact a response to their mark in comparison with their peers' mark, and is a commentary about their belief about the quality of their peers' work in comparison with their own work; their negative commentary, and anxiety are, in fact, a form of peer assessment. The aggrieved student will often point to her peer's work and say that she did not believe this work "deserved a Distinction" whereas, I claim, what she is saying is "I do not see how this work differs in quality from my own so substantially that it is considered to be worthy of a Distinction whereas mine is worthy only of a Pass." This student has most to gain, I claim, from a situation like the Fishbowl Critique where competent designs, the thinking behind them and the broad issues with which each student had to deal were explicated, not by the staff but by the students. This seems important in students understanding the issues and accepting their assessment.

8. Tilbury (1992) refers to "the central topic"..."which involves evaluating student design concepts" as Topic A, and "the secondary topic"..."concerned with presentation (graphic) skills" as Topic B. I have adopted this naming.
Not all students benefit in the same way from this type of critique which models presentation and critique skills, as well as demonstrating step by step how good designers address the criteria for design, and hence assessment. Some students found it difficult to abstract from the schemes discussed to their own schemes, and displayed the poor judgement models in relation to looking at their own work (in comparison with the four Fishbowl exemplars). Peterson (1976) questioned whether some students are poor students simply because they have a poorly developed judgement model, tending to overrate themselves, and displaying defensive behaviour in regards to receiving critique. By contrast, Peterson noted that the willingness of a good designer to undervalue his own work on hearing it criticized may contribute to his being a good designer in the first place...the fact that hearing criticism even from (or maybe especially from) peers led good designers to undervalue their own work and suggests that they do benefit [from critique]. They are willing to see their own faults or differing views of their own work. (p. 153)

I would therefore not recommend the sole use of Fishbowl Critiques as not only are some students unable to extrapolate from the discussion of the schemes under review to their own schemes, but also it could be possible for the same "good" students to have their work critiqued in the Fishbowl time after time which may set up a "them" and "me" dualism which is very unhelpful in the promotion of peer critique and assessment. Rather than promote a co-operative learning environment where competent designers model their thinking to less competent designers, this dualism may reinforce the 'gap' which exists between competent designers and those still struggling with the multiple criteria of design, thereby promoting an even more competitive learning environment in the studio.

**Example 3: Exhibition Format Review Session for Final Year Students in Semester 1**

Whilst a strong argument can be mounted that beginning students may benefit from small group critiques, continuing and completing students may believe that they are best served by participating in whole-of-class critiques as a preparation for professional life. Student opinion on the role of architectural education in preparing students for entry to the profession is divided, as can be seen in Chapter 4. Whilst some students believe that this is
a central role for the School, others consider that this is not an important focus, and that they will learn more about the profession in six months in an Office than in six years in the School. I believe that it is important to have a range of critique activities for continuing and completing students to broaden their experiences and to reflect students' varying needs and expectations. These could include critique with peers only in small groups, critique with whole of class and teachers only, critique with peers and professional consultants in small groups and whole of class situations, and "professional" critiques with representative of user groups, clients and community stake holders whilst within the School. Dana Cuff (1991) comments that a strong criticism she has of traditional in-School critiques is that those people whose evaluation of the architectural project is, in practice, the most important, are in fact the least likely to appear on architectural juries.

At the final review, a critique of the students' completed work becomes a formal ritual in which several respected jurors are invited to evaluate students' projects. Some critics are drawn from the pool of in-house studio instructors, some from the local community, and some schools fly in famous architects to the campus to participate in juries. Most guest critics are not only architects but architect-teachers; rarely are clients, users, engineers and planners, or neighbours invited, even though their evaluation of architectural projects is important in actual practice. (Cuff, 1991, 122)

The educational objectives for continuing and completing architecture students must promote flexibility in practice within the School. Practice at presenting schemes to different juries, and understanding the composition of juries to include various stake-holders, is valuable professional preparation. Similarly, mounting a shop-front display or writing an article for a local newspaper about a locally contentious design proposal may be a useful way of eliciting valuable community critique and prepares students for another dimension of their professional lives. It is useful to reconsider Boud's (1990) statement in this regard. He says that "we need to examine assessment tasks to see if they reflect adequately the decision making processes which are required of practitioners in any given domain of knowledge" (p. 108). Critique, as a presentation and assessment process for more senior students must be formulated to:

- encourage meaningful learning;
- develop an appreciation of the central concepts in a given area;
- promote a variety of approaches to stimulate interest in receiving critique from a range of
  stake-holders in the built environment, including self and peers;
- promote the centrality of self-assessment skills to ensuring autonomy in the profession.

Critiques for completing students can address concerns raised in Chapter 4 through
presenting a format in which students can build their confidence as commencing
professionals, particularly through introducing them to different models for success from
within the School. Critique protocols which disrupt traditional notions of hierarchy, and
competitive achievement, present a wider range of ways in which students can view
themselves, and practice.

The final small group critiques I will consider were situated in a studio which I observed
and did not participate in as a teacher. James North established an exhibition format for a
formative critique for advanced students in the studio he facilitated. In this exhibition
situation, professional consultants and client representatives mixed informally in the studio
with the students, who had both individual and group schemes on exhibition. The following
narrative excerpt describes the occasion more fully.

Narrative excerpt from Dana Cuff Studio.

The simultaneous pin-up for the two projects displayed the four 'Housing Design' group
projects together with twenty two individual 'West End' projects in an exhibition format
review session involving all the students and several consultants: a Quantity Surveyor, an
Interior Designer, a Landscape Architect, and a Structural Engineer as well as the 'West
End' client. In attendance were James North and a tutor, Peter, who circulated
informally amongst the students. This exhibition format with the attendance of
professional consultants provided all the groups with the opportunity for lengthy and
detailed professional discussion and critique of their group 'Housing Design' project at a

9. This studio has been extensively described in Shannon and Brine, 1994.
10. James North has questioned my use of the expression "exhibition" as perhaps giving
what he presented to the students as an opportunity to "Get your work pinned up - it's a
good chance to talk to [the consultants] about your work" a greater theoretical basis than it
had. I suggested that this format of staff, students and consultants informally moving about
work posted for review with the designer adjacent to their own work to provide a
commentary and receive criticism was referred to elsewhere (Anthony, 1991, p125) as an
"exhibition" and this 'label' simplified repeated explanation of the format. James, I believe,
would have preferred to see another expression, such as the one he used in his personal
diary "small group/individual criticism and information exchange" used throughout but I
felt that even this expression failed to describe the fact that all work was hung
simultaneously for informal criticism. Therefore I have continued to use the expression
"exhibition" in the text whilst acknowledging that James does not wish to be seen to be
"institutionalising" what he saw as an informal occasion.
formative stage, as well as individual discussion and critique of their 'West End' proposal subsequent to its completion.

I have observed, over the years, that James North does not often hold formal traditional critiques as a means of providing formative or summative assessment.

He believes that in his final year studio:

"...[we got the best value from] the input from outside practitioners, whether they be practising architects, quantity surveyors or whatever...floating around in a small group/individual criticism and information exchange..." (James North Pers. comment 29-4-199 and Pers. Diary 27-3-199)

He nevertheless strongly believes and advocates that:

"The process of assessment, criticism and feedback is understood to be an important part of the teaching and learning process." (Teaching and Learning Strategies Hand-out to students 20-2-199)

Some of the students were more comfortable with the process of the exhibition than others. As James said later he thought that this degree of comfort related to their personal characteristics rather than to the exhibition format. In order to maximise the opportunities presented by the presence of the consultants, the students - either as a group or as individuals - had to be willing to approach the consultants and ask them to come over to the screens where their scheme was displayed to draw them into conversation about their work. James and Peter discreetly and ably facilitated some of these consultations by suggesting "Would this group like to show Mr Smith, the Consulting Engineer, their work?" or "This group had an interesting problem with the Landscape Design that they might like to show to Mr Green, the Landscape Architect", or by introducing individual students to particular consultants in the context of concerns that the staff had about the particular student's work.

James also subsequently, in the review of the first draft of this narrative, raised with me the matter of the choice of the consultants for this review session. One important role he saw as a facilitator was the selection of consultants and the potential for harmony between them and the students. He described his decision not to invite a practising architect who had previously worked with these students on their projects as calculated to promote harmony and discussion and to permit the students to function best in the role he was reinforcing as emerging professionals. He wanted to be able to optimise the input of the invited consultants; the informal exhibition format with a particular group of consultants was one way of doing this.

The exhibition format review session

What were the features of the review session in the informal exhibition format? James had asked the students to pin up their work in the Display Room; he had invited several professional consultants to be present at various times during the afternoon to suit their convenience. The consultants were not all present at the same time; they came and went as their schedules permitted.

The first review I observed was an "Office" group of six students discussing their scheme for the 'Housing Design' project with the Landscape Architect. (Simultaneously the Structural Engineer and the Interior Designer were discussing another group scheme elsewhere in the Display Room.) Two of the students took on the role of spokespersons for the group - they were articulate and confident male students - and it was noticeable that the other students, including a normally very articulate female student, Wendy, said nothing at all. One would not have thought that they were "in the group" - they did not, by particular proximity to the scheme "own their work" either. When I subsequently asked James about the lack of involvement of the female student in the discussions with
the consultant James replied that she was "very tired". Five out of six of the group were male; three males and Wendy were Australian students; the other males were a recent Australian resident of non English speaking background and an exchange student who spoke English.

The Landscape Architect, Mr Green, was careful and controlled in his criticisms - at one point he criticised the way that two paths crossed as "messy" and then said "Oh, no, that's not important" as a criticism. He said that he thought it seemed important to find the one or two things which the students were doing well, and to praise them for this before pointing to the things which were done less well. He affirmed to them that they had "all the big things right" and invited the group to work with him on their design - he suggested this twice and the group spokespersons said "Well, we might just take you up on that sometime." Despite James' earlier request to me to remain in the background, I interposed to say "I think Mr Green means now" after Mr Green had received no response after twice asking for a butter paper overlay. The group did not seem to engage with the opportunity offered to have a working session right then but eventually produced a piece of butter paper, took the work down from the screens, and sat down as a group around a nearby the table to work on their design with Mr Green. Could this simply have been as a result of their fatigue, or because they wanted to use the time to engage other consultants in discussion or because this was a completely unfamiliar mode of critique which they had not previously experienced so that they did not appreciate the "cues"? I believe it was the latter: the critique format lent itself to being a "working session" in contrast to any critiques the students had participated in over the three previous years. Mr Green's critique style and his general demeanour were gentle; he sought to draw out the students' ideas so that he could promote the good ones. He told the group that he believed that "an average idea worked on was better than a brilliant idea with three hours to put it across!"

It was a very good illustration of his "theory in action" that Mr Green encouraged them to take their work down from the screens, and, used his own professional vocabulary to talk about the work, the ideas, the genesis of the ideas, the refinements and iterations which are possible to these ideas while all the time sketching over their presentation on a sheet of butter paper. His facilitative style was pure Schon: "Follow me!" and his most comfortable mode for critique was butter paper laid over the students' work and a felt tipped pen. He worked in the same visual and graphic mode that the students had used for their presentation - he was not reliant on text or words to get his constructive criticisms across to the students.

The interaction between the students and the consultant was enabled because the site for this discussion was a real project and a current competition. In fact James asked Mr. Green in the presence of the group: "Have you entered this competition?" to which Mr

11. This raises a point about the wisdom or otherwise of holding the review session immediately following a hand-in. The students who have had very little sleep will not be able to fully contribute to, nor to derive much benefit from the reviews; the opportunities for maximizing input and output may be as limited as extreme fatigue will permit. Anthony's (1991, 39) research revealed that "The night before a jury about one third of the architecture students surveyed do not sleep at all, and another half sleep only for one to four hours. Less than a quarter sleep for five hours or more." 80% of 375 respondents agreed that their sleeping patterns before the jury affect their performance at the jury. Of those who agreed, 72% admitted that their performance is worse as a result of little sleep.

With 25% of the mark for the half Semester related to the hand-in for the individual design project on the day before the review, and 10% of the half-semester mark for the group hand-in on the day of the review, I would challenge any assertion that this session was seen by the students as anything other than a "review" in Anthony's sense of the word "review" or "critique" as synonymous with "jury" when used to describe a jury as the predominant method to evaluate student's performance in the design studio (p. 3).

12. Donald Schon (1987, 207) Educating the Reflective Practitioner has coined this phrase "follow me!" along with other coaching styles "hall of mirrors" and "joint experimentation" to describe the facilitative action of the studio teacher.
Green replied "No". James did not need to tell Mr Green of all that had preceded this interaction in studio teaching - Mr Green bringing the skills of a mature professional knew what was going on - which permitted him to reflect and respond from his real world base. An example of this reflection follows:

Mr Green: "I've tried with [similar] entrances to make it a sequence of opening, closing, opening, closing..."

Student: "And did you landscape the open spaces?"

Mr Green: Well, I used to. But I don't any more. I found that when I created an opening, maybe one metre square, and paved it, the people who lived there came along and used it. Someone put a beautiful, big, outdoor pot there. Another one had a sign saying "This garden is sponsored by the Lions Club". So now I don't.

This is heuristic knowledge. Mr Green's "trial-by-doing" can be handed on to the students gently; he doesn't tell them what to do; he told them what he would have done.

The next review I observed was Mr Smith, the Structural Engineer, and Ms. Uurlin, the Interior Designer, discussing the 'West End' scheme designed by Rhianna. The review proceeded with Rhianna explaining how important it had been to her to maintain great structural eccentricity in her steel portal frames despite the higher costs incurred in so doing in comparison with maintaining vertical columns. Mr Smith questioned her closely about the steps in her decision making process; thoroughly drawing her out on the actual processes of informing herself she had engaged in order to satisfy herself that the frame was within budget. A major theme for this individual project was the notion of accountability to cost effectiveness. Rhianna was able to support her arguments for her unconventional frame by detailed costings by a Quantity Surveyor she had prepared and mounted with her work. While this detailed discussion of the structural framework was ensuing Ms. Uurlin did not interrupt, and generally did not engage Rhianna in conversation about the merits or otherwise to her internal spaces created by the eccentric portal frame which was the entire focus of the Review up to this time.

There was a sense of a conversation or discussion between equals - Mr Smith and Rhianna - not a critique protocol dependent on hierarchical power based relationships. Both Mr Smith and Rhianna initiated questions and commentary. Rhianna listened to what Mr Smith had to say and Mr Smith listened to what Rhianna had to say. Rhianna brought forth her difficulties with her design prefacing her disclosure by saying:

"I probably shouldn't be saying this because you probably wouldn't have picked it up..."

which made her deception transparent. She revealed not only her design difficulty but also the fact that she was aware that her presentation had the ability to deceive. This is significant risk taking and mirrors the way that two professionals would discuss a design issue where there is a symmetry of power...and is notably different from the attempts of many students to limit their exposure by responding only to questions and not initiating commentary on their own short-comings - particularly the short-comings which would not be noticed in the critique situation.

I believed that the removal of any responsibility for assessing the students' work from the consultants enhanced their easy exchanges with students like Rhianna who were prepared to discuss the most critical and perhaps worrisome thing about their design solution. The review protocol with Mr Smith's close questioning also empowered Rhianna to know what his criteria for assessment of her structural system's efficiency were. Rhianna could hear what questions were being asked by Mr Smith in his discipline area - he had made his thinking transparent to her.

Ms Uurlin critiqued Rhianna in quite a different way - about her design process, not her building. Her concept for a process was to carry out all her analysis first, look up all the Regulations which would affect the work and then to do something really innovative with the outcomes. She was recommending that Rhianna use an analysis-synthesis
model; whereas what Rhianna had used was closer to Ledewitz’ concept-test model. Rhianna did not respond to this criticism other than to agree that it was an oversight of hers not to peruse the pertinent Regulations to ascertain the fire-rating for the steel frame. Ms. Urlwin suggested to Rhianna that she could then take an "ordinary member and do something really unusual with it - like turn it upside down!"

I then observed another of the five female students in the year, Trina, having her individual work reviewed by the Quantity Surveyor. Trina was very quiet in her explanation of her decision making and the thinking about costing that had caused her to adopt the forms and finishes she had for her building. She did not draw his attention at all to her detailed costing of her building at $385-00 per square metre even after his close questioning about the structural system and internal and external cladding and fenestration when he estimated the cost of the building to be approximately $400-00 per square metre. Trina comes from a non-English speaking background; she nevertheless has an excellent grasp of both conversational and architectural vocabulary yet her speech markers are silences. Some people find these silences disconcerting thinking that Trina is "stuck" for something to say or the vocabulary to say it. However, she was able to respond fully to all his questions about structure, cladding, floor finish, internal lining, and the extent of the mezzanine at her preferred measured pace, in this one-on-one situation with the Quantity Surveyor when he was relaxed and casual, and without interruptions from others, (which normally fill her silences).

This was also the case for Muriel, who received a review of her work by the Quantity Surveyor quite late in the afternoon at the suggestion of Peter, the tutor, after many students had already left. Muriel discovered during the discussion one-on-one with the Quantity Surveyor that she had sacrificed too early, without adequate investigation of the costing inferences, an interesting curved portal frame structure for a more prosaic one, because "as soon as I heard about the need for costing the project I panicked."

Her meeting with the Quantity Surveyor about her choice between the curved portals she had favoured in her preliminary design and the conventional portals now adopted had revealed to her that there was only a 10% penalty for curving in the cost of the steel and that even that could have been reduced by selecting certain extrusions. If only Muriel had been in possession of this information at the critical decision making time! She had not felt confident, as a student, to use the telephone to seek information from the trade or consultants and yet was now well able to see how the earlier review of her work by the Quantity Surveyor in the studio or costing discussions with a steel fabricator, could have empowered her decision making.

In concluding the discussion of the informal exhibition format from a consideration of

13. Stefani Ledewitz (1985) Models of Design in Studio Teaching proposed that the Analysis-Synthesis model is associated with learning difficulties for many reasons, not the least of which is its theoretical underpinning because "factual (perceptual) knowledge" cannot exist outside a theoretical (cognitive) framework and because the logic of induction, as demonstrated by Popper is "both unattainable and unnecessary" (Ledewitz, p. 4), whereas her proposed Concept-Test model is presented as more tenable in theory and more useful in practice. She describes this model:

By conjecturing, or imaging, a designer conceives of a solution in principle early in the design process, which is progressively refined (or discarded). The representation of the conjecture by drawing or making models is a means of elaborating it and communicating it back to the designer or to others for evaluation or testing. "Testing is a feed-back and feed-forward process, adjusting the relation between a design product as it develops and the many criteria and qualities the product is intended to meet." The activities of conjecturing and testing, intuition and rationality, creative leaping and rigorous analysis, thrive on each other. Oscillating or cycling between them is what enables the designer to learn from his or her work and progressively improve the design. (Ledewitz, p. 5)

14. I suspect that other more confident (male) students would have been quick to show their knowledge; Trina was passive in this exchange.
the exchange of different students with consultants there is the potential for effective, concise and professional critique from the consultants if the students, either individually, or as a group, are prepared to bring forth their short-comings in skills, knowledge and understandings to the consultants for consultation instead of lapsing into the passive, deceptive role many adopt in the conventional critique situation characterised by asymmetry of power. One of the ingredients of this symmetry of power is the removal of the assessment task from the consultant.

Conclusion

In this section on small group critiques I have considered alternatives to the traditional whole-of-class critiques. I have argued that the educational benefits of students developing their own judgement are promoted through small group critiques when the anxiety of the public nature of critique and the assessment role for critique is removed for beginning students. For completing students, the benefits of participating in small group critiques relate to the role small group critiques can play in preparing students for imminent professional practice. The crits may act as exemplars of exchanges between groups of architect peers in a co-operative office situation, and exchanges between consultant teams in a co-operative project situation.

There is a very strong link between small group critiques and the promotion of students' "voice" in these situations, and the opportunity presented by convening small group critiques to formalise self and peer critique - critique which naturally happens in the studio for some groups of students. The argument can be advanced that through modelling self and peer critique in formal self and peer critique colloquia, students are able to experience the inputs which contribute to worthwhile critique, and to propose models for self and peer critique which enhance self-judgement.

Self And Peer Critique
Introduction

Despite the extensive general literature concerned with self and peer-assessment, there is very little literature pertaining directly to the practice of self and peer-critique with architecture students. Given my arguments for the centrality of developing skills with criticism both as a designer and as a critic, this lack underlines Cuff's (1991) statements about the ability of expert critique to remind architecture students about their place in the hegemonic structure of architecture. She says that: "As a ritual, the crit...offers a model of professional behaviour, implying that full-fledged architects hold positions that can be challenged only by other full-fledged architects...It sets students in relation to their seniors, who publicly judge the strengths and weaknesses of their early works" (Cuff, 1991, 126). Promoting skills with self and peer-critique from the beginning of architectural education has the potential to disrupt perceived hierarchies and challenge existing models for success as well as to disrupt the competitive assessment model upon which much critique activity is predicated.

Literature Review

The small amount of literature on self, and peer-assessment in architecture courses, includes Peterson's (1976, 1981) papers on architectural judgement. The paper Jury Criticism and Design Ability: Factors in Evaluative Judgments of Design (1976) is summarised:

Critical comment (the "crit") is used to teach judgement and design to architects. It is assumed by the experts that the best designers are likely to be the best judges. In this study [male] architecture students judged their own and their peers' work before or during a peer jury; 3 instructors' evaluations were criteria [against which judgements about the accuracy of the students' judgements were made]. When students judged their own work, good designers were more accurate than poor ones and hearing the jury assisted both good designers and poor designers. When students judged one another's work, their own ability to design made no difference. Again, the jury assisted both groups. It appears that all students tend to overrate poor designs by others. (p. 147)

Peterson's research further asserts that "new teaching strategies may be necessary to help poor designers learn self-criticism" and that "criticism cannot take place without judgment"
(p. 153). He believed that the development of judgement was central to his research outcome that students appeared to perceive criticism as one task, and rating-grading as a distinctly different task. This gave rise to the finding that whilst both good and poor designers were "extraordinarily accurate in judging good work", they were "equally inaccurate in judging poor work" (p. 153). His unanswered research questions give rise to thoughtful consideration in regard to the role of self and peer critique in developing self-judgement: "Is the ability to judge poor design accurately essential to design ability?" and "Is this ability to judge, especially one's own work, an ability which can be learned at this point [as a beginning architecture student] or beyond in a student's life, or is he [sic] locked in by genetics or earlier training?" (p. 153-154).

Peterson's unanswered research questions about developing self-judgement were further explored in Peterson (1981) Architectural Judgment: Effects of Design Differences in Products and Judges. He found that when a group of 27 male architecture students rated 15 designs by other students, good designers consistently rated lower than "average and poor designers", and poor designers erred in the opposite direction. He believed that the underrating of good design "might be more of a function of a view of good design rather than a difference in ability to judge it". He continued that there are "factors other than the students' ability-to-judge operating in the judgment of poor designs" and that "it is possible that the poor designers see something of themselves in the poor work - they are threatened." He believed that if the "nature and source" of that threat could be identified and overcome, they "might become better designers and more accurate judges", speculating that "perhaps [poor designers] see their own work as better than it is, and they see good design as poor design because it is not what they do" (p.424).

Differences between male and female judgement models were revealed in Schnorr et al.'s (1991) work which surveyed predictive and actual outcomes from beginning architecture students. Therefore Peterson's work, which is confined to judgement patterns amongst male students, cannot be said to characterise judgement patterns for architecture students.
Boud's (1986) *Implementing student self-assessment* Case Study Number 3 looked at self-assessment with final year landscape architecture students at the University of New South Wales. This work is written up more fully in Boud and Lublin (1983a) *Student self-assessment* in Squires (1983) *Innovation through Recession*. A theme of discussion on self-assessment concerns the use of self-assessment as a means of lessening the teacher's load in difficult times, instead of placing the emphasis on *the benefits to the student*, which Boud and Lublin believe are several:

First, the ability to assess oneself and one's performance realistically is an essential component of competent professional practice. Also, self-assessment is a necessary component of independent or autonomous thinking and must be fostered if the courses aspire to the development of critical thinking in students. If students are only exposed to unilateral assessments [when staff alone...set the learning goals and then choose and apply the criteria to evaluate whether these have been achieved] by their teachers and are not placed in situations where they must make decisions about their own work, they cannot be expected to develop these higher level abilities which are alleged to be the hallmark of higher education. Indeed, it could be said that as one of the main aims of higher education is to encourage individual responsibility in learning, one of the complementary aims must be to encourage individual responsibility in assessment, i.e. *that students should move from a position of dependence in assessment to a position of independence where they can make their own realistic estimates of the nature and extent of their learning.* (Boud and Lublin, 1983a, 93-4, my italics)

Final year students in the landscape architecture course were invited individually to determine the criteria which they considered should be applied to the outcomes of the design project. These included both considerations of good design and factors which are unique to the particular problem which had been set. When the projects were complete, the students met for a session in which they each had the opportunity of receiving feedback from their peers on their own design. Following this, students completed a self-assessment of their own project in the light of their original criteria, suitably modified in the light of their own experience and that of the feedback from their peers. In this case the outcomes did not form part of the formal assessment system, but students appreciated the opportunity for feedback on their own work. (Boud and Lublin, 1983a, 96)

As Collier (1985) suggests, "the spirit and style of student assessment define the de facto curriculum" (p. 17) and "there does appear to be a move towards consciously matching assessment techniques to the balance of skills aimed at in courses" (p. 18). In contrast with

---

15. The range of generic skills with which students graduating from University should be equipped to meet employer's expectations are outlined in Johnston, Stephen (1992) 'Broadening the Curriculum: Non-specialist Skills which Professionals Use', *HERDSA News* 14;1 9-12 and Sellick, Robert (1993) 'Arts graduates: meeting crucial employer needs', *Adelaidian* June 7, 1993.
this introductory work by Boud and Lublin, my approach with introducing peer and self-assessment for beginning architecture students was partially informed by the belief that students "give precedence to assessment which is graded...Grading acts as a kind of currency indicating what teachers value" (Boud, 1990,103). Therefore, whilst students are being encouraged through the use of self and peer-assessment to "develop the skills of learning how to learn, how to monitor their own work, how to establish their own criteria and how to make judgments about the worth of their achievements, all of which are necessary elements of professional practice", (p. 104) the teacher gives legitimacy to this task by formally utilising the results as a component of the overall summative assessment.

This legitimation of the importance of the task through incorporating the results in the overall summative assessment differs from a peer evaluation situation upon which Boud (1989) comments. He proposes that it is possible to incorporate student self-assessment through weighting for the quality of the self-assessment only, instead of utilising the assessment itself as a component of the mark. He states that the disadvantage of this former approach is that "it turns self-assessment into another course assignment, and may lead it to be regarded simply as a barrier to overcome in the quest for good marks." Whilst he believes that assessing the quality of self-assessment colludes with the (regrettable) attitude that students should not expect to do anything unless it is marked, this approach can nevertheless encourage critical self-assessment (p. 124).

Boud (1989) had further developed the position he explored with landscape architecture students in 1983 by 1989 when he presented the paper Can Student Self-Assessment be Used For Formal Assessment Purposes? In this paper he argued that unless students can be relatively accurate self-assessors, and the context of formal assessment procedures does not distort their ratings, the assessments should "either be restricted to a purely learning role, or it should be used in a way that recognises its potential for bias and distortion and controls for this through some form of moderating device or strategy which does not involve a direct input of student-generated marks into formal processes" (p. 120). He concluded, with a
reasonable degree of confidence from the quantitative advice then available, which he did not hold in high regard, that:

the best evidence which can be deduced from the literature suggests that, so long as the studies which involve students grading themselves on effort, rather than on achievement are excluded from consideration, most students generate marks which are reasonably consistent with marks given by staff. However, weaker students do have a tendency to over-rate themselves, sometimes quite considerably and stronger students have the opposite tendency though of a lesser magnitude. The context of formal assessment appears to increase the tendency for students to over-rate themselves. (Boud, 1989, 122)

He described methods to improve marker reliability, and strategies for incorporating student self-marking to demonstrate that there are a variety of ways in which student self-assessment can legitimately be used in formal assessments. He summarises the requirements to be met before self-assessments are incorporated into assessments as:

(a) there is a high trust, high integrity learning environment.
(b) students are rewarded for high integrity marking.
(c) marks are moderated by staff so that deviations from staff marks need to be justified.
(d) blind peer marking is used as a check.
(e) random staff marking is used as a check.
(f) a major goal is the achievement of effective self-assessment and students have had ample opportunity to practice and develop their skills.
(g) the criteria against which achievement is to be judged have been sufficiently unambiguously defined for there to be little scope for misinterpretation of grade boundaries.
(h) effort is explicitly excluded as a criterion. (Boud, 1989, 125)

Magin's (1994) work on peer-assessment continues this thread of argument concerning the input of other than teacher-derived and accredited marks for summative assessment, asking Should Student Peer Ratings be Used as Part of Summative Assessment? He found that whilst there was recognition of the pedagogical value of students engaging in peer-assessment, there was a general consensus in the literature in relation to assessing communication skills or group work skills, that the marks from peers were too unreliable to be given significant weighting in the final assessments (Boud, 1986). Through a process of co-developing the peer assessment criteria in order to ensure that staff and students supported the selected criteria, Magin was able to show that when multiple peer-assessments

16. There was a sense in Loris' peer assessment (discussed Ch. 5, pp. 340) that the peers were rewarding effort. This belief supports Peterson's view that "students hesitate to depreciate a peer and associate, especially for 'the record'" (Peterson, 1976, 153).
(from approximately 10 students) were averaged, they provided a high level of reliability where the teacher's score was used as a referent despite the low reliability of individual student raters. Magin believed that student and staff understanding of, and commitment to, peer-assessment is essential to the success of this process, as is an appreciation of the educational benefits derived from engaging this process. He believed that part of the process would thus require students to participate in determining the criteria which were to be used in peer marking.

Reizes and Magin's (1994) study *Peer Assessment of Engineering Students' Oral Communication Skills: A Case Study* provided details of results of peer-assessment for 19 groups of approximately 7 engineering students. Averaged results from the 19 groups indicated that the scores obtained from multiple peer ratings of oral communication skills were reasonably reliable. However, reliabilities for individual student raters suggested that students individually were not proficient at rating their fellow students.

Once again this study of peer rating reliability was a very bounded study, looking at one identifiable skill only. These studies, important as they are, reveal in part why there is not more literature available on self-assessment and peer-assessment in architectural design. When assessing architectural design is seen as a complex multiple criteria assessment task, there is a certain reluctance on the part of 'expert' teachers to consider that students have developed sufficient judgement of architectural design to be able to make holistic assessments. Teachers themselves in the School observed relied more on 'global' marking strategies than on individual assessment using multiple criteria. When students were invited to engage in peer-assessment during studios in which I was researcher-participant, I felt it was very important to co-develop criteria for assessment so that everyone was assessing from a commonly agreed set of criteria. Maintaining the 'global' marking strategies of mature professionals is not helpful for students. As John Izard, Australian Council for Educational Research said:
I have no problem with 'global' marking strategies as a way of assessing - with care such assessments can be reliable. My concern is that students (and lecturers) receive no feedback on the bases being used for assessment and on the reasons why such an assessment was high, medium, or low. Students have no information on what factors lead to better assessments, nor on what they can do to improve matters. All they know is that they have to be better 'globally'. (pers. corr. 5-10-1993)

As an outcome from my observations as a researcher-participant I believe that students who have spent six weeks on a design project are in a very strong position to judge both their own, and their peers' work, as long as they use co-developed assessment criteria and a standard rating scale with which they are very familiar.

Example 1: First Year Architecture Students, Semester 1 Tea House Project

The following excerpt explores one studio situation in which self and peer-assessment skills for beginning architecture students were promoted. The results were used as a means of providing multiple feedback about formative work to encourage critical self-assessment (much as Boud did with the landscape architecture students) and to promote confidence, rather than as a contribution to the summative assessment. Boud and Brew (1995) also comment on the use of self assessment as a means to improving critical reflection. On this particular project, where each tutor had autonomy in the way in which formative critiques were organised, there was an administrative barrier to utilising a component of the peer and self-assessments for the 20% contribution by formative assessment towards the summative assessment as some students had participated in formal self and peer-assessment whilst others had not.

Excerpt from Narrative - Reflection on Critique Processes For First Year BArch Students In Semester 1, 199_Tea House Project

17. Others do. When I shared his comments with other academics the response from a 'detractor' from global assessments was that there was no evidence that global assessments can be reliable (whatever this means: presumably reliable as in Peterson's terms - that the students could rate schemes similarly to the staff assessors' ratings), whilst a 'supporter' said that lack of feedback as a result of global assessment was not an outcome from global assessment; that one can assess globally and still give feedback. My opinion is that global assessment is unhelpful for students and it frequently masks an unwillingness of the assessor to be explicit about the criteria for assessment and the means by which the assessment could be improved, although I agree with the above comment that this failure to be explicit is not necessarily a function of global assessment. However, it is easy for assessors to be inexplicit when giving feedback about global assessment. The very fact that many call it "gut reaction" would indicate that the feedback may be in terms such as "I don't like it".
Once again in 199_ the first year B Arch students have focused their first B Arch experiences in architectural design around the Tea House Project.

The students had been considering this project from the first day of the Semester and submitted preliminary ideas at the end of Week 3. The Hand-in had asked for a brief, 'parti' and preliminary design concepts presented in an optional format including at least scale plans and a working model and 3-dimensional 'thumb-nail' sketches.

On the Monday of Week 4 the first critique session for the Tea House Project was held. When the students convened at 2 p.m. they did so in their groups of seven or eight students together with their design tutor to whom they had been assigned for the project.

The design tutor would already have been familiar with the work after two desk-crits; not so the other members of the group unless they had sought out their fellow group members and discussed their designs already. However the designs had been publicly displayed in the Crit Room from Thursday morning until Monday afternoon so there was an expectation that the students would have perused their peers' work in some detail.

Each of the four tutors had complete autonomy in the choice of format for the three hour critique. The formats adopted ranged from the traditional presentation by the students of their work followed by critique largely from the design tutor with some peer input, through to presentation from the student followed by peer and tutor critique in a format which placed the responsibility for questioning the designer, commenting on the designers' intentions and strategies for implementation and proffering some critique with the peer group.

The impetus for formalising processes for peer interaction very early in the year arose as a result of what I perceived to be the poorly founded educational bases for the Week 4 'Whole-of-Class' critique for the Tea House Project the previous year, with its rather heavy-handed critique by 'experts', in a completely public sphere so early in the year (Shannon, 1992).

Additionally, the Tea House Project is run as a completely integrated project based learning situation where the intra-subject barriers erected between studio-based design teaching and other curriculum strands are dissolved to enable design, construction, structures and science teaching to be project based and largely studio centred. Integrated project based learning places emphasis on developing sound processes as well as developing high level discipline specific skills. This rhetoric from the education discipline has to be developed into learning strategies within the architectural studio teaching if it is to ever be more than rhetoric. As a result traditional methods for studio-based critique which rely heavily on critique from experienced professionals, may need modification_18 to develop more opportunities for students to be drawn into a consideration and discussion of their own design processes and those of others as a way of developing, modelling or demonstrating sound processes.

Another level of meaning about what a focus on process may predicate in the studio comes from a consideration of the purpose of process in critically examining work in progress, and creatively responding to criticism.

The format I adopted for the first critique (or pin-up) session was intended to reaffirm to the students that a soundness of process leading to the design of a satisfactory Teahouse which could be demonstrated in a situation at the drawing board one-on-one with the design tutor could also be demonstrated to the larger group in a pin-up situation. I selected a medium risk strategy which involved the whole group (of eight) in detailed discussions of their own, and others' work. The format was as follows:

18. Wagner (1994) says that if there is an intention to validate experience in the problem-based learning studio, there is an attendant presumption that assessment tasks will be varied beyond those traditionally associated with design courses.
After convening the group, and describing the format for the afternoon's critiques I proposed that:

- each designer present their work to the group for five minutes;
- five minutes of questions, discussion and critique from two nominated peers;
- five minutes of any further input from the whole group;
- summary from me; and
- a statement about 'where to go from here' from the designer.

I asked the students to break for 15 minutes during which time they were to decide on the *evaluative criteria for the critique*. One student, Brian, responded to this request by querying his ability to perform this task:

"How can we propose criteria for the critique when we haven't even heard our work critiqued yet?"

My response was to reassure the group that as they had carried out a process of design and presentation for the first Tea House critique they had each already made certain decisions about what it was that they wanted to foreground in their own schemes; the opportunity to discuss this with the rest of the group prior to the critique commencement existed merely for the group to gain some consensus for what would be presented to the rest of the group by the designers in their five minute presentation; and which would form the basis for the development of discussion by the rest of the group. What I was seeking was an explication from the group of *what they perceived to be the main issues* in their design development to date and for this presentation.

At the end of their meeting to debate the issues the group proposed a list:

Brief
Parti
Methodology
Concepts Into Facts
Construction - Details
Next Stage/progress Since

There was considerable breadth in the list (to what extent I would have interfered to change or expand their proposals I have not explored as this did not seem necessary) and the session commenced with Loris presenting her work to the group; it was then discussed for the group by Meara and Brian prior to the whole group and me having some input. Loris was confident and articulate - it was for this reason that I had selected her to be the first designer to present her work to the group. Similarly with the selection of the discussants, or critics, I believed that Meara in particular, who had her drawing board next to Loris in the studio and would be accustomed to sharing informally with Loris, would be a confident critic. So much depends in this type of interactive teaching on whether things get off to a good start; the tutor's role as facilitator is very evident here.

At the end of the cycle of presentation, discussion and commentary, both the designer and the critics were asked to grade the work that Loris had produced for this first critique. Loris felt that her work was worth a Pass+/Credit whereas her critics both awarded her a Credit. Grading was done publicly and the marks awarded by Loris and her peers in a relatively unselfconscious way.
On reflection I thought that Loris' work, which demonstrated a very dense knowledge of the subject with considerable detailed investigation, illustrated on packed sheets mixing constructional and functional ideas, rated a Credit for the process and a Pass for the design product. The peer overrating of Loris' work in comparison with my assessment as referent derived in part, I believe, from politeness, and in part from the fact that Loris was the first of the students in the group to have their work assessed and lastly, and most importantly, from the fact that Loris had demonstrated hours and hours of rigorous investigation on her hand-in. I wondered whether the students were rewarding her effort. I believe that especially beginning design students mistake effort expended with design output; the students sometimes say, "But I worked so hard on it!" when their design shortcomings are exposed as though there is a relationship between study hours and design adequacy. It is a difficult concept for the beginning design student to grasp that good ideas and effective presentations are often the result of clever thinking over a short time rather than of laboured hours.

The critique proceeded to the next student, James, who presented his work in rather stilted formal language - he had a very significant theoretical parti which he sought to explain to the group in detail. He left little of his presentation time to explore the other concepts which the group sought to have explicated and this coupled with his LATE stamped unfinished drawings meant that it was difficult for his critics, and the rest of the group, to gain a clear idea of the translation of his strongly theoretical parti into a design. He nevertheless assessed his own work as a Pass and his peer critics Loris and Brian both concurred. My estimation was the same both for considerations of process and product; it was a powerful generating parti which had not been allowed time to mature through repeated iterations of conception and testing to be presented as a building; it was still at the stage of an idea, but one with unrealized potential.

The process for the critique proceeded through the afternoon. There was one student, Brian, whose work was self and peer-assessed to return a completely different result from my assessment. His situation is worthy of consideration because it illustrates points about the process of peer critique.

Brian, who was the eighth and last student to present his work had a very extended critique both from his peer critics and from me as I sought to use his work to summarise some of the general points which had plagued many of the earlier schemes. Studio-based staff, on the whole, find it easy to change from the role of critic to that of teacher whilst heralding to the class that this change is about to take place (Dinham, 1986,52). Brian's proposal for a Tea House was very poorly drawn; there was no indication of the joyous delight possible in a fun recreational building in his technical drawing type of presentation. He was very concerned with minute - often banal - detail to the exclusion of developing real style or intent for his building. There were a number of very general points relating to Topic A (evaluating student design concepts (Tilbury, 1992,7)) to be made to the whole class illustrated by Brian's work: one about doors creating a sense of arrival and entrance if handled well in public buildings; one about the opportunities for outdoor terraces facing north to be shaded in summer but becoming winter sun traps. There were also secondary Topic B considerations (of presentation skills and weaknesses (Tilbury, 1992,7)) about the importance of showing the object-ground relationship in order to explain the relationship between the site and the building and the use of colour to portray the joyous recreational usage of the building. At the end, then, of what was a detailed critique both in relation to his own work and more general points for the whole class, Brian responded:

"So all I have to do is put a canopy over this door, extend this paving around here a bit and put in a ground line."

His reduction view of what he had heard at the critique was breath-taking! After hearing this response I had an instant conversion to the idea of students taping their critiques which can then be replayed over and over! (Anthony, 1991,74)

Brian assessed his work as a Credit - whilst his peers Meara and Veronica assessed it as
a Credit and a Credit + respectively. My assessment of a bare Pass for process and product reflected my deep concerns about Brian's thinking and designing skills. It was very much of concern that Brian and his peers so significantly over-rated his own work. Peterson (1976) reported that "all students tend to overrate poor design by others" (p. 147) which correlates with the responses of Brian and his peers with Peterson's sample.

The more important insight into what may be happening here comes from Byard (1989) who reports about peer group critiquing in the writing classroom that "peer groups are often marked more by inhibition and constraint than by collaboration, with students resisting both giving and receiving critiques" (p. 4). Further considerations of the inhibitions and constraints in giving and receiving critiques are considered by Tilbury (1992) in her paper exploring how politeness strategies are jointly enacted by students and staff in an architectural critique, which concurs with Byard's view. It is possibly threatening for Brian, who hardly knows the other students in the group (it being the beginning of the year and he not having proceeded through the undergraduate degree with this peer group), to risk loss of face by disclosing a view of his work as poor. Similarly it is possibly embarrassing, non-congruent behaviour for his peers to challenge him publicly by their assignment of a grade which was lower than his grade. Brian may also find it difficult with a peer group to acknowledge his shortcomings in process. He has shown a very strategic approach to learning with his confirmation to the tutor of the programme for correcting what he perceived as the shortcomings of his scheme which is paradigmatically opposed to the self-disclosure which is the first step to reforming his design process. He himself needs to be able to reflect on the process in sufficient depth to appreciate that he is self-deluding and that his peers are avoiding threatening his face, and their own, through public non-concurrence with his self-assessed grade.

Two weeks later the same students participated in the second critique for the Tea House project. In order to build on the self presentation and peer critiquing of the previous session it was decided after long discussion between the studio-based staff to propose a critique protocol which took the earlier process of peer review one step further. This I considered to be a moderate risk situation for the students - there was a 30% assessment for this second hand-in; full attendance at the critique session demonstrated a commitment from the students to presenting their own work and critiquing their peers' work.

The process proposed was one which sought to formalise the reliance on peer input. Each designer prior to the session had to brief a peer about his/her design so that the peer could present the designer's work to their Group of half the class (15 or 16 students) for two minutes.

As I was a participant observer in Group East I will now confine my commentary to what I observed in that group. When the two groups convened, the Group East critiques commenced with Student 1 presenting Student 3's work to the class for two minutes; then Student 2 critiqued Student 3's work for two minutes. After the peer presentation and peer critique the designer had the opportunity to respond for two minutes. Whilst there was no set format for the response - the designers could, and usually did, use the time to respond to their critics although some sought to further explicate their parti - there was a rigid format imposed through "rules" for the peer critique. The critic could only commence the critique by making three positive, constructive criticisms which then could be followed by up to, and preferably, three negative, constructive criticisms. The number of negative criticisms could not exceed the number of positive criticisms.

After the designer's response there was an opportunity for response and questions from the whole group and the two tutors. Very seldom during the afternoon did the two tutors in Group East make any comment; the process flowed, the peers offered criticism and there was really little time (or even need) for additional staff critique.

There were two staff tutors facilitating each group as the whole class had been broken into two groups. There was a random allocation of the staff to the groups in relation to who comprised the seven or eight students in the tutor's own studio group. This was achieved by selecting the two groups for this critique on the basis only of where the
work was hung in the Crit Room.

The "geographic" allocation of groups proved problematic for equity: Group East (16 students) comprised 10 women and 6 men including 3 men in the lowest 10 ranked students in the year entry quota; Group West (15 students) comprised 7 women and 8 men including 2 women and 4 men in the lowest rankings for the year. With a total of 17 women and 14 men (including 7 out of 10 of the lowest ranking students in the year), a more equitable Group West may have been created if the groups had been differently selected with 8 women and 7 men in the smaller group and 9 women and 7 men in the larger group.

It would have been preferable to distribute the lower ranking students equally between the two groups to avoid the situation which arose, in Group West, of 5 out of the first 8 student designers to have their work presented being low ranking students. The way the critique was set up with Student 1 presenting and Student 2 critiquing Student 3's work meant that a concentration of any particular subgroup on the list - e.g. women, men, the lower ranked students - would see those students presented and critiqued in fact by their peers so that women were presented and critiqued by women, men by men, low ranked students by low ranked students and so on. This is unproblematic in some ways - for example it may realistically model practice - but problematic in others. The problem that arose in the Tea House critique was that the Group West peer critiques were thought, by one tutor allocated to that Group, to often be banal, and so lacking in rigour that there was a great need for the tutor to proffer further meaningful criticism. This difficulty may be correlated with the number of low-ranked students in the Group (almost half) and the fact that they were bunched in the first eight students.

One of the low-ranked female students in Group West who was in my studio-based group of eight students reported to me at the next scheduled studio session (when many of the students sought detailed feedback and critique from both their "own" tutor and their critique Group tutor) that she was frustrated and dissatisfied with her introductory presentation by her peer - a male classmate who was also a low-ranked student. She complained that he didn't represent her explanation of her part in the presentation, and that he actually got off track to the point where he was presenting as design generators things which she hadn't told him about and which she hadn't used as design generators.

The afternoon's critiques proceeded with strict time-keeping - the reliance on the Group moving on to a consideration of the next design after eight minutes spent on each design was paramount in considering the work of everyone in the Group with enough time at the conclusion of the critique for each student to prepare an anonymous ranking of the work of all students in their Group including their own work. This ranking was a form of self and peer-assessment which built on the skills developed in the first critique session.

We know from the first critique and self-assessment that Brian had a view of his work which overrated it in reference to the tutor's viewpoint. Problematically his peers assessed the work as very worthy. By chance Brian was in the Group East which I facilitated; his work on this occasion, which was presented by Liam and critiqued by Deirdre, was consistently ranked by the Group East in their confidential, and anonymous, rankings to be poor work. Similarly Deirdre's work was ranked by her peers near the bottom of their list. The rankings of the two studio-based staff tutors facilitating the group placed Brian and Deirdre at the bottom of their lists. The tutor's rankings were prepared independently of each other and knowledge of the students' rankings - there was no discussion or collusion about marks or ranking. The students were able to privately, and anonymously, rank Brian where they may have believed his work belonged even during the first critique but politeness and the risk of embarrassing themselves and Brian were more powerful social constructs than the desire to honestly tell Brian about their ranking of the quality of his work as poor.

At the top of the list there was once again class concurrence that Matthew's work was the best. The two tutors, who it must be remembered had almost no, if any, input whatsoever in the critiquing process, (and therefore the claim that their critique
influenced the ranking cannot be made), both independently placed Matthew at the top of their ranking. The tutors had a high level of correlation in their marks and rankings for the rest of the group ranking between Matthew at the top and Brian at the bottom, the students exhibited no such correlation. All that can be deduced is that students, in Group East, on the whole, in the Tea House critique, were able, after the conclusion of a peer critique, to recognise excellent, and poor, work and to rank it appropriately in comparison with their own work. This finding agrees with Peterson (1981) who in his study looking at whether good designers are the best judges of architectural design found that average students were the most accurate judges of good and poor designs; that poor designs, on the average, were most accurately rated, and that good design is underrated in comparison with the instructors' view whilst exhibiting the greatest agreement that it was good design across students of all design abilities.

As James said to me at the desk crit following the peer critique session the following Wednesday:

"This is our first project. It takes time to be able to discriminate."

The opportunity for peer and self-review through critique sessions which draw on a variety of stake-holders' criteria for "good" design is useful in developing autonomous professional judgement.

The Dana Cuff Studio (see also Ch. 5, pp. 325-330) had many of these features: a group of critics representing broader interests during the Exhibition Review Session, a self and peer-assessment component, and a focus on establishing practices within the School for life-long learning and imminent professional practice. It is on the process of self and peer-review that the following narrative focuses. In this studio I was an observer only - James North had proposed the review process in which the final year students engaged as one of several different types of critique sessions during the project. He believed that the final year students' preparation for professional practice would be enhanced through a focus on self and peer-review in critique sessions.

Example 2: Final Year Architecture Students, Semester 1 'West End' Project

Excerpt from Dana Cuff Studio

The peer and self-critique review session.

Two days after the exhibition review session the class gathered for a session of self and peer review relating to the individual submissions for the 'West End' Project.

The students had been prepared for this session which took place on 2nd April by a hand-out from James North in which he made important statements about the role for
Developing design skills in a holistic sense will include developing the skills of criticism. The ability to stand back and objectively assess one's own work as well as developing the ability to confidently and fairly assess the work of others is an important skill which inevitably will lead the individual to more effective designing.

Toward the end of a formal architectural education - but remember, one's architectural education and professional development will never come to a full stop - the architect should develop a confidence in her/his ability to understand strengths and weaknesses in architectural design, and how to express an opinion about this...

From 9-30 to 12 noon on Friday 2 April everyone should be present for a critical review of design work on the 'West End' project. As discussed, each office group (as you shared the same design brief) will run its own architectural criticism session, which should last for about half an hour, to discuss the work of the individuals who make up that team. There are many ways to go about this, but I am sure everyone has produced a design which merits praise for some aspects as well as constructive criticism in other aspects.

Your group may already have run such a session because you like to devote more time to developing critical skills, or you may plan to do so before 2 April. That's fine, but on this occasion everyone will be present to learn something, and, with Peter, I will be looking for your self / peer evaluation of your design in order to influence how we will allocate the 25% of the subject assessment that this part of the project can score."

J.N.

24.3.9_

The students had therefore been encouraged to think of this session as an opportunity for self and peer critique; they were working in four self selected groups on four different sites on the 'West End' project but their work - except for proposing the brief - was individual. The format, which was student-directed except for initial input by James, was that each student would present their own work for two minutes followed by two minutes of peer critique from the members of their own group and then open discussion with the rest of the class for a few minutes. Each session was timed to ensure that the class ran to schedule.

A mature age student, Reginald, commenced the presentations. He was the first of a group which included three male "Qualifying" students (whose first degree was not in architecture and had undertaken bridging studies in architecture prior to commencing the BArch degree two years previously), Rhianna and an exchange student, Paul, who was newly enrolled in this class. Reginald was typical of the students in this group - older than the rest of the class, a very able student and very confident with his oral and graphic presentation skills. He had a prepared dialogue, similar to, but more concise and refined than, the impromptu presentation he had made at my request about his work two days earlier for a group of undergraduates. It was descriptive dialogue and the comments and questions of his peers were directed at finding out how his building worked, and debating the pros and cons of the significant form of a major turning element which did not have a major function, than about criticism. Reginald's well received presentation was followed by Jason's presentation which alluded to the part played by his parti and the group's shared brief in his development of a design.

At this point, after question time from the class, James interrupted the proceedings for
the first time (after I noticed him passing a note to Peter) to say that he felt that the current mode of the proceedings was diverging considerably from the aim of the day - which was to hear **self and peer** critique. He believed that the presentations had been descriptive, not critical. James told me later that it was not coincidental that he interrupted immediately before Rhianna's presentation. He believed that as Rhianna was both a very competent and forthright student he believed she would be able to meet his new expectations. He had also heard her critique session with the Consultant Engineer and Interior Designer two days previously, and therefore knew that she would have had two days to think about the criticism that she had received and would perhaps respond during her allotted two minutes.

Rhianna did not disappoint James' expectation of her. She said that, on reflection, she would have altered the portal frame to a regular spacing (which was the problem she disclosed to the Civil Engineer Mr Green); she could see how this would improve the flexibility and cost effectiveness of the scheme. In order to be able to offer this **significant** critique of her own work the inputs she had were:

1. Full costing by a Quantity Surveyor;

2. Comments from a steel fabricator (which she'd humorously recounted to the class). When enquiring about the cost for the portal frames the fabricator asked her whether the non modular spacings were correct. She replied that they were unevenly spaced apart as the drawings showed. "Oh" he said "It must be one of your 'architectural statements'". They all laughed with Rhianna.

3. The critique from the Consultant Engineer two days previously that she had maximised the efficiency of her structural elements.

4. The Interior Designer's critique that Rhianna had employed a process that made all her other ideas "fit" the frame configuration.

5. Feedback from the client.

6. Peer comment during the design process.19

7. Staff input and commentary at the drawing board in the studio.

All of these sources had contributed to Rhianna being able to critique her own work and say:

"One criticism I would have is of my truss spacing".

She also criticised the formal language of the building and drew the class's attention to a poorly conceived roof junction. This self-criticism was offered about a scheme which had a form which was not significantly damaged by one poor roof junction20.

Her peers critiqued her work very positively; they thought that she had, within budget, produced a dynamic scheme. They found it difficult to find much to criticise - not only

---

19. Rhianna's Office group, with the exception of the exchange student, have been friends for the years they have spent together at University. At the end of their first year of the BArch they made a 'pact' that they would proffer substantial and realistic critique to each other instead of saying "that's nice".

20. In this respect Rhianna has made considerable advances. In an interview at the end of her first year she said about her ability to make the design process explicit:

**Rhianna:** If you're basically at the end of the project with something you're basically not happy with but you've got to go for it - as [the tutor] says you've got to have good genes to start with - but if you're getting to the end and just don't feel you have, you've got to try - you seriously do - you've got to make it sound good even if you don't believe it.
was her scheme very competent but she had forestalled their criticisms by 'owning' them and bringing them to the attention of the class herself.

In James North's studio final year students had the opportunity to interrupt the judgement by experts which had been a feature of most of their critiques up to that time. In so doing the students acquired the tools to dismantle a judgemental hierarchy, and an opportunity to redefine a model for success which reflected the centrality of the ability to judge their own, and others' work, rather than relying on the judgement of others.

In the *Student Evaluations of Teaching*\(^2\) James conducted at the end of the studio the students' opinions about the benefit of self and peer critique are expressed. The Student Evaluation of Teaching question was: *What is the best aspect of this course, and why?* A very affirming response was:

```
Recognition that by final year we are able effectively to work and study on our own.
```

Understandably, considering the focus of the previous five years of their course had been on receiving expert critique, not all students concurred with this view of the benefits of self-directed learning. In response to the question: *What is the worst aspect of the course and why?* students commented about the lack of 'expert' critique:

```
The subject co-ordinator refuses to be drawn into effective, direct critique of the work.
```

```
...We need not only facilitators but educators. Is professional development the only aim?
```

```
More critical input from the university would be appreciated. Organising visitors is great, but we should not rely on them alone.
```

\(^2\) These are the formal course review evaluations compiled by the teacher in collaboration with the Advisory Centre for University Education, conducted by a facilitator, for the teacher, and collated by the Advisory Centre for University Education.
Although James was continually asked for critique from the students he resisted lapsing into "old" roles, and said that he needed to be "thick skinned" in relation to continuing student requests, believing that the facilitation role he had adopted in the final year studio placed students' reliance on their own self-judgement and the critique of their peers ahead of his 'expert' critique. Boud and Brew (1995, 130) comment on the irony that although self-assessment is a goal of higher education it is a goal which is often pursued through courses which have no self-assessment component. "However", Boud and Brew argue, "as many courses in higher education have been designed in ways which inhibit the development of self-assessment skills, a useful first step is the introduction of explicit self assessment activities (Boud and Brew, 1995, 130).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I turn to the work of Vicki Byard (1989) whose thesis points to the coercive and consequently disciplining nature of peer critiquing, in comparison with the positive attributes Boud and Magin have ascribed to proficiency with peer critique. She said that:

Although in peer critiquing the authority figure - the teacher - is not immediately present, it would be a mistake to think that the amount of rule being exercised in the classroom is therefore reduced. The importance that students ascribe to their peers' opinions is clear...and John Clifford (1981) has proven empirically that "feedback from an immediate, socially appropriate audience [specifically peer groups] seems to [provide] a more compelling impetus to change than the abstract grade rewards typical of the current-traditional paradigm"(p. 50). Thus in peer critiquing, the observation of the teacher-sovereign is superseded by what Foucault (1977) terms "the vigilance of intersecting gazes", yielding a more subtle, coercive administration of power.(p. 6)

Yet, knowing all this I am not willing to abandon peer groups. My point is that we need to recognise that the architecture of peer critiquing inherently operates at cross purposes with our own objectives for collaborative learning...If we institute peer critiquing without having a methodology to ensure that our students will do more than discipline one another, the [critiquing] will be more likely to imprison than empower.(p. 7) (Byard, 1989, 6-7)

There is, in the preceding narrative, a very strong thread of the opportunities for peer and self-assessment to be experienced within a studio structured as a Problem Based Learning Studio without it necessarily succumbing to "a more subtle, coercive administration of power" as Byard suggests through the "vigilance of intersecting gazes". Through self-
directed learning, which is at the centre of the approach of Problem Based Learning, students are invited to develop their skills of self-assessment more than in a traditionally structured studio environment where there is ready availability of the studio tutor in an expert role, and an attendant expectation that the tutor’s judgement is the only judgement that counts in assessment. The following section considers the opportunities that Problem Based Learning, and the use of Learning Contracts offer in promoting self-judgement and confidence. Furthermore, through the emphasis of PBL on individualised learning, students with different learning backgrounds, and students with different professional aspirations, are able to tailor their learning to their needs. All three categorisations of self assessment to which Boud and Brew (1995, 133-135) refer are catered for in a well-structured PBL classroom. Here the learner is not only responsible for developing and negotiating the criteria for assessment of their own work (called "communicative interest" by Boud and Brew) but also for assessing the competencies of their project-specific technical knowledge for presentation to the class, or tutor (called "technical interest" by Boud and Brew), and for practising self-reflection about the process (called "emancipatory interest" by Boud and Brew).

**Problem Based Learning and the Use of Learning Contracts**

In concluding *Teaching Methods in Higher Education: The Changing Scene, with Special Reference to Small-group Work* Collier (1985) reports that the Club of Rome urges that the potential for catastrophe in the human world has enormously increased in recent years and no system of higher education sends out graduates equipped to tackle the situation. Apart from the implications for course content, *there are major implications in the way in which students' learning is organized. These point to a much greater extent of problem-based work, in which the focus is on the real world and the academic material is used as an analytic tool, rather than the reverse; and to a wide range of independent and collaborative study.* (p. 20, my italics)

Boud and Feletti (1991) share a common view of what constitutes basic PBL.

The principal idea behind problem-based learning is...that the starting point for learning should be a problem, a query or a puzzle that the learner wishes to solve (Boud, 1985a, 13, cited by Boud and Feletti, 1991, 13)
There are theoretical and practical reasons why problem based learning (PBL) is particularly suited to the study of architecture. Kingsland (1995) in *Integrated Problem Based Learning in Architecture* reviews ten years of successful operation of PBL at the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Newcastle:

The current form for all our offerings is as integrated problem based learning curricula. Learning derives from project scenarios and students have to integrate all components within their submissions. They have to be able to prioritise the information which they are given and which they source from other places, to manage conflicts between competing demands, study various aspects in isolation and bring these aspects together in an integrated submission. Individual study disciplines are seen as providing additional depth and supporting material for greater refinement of the central activity of design. The study area material is thus designed to integrate with the current project and support students' development. (p. 9)

before conjecturing about the theoretical basis for their PBL course.

The general basis on which our programmes are premised is to provide education for capability - that is to enable students to develop the skills to be able to study new situations and determine a course of action as dictated by the circumstances. They should develop skills specific to their practice as architects, but also certain approaches and attitudes that should be applicable to wider endeavours. (p. 9)

The development of self-judgement is central to the thinking behind PBL: eschewing a standard curriculum for all students and adopting, in its place, a dynamic self-paced curriculum which validates prior learning and lived experience. Based on my experiences with the implementation of PBL it would seem that as a generic approach to education, as a teaching method, and as a tutorial approach or method characterized by defined educational goals, PBL is highly congruent with existing practices in integrated project-based learning, which is the dominant curriculum organisation in the observed School. It is largely in teaching/learning approaches that there is a distinction between PBL and project-based learning. This difference lies in the philosophical underpinning of PBL which concerns "handing responsibility for learning to the students and trusting them to learn whilst acknowledging that the trust takes some time to build", (Wallis, 1992) rather than that of project-based learning where the students' staff-directed learning is situated within the constraints of the brief given for the project.
It is important to realise that in promoting any self-directed learning proposal, including PBL, but not specifically limited to PBL, that teachers unsettle students' very considerable ingrained expectations that the teachers' job is to teach, and to provide such instruction "as will ensure a pass in their examinations" whilst teachers' view of themselves as having "the authority to define the subject matter to be acquired" and "to reinforce this definition by his function as an examiner" is considerably disrupted (Collier, 1985, p. 8).

Literature Review

There is considerable support in the literature for the view that, despite the teaching/learning context of different institutions or discipline areas, the ultimate aim of higher education is commonly held to be:

...the development of students' intellectual and imaginative powers; their understanding and judgement; their problem-solving skills; their ability to communicate; their ability to see relationships within what they have learned and to perceive their field of study in a broader perspective. The programme must aim to stimulate an enquiring, analytical and creative approach, encouraging independent judgement and critical self-awareness. (Gibbs, 1992)

Traditional didactic (lecture style) instruction supported by a programme of tutorials, workshops and seminars and assessed by examinations or end-of-semester essay tasks is thought (Ramsden, 1992, 1985; Collier, 1985; Boud and Lublin, 1983a; Gibbs, 1984, 1992) not to encourage the centrality of these higher order learning attributes. These writers promote the view that dependence in learning rather than the desired independence in learning is a likely outcome of this style of instruction, where the lecturer is seen to be "all knowledgeable" and the student as "lacking knowledge" which in turn promotes the concept of a power differential between the teacher and the student reinforcing the hierarchical authority/dependency relationship. The continuance of this inequality is at odds with fostering independent judgement and critical self-awareness as it is instrumental in promoting a competitive assessment-oriented strategic learning approach.
Ramsden (1992) and Boud (1990) concur that as assessment requirements largely drive students' perceptions of the curriculum and dictate their mode of learning there must be close attention to promoting assessment modes which have been shown to be associated with deep approaches to learning. These approaches are typified as being associated with intrinsic motivation, and are summarized by Entwistle (1987) as:

- intention to understand;
- vigorous interaction with the content;
- relate new ideas to previous knowledge;
- relate concepts to everyday experience;
- relate evidence to conclusions;
- examine the logic of the argument (Entwistle, 1987)

Gibbs (1992) states that appropriate course design, teaching and assessment methods can foster the desired deep approach to learning. Feletti22 believes that all good teaching is typified by being interactive, interesting, integrated and promoting independence for the learner.

PBL, which Feletti defined both as a teaching method and as a generic approach to education, constitutes one structured way which promotes all of these features. As a generic approach to education it includes elements of all the other strategies listed by Gibbs (1992) as fostering a deep approach to learning by students. As a teaching method PBL is defined as:

- a small group activity in which students, as active learners, identify their own problems, and then, using techniques of self-directed learning, seek information. (Wallis, 1992)

Feletti suggested that group learning is not integral with the generic concept of PBL but has been introduced as a means of motivation.

In conclusion, the literature supports the view that the problem based approach to learning supports desired learning outcomes by incorporating the following:

---

22. Graham Feletti, Keynote address "Problem Based Learning : Is the action louder than the words?" on 6-12-1994 at the Problem Based Learning 1992 Conference "Problem-Based Learning in Education and Training", Women's College, University of Sydney. Published in The Australian Problem Based Learning Network and Individual Authors (1992) (eds.) Research and Development in Problem Based Learning.
- the development of problem-solving skills;
- the development of self-directed learning ability;
- the integrated structuring of learning within the context of professional practice; and
- the encouragement of motivation for learning.

There is considerable research output on PBL which suggests that there is student enthusiasm and support for it in comparison with conventional learning models, and that as a curriculum basis it has the opportunity to substantially alter a profession (Wallis, 1989). Whilst the majority of the research to date focuses on medicine, nursing and the other health care professions, there is also the substantial research output of the Newcastle School of Architecture regarding the introduction of PBL into that School ten years ago, and the development over the ten year period. In *Profile of an Integrated Problem-based Architecture Course - Students' Perceptions and Preferences* Chen (1991) concludes as a result of extensive data gathering over several years to examine students' perceptions of their learning environment in this School, that "course profiles and ratings show that students perceive the architecture course at Newcastle to be problem-based and teacher-centred, and that they would prefer the course to be even more problem-based and learner-centred".

Dwyer (1993), in presenting the preliminary results of a larger longitudinal survey, looked at the "shift-in-readiness" for self-directed learning from beginning nursing students during their first year of their course which had a Problem-Based curriculum and implementation. Whilst there was no overall shift in their readiness for self-directed

---

23. The Australian Problem-Based Learning Network publishes a Problem Based Learning Bibliography annually as an annexure to its journal PROBE.
25. Some of the key areas identified by Dwyer during their first year of PBL by school leavers or mature entry student with traditional dependent, convergent learning styles came in the responses to the following questions:
   1. "I'm looking forward to learning as long as I live" (More "Almost True" in Nov than Feb)
   2. "If I don't learn it's not my fault" (Accepting more responsibility for learning in Nov than Feb)
   3. "I know when I need to learn more about something" (Less sure of what they needed to learn in Nov than Feb; not as good at prediction as they thought in Feb;
learning from February to November over the total score of the 58 questions in the Self Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) there were significant differences in the answers to some questions. There is support from Dwyer's research for a belief that students are acquiring concepts of lifelong learning; they are taking more responsibility for their learning; they are becoming less positivist and more aware of disparate view points; and that PBL has given them confidence in self-directed learning tasks. In considering the nature of these responses there is again a correlation with the thrust of outcomes from educational theory into desirable learning attributes to promote independent judgement and critical self awareness.

In the B. Arch degree in the School in which I taught there is an emphasis on developing student autonomy in learning as one of the aims for the degree. This emphasis is one of the means of equipping students for directed employment in architectural practice. Together with equipping students with good skills of self-assessment and the ability to provide peer assessment these are perhaps the key areas in which PBL excels, and would, as a learning approach, contribute substantially to the readiness for practice of graduating students (Shannon and Brine, 1994; Brine and Shannon, 1994).

The features of PBL which particularly fit it to the study of architecture can be summarised:

1. The emphasis in PBL is on processes in learning rather than the content of the curriculum and the end product. In PBL the acquisition of necessary curriculum content is seen as an initial vehicle for approaches to life-long learning.

2. The emphasis of PBL is in fostering deep learning approaches, which is congruent with current educational theory.

difference between their expectation as school leavers and as tertiary students of the learning task.)

4. "I'm capable of learning for myself almost anything I want to know" (Nov score was better than Feb; the teaching/learning situation has contributed to confidence)
3. The emphasis of PBL on *integrated self-directed learning* fits well with understandings of how professional architects and architecture students learn (McCart 1985, Kolb, 1973, 1976), and crosses artificial subject boundaries.

4. The *assessment* emphasis of PBL on *self and peer-assessment* is congruent with the aims of the studio culture, manifested in frequent, informal, small group discussion between students and staff or students or staff, which, in a well functioning studio which has fore-fronted these outcomes as aims of the studio, should serve to provide a basis for reflection and self-judgement.

5. The emphasis on the *group* as a motivator for individual self-directed study models well the notion of *co-operative team work* in the practice of architecture. The fundamental goal of problem-based tutorial groups is to enable each student to develop a system of PBL in order to acquire and utilize knowledge and skills and other attributes necessary to become an effective practitioner and to sustain life-long learning. The group also provides a location and setting for developing effective communication skills, using a deductive reasoning process, identifying appropriate information and resources, and for emotional, social and personal interaction.

6. The emphasis on *learning structured around exploration of a real world problem* (or simulation) fits well with Kolb's (1976) research findings about architects' preferred learning approach. Kolb's situation of architects as "divergers" (that is reliant upon concrete experience and reflective observation) infers that as students they will benefit from well constructed PBL "scenarios" or "triggers" which should be concrete, practical, and explicitly relevant for students and relate back to their past experience, both inside and outside the School.

7. The emphasis on *self-directed learning and students taking responsibility for their learning* supports the view that students, as adult learners, in an institution concerned with access and equity, should be able to:

- learn at their own rate and level;
- be recognised for bringing prior learning and knowledge to the learning site;
- be acknowledged and promoted for divergent approaches and outcomes;
- individualize their learning to reflect different approaches, processes and outcomes;
- be acknowledged for their different achievements where appropriate, and receive credit, support and extension commensurate with their needs;
- be supported if "at risk" for whatever reason.

There are many tertiary students who are "at risk" of performing below their potential, and the Institution's expectations of them. Factors influencing "at risk" status may include some, or several of the following circumstances:
- they are members of a minority group - which in Schools of Architecture includes women;
- they do not know many of their fellow students;
- they have a long time span between previous formal study and commencing current studies;
- they are undertaking significant amounts of paid employment in order to finance their studies;
- they have recently arrived from overseas;
- they come from a non-English speaking background;
- they have a poor study environment at home;
- they have had, or are having, personal problems;
- they have been ill, or otherwise impaired.

"At risk" students may be better supported within PBL which relies on self-directed learning and group support than within conventional programmes because there is an emphasis away from output as the sole measure of process. Resources can be prudently directed towards increasing "at risk" students' skills and understandings of discipline area knowledge, deductive reasoning, skills development, time management, information and resource gathering and personal development in the context of a well structured problem.
Alternatively, as suggested by Feletti (1992), it may be a problem for "at risk" students to reach a Department's expectations of them. Identified or potential "at risk" students could work in a group in the normal PBL cycle through this problem in order both to reinforce process and to get outcomes but also to reinforce the sense of them taking responsibility for their learning and acknowledging that their learning outcomes are partially contingent on their own learning inputs. The argument Feletti was promoting was that in PBL there is less opportunity for any student to place the blame for her/his failure to learn solely onto the teacher.

Despite the principle of PBL to "place the responsibility for learning with the student", I am extremely interested in the learning support appropriate for "at risk" students in any PBL project. Dependent learners, that is those for whom the learning task must be closely defined, I claim, are possibly even further "at risk" in a situation where 'the problem', as defined by the individual student designer, is pursued through a number of intermediate stages to a Hand-in upon which the majority of the summative assessment is awarded, than in a highly controlled studio style where the learning task is closely and exactly defined by the staff who then monitor students' satisfactory resolution of their designs to an acceptable level for the predefined 'problem'. This concern was also voiced by Peterson (1976), whose findings about the poorly developed judgement patterns of "poor" students, related to his belief that there is a "pattern of judgment displayed by poor designers [which is] part of a judgment model which the poor designer does not possess" (p. 153).

To "change the rules" part way through a tertiary course to accommodate self-directed learning relies on the developed and accurate abilities of self-judgement of the students being present. As was argued in chapter 4, one possibility may be to introduce PBL for commencing architecture students, to immediately challenge them out of dependent learning styles. However, there would be a number of aspects to consider from a theoretical framework if this scenario were to be proposed. They include the understandings that:

1. Assessment tasks drive the learning process (Boud, 1990); if the assessment task remains the same there is little incentive for a student to alter her/his learning approach.
2. Learning styles are already established through early successes (Murray-Harvey and Keeves, 1994) and are unlikely to change; Murray-Harvey and Keeves found that one of the strongest determinants for learning approach was early assessment success using that style.

3. Students entering tertiary institutions from a background of dependent learning styles may suffer a crisis of confidence in the new expectations of the tertiary institution at the very time when the institution seeks to promote the students' confidence in learning to tackle PBL. The eroded confidence must then be re-established through validating students' prior learning, which then moves around the cycle of reinforcing for students the validity of their previous learning approaches, away from which the institution may wish to challenge them. Martin et al. (1989) found that "students who focus on the similarities between school and tertiary study are most likely to adapt to tertiary study" which contrasts with the outcomes of those who focus on the differences and are then more likely to experience problems in adapting. This finding compounds even further the difficulties in challenging students away from dependent, convergent learning approaches.

Learning Contracts

Anderson, Boud and Sampson (1994) define "a learning contract as a document used to assist in the planning of an individualised learning project" (p. 4). They suggest that they would be used

to motivate
- through acknowledging individual differences and enabling learning activities to be tailored to the specific needs and interests of each learner (p. 9);
- through providing a means of reconciling the learner's personal needs with the formal assessment requirements of an educational institution or other accreditation authority (p. 9);
- through developing specific skills and competencies relevant to each learner's own work or field of practice (p. 9);
to encourage *autonomy*

- through encouraging students to take responsibility for their own learning and to become more autonomous as learners, and less dependent upon direction from others (p. 10);
- through allowing more freedom of choice in terms of what to learn and how to learn it (p. 10);
- through encouraging students to take a much more effective role in the total learning process, from setting objectives to designing learning strategies and finally to evaluating outcomes (p. 10)

*to provide a structure*

- through providing a formal framework for structuring learning experiences so that all interested parties (students, advisers, institutions, employers or field supervisors) will have similar expectations of the learning project (p. 10);

*to fostering equity*

- through fostering an awareness of individual differences (p. 11)
- through their ability to be tailored to suit individual needs (p. 11).

The use of Learning Contracts has the potential to extend the intentions of PBL beyond validating personal experience through self-directed learning by asking students

- to define their learning aims and objectives;
- to list strategies for achieving these aims;
- to express a means of monitoring when these aims have been met;
- to define criteria for their own assessment by themselves, their peers or assessors.

Whilst there is no literature on the use of Learning Contracts for architecture students in the central design subject (Sampson, pers. corr. 6-4-1994, although Kingsland at Newcastle has used them in a computing component of the integrated Newcastle PBL course in 1995), I believe that the use of Learning Contracts could expand and extend the central features of PBL. I have not made a trial of the use of Learning Contracts *per se*, but in the use of
individual student statements about a specialised area for learning in the Child Care Project (p. 363) and then following on from that the individual selection of assessment criteria related to the specialised area (p. 367) I invited the students to propose an individual field of study and an associated method of assessment. The responses of individual students to that opportunity (pp. 373-374) represent something of the breadth of response which those initiating Learning Contracts can expect to receive in a studio situation. As has already been suggested, self-directed learning is not universally supported, either by students or teachers.

Anderson, Boud and Sampson (1994a, 1994b, 1992) are foremost in the theoretical exposition of the role of learning contracts in the tertiary sector in Australia. In *The Effective Use of Learning Contracts* (1994a, 1994b) they present information about how to start using learning contracts, and how to train staff and students in the use of learning contracts. They consider the common criticisms which are directed at the use of learning contracts, how to handle the use of learning contracts in a large class, and how assessments are conducted within learning contracts. This National Teaching Development Grant commissioned project builds on *Engaging with Diversity: Using Learning Contracts to link the Needs of Students, Work and Academic Programs* (Sampson et al., 1994) and *Encouraging Effective Learning Contracts* (1992). The authors believe that:

Addressing diversity in student backgrounds, whilst maintaining relevance within formal academic programs, requires an innovative approach to teaching and learning. Learning contracts provide students with such an approach. Offering possible flexibility and choice within the overall structure of the course, learning contracts have the potential to enable students to relate their varied work and life experiences to learning in the formal course. (Sampson et al., 1994, 311)

and furthermore that:

For the learner to write a learning contract proposal, it is necessary to develop skills and understandings about learning and problem solving beyond the level usually expected on undergraduate programs. (Anderson et al, 1992)

The future use of learning contracts to encourage diversity in learning approaches, in validating prior learning and lived experience, as well as being a significant means of
enhancing self-direction in learning, may enrich the opportunities available to architecture
students to develop self-judgement in the following ways:

- learning contracts encourage *individualism* - that is validating the intrinsic difference
which learners bring to the learning site as a result of their background, prior education,
and response to the problem - which is central to developing self-judgement - in that the
learner must make frequent *individual* decisions about every aspect of their learning;

- the process of developing a learning contract *extends the students' views of themselves as
learners* - the aim is to become a competent learner as well as competent in the discipline
area.

- learning contracts provide a structured way of proposing and engaging in a range of
different *critique* situations both within each contract and between contracts. They
encourage students to make a decision for themselves about *critiques* - what will be
produced for critiques, what quality or standard will be achieved, and who is best placed to
provide meaningful critique at all stages of the project.

- learning contracts encourage different and multiple methods of *assessment* for design
projects. They encourage students from the time of drafting the learning contract to
establish the purpose for each assessment, deciding whether it may contribute to either/both
their learning or their formative or summative assessment; to establish a relevant framework
for the assessment driven by their own educational framework; and to ascertain what
proportion of assessment will be apportioned to each of the stake-holders in the design who
could include a mix of self, peers, teachers, clients, site neighbours, consultants etc.

Through the necessity for students to participate at every stage of planning and discharging
a learning contract their self-judgement is central and paramount to decision making. In the
use of learning contracts there is no sense that the "real power" lies elsewhere and that the
students' efforts in organising, directing and judging the quality of their own learning is a

26. This emphasis on individuality does not necessarily diminish the cooperative,
groupwork approach promoted within PBL. Students in the final year BArch worked on
individual components of group projects - they could have developed individual learning
contracts for these components.
side issue to the "real" business of meeting the expectations of the teacher and ultimately, in the study of architecture, the profession. In this way, it is argued, the centrality of developing self-judgement to their learning, and their understanding of how, and why, they learn, may enable students to question and disrupt the authority of the power structures of the profession from within the School.

As with any new learning proposal, and Knowles has described the introduction of learning contracts as "without question, the single most potent tool I have come across in my forty-three years of experience with adult education" (Anderson et al. 1994a, 9), there are limitations and general concerns. Whilst this thesis is not a suitable avenue for detailed discussion of the limitations of learning contracts; these arguments are well developed in Anderson et al. (1994a and 1994b).

**Problem Based Learning Studios**

During the research project I developed and co-ordinated a Problem Based Learning studio for beginning architecture students which is described in the following narrative, and observed a PBL studio for the completing architecture students coordinated by James North which has been described in Ch 5 pp. 325-330 and pp. 343-345.

Students' comments relating to the new expectations of them participating in self-directed learning follow the narrative. These comments are not linked directly to my research project. I did not elicit them in the research project context. They derived from Student Evaluation of Teaching pro-formas which James North and I had independently prepared to assess the responses to the introduction of PBL. Therefore they do not deal specifically with the question of whether the use of Problem Based Learning had helped students to overcome questions of race, class and gender, as revealed in Chapter 4.

However, it is possible through linking together the students comments on pp. 346-347 about what they have gained as completing students from a PBL studio, and Mick's
comments on pp. 268-269 about his lack of context and understanding he believed were his outcomes from a traditionally structured first degree, to suggest that Mick would have benefited from participating in a PBL studio in which he could have expressed his background, his prior learning and his individual response to the problem. Clearly from his comments Mick is very dissatisfied with "what he hasn't learned in this course". He believed that he was ill-prepared by his prior learning for the course in architecture he was then undertaking. Revamping education for women and minority groups to achieve equity and access considerations involves looking more at what their existing context is and making their lived experience more immediately relevant (Lewis, 1993). PBL as an approach has the flexibility to be able to do this.

Example: Problem Based Studio for First Year Architecture Students Semester 2

In this studio for first year students, I was the studio co-ordinator as well as one of the four tutors. In the co-ordination role, I proposed the educational aims and objectives for the project, and developed a 'real' project around them, involving a 'real' client, 'real' site and extensive staff and peer feedback at formative and summative stages as well as evaluation of the process.

The other tutors were Andy, a junior staff member in the School, and Louis, a post-graduate student who stood in for the late arrival of Gerald, the Head of another Australian School of Architecture who was visiting the School for several weeks. After I had written the narrative I distributed it to Gerald and Andy. Gerald had no input into the negotiation phase although I sent him a draft copy and sought his commentary. As always, Andy was

27. 'Real' projects are real world projects in comparison with fictitious educational projects. Ward (1991) considers the pedagogical benefits of one 'real' project at length focusing on the benefits to the community as well as to the students. I confine my narrative to the benefits to the students.
28. The outcomes of this studio were extensively evaluated, both by the School, through Student Evaluation of Teaching, and by a CAUT National Teaching and Assessment Project coordinated by Dr Eleanor Long as well as further input provided from her colleague in that project, Dr John Izzard of The Australian Council for Educational Research. It was also submitted as a Case Study to project team of The University of New South Wales Assessing and Examining Project commissioned by the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching.
willing to discuss and negotiate the account.

Excerpt from a Narrative: Educating the Reflective Practitioner: The Child Care Studio

The project, a Child Care Centre in an outlying suburb, focused on the needs of a 'special client' - that is a client whose circumstances call for greater insight and understanding of 'the problem' as the students defined it. The project was deliberately open-ended to allow the students to define their own problem and pursue independent learning in the area of greatest interest to them.

The assignment hand-out to the students and the subsequent discussion focused very much on the notion that each student would work on a substantial self-directed brief and that the assessment for each student would be taking into consideration whether the student had met her/his self-stated goals in terms of what she/he set out to do. The students had some difficulty coming to terms with two concepts here: that they were being encouraged, in fact obliged, to pursue, for assessment purposes, an area of great interest to them as well as fulfilling the standard brief for the Child Care Centre, and that their work would be assessed by their self-selected criteria. This is a methodological break from learning dependence.

The opportunities for areas of specialisation were discussed at length as well as the notion that students would, as part of the requirements for the first assessment, record the areas for their specialisation and the criteria by which their work would be assessed. Never before had the structure of their assessment as it related to their work, and the opportunity for excellence in many different areas, been so actively promoted. This 'openness' may cause some difficulty for dependent learners. The idea of selecting an area of personal interest in architecture (e.g. interior design, landscaping, construction detailing, costing and budget) and developing a range of criteria for the assessment by peers and staff, requires students to make transparent their thinking in a way that perhaps has not previously been required.

There was also detailed discussion on the notion of formative and summative assessment and the relative weighting given to each. Some students felt that the weighting of 15% for formative assessment given to the preliminary Hand-in at the end of Week 4 was too low; others in the class said they felt comfortable with the lower proportion for the formative assessment and the higher proportion, 80%, for summative assessment as, one student said:

"If you are going well and have a scheme developed by the end of the second week of the project you advantage yourself anyway as you have more time to develop the scheme and more time to receive critique."

The other tutor, Andy, said that she felt that the aim was to become professional and that regardless of the process, the end product - the building - was what counted in the end. I reminded the students that as we progressed through the year, whilst the design process remained vitally important, there was an attendant emphasis away from valorising the process for itself and an inclination to view the process as necessary for producing good design. "Our ultimate educational aim is to graduate professionals and as practising architects the client does not care at all how we got what we got, what they are interested in is the outcome - the product." Therefore, in order to underline the importance of process while trying to shift the emphasis to the process as noteworthy only in producing the eventual product, after much discussion, Andy and I had decided to award 15% for formative assessment - largely assessment of process - and 70% for the final Hand-in to be assessed on the basis of co-developed criteria, with another 10% being attributed by the students themselves through peer assessment, and 5% being attributed for demonstrating reflective process through a Reflective Journal.

This attribution for peer assessment was the other major problem the students voiced about assessment. Some felt that the peer assessment would not work at all, others that it would degenerate into an award of grades on a friendship or mateship basis only, and others that 10% of summative assessment was too high for peer assessment. I tried to draw out the students' concerns; it appeared that the underlying trust which is essential and implicit in the process of well functioning peer assessment was absent in the year (Boud, 1989,125). The students who were expressing doubt and concern were probably only the tip of the iceberg! It is essential then, through modelling, through encouraging students to make explicit their self directed learning programme and the basis on which they would like to be assessed to demonstrate a sound and equitable basis for peer assessment and to allay students' fears that peer assessment could become a popularity poll.

It is essential for students assessing their peers' work to have the following information available to them - in exactly the same way that staff assessing students work have access to this information (Dinham and Stritter, 1986, 961):

- an understanding of the students' aims and objectives;
- a thorough knowledge of the students' strategies employed in reaching their aims;
- a knowledge of what is an excellent, a good and a poor attempt to pursue the self-stated aims.

This is the most difficult for students because they are often obliged to compare the work with their own, particularly with their own struggles with the same problem type, whereas for staff it is the result of professional maturity. Therefore, sometimes it is very difficult for less able students to be good judges of very able work as they simply have not engaged in their own work with a whole range of the issues which have confronted and been dealt with by the designer. Conversely, a very able student is perhaps not the best judge of average work as very able students can always see the unanswered questions, the lack of resolution and engagement with the problem which typifies their own work.

- a vocabulary with which to express an opinion about architectural theory and designs;
- a willingness to participate in a process which does not have the obvious links to one's own learning outcomes that some other forms of studio teaching may have e.g. desk crits.

This willingness involves a suspension of competitiveness and a world view which permits the student to understand that professional self-judgement derives in part from the internalisation of the same processes of posing the questions and exploring the answers through design as peer critique invites.

My fellow tutor, Andy, and I were, on the whole, delighted by the submissions for the Preliminary Sketch Design ten days into the scheme. We spent an hour and a half assessing the work and discussing the broad issues which were to be addressed at the forthcoming Fish Bowl critique (described on p. 322). There was a really enjoyable ambience in the Crit Room with the class informally moving around looking at each other's work and answering any questions we posed as assessors as we marked. It was relaxed and informal, causing one student, Veronica, to comment:

"In my almost four years here I have never seen work marked ...just like that! It's amazing!" (Pers. comment 19-8-199_)

I was quite aware that some students did not want to leave the Crit Room until the assessors (Andy and I) left as they felt they might have missed out on an opportunity to answer our questions but the marking - 15% of the total project mark - mainly for evidence of process - meant that the student developed categories for assessment of:
Brief Parti
Preliminary Sketch Designs which was further subdivided into:
Scale, Volume and Function
matched up exactly with the stated requirements of the Department's brief to the students to Hand In Brief, Parti and Preliminary Sketch Designs whilst emphasising the aims of the project. Generally, regardless of the design methodology adopted by the students and regardless of the direction in which each student was moving in their self-selected specialisation, the Preliminary Sketch Designs were of a very high standard. The approaches taken to representation varied enormously given the encouragement from tutors to each student to make their representation talk about their parti and to begin to define the specialisation each student would pursue at the same time as developing the basic Child Care Centre brief over the next three weeks.

A week before the Final Hand-In I scheduled a class meeting to discuss the forthcoming summative critique process. The agenda included responding to students' concerns about the nature of the staff-selected studio tutorial groups and the carryover of the same groups to the final critique; and the development of an assessment proforma which everyone - staff and students alike - could use for their assessment of the work. I said that my idea was that we would together develop an assessment proforma which we agreed upon and which would be the basis for the peer and staff assessment and feedback. First we discussed the critique group formation. I said that Andy and I had discussed their concerns of the earlier class meeting in detail and felt that whilst we would like to maintain a gender and ability group balance in each of the three groups that we had no objection to negotiated self-selection out of a particular group and into another group. To my surprise the class came up with a whole lot of reasons why this was unnecessary: that they had to become accustomed to receiving critique from anyone and that the staff selected groups retained a 'real world' attraction because in reality (in the profession?) one could not choose one's critics. I put back to them that I was giving them this opportunity in response to their concerns raised at the earlier class meeting but they responded that it was no longer an issue. Andy thought that their field trip away during the previous week together had cemented many new friendships in the year and that the concerns of Week 3 were not the concerns of the students in Week 7. I was happy to concur with the students as the gender and ability balance I had tried to promote in the small groups in response to the unbalanced groups of the Tea House Project seemed to provide more learning opportunities for students.

The main issue for the day was developing a proforma for staff and peer-assessments.

I invited the class to suggest assessment categories for the Child Care Centre Project. The list the class and contributing tutors Andy, Gerald and I eventually produced was: Brief, Functional Relationships, Indoor/Outdoor, Materials, Materiality, Scale, Structure, Colours, Articulation of Building programme, Innovations, Risk taking, Form, Relation of Special Study to Child Care Centre, Intuitive Response, Presentation-Oral, Clarity of Ideas, and Communication. The development of the list was not as straightforward as I make it appear. One student, Tina, said that she couldn't possibly split up her response to the scheme under review into all those categories and suggested the category "Intuitive Response". She was then interrupted by Ben who said that if there was no categorisation the peer assessment could degenerate into a popularity mark and the designer would have no information about her/his scheme. Another group of students said that they couldn't agree on these categories for everyone's scheme until they had been advised how much weight in the marking would be given to their self...

30. After student complaints about the random group selection make-up in the Tea House Project earlier that year, I ran two checks: gender and entry-ranking group make-up. The East Enders had 3/10 of the academically lowest ranked students in the year - the West Enders the remaining seven. East Enders 6 males (including 3 lowest ranked) and 10 females; and West Enders 8 males (including 5 lowest ranked) and 7 females. There was a skew in West Enders to lower academic ranking and East Enders to overrepresentation by women. I sought to correct these imbalances in the group selection for the Child Care Centre.
selected area of specialisation. We discussed this point before progressing and there was some consensus that an equal number of categories should be named by everyone for general consideration in each student's work as should be named for the student to select for consideration in their own work. We worked on through the general list despite the frequent interruption of the speaker naming a category by those who thought it was not a good idea or who thought it had already been covered. We then, as a group, worked through the list accreting like categories and incorporating same categories until we ended up with four main categories. The proforma we eventually developed is shown on p. 367.
THE UNIVERSITY OF _______ DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

AD1S PEER ASSESSMENT PROFORMA 15-9-199_

DESIGNER'S NAME:  

ASSessor'S NAME:  

AGREED GENERAL CATEGORIES  

ABOUT THE BRIEF  

ABOUT FORM-MAKING  
MATERIALS/MATERIALITY/SCALE/STRUCTURE/COLOURS  

ABOUT REPRESENTATION  
PRESENTATION - GRAPHIC AND ORAL/ CLARITY OF IDEAS/COMMUNICATION  

ABOUT INNOVATION AND RISK-TAKING  

DESIGNERS NOMINATED FOUR CATEGORIES RELATING TO HER/HIS DESIGN AND AREA OF SPECIALISATION  

1.  

2.  

3.  

4.  

MARK AWARDED TO SCHEME (please give a mark not a grade) =  %  
Distinction + > or = to 85%  
Distinction 75-84  
Credit + 70-74  
Credit 65-69  
Pass + 60-64  
Pass 55-59  
Pass - 50-54  
Fail 40-49
The students completed their designs and all their presentation work knowing exactly what the staff and peer assessors would focus on in the final assessment and furthermore knowing that they could name up to 4 categories for assessment related to their specialisation or special topic or their design in general. There were very few queries about the way that the proforma would be used after the class meeting so I took this to mean that everyone agreed about what we were doing and knew how to use the proforma. The proforma was a very basic form of negotiated learning contract - the only such learning contract I have experienced using.

As soon as work was pinned up after the final Hand-in of the developed sketch design, the three tutors, Andy, Gerald and I moved around in the two Crit spaces assessing work informally using a 'global reaction' technique aided by the assessment proforma sheet. We did not compare marks at all. The next morning Gerald and I again went through quite a few schemes together, once again marking independently.

During my marking sessions I was particularly noting items for discussion for each scheme in the Final Critique which was held that afternoon. The client returned on the day of the final crits to review the Sketch Designs and to provide a further critique as an outside stake-holder. The three client representatives were their Acting Director Planning and Programming; their in-house Building Consultant, and the public authority Architect who designed all their buildings. The format for the Crit was that each student would have a 15 minute time-slot dedicated to the consideration of their work and that they would have a maximum of five minutes to present the work followed by peer, staff and client/visitor critique.

The students handed in their personalised, completed copy of the assessment proforma the morning of the final critique; I photocopied them and returned them to the students. The designer handed out one copy of the assessment schedule personalised for her/his categories to each peer at the critique and one copy to the staff assessor in attendance and to the client visitor.

The assessment sheets provided a focus for commentary because everyone had in front of them the aims of the student about which they wanted to be assessed as well as the categories against which all the work was to be assessed. Everyone in the group was furiously writing for most of the presentation time to provide their peers with feedback.

The independent assessment for each student designer arrived at using the 'global response' of a mature professional in the table (inserted as p. 369). Marker 1 is Andy, Marker 2 is Gerald and Marker 3 is me. Column E shows the Markers' average (mean). Columns F-N show the 9 Peers marks (or less if not all 9 submitted their mark). Column O shows the Peer average. By looking at the comparison between the mean mark the staff awarded the scheme (Column P) and the mean mark the peers awarded the scheme (Column O) several features of peer assessment can be seen. Students' designs assessed as average by staff assessors tend to be assessed as average by students, who tend to slightly overrate their peers (in comparison with the staff mark as a referent); whilst students' designs rated very highly by staff assessors tended to be underrated by their peers. Students whose design was rated poorly by the staff assessors tended to be overrated by their peers. The peers comments, rather than their ratings, provided the best feedback to their peers.

The students in my group gave some immediate feedback about the format for the presentation. They said that whilst they would have liked to hear everyone's presentations they were sure that they wanted small groups. The issues they raised in favour of small groups were:
- fatigue in having the whole class present;
- the amount of time this would take;
- repetition of the same themes and increased nervousness in front of a big group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Marker 1</th>
<th>Marker 2</th>
<th>Marker 3</th>
<th>Av.1/2/3</th>
<th>peer 1</th>
<th>peer 2</th>
<th>peer 3</th>
<th>peer 4</th>
<th>peer 5</th>
<th>peer 6</th>
<th>peer 7</th>
<th>peer 8</th>
<th>peer 9</th>
<th>peer av</th>
<th>av1/2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meara</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loris</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enid</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beata</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lui</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deidre</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katina</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reflective journals which were to be submitted with the schemes varied substantially in quantity, quality and level of reflection. The most reflective were a window of insight into the student's thinking processes; especially interesting was the reflection about critique received and the designer's response to it. One student, Ben, submitted his late but included a reflection on the final critique which was very rewarding. I am aware of the feminist critique of "marking" reflective journals and sought only in my (all too brief) scrutiny of them to establish merely their narrative or reflective style in order to ascertain the members of the class who are not yet reflective, or who cannot write reflectively.

The two Chinese students failed to submit Reflective Journals at all. In speaking with colleagues I discovered that students from different, and particularly Asian, cultural backgrounds have more difficulty with writing autobiography than their Australian peers. Self disclosure is culturally alien to them. I now realise the teacher making it a hand-in requirement as was the case here is a form of insensitive cultural colonialism and I regret that 5% was a penalty mark for those two students. Similarly one of the best designers, Matthew, failed to submit a reflective journal as did Veronica. Matthew, I believe, demonstrates an intrinsic learning orientation which would dictate to him that he does nothing "just for the marks." I believe that Matthew behaves like a beginning professional; he is a self-motivated learner who engages with the problem for what he can learn himself. Performing for assessment is a secondary consideration. Veronica uses a journal daily but it is not reflective, on the whole; rather it is a record of her processes. As she uses it daily (as one should use a journal if keeping one) she did not hand it in and told me that she had used it in preparing her oral presentation. To what extent her cultural conditioning prevents her from becoming reflective and/or handing in her daily journal for scrutiny I could only conjecture. She deliberately avoids confrontation and critique of her design, and seems ill-equipped to cope with the rigours of publicly showing her scheme (Ch. 4, pp. 200-204).

While students were waiting for me to finish collating the 4 bands of marks, they were talking about their response to the peer assessment and evaluation sheets which I had distributed back to the students having transposed their peers' marks that morning. Dan jokingly said "There will be all these new friendships springing up in the year!" whilst Tina said "There were too many categories. Every time I started writing on the sheets things were just going over my head. I couldn't write and listen at the same time." Gwen added that "It is near impossible to follow the Crit and write as well."

On the following day I invited students who wanted to discuss their assessments to make an appointment with me. The facilitative role of the tutor in a reflective programme of Problem Based Learning should extend to the post-assessment interviews. If students can show a response to the criticism they have received, and describe what they need to do for themselves, the tutor's role as facilitator is functioning well - by providing a venue and a time for students to reflect aloud about their response to the criticism.

The second student to see me about assessment was Ben. "What", he wanted to know, "should I spend my time on for the resubmission of this work which I am going to undertake for the Folio Review at the end of the Semester?" I encouraged him to go on. He felt that his presentation had let him down, but when I got him to show me his peers' comments he could see that there was, on his peers' and Andy's assessment sheets a criticism of the size of the building and of the circulation difficulties associated with the planning with all the administration spaces entrant only from the play spaces. He is a reflective person and was able then for himself to identify the areas for attention in his resubmission - he also revealed that he was already talking to the best "presenters" in the year about his techniques for colouring.

I had asked those who made appointments to discuss their assessment to come with written questions so that they and I knew what they wanted to talk about. The next student Meara had done just that.

Meara along with Max had received a Fail Grade for her Preliminary Sketch Design - largely because it was presented as a diagram and not a building - and had made a huge
improvement to her building to receive the Pass grade she finally recorded. Her complaints were much the same as Loris' - that she had been present on every Tutorial day and had discussed her developing scheme in detail with Andy who she felt had validated the decisions she had made about planning and form-making. She believed that as she had her final model in the Studio on desk-crit days as well as two previous working models that there was no question in her case that Andy, her Tutor, had only seen the final design at the Final Critique and therefore had been unable to critique the work. Meara had the same concerns as Loris and yet her assessment outcome was much better - she was effectively asking why she did not have a Credit or a Distinction. She had been awarded a Distinction by three of her peers and a Credit by three others so what she had written down on her points for discussion sheet was: "How could there be so much variation between her peers' assessment of the work and the staff assessment of her work?"

I showed her that the peer assessment was very bunched up around Pass plus and Credit. I believed the bunching said more about studio and gendered relations and saving face than necessarily true assessment of the work. This is not perhaps the most prudent thing to say to students when contributing 10% of the summative assessment from peer assessment, but what I was trying to say to Meara was that the staff have many more years of expertise not only with building design and assessment but also with discrimination between rewarding effort and development - which I suggested to Meara may well have been what her peers were rewarding in their marks for her - and rewarding excellent design. I concluded by saying to Meara that all the development she had undertaken of what was effectively her first design idea may not have produced a Distinction scheme as the underlying planning and form-making were perhaps not exemplary. She found this concept hard to grasp - that she had developed her scheme significantly and all the while with the approval and encouragement of the Tutor, but that whilst her Peers validated her building the staff in awarding her Pass and Pass plus grades could see serious shortcomings. In a nutshell her question was "What do I have to do to get a Distinction?" In architecture, and other design fields where there is no "right answer" this is an impossible question to answer because the tutors cannot name the ways, in advance, that the students who do get Distinctions will get there...similarly there is no ability afterwards to follow an audit trial to see how they got them and the sheer energy and creativity and iterative and reiterative qualities which characterise the best design work are as static in the presentation sheets of excellent work as is the languor and ordinariness of the poorest work.

However, through considering the comments on the assessment proforma sheets relating to the different criteria for assessment, Meara could receive a range of feedback. Meara's scheme on my review, had serious shortcomings related to scale and ingress of sun and light in an uncontrolled manner, despite having other attractive and desirable features. The critique that Meara received of her work should have helped her to understand the areas of poor resolution for which she was penalised. Additionally, the comment of her peers (in her group) that they could not understand or get into the scheme without her commentary should have alerted her to the inability of two of the three staff markers (who were not present at her oral presentation) to read the building from her drawings and model alone.

On reflection I have learnt a lot about student learning, peer and staff assessment, and administering a Problem Based Learning studio programme. I think that the outcomes over the weeks of the project demonstrate that 'real problems' are wonderful triggers for learning and that the facilitative style of the tutor in charge is a valuable one. Moreover, I believe that the involvement of students and staff in assessment has been very valuable for the students as a learning tool and for the staff to assist students to recognise and respond to criticism.

The use of an assessment proforma, whilst involving everyone in a lot of extra recording, serves a useful purpose in pin-pointing for students the breadth of areas for consideration in the marking and gives them a sense, I hope, that the assessment response of students and staff was not subjective. However, at the end of the day, all the staff assessment was undertaken from a 'global marking' viewpoint and differed between
the markers very insubstantially except in one or two cases where the markers disagreed about the potential for the scheme under review perhaps more than anything else. (It is always dangerous to mark for potential; I believe we should only mark what is there.) The staff complied with the Department's request to give students written feedback on their work but in fact marked the work of all students on a global scale, and not as the accretion of the categories for assessment consideration from the Proforma. There was obviously, contingent upon the small group nature of the Final Crits, an opportunity for only one staff member to review their marking subsequent to hearing the student's explanatory presentation. To what extent staff rely on oral presentations to form their assessment grade when they have probably spoken to every student in the studio about their part I am not sure. I find sometimes areas of concern are explicited but that it doesn't usually mean I am not still concerned - it just means that I know why the student has done that thing. Their explication does not necessarily validate their thinking and I will still name a poor judgement model for what it is in the assessments. This is where tutors traditionally wield their greatest control - and through their failure to validate through assessment the student may be tempted to respond in the next project by "giving the tutor what she wants to see." As this is unhelpful it behoves the staff assessor to take care not to impose essentially 'high culture' value systems onto the culturally diverse range of schemes from the culturally diverse range of students in the class. But this does differ from rewarding through the marking system well explicated but poorly conceived or developed ideas.

End of Narrative: Educating the Reflective Practitioner

The preceding Child Care Centre narrative describes a first year (B.Arch) class where self-directed learning approaches were emphasised. Understandably, not all students were confident of the new expectations of them, and some responded to the end of Semester evaluation in a way which reminded staff that there is much resistance from students to notions of overturning learning expectations - that their strongest position may be as dependent learners with a defined assessment task and an exact and established route to achieving desirable assessment outcomes. Through their responses students indicate their resistance to moves to direct their learning along more independent lines, their uncertainty of the success of the programme of which a trial was conducted, and their anxiety about participating in new learning experiences when they may feel that the old ones have served them well.

First year BArch students were asked at the end of Semester 1, after participating in a studio focusing on the input of peer and self-assessment, and in which there was a focus on informal and formal peer-critique:

Do you have any comments on this method of teaching?

There were a range of responses.
The teaching method is good in that it leaves a lot of time for self directed learning. However, at times I felt bewildered by what was expected, and unsure what was expected. This was countered by crits at the end of each hand-in. These were valuable in realising where each student stands in relation to the rest of the class and a helpful experience in general.

There was more learning from our own experience and mistakes rather than being lectured. We should be shown the basics first.

Susan Shannon please read. Peer assessment is a good idea in theory but does not work in practice. The prelim assignment for the ______ Project was a joke as people cracked the code to find out what students have given what marks. It was found that some students had given good schemes very low marks just because they didn’t like the person (not the scheme) and some openly admitted it was a good way to "get back" at people in the class.

If students are given extra responsibility for their education it is either because ‘teachers’ don’t want it or do not know what to do with it.

It is not unreasonable to say that most of what I’ve learnt is what I’ve discovered myself. The teaching process acts as a stimulus and guide. I feel like there is so very much that I don’t know and could have been shown.

At the end of the year the students, after further experience with self-directed learning and a contingent strong emphasis on self and peer assessment in the Child Care Centre Project, were again asked about their experiences with this learning style.

The evaluation question was:

*Overall, my comments on this style of facilitated, self-directed learning are...*

Good

Fine. Peer assessment seemed to go better than with the ______ Project.

Positive, and I liked the idea of having a special topic to concentrate on.
Great to choose area of specialisation and points for critique to focus on.

Useful for the individual students' ability to understand/assess their own work and that of their peers.

The more we use this system, the more we can 'successfully self-direct' ourselves...use the system to your advantage. Does this mean that students with less confidence in themselves suffer - [through] lack of initiative or direction?

Self directed learning is fine for those who have the confidence and experience to know what they want to do. Others, the majority of the class, needed aid in not only developing their specialised area but in choosing an appropriate one to begin with.

This style of learning is fine until it comes to assessment. The marks, I feel, were not a good indication of the work submitted. Self directed learning = self assessment?

I don't really think I learned a thing from this project.

Need more feedback from tutors that is constructive and helpful, rather than just comments - more directive.

After another Semester, with a year of focusing on self-directed learning, some students were responding more positively, and in so doing recognised the advantages of being able to pursue their own area of expertise in a self-directed learning course. However, many students were ambivalent about, or actively resisted the new opportunities. The tutors in this class actively resisted the dominant discourse about what it is that teachers "do", choosing instead to adopt a facilitative role. The teacher's position in the hierarchy of the School, and the University is not evident in this role - the better the facilitative efforts of the teacher, the more invisible the teacher becomes. This irony, highlighted in the first Semester comments about the 'teacher' becomes even more pronounced at the end of the year. Additionally, more than one student commented that this style of self-directed learning may not suit less confident students. This is highlighted in the Dana Cuff narrative (p. 329) concerning Muriel's struggles to meet new expectations in James North's final year studio.
Some students' resistance to changes in how they view the hierarchy of the school and the role of teachers within that hierarchy changed when they had more opportunity to experience, and become competent with, self-directed learning and the resulting expectations in relation to peer and self-assessments. Some students resist changes to traditional teaching roles in this School possibly more than some teachers resist adopting a more facilitative and less hierarchical role. This may be related to complex considerations of where students see the power residing within self-directed learning studios - that the lack of choice they exercise in whether they participate in self-directed learning countermands any choice they may exercise within the project. Therefore, there may be a strong perception that, the invitation to participate in self-directed learning is simply another part of the curriculum, and has a concomitant assessment expectation, regardless of its seemingly democratic, and non-hierarchical origins.

Conclusion

In Chapter 5 I have recorded details of some teaching and critique practices in the School of Architecture in which I researched and taught, and have presented the reader with new narrative insights into how students and staff go about the process of critique. I believe that these approaches to conducting critiques with small groups, promoting opportunities for self and peer-assessment and situating learning in a Problem Based Learning curriculum, can enhance students' development of self-judgement through creating situations in which students are more comfortable and confident to express their understandings and to acknowledge what they need to learn.

These approaches encourage students to take control of their own learning, which I recognise as a means of developing their autonomy and self-judgement which are important in preparation for life-long learning. Furthermore, empowering development of self-judgement and with it confidence through self-assessment is a means to building students' ability to judge the work of others, and to withstand negative "expert" critique of their own work. Finally, the ability of all students to develop a sound judgement model may be
enhanced when the power of expert critique is diminished in favour of critique processes which develop and build on the judgement skills of students.
EPILOGUE

CONCLUDING THE PROCESS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Introduction

Both the process of conducting educational research and that of writing a thesis are intensely lived experiences. In this epilogue I reflect on the process of educational research and summarise the outcomes. As has been noted in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, the strength of the process lies in its ability to inform both the participants in the research, and the reader, and thereby to encourage their reflection on their own situation as a result of the fine-grained account of the everyday made problematic.

What the research set out to do

In Chapter 1, Introduction, the purpose of this study is stated (p. 32) as being "to provide an insightful text relating studio-based critique in architectural education to developing students' self-judgement, and thereby promoting a more effective use of critique by students and educators". I interpret critique through feminist poststructuralist concepts to demonstrate how critique sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessing and socialising students into the profession. I consider that by relating studio-based critique to developing students' sound self-judgement, a more effective use of critique by educators and students may be promoted. In Chapter 5 I explore the link between the above two theses with the aim of proposing that all students may potentially be empowered when there are certain changes in the critique experience.

In Chapter 2, Literature Review, the research of Kathryn Anthony and Sarah Dinham in particular, defines some of the questions which the thesis seeks to address. The questions concern the 'gaps' between Anthony's and Dinham's research into studio education and the
critique, and the focus of this research. In summary, Anthony and Dinham did not examine
the operations of the studio-based critique from a learner-centred perspective which
considers access and equity, (although Ahrentzen and Anthony's 1993 research considers
gendered educational practices and architecture), nor from a perspective which has in the
fore-front the aim of critique as the empowerment of students' self-judgement through
educational processes which are sensitive to the students' needs. This is what this thesis sets
out to do.

This thesis addresses considerations of access and equity in studio-based education. The
feminist critical ethnographic study, which forms the research component of the thesis,
investigates educational practices through questioning whether current critique practices are
discriminatory in that they serve the interests of some students better than others. Some of
the questions investigated by the researcher concern the issues: Does the public nature of
critique reduce women's confidence in dealing with negative critique? Should critique aim
to build the development of confidence and self-judgement? Has the enhancement of
confidence, and with it self-judgement, been identified and promoted as one of the primary
tasks of architectural critique? Are students being encouraged to take responsibility for their
own learning and self-knowledge in the practices of critique? Does the existence of a master
critic subjugate students' self-judgement rather than increase their confidence in their ability
to judge their own, and others' work? Do particular practices discriminate against women?

**How the research was conducted**

The feminist critical ethnographic research methodology which was selected for conducting
this research, described in Chapter 3, *Methodology*, combines the strength of a fine-grained
case study approach with the political awareness of advocacy research. The research has, as
its hoped for outcomes (pp. 115-7), the transformation of students' education through a
focus on *praxis* - informed practice based on self-reflection. Praxis derives its
transformative outcomes partly through researcher, teacher, student and reader reflection on
the "face validity" of the presented accounts: that is, the extent to which the descriptions of
events provides a "'click of recognition', and a 'yes, of course' instead of a 'yes, but' experience" (Lather, 1986, 271) and through the notion of "catalytic validity", which Lather describes as the "degree to which the research process reorients, focuses, and energises participants towards knowing reality in order to transform it" (p. 272). In summary, as a research methodology, feminist critical ethnography does not rely on generalisations, but instead on the reflection of the participants and reader on single events which may exemplify and inform hegemonic practices. Consequent upon the need of the researcher as observer to vividly illustrate hegemonic practice, "the critical ethnographer will consider an event worth recording and reporting because it exemplifies a hegemonic practice" (Brodkey, 1987, 1).

I planned the observations to be carried out in the School over a period of three years to include observing critique sessions for the three years of the Bachelor of Architecture (professional) degree, as well as critiques for Bachelor of Architectural Studies undergraduate students in design subjects. I also observed professional critiques outside the School. In order to observe students grow and change, I observed, and interviewed, the same students over three years of their studies. In order to experience a variety of critique contexts I observed critiques in which students alone participated, through to critique with eminent members of the profession as well as senior academic staff of the School. Through this range of experiences of critique I observed critique from informal through to formal settings, from small critiques involving one student and one critic through to critiques involving the whole class, from the informal drawing board critique with no assessment outcome through to a formal closed jury setting as the final in-School critique and assessment situation.

Some of the dilemmas inherent in conducting ethnographic research were identified and discussed in Chapter 3. In particular, in the data gathering process, there was a difficulty separating the role of 'researcher' and 'researched' which became even more difficult for me as a feminist researcher who had eschewed all notions of disinterest, and who was available to the students as a friend, and who earnestly sought to discuss emerging
hypotheses with students. This, as Stacey (1988) says, made leave taking, both from the participants, and from the School, very difficult at the conclusion of the research process. Lather mentions too, that the tendency to voyeurism is always present where the intimacy with the researcher encourages self-disclosure (Lather, 1994). What is sought in feminist critical research is reciprocity, and an opportunity for the 'researcher' and the 'researched' to influence, and be influenced by, the research process and outcomes.

In order to address some of the identified methodological difficulties, I have disclosed my subjectivities inasmuch as this is ever possible, in Susan's Story (pp. 182-184), as a lens through which to consider my interpretations, my understandings and my construction of a particular kind of knowledge.

I have guarded against exploitation of the participants in many ways, including maintaining strict anonymity (through the use of pseudonyms for students and projects, and not referring explicitly to dates) and confidentiality driven by the Code of Ethics for conducting this research. I have negotiated narratives with participants, both teachers and students, in order to discuss emerging understandings with them. Finally I have sought to bar access to the thesis until the student 'actors' are no longer enrolled in the School.

**How the research is presented**

The outcomes from the research, which derive from my observations in a School of Architecture over three years, form Chapter 4, Narratives, Interviews, Critical Analysis and Discussion. The critical analysis, through which the students' voices, and the narratives which situate their voices in relation to their architectural education, are considered, is driven by the notion of an organising problematic derived from critical theory (Simon and Dippo, 1986, 197). In this research project the organising problematic is that of the hegemonic practices which maintain the status quo of power relationships within the School. The conventional task for critical analysis in critical educational research, which Brodkey believes is to interrupt those social practices researchers believe oppress certain
classes inside educational institutions (Brodky, 1987, 67), intersects in this research with notions of analysis within poststructural feminism, so that the role for critical analysis includes identifying the subject positions from which the 'actors' speak, and disrupting the binaries into which the 'actors' speak themselves as a result of historical, social and educational practices (Davies, 1994). Furthermore, the role for the critical analysis extends to that of leading the reader from the students' voices and the narratives, as vignettes of studio life portraying critique in many contexts, through to the raison d'être of the methodology - chosen as it is for its ability to expose the hegemonic practices through a finely tuned focus on the 'everyday made problematic' by asking "How do the practices of critique discriminate against some students?" and "How may self-judgement be empowered?"

In Chapter 4 my focus was on the 'interruptions' to social practice which must occur before students and teachers in Schools of Architecture can begin to recognise enabling and disabling practices for themselves, and from this basis I explore the possibilities of critique as a process central to the development of students' self-judgement. Some themes in the social practices of the studio were identified. The themes included silencing, exclusion, marginalisation, conforming, competing, and accepting/rejecting models for success and the role of hierarchy which together, and separately, help to form and assert the hegemonic practices which maintain the status quo in architectural education.

In constructing the text, I further interrupted the narratives which formed the everyday observations of the studio-based critique to weave together the narratives, interviews and interpretations into a conceptual narrative (Brodky, 1987,71) which invites the reader into "an active interpretation of the reconstruction", for, as Atkinson says, "[o]ver and above any propositional content and the 'conclusions' or 'findings' to be presented, the ethnographic text depends on the plausibility of its account" (Atkinson, 1990, 2).

What the research uncovered
Part 1: Beginning Architecture Studies
Themes: Silence, Isolation, Inclusion/Exclusion, Marginalisation

The stories of Max and Veronica, as commencing students, illustrate the marginalising potential of class and ethnic difference. Through their 'fringe' status in the class, which the critical analysis argues preceded the enrolment of any students, reflecting the status quo of the 'insider' group, the notions of marginalisation leading to isolation and exclusion are considered. It is argued that through their silent acceptance of "the way things are", and their rejection of other means of self-expression which better relate to their backgrounds, they are thrust further and further out of the studio culture. The consequences of this marginalisation for both of them are academically overwhelming as they attempt to participate in critique sessions. Their poor confidence manifests itself in personal and professional situations, and underlines the premise that developing students' confidence in critique situations is a forerunner to developing sound judgement.

In contrast to the stories of Veronica and Max is the confidence with which Rhianna, Reginald, Jason and Nick tackle their studies. They reject roles which they do not want and avail themselves of the role of 'insider' through proffering and responding to peer critique. Through their stories the confident development of their judgement to a level of proficiency worthy of Australia-wide acclaim is unfolded. Rhianna's story further describes what it means to be a woman studying in the School. Despite her location in the 'core' group in the studio, she articulates a sense of exclusion from the 'real' debate, a knowledge of the struggles she will encounter as a woman in the building construction industry, a marginalisation even within her own peer group due to her socialised gender differences, and her isolation within critiques through wanting to "make it sound good" instead of honestly speaking up about her design's shortcomings.

In summary, the struggles of Veronica, Max and Rhianna are informed through considering the role of racial, class and gender discrimination in studio-based education. In considering how the discrimination happens it is not so much a case of pin-pointing practices, although
this is sometimes possible, as considering the implicit expectations of the hidden curriculum with the assumption of a familiarity with "cultural capital" which are missing for Max and Veronica, and an acceptance of competitive achievement with which Rhianna struggles. Although inducted well into the expectations of a professional career in the construction industry through her family background, Rhianna speaks out against the covert gender discrimination experienced by women in the School.

Part 2: Continuing Architecture Studies
Themes: Conforming, Competing, Confidence

Rhianna's struggles to conform to the dominant discourse about what architecture students "do" are illuminated in Part 2. Through a number of examples from studio life her struggles to promote harmony, and maintain relationships in the studio, as a result of her gender socialisation, are set against her need to compete in all spheres within the School, and to get a job. She is aided in balancing the underlying conflict that frequently arises between the demands for conformity and complicity with "accepting things the way they are" concerning the demands of competitive endeavour by her supreme inner confidence and developed self-judgement. She knows what she needs to do to survive in the School, and get into the profession, and weighs up every situation. Whilst praising the bold and contradictory expression of Val, in "bucking the system", she will not criticise the traditional achievement model she sees in Colleen Page. Although she recognises that Colleen's conformity may have smoothed her path, Rhianna, through her self-stated embarrassment lest anyone be on the outer, is a fearless advocate for the disadvantaged, and this advocacy often places her in a position of choosing between conformity - a silent acceptance - and speaking out against unfair practices.

The lack of confidence with which her peer, Muriel, tackles her studies contrasts with Rhianna's confidence. Through Muriel's struggles to gain a voice in the studio, and to express herself in critique situations, the reader can identify some of the issues which are fundamental to Muriel's lack of confidence: sexual harassment, a lack of available role
models, and a lack of preparation to tackle learning independently. Her poor self-judgement and anxiety about public speaking are very limiting to her chance to perform well in critique situations. By contrast, Rhianna, as a now-experienced student, has developed her self-judgement to such an extent that she has developed a facility of "giving away her unknowns" in critiques to let her critics come back in again to build her up. She has redefined what the role of critique could be, and in so doing, what a new model of success and competition could be for her as an architecture student.

The role of confidence in the ability of students to promote themselves and their designs in public critique situations is central to Garry's concerns about losing face in front of his peers. The anxieties this fear engenders in him and other students who then avoid public critique situations, are considered in terms of Garry's different back-ground in Part 3.

Part 3: Completing Architecture Studies
Themes: Models for Success, Hierarchy.

The stories of Mick, an Aboriginal student, and Garry, a man with an out-of-date technical training who has returned to study after many years, are presented in detail to describe the difficulties of students coming into the School without the same 'high culture' values and current-status pre-requisites as many of the other students. Through their efforts to learn in an environment not structured for their learning needs, the futility of aspiration to a 'high culture' profession from a background devoid of high culture values is explored. Mick's voice tells us what it means to be a black student in a School of whites, in a culture which has values he does not share, and with aspirations to a profession where he does not know of any aboriginal practitioners other than a "coconut" who has lost his cultural identity. His rejection of the available models for success marginalises him. But Garry is his friend. Struggling with many of the same problems, though deriving from different bases, Garry and Mick exemplify the difficulties of non-traditional students in the School. Their responses to peer review, and to public critique, underline their rejection of the only culture they see in the School - a 'high value' culture. Despite all this, Garry has learnt to be
reflective - albeit through a process he "hated" - of having his ideas torn apart by the critic. He now realises that not every idea he has is a good one, and his skill of self-judgement is being developed through his reflection. It is a skill he has had to labour at; it was not a skill he came into the School with. Similarly, he "hated" every minute of studying Computer Aided Design, which he now acknowledges as being his best prospect for employment. Is it a coincidence that in reflecting in detail on two learning experiences he has described them both as hateful? His strength of language is an indication of the tremendous difficulties he has had to overcome to learn in a traditional University environment, structured more for the needs of students replete with cultural capital than students like him.

Whilst Mick and Garry have not identified valid role models which would support their different aspirations, Nick and Jason already display a knowledge of what is required to be successful in current architectural practice. Rhianna and Jason fear that many of their skills will be overlooked by prospective employers, and bemoan the fact that there is very little alternative to them joining mainstream practice. As completing students they are undecided about the necessity for the school to focus on preparation for professional practice as a major part of their completion of education. Reginald believes that it is an unnecessary focus for the School, whilst Jason believes that if it is one of the stated aims of the School, part of the preparation for this role is in their participation in formally constituted jury situations which emulate professional practice.

Muriel's struggles to come to terms with the new expectations that she will begin to act like a professional from within the School during her final year are described in Part 3. Part of this expectation involved Muriel in taking responsibility for her own learning, and this expectation was promoted by James North rejecting the traditional role of "teacher-as-teller" in favour of a facilitation role, thereby disrupting perceived hierarchies. It is arguable that students like Muriel have much at stake when, towards the end of their education, there is an expectation that they will display, in self and peer-critique, a mature judgement model which has not been nurtured from the commencement of their studies. Although Muriel has been almost exclusively subjected to critique by experts in the earlier
years of her in-School education, she has not developed the confidence, the vocabulary and the stance to present and defend her own work, or that of her peers, in a public peer-critique session. In proposing an independent-learning studio the intention of her teacher was to increase students' confidence and to provide opportunities for them to develop and demonstrate self-judgement. To propose such curriculum changes he relied on his autonomous judgement and hierarchical power. I argue that students like Muriel possibly would reject the opportunity to participate in studios which promote independent learning, were they given a choice, despite the intention of these studios to fore-ground acquiring the very critique skills which Muriel lacks.

How teaching practice might be improved

In Chapter 5, Researcher Reflection and Transformative Action in Teaching, I consider, through examples from my own and others' teaching, understandings about how critique discriminates against some students, and how self-judgement might be promoted through certain changes in the critique experience. I further consider how these understandings can be worked back into teaching and critique situations. The examples are not prescriptions for action in other studios, but an attempt to close the researcher mode of the critical ethnographic cycle (p.117) which calls for researcher self-reflection (Smith, 1993b, 14). The theories of Reason, Rowan and Heron are considered to argue that for the critical researcher it is not sufficient to reflect on the outcomes of research, but that reflexivity produces "increased insight and ability to act" (Rowan, 1981, 168). The means available to me "to act" were to change my teaching. My own process of cycling the research understandings I gained back into transformative and political action through the teaching practices I engaged in as a result of my understandings form the basis of Chapter 5.

As explained in Chapter 3 and 4 it is outside my control to demand transformative outcomes from participants. However, the students in the classes in which I taught, and those of James North, through participating in completely different types of critiques from those traditionally experienced in the School, were made aware of the emerging
understandings I had about the power of expert critique to silence students and obfuscate issues. They began to understand the role of self and peer-critique in developing self-judgement, and why they were the experts at generating criteria against which their work could be critiqued and assessed. In order to develop these understandings some students questioned the role of hierarchy and authority in the studio, and what they considered their role, and the teacher's and institution's role to be, as can be seen from their Evaluation of Teaching comments (on p. 346, 373).

Through understanding that my efforts with small group critiques for beginning students in the First Year Studios were aimed at involving everyone in the class in giving and receiving critique, the potential of ethnic, class and gender differences per se to marginalise and exclude students through silence was disrupted. The students accrued skills through working as dyads to describe their schemes to a peer who would then present it, forming a critique of positive and negative features of the project, and developing criteria for assessment with the whole class. The modelling of the Fishbowl Critique enabled students like Brian to see the complexity of consideration which was engaged by confident, articulate speakers with competent designs, and to hear the articulate critique of peers and tutors directed towards consideration of the critics for assessment. More advanced level students in the final years participated in an exhibition review session with consultants which was facilitated by their teacher, James North, to give them the opportunity to present their work in a professional genre to consultants who were not also assessors.

I am proud of my teaching - many teachers are - but through the process of considering the barriers to students developing sound judgement of their own work, I have come to realise that it is in the role of facilitator that I can have the greatest benefit to students. In support of Fenstermacher's arguments (Ch 2, 90) that the teacher's greatest role lies in fostering students' attempts at learning, I value an organisational role which supports students' attempts at autonomous learning. There is a considerable conflict between the view of oneself in a "learning hierarchy", (if such a notion is credible), as a "facilitator", and that of "controller" or "orchestrater", which are two of the roles Dinham (1989b, 82) identified as
common self-conceptualizations of studio instructors. I would argue that a dismantling of hierarchy is not possible within the current conceptions studio instructors hold of themselves as controllers or orchestraters, as a dismantling of hierarchy involves supporting a belief that students do have the skills to learn independently.

If the proposal that "facilitator" is the preferred role for a studio instructor is accepted there are several changes to general patterns about the way things could be done in the studio. I will illustrate these changes with reference to two outcomes from my reflection on studio-based education as a result of this research.

The first concerns the importance of establishing clear, unambiguous criteria, co-derived by students and teachers, for critiques and subsequent assessment, early in any design project. Through this simple device, student designers can compare their proposals against a check-list before they complete their submission prior to receiving critique and assessment, and teachers and students giving feedback to others about their designs have a check-list for discussion or assessment. Through the process of developing criteria and addressing how well their design has achieved the various criteria, students are encouraged to verbalise the "mystery" of their designs. A further benefit comes from critics being obliged to make explicit, in terms of the criteria, their response to the design; in this way their critique and assessment outcomes become more accountable.

Whilst it is currently common practice in the School for critics to provide assessment, students and critics may benefit from the separation of the role of critic and assessor. The argument can be mounted that through separating the role of critic and assessor a more reciprocal relationship may be promoted between student and critic, where the student is more prepared to disclose short-comings and use the critique as a time to seek information and feedback because assessment is not also involved.

1. I suggest that it is a relatively simple process to facilitate a session during which teachers and students contribute to a list of criteria. Such a process was discussed in Ch 5, p.338, and p.364. I am not suggesting that students, or teachers, find it simple to discriminate between multiple and conflicting criteria, either in designing or proferring critique. What I am suggesting is that discussing and listing the potential criteria, and agreement that they form the bases for assessment, provides useful information for students and critics.
The second example concerns the consideration that an abandonment of narrow marking bands in favour of *non-graded passes* (n.g.p.) and *work not yet completed* (w.n.c.) for design work may also help to break the dominance of the assessors' judgement in favour of the development of students' judgement. Although such a move would disrupt the dominance of competitive achievement in the School, and therefore may cause anxiety for students who are accustomed to having their design skills validated by an assessor in accordance with that assessors' judgement of the design's merits, a move towards n.g.p. would be a move towards validating students' judgement models. A further important argument in favour of the adoption of n.g.p./w.n.c is that poor work can be viewed as "work-in-progress", subject only to the externally imposed deadlines of the institution for submission. This would further allow the realisation of the rhetoric of Problem Based Learning in favour of removing normative assessment. Furthermore, as assessment grades and a competitive approach to learning are clearly linked (Biggs, 1989; Boud, 1990; Ramsden, 1988; Entwistle, 1987; Entwistle and Ramsden, 1983; Gibbs, 1992; 1991), promoting the desired deep learning approach in lieu of a surface learning approach (with its emphasis on learning for assessment) (Ramsden, 1985, 54) may be further promoted through the use of n.g.p. and w.n.c. assessment outcomes.

**Questions for further research**

In this final section of the thesis I reflect on the process of conducting critical educational research to suggest that, for teachers who want to change educational practice in their classes, I would recommend engaging in a process of critical educational research. Through this process I gained the ability to reflect on concerns I had identified as a teacher, yet barely articulated, through the eyes of the students and teachers. Through engaging in a reflexive critical analysis of the taken-for-granted practices of critique I altered my own teaching practices to reflect my new insights into the ability of critique practices to discriminate, to silence, and to reinforce the "mister-master-mystery" cycle. I transformed
my studios and the critiques I facilitated to emphasize the potential for critiques to contribute to the development of sound judgement.

Conducting the research has given rise to many research questions which could not be considered within the scope of the thesis. As the unanswered research questions of other researchers have helped me to establish the 'gap' between their research and mine, I offer some of my unanswered research questions in the same spirit.

- What happens to women (and men) who complete a degree in architecture and do not practice? Is there a link between their in-School experiences and their failure to practice? A longitudinal, qualitative study is necessary.

- What teaching techniques promote self-judgement within Problem Based Learning? An associated question is: How can learning support be provided for 'at-risk' students within PBL? How can PBL be adapted for architecture courses when the current PBL models in use commence by giving the students the problem. Rather it is defining the problem (problem definition) that is so central to facility as a designer, as is sound judgement in order to define the problem. As stated in Ch 5 on p.357, how can dependent, convergent learners be challenged away from that learning style when their early successes play such a part in establishing their confidence to learn?

- What new teaching strategies are necessary to facilitate students' skills at self and peer-critique? There is very little research on architecture students and self and peer-critique. As students, their needs differ from those of the students who are considered in much of the writing in the field of self and peer-critique, because there are multiple and conflicting criteria for critique and assessment in architectural education.

Research into these questions would complement this study by uncovering more of the nature of teaching and learning in a studio based education, and would provide some of the
understandings educators need about the link between formal education and preparation for practice, and life-long learning, through developing confidence and sound judgement.

In concluding, I posit some thoughts on the conduct of the research project, and the resulting text. As Atkinson (1990) says, "the term 'ethnography' refers to a research style, and to the written product of research activity" (p. 3). Both my conduct of a feminist critical ethnography in the field and the resultant text have been informed by the dilemmas (Shannon, 1994a) inherent in the conduct of an emerging research paradigm, and were I to begin the enterprise anew, with the knowledges of having conducted it and written the text, I would change many things. In particular, I would seek a co-operative research enquiry style from the outset, where participants were decision makers in the research question, the mode of data collection, and the assembly of the textual result. This would encourage a text of multiple voices, where the ethnographers voice is one among many with no particular authority. In suggesting these approaches to other feminist ethnographers, in order to seek greater reciprocity and possibly empowerment for the participants, I further consider that such a transformed research activity would encourage a greater capacity for readers to respond directly to the participant's experiences.
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Dilemmas of a feminist ethnography.

Judith Stacey asked Can there be a feminist ethnography? in 1988 (Women's Studies Int. Forum, 11:1 21-27). Stacey critiqued the relationship of the researcher to the researched in the context of both the research methodology and the textual outcome, claiming that the great intrusion of the ethnographer into the lives of the group under study makes leave taking very difficult; and that despite often considerable earlier collaboration the textual product is usually solely the researcher's voice.

I have been struggling with these concepts whilst I have, for the past three years, been an observer undertaking a critical ethnographic study in a School of Architecture.

The paper addresses the evolving role of researcher-observer; has insights into the construction of text and meaning from narrative that a hands-on approach as researcher-participant can offer and the departures from 'master narrative' theory about the 'right' way to structure an ethnographic piece of writing that a feminist post-structuralist vision has demanded in practice.
Dilemmas of a Feminist Ethnography

Susan Shannon
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Introduction

Poststructuralism and Language

My project concerns the potential of architectural critique, used as a means of teaching, assessing and socialising students into the dominant habitus of the architectural profession, to discriminate against some students, particularly women. The contribution that post-structural/discursive thinking has made to the theory and practice of conducting a feminist research project in an educational setting comes in the acknowledgement that, in critical research, the research outcomes do not uncover truths, but are rather, as Simon and Dippo (1986,196) assert, a particular kind of knowledge production concerned with seeking transformative outcomes through political awareness, and political action as a result of that awareness.

Going on then from this understanding is the complex relationship of a research methodology concerned with knowledge production, and the invitation of post-structuralism into the constructed world of the 'actors' who constitute meaning through their language. As Weedon (1987) says, there are many post-structuralisms, not all of which are necessarily productive to feminism, but they all share in fundamental assumptions about language, meaning and subjectivity (p.20).

For poststructuralist theory the common factor in the analysis of social organization, social meanings, power and individual consciousness is language (p.21).
Weedon says that language is the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed (p.21). She says that:

like all theories, post-structuralism makes certain assumptions about language, subjectivity, knowledge and truth. Its founding insight, taken from Ferdinand de Saussure, is that language, far from reflecting an already given social reality, constitutes social reality for us. *Neither social reality nor the 'natural' world has fixed intrinsic meanings which language reflects or expresses.*

(Weedon, 1987, 22, my italics)

Weedon expresses a view about subjectivity in relation to post-structuralism which differentiates between the post-structuralist view of human agency as "precarious, contradictory and in process, constantly being reconstituted in discourse each time we think or speak" (p.33), and the view presumed by humanist discourses which "presuppose an essence at the heart of the individual which is unique, fixed and coherent and which makes her what she is" (p.32).

Lather (1991b) also rejects the essentialist view of gender differentiation in presenting a view of the feminist researcher. Simply stated, Lather says that "feminist researchers see gender as a basic organizing principle which profoundly shapes and mediates the conditions of our lives"(p.71). She states that:

The overt ideological goal of feminist research in the human sciences is to correct both the invisibility and the distortion of female experience in ways relevant to ending women's unequal social position. *This entails the substantive task of making gender a fundamental category for our understanding of the social order.*

(Lather, 1991b, 71-2, my italics)

1. Other texts informing the notion of the feminist researcher are:

Bannerji, Himani; Carty, Linda; Dehli, Kari; Heald, Susan and McKenna, Kate (1991) *Unsettling Relations: the university as a site of feminist struggles* Toronto: Women's Press.


Luke and Gore (1992) argue that, from the stand-point of post-structuralist feminisms, "in relation to pedagogical discourse, a poststructuralist feminist position suggests we cannot claim single-strategy pedagogies of empowerment, emancipation, and liberation" (p.7).

It is important to accept then, that in this project of critical analysis, my understandings of process are informed by feminist and poststructuralist discourses, and my understandings will rest on the meanings I subscribe to language and my subjectivity, which is "precarious, contradictory and in process" (Weedon, 1987, 33). My research process of critical analysis then becomes that of feminist post-structuralism.

Feminist post-structuralism, then, is a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to understand existing power relations and to identify areas and strategies for change. Through a concept of *discourse*, which is seen as a structuring principle of society, in social institutions, modes of thought and individual subjectivity, feminist post-structuralism is able, in detailed, historically specific analysis, to *explain the working of power on behalf of specific interests and to analyse the opportunities for resistance to it*. It is a theory which de-centres the rational, self-present subject of humanism, seeing subjectivity and consciousness, as socially produced in language, as a site of struggle and potential change. Language is not transparent as in humanist discourse, it is not expressive and does not label a 'real' world. Meanings do not exist prior to their articulation in language and language is not an abstract system, but is socially and historically located in discourses. Discourses represent political interests and in consequence are constantly vying for status and power. The site of this battle for power is the subjectivity of the individual...

*At the level of the individual, this theory is able to offer an explanation of where our experience comes from, why it is contradictory or incoherent and why and how it can change.* (Weedon, 1987, 40-1, my italics).

**The Dilemmas of Conducting Feminist Research.**

An understanding of the subjectivity, agency and the "speaking into existence" of the lives of the students and teachers in a critical ethnographic study has not lessened the dilemmas inherent in conducting the research.

Judith Stacey (1988) asked *Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography?* Stacey critiqued the relationship of the researcher to the researched in the context of both the research methodology and the textual outcome, claiming that the great intrusion of the ethnographer into the lives of the group under study makes leave taking very difficult; and that despite
often considerable earlier collaboration the textual product is usually solely the researcher's voice.

She claimed that, whilst ethnographic studies are in many ways suited to what she calls "traditionally female strengths" such as empathy and human concern, and they allow for an egalitarian, reciprocal relationship between knower and known, they also, ironically, "subject research subjects to greater risk of exploitation, betrayal, and abandonment by the researcher than does much positivist research" (p.21).

Indeed she said that:

...fieldwork experiences forced my recognition that conflicts of interest and emotion between the ethnographer as authentic, related person (i.e. participant), and as exploiting researcher (i.e. observer) are also an inescapable feature of ethnographic method. (p.23)

As Stacey pointed out, the worse things get in terms of the subject's lives, the stronger the ethnography, as the more there is to observe and report.

Indeed the irony I now perceive is that ethnographic method exposes subjects to far greater danger and exploitation than do more positivist, abstract and "masculinist" research methods. The greater the intimacy, the apparent mutuality of the researcher/researched relationship, the greater is the danger. (p.24, my italics)

My Project

I have had no cause to argue with these statements of Stacey's whilst I have, for the past three years, been engaged in an ethnographic study of a School of Architecture. My project is about architectural education, and particularly the main teaching and assessment protocol, which is architectural critique. My thesis is that:

critique, in its complex and sometimes contradictory roles in teaching, assessment and socialising students into the dominant habitus of the profession, sometimes discriminates against some students, particularly women.
At the micro-scale the research is concerned with single events (Bassey, 1981) in students’ lives which cause self-reflection; whilst at the macro-scale the research is concerned with the notion of an architectural education embedded in a culture of architecture which has a strong tradition of male domination. At the micro-scale it is concerned with "making the natural appear unnatural" and at the macro-scale with shifting power relationships, examining structures, and overturning notions of hierarchy. The hoped for outcome is the empowerment of students through their own self-reflection about the nature of "taken-for-granted" practices embedded in patriarchy.

The Critical Ethnography Research Methodology

Clearly it is not value free, and whilst I have adopted an ethnographic research approach - with the researcher as observer as the method of data gathering - I have eschewed the notion of the researcher as a disinterested onlooker. The notion of a critical ethnography involves the researcher seeking an understanding of the "natural made unnatural" which, in my instance, involves deconstructing the habitus of the profession to question taken-for-granted practices in Schools which have been effective in maintaining a profession dominated by men, many of whom are practising in ways which pay little credence to the emerging view of the professional architect as a team-worker in collaborative enterprises with colleagues, consultants, clients, builders, and developers.

Ethnography is a form of advocacy research, becoming critical when it is openly ideological, socially critical, overtly political, and emancipatory in orientation (Smith, 1993; Lather, 1991a, 1986a, 1986b; Simon and Dippo, 1986). In my case it is critical in the sense of disrupting the hegemonic readings of the day-to-day life in a School of Architecture, and in looking for the underlying political and institutional structures which act to shape the researchers’ understandings of the research outcomes. Bourdieu (1977) has commented in Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture on the notion of a professional habitus - a term he has used to define the distinctive modes of perception, of

2. More than 93% of Registered Architects in Australia are men. (Shannon, 1993a)
thinking, of appreciation and of action which have traditionally privileged those from homes possessed of cultural capital (Churchman, 1992; Stevens, 1993). My research seeks to look again at the *habitus* and to identify and question the in-School practices which maintain, support or prepare students for the current *habitus* of the profession.

In critical ethnographic research the essential stages of the research project are:
1. negotiated attendance for observation and interview;
2. validating interview transcripts;
3. critical analysis;
4. the production of the critical narrative; and
5. researcher self-reflection leading to a further cycling of negotiating access, participant observations, critical analysis and critical narratives.

Whilst participant reflection and transformation are hoped for outcomes from the research they are not *methodologically* essential. The critical methodology of critical ethnography has *transformative action* as its desirable outcome; the success of the research project can be measured both in the self-reflection of the participants who question the institutional power and hegemonic discourse of the profession, and also in the politically motivated transformative outcomes which may then be forthcoming as a result of the self-reflection of students and teachers. However, the difference between critical ethnography and the many other critical research approaches (Smith, 1993b) is the degree of accommodation of a *praxis* methodology. Praxis is used here to describe informed practice based on self-reflection (Smith, 1990).

So much for the 'master narrative' about critical ethnography. It is, as a methodology, gaining acceptance for the depth of understandings which are revealed, and for the finely textured pattern of life which can be reported within its paradigm. When considering the adoption of one particular methodology over another at the commencement of a research project, or in my case overlaying the methodological constraints over what I was already doing part way through a project, there is seldom a cautionary voice arguing that "all is not
what it seems* and that the methodology as well as being empowering, may also lead to
difficult situations.

However, there is a cautionary voice in Stacey's critique of ethnography.

What are the dilemmas of the ethnographic gaze for a feminist? In this paper I will identify
some I have encountered and discuss how I construed these dilemmas, how they affected
my research project, and pose questions about the rigidity of methodological "rules" for an
essentially discursive paradigm. I will consider the role of the ethnographer both in the
"field work", or observation stage, and in the "desk work" or textual construction phase of
the ethnographic project. I will propose that the adoption of a participatory research role
along with the privileging of the participants' voice in the text, together with the "viewer
catching themselves in the act of seeing in particular ways" (Davies, 1994, 46), can enrich
the observations and diminish the apartness of the researcher and researched, as well as
promoting the possibility of "research with an emancipatory intent which strives to
empower participants to make changes" (Smith, 1993, 216). However, despite the best
intentions of the researcher, in this regard Acker asserts that "an emancipatory intent is no

The role of researcher-observer

Within this paper I would like to address the evolving role of researcher-observer. My
experiences are that, despite the separation of the role of researcher and participant in the
literature, in practice, and here I am referring to feminist practice, no such clear delineation
has existed. This, in turn, has given rise to some of the fundamental dilemmas I have
experienced as I have struggled to keep my research process on a footing which was
acceptable to the institution within which I researched, whilst believing that there was no
case for the role of detached observer, nor for reporting the observations as value free data.
When I commenced my project with the intention perhaps of maintaining the role of observer only without participant involvement - by which I mean without my participation in the student's learning processes and without the reciprocal involvement of students and teachers as "the researched" in the research design and execution - I was naive in believing that this role was either possible or desirable. I now claim that a stance of observer only is impossible, and quite undesirable as it has its roots in a view of the world as structured in a way which can be "read" by the disinterested observer. As Weedon asserts:

"Language is not transparent as in humanist discourse, it is not expressive and does not label a 'real' world." (Weedon, 1987, 41)

The notion of the researcher as observer only sets apart the researcher and the researched with the consequence that the data is "yielded up" by the researched and "owned" by the researcher. The reciprocity so sought by feminists has no place in this scheme.

However, having said this, there have been times during my research project when the role of observer only has been the only form of attendance I could negotiate within the hosting School for particular critique sessions. My presence alone as observer was tolerated as long as I took no notes or tapes, had no voice and did not seek to participate in any way. This is obviously a difficult task but I did comply because the academic world is structured so unequally that a research student simply does not have the power or authority to question judgements by senior academic staff if the researcher wishes to remain viable within the School. Therefore the wielding of power in this way can, and must become part of the research into the social structure of the School itself. This then gives rise to another of the dilemmas, that the process itself yields some of the richest data but the boundaries of the Code of Ethics may place this data "out of bounds".

Later I interviewed a sub-group of the students I observed in the School about my role as observer only to ask them simply "What does my role of observer only mean to you and your classmates?" This interview took place as a response to the decision of the School to, for the first time, permit students other than the student being examined to be present at the
final critiques for final year students - traditionally a "jury" examination before senior academics and members of the profession, held behind closed doors. Through asking about my own presence as an observer only, a situation with which they were familiar, I sought to draw the students out about what the changes for the examined students would be given the presence of peers at their final critiques.

*Interview excerpt 13-8-199_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Shannon: Jason, you were saying last week that it really does alter things having an observer there.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> Ummmm. Well, yeah. Having another person there, full stop, alters the situation. And it’s a matter of to what degree. And then that obviously raises the issue of what person. If the person is known, if the person’s slant, bias, or whatever it is known as...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhianna:</strong> Bias (giggles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> ...the analogy I made was having you sit in Reginald’s and Rhianna’s critique as opposed to you sitting in on Ernie’s or Kang’s perhaps. Where you have AI [another tutor] sitting in on Rhianna’s critique as opposed to AI sitting in on Ernie’s. Now there’s a huge difference. Whether they say anything verbally... they’re certainly going to be saying things...you’d be able to see the clock ticking over inside. So there’s that, if the person is known, it can have a huge effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhianna:</strong> What if the person is known as friendly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong> What if the person is known as friendly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> If they’re known either way it can have a huge effect. Buoy or severely dent a person’s general mood. Not necessarily confidence but it can ... walking into this and thinking... My God! He’s there, or she’s there. It can make a difference. It’s a matter of degrees but the point is it can make a big difference but I’d say for most of the time it probably doesn’t. And if the person is not known then I think you’re just dealing with inbuilt prejudices probably but still even any other person there in a psychological sense does make some difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong>...certainly in this particular education research there is no way that I am value free but I still want to pick up on that point about my &quot;known&quot; values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> Perceived values, they’re not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong>...they’re even known because I’ve taught most of these people. My known values go before me. They are a presence in the room, a palpable presence. So you feel more, or less, happy about saying what you were going to say with me there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jason:</strong> With anyone there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susan:</strong> This is going to be a real issue for the juries this year, whether I should even seek access, so I am...It’s really good to this out in the open now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhianna: So do you want it out in the open? Bluntly?

Susan: Yeah

Rhianna: We talked about this in the Studio. There are real factions, you know this.

Jason: Basically the "Seaside Project" faction is fine but you'd have trouble getting into the other one.

Susan: Oh, but I've not even been offered access to the other "faction".

Rhianna: But there are individuals who say "No way." That you are a feminist, that you're tough, too opinionated...

Jason: It's not what I'd say.

Susan: But I'd like to hear this, what descriptors are used? Because when we had our recent Departmental meeting when we got all our results back from the Australian Council of Educational Research about assessment and we had to assess a whole roomful of drawings, everyone in the Department, and that was put on a standard deviation curve; the hardest marker, the most lenient marker and the person on the mean, the person on the mean is me. The professor is slightly to one side of me. Lena is the most lenient marker in the School. And Williams is the most stringent marker in the School. It was a stringency/leniency scale.

Jason: That would have been interesting.

Susan: I have now set myself up as a "mean" consultant!...so that's interesting that "she's feminist", "she's tough". Ummm. But I haven't been offered access into the other group and that is because Dan [their tutor] does not agree with educational research.

Jason: Those reasons that Rhianna said... I think that they are minor...I think the reasons that are more... ummm... the slant... the stylistic slant that some students might take. In my history you've made people justify the building, and......

Rhianna: Ask them where the building is!

Jason: Justify the (and sort of my stuff comes in here in a sense) ... Ummm "Yes, it's all very well to do all that other stuff but you still have to cover the brief." And this is where they've taken you as a style setter. "You want to do the other stuff and not cover the brief? No, no, no. You can go on your own slant but you must cover the brief as well." Basically you don't let them get away with it! That's how I would word it!

Rhianna: But it's also a personality thing... like Rae... it's like "Oh, Rae's going to make us do Aboriginal Child Care"., and stuff like that... and you know people think Rae's going to be so passionate about it, I'm not going to be able to crack into it. I think they think about you, well some people in the other group think, that you are very passionate about what you think is important, and I don't think that they think you won't listen to their other ideas like some other tutors here. They think that they will have real trouble getting them off their own ideas, but I think that these other people think that you're going to make them, as Jason said, deal with the brief.

Jason: If you want to have other issues, that's O.K. but you have to deal with the brief.

Rhianna: And also, as a female, I'd also say that you're threatening as a capable female to a lot of those young boys. Now you guys might laugh me right out of the place but that's true.

Reginald: That's dead right.
Susan: So, can you talk to me about what I think of as the difference between *passive observer* and *participant-observer*? Say like for that Semester 1 project when I sat through all your Crits and that peer critique for those "West End Projects" and I said not a word and I took no notes and no tape recordings and I sat at the back and purposely tried to make myself small, and what not, are those comments about my value system still true then? Would it have made it more difficult for some people to talk about the poetry that they'd engaged with, with me there?

Jason: It's a matter of degrees. I would say it, if I had to sort of say how did I do that I would say that it would have been very minor, if anything at all, but you can't discount it because you don't know what's going on in other people's heads, basically.

Rhianna: What about if you being there, I might have thought "Oh Sue's there. Great! This is encouraging for me because she'll like..." You know, I can find some rapport there. Now is that advantageous for me and is that medical - what's the word?

Jason: I would say, yes.

Susan: Is it ethical?

Rhianna: Yes

Susan: And then going on to this concept that's been floated about the whole class being there for the final jury...I don't know if you were there when...I was just saying...

*End of excerpt.*

This excerpt begins to illustrate the reciprocity attained at the end of a long ethnographic project when the students and the researcher have a daily working relationship. Both students and researcher feel they can comment on the other's "project". The students are willing to critique my stance, and to comment on how other members of the class view my presence less well. In so doing they adopt a participatory role in relation to the research project. In turn I felt that I could comment on matters affecting their class - for example the proposition to alter the "rules" for the final jury - from my role as observer.

The students were adamant that my presence alone changed the situation as I was well known to them from previous teaching. In particular in the interview they mentioned my "feminist stance" as being a factor that all the students knew about and responded to by behaving perhaps differently than they would have otherwise despite my silence and lack of involvement in any teaching or assessment. As the students' responses indicate, mere silence is not voicelessness. Reginald's response "That's dead right" to Rhianna's assertion that "you're threatening as a capable female to a lot of those young boys" is very vehement. The disruption to his view of the gendered practice of architecture through his exposure to
me is demonstrated in the strength of his response, which seems to indicate that he has sampled that subject position of being a male, threatened by my "capability".

Can the dilemmas posed by reciprocity and the relationship of the researcher and the researched be avoided by adopting the role of stranger-observer? The role of stranger-observer is perhaps possible until one considers the context of the data. Certainly when I observed critiques in another School where I was unknown to students and staff I had a very real sense of it being "business as usual". However, how does one gather "thick data" in a strange situation? What is the history of the School, the learning background of the students, the facilitative style of the teachers, the influence of the profession? The observations happen in a contextual vacuum, and resultingy, it could be claimed that transformative outcomes from the research are an unlikely occurrence. Therefore, it could be claimed that a relationship based on mutuality, collaboration and reciprocity between the researcher and the researched is essential for transformation. Indeed Lather (1991a) said:

An emancipatory social research calls for empowering approaches to research where both the researcher and the researched become, in the words of the feminist singer-poet, Cris Williamson, "the changer and the changed" (p.56).

and further, in conclusion that:

a more collaborative approach to critical inquiry is needed to empower the researched, build emancipatory theory, and to move toward data credibility within praxis-oriented, advocacy research (p.69).

To conclude my commentary on the possibilities for the role of observer I would say that through the inclination of "researched" to have a greater input into the research and desire for a greater relationship with the researcher; and as the researcher does not maintain a value free stance even when in the role of observer only - there is little scope for the role of researcher only in ethnographic work; and even less of a role for this disassociated style of observation in the critical research paradigm. I would reject it, although operationally it is the most straightforward role an ethnographer could wish for. Herein lies another dilemma for the faint hearted when considering the framework of any research project: that the path with the accepted methodology with clear cut boundaries to the limits of the researcher's role in data gathering may be the most attractive for purely operational reasons.
Back to the taxonomy of possible roles for the researcher. From Taft (1988) we have the notion of participant-observer defined in its fullest sense. Taft suggests that "the role of participant observer has some advantages as a viewing point over that of the participant who plays the additional role of an observer" (p.60). This is a fine distinction. Taft suggests that the "description of the investigator as a participant in the life of the group implies that he or she has some role in it which is recognised by the group" (p.60). Taft says in the educational setting, certainly in schools, there is a legitimate role for participant observer in the classroom as people are often in the classroom to observe the class for one reason or another. However Taft also says that the teacher, also observing the class, performs in the role of the participant observer "in the fullest sense" (p.60).

This is the way that I approached my project. I realised that I participated in the world of the researched all the time whether or not I had a voice. What this has meant for the project is my total immersion in the School under observation for two years since I commenced the study - and incidentally for five years before that - on a teaching basis. I sought not to differentiate between teaching and research or observations and teaching. Therefore this decision has implications both for my teaching and for my research. The participant role - teaching has made me much more aware of the students' world and of the notion of a hierarchy in the School than I would perhaps have understood as an observer only. It has given me privileged access to staff and students. It has allowed me to observe students in critique situations as a participant and then to discuss their presentations with them and other staff participants to gain a negotiated understanding of what I saw happening. It has allowed me to co-develop new teaching and assessment paradigms as a result of the research outcomes, and to trial, evaluate and report on their successes and failures to students and staff. People seek me out: staff want ideas for teaching/learning situations; students want to discuss their projects and critiques. The School itself wants my opinion on proposed curriculum changes and there are many opportunities for demonstrating transformative outcomes from the research.
All this, I claim, has been possible partly because I was a participant-observer with legitimacy with both the students and the staff. However, the melding of the roles of teacher and researcher has given rise to ethical dilemmas. Do students make an informed decision to participate in the research when the researcher is also a teacher with assessment power? Can students deny access to the site of learning as a research site when access has been granted by the School and staff? If research is taking place alongside them as they learn, should the research outcomes be made available to them despite the possibility that they could be destructive to the esteem of individuals? These are research dilemmas deeply embedded in the ethics of conducting educational research of any kind, but they are more difficult to postulate and theorise about when the project is of long standing in the School and the students are well informed about it, and the researcher is a participant-observer with a legitimate teaching role.

The participant students' views provide some insight into how they view themselves in the research process, and the extent to which they have access to the research process and results.

*Interview Excerpt 13-8-199*

**Rhianna:** The other thing is, I would like to get something more out of all your studies over the last three years and I would be very interested to see who I was, and what your observations of me revealed, and how I fitted into the literature - I'd be fascinated.

Rhianna requests a different subject position in relation to the research project - that of "insider". Another construction of the students' position in regard to any educational research which relies on their participation is that is empowers them to say "yes" as well as "no".

*Narrative excerpt*

Very early in the year during Orientation week after we had not seen each other for more than six months Rhianna stopped me in the corridor to ask me how my
research was progressing and whether I would be involved with her class, the third year students, during Semester 1. I replied that as I was heavily involved in the first year studio where I was able to participate in the role of "participant observer" - a role with which I felt comfortable, which was supported by the texts on educational research and by the Department, my involvement there may preclude much wanted involvement in the final year. I then recounted to Rhianna that I would very much like to be involved in the third year studio particularly during their Semester 2 project (when I would not be involved with the first year students) but that opportunity had been denied me in the previous year. Rhianna, who is the class representative, said:

We wouldn't stand for it. As a class we just wouldn't let that happen. No-one can tell us that you cannot be there if we want you to be.

In concluding my comments about the role of participant-observer I believe that we can move on even further from this expression or description of the role of the ethnographer to the term researcher-participant as an inclusive term which acknowledges the centrality of the research mode to any project and links the importance of the research to the participatory modes in which this research is conducted. Highlighting participatory modes reflects the collaborative nature of the research and the joint ownership and privileging of the "voice" of the "researched" in the textual outcome. In this way, I claim, the praxis opportunities may be maximised.

So much for titles, although I believe that even this discussion about what the researcher calls herself highlights one of the dilemmas of the feminist researcher. As I feminist I eschew the notion of observer only as deluding, of participant-observer as perhaps underplaying the centrality of the research to ensure a friendly reception when negotiating attendance, and embrace the notion of researcher-participant as describing more fully the intersection of the research task and my role as participant.

The dilemmas of constructing feminist text

What then has the intersection of feminist theory and practice with the traditional role of observer in ethnographic studies, meant for the construction of text in which I have engaged? The gathered data comprises a number of bounded observations of critique sessions, and a larger number of other day-to-day observations. Whilst the analytic

3. Malinowski said that it was "to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realise his view of the world" (Malinowski, p.25 cited in Taft, 1988, p.59)
procedures are those advocated by Davies (1994, 45), in relation to any particular situation she describes these as being "my desire, my subjectivity, my life history" (p.48). From my subject position, as a researcher-participant I have observed and recorded happenings in critique sessions through my subjective gaze, constituted through my history, experience and subjectivity.

I posit that historically, the early ethnographers wanting to be accepted by the empiricists and overlaying their simple techniques of observation, recall, "thick" description, what does it mean, and what sense do I and the observed make of this into a quasi-scientific endeavour with coding, triangulation, member checks and negotiated understandings perhaps paid too much deference to the established positivist research paradigm. In its maturity as an established and respected paradigm, feminist poststructuralist ethnographers feel freer now to move away from these "rules". Accepting that, as Weedon (1987) says:

> Different languages and different discourse within the same language divide up the world and give it meaning in different ways which cannot be reduced to one another through translation or by an appeal to universally shared concepts reflecting a fixed reality...All forms of post-structuralism assume that meaning is constituted within language and is not guaranteed by the subject who speaks it. (Weedon, 1987,22)

Lather (1993a) has, in a recent article reneged on an earlier (1986b) insistence on the need for triangulation of data, which, in the critical ethnographic tradition, is referred to as "textual negotiation". Lather is investigating, in a new piece of writing on AIDS/HIV patients, new arrangements of text which seek to privilege the voice of the participants, and to eschew the notion of negotiation of the text. She has been criticised in some quarters for including her own commentary on the same page of text at all; but my view is that she is trialling a powerful new voice paradigm which separates participant narrative and researcher critique whilst changing entirely the critique paradigm in which she refrains from commentary on the stories of the AIDS/HIV patients, instead telling her own story about her involvement with their support group. The transformative possibilities are evident to me in the universality of her story and the realisation that an AIDS/HIV status reflects a location on the AIDS/HIV continuum as "not yet positive".
I believe that the insistence on negotiated understandings of observation has resulted in my own work in a certain amount of understatement of key issues. I have been prevailed upon in the negotiation phase to negotiate the text in order to present a narrative that was more palatable to the teacher involved. I consider that the commentary as narrative should stand alone and then be accompanied by the critique of the teacher, the critique of the students and finally the critique of the researcher. The feminist rage is all but lost in the politics of negotiation. The dilemmas are at least two fold. First, either I should negotiate the narrative and subsume rage to the politics inherent in negotiation, for as a researcher there is always the question of maintaining harmony with the Institution, the School and harmony with the teachers who may control access to their classes, or rest on subjectivity and break with the methodological "rules". This is a question of power. The extent to which text is negotiated to present a palatable view of the world reflects where power is perceived to lie by the researcher.

Whilst in my research project the data gathering never sets out to be anything other than critical - and how can it be when to look for one thing relegates something else to obscurity? - yet the charge of polemical can, and is raised in relation to my work. The feminist has to fight for the right to hold her beliefs and to research and write through the lens of feminism - whereas the critical scholar may, on the stance of social justice, for example, be accepted at a level that feminists are not (Luke and Gore, 1992, 193).

As a researcher I have been asked to separate polemic from argument. The request made was for the research data to be able to be viewed independent of the argument - a request which clearly was underlaid by an assumption that this was not only possible but desirable. It is an assumption which presumes that there is an unassailable truth which I am tampering with - that there is a reality there which is not constructed. Such a request is the absolute denial that feminism is a lens through which the world is viewed - that the data could have a life of its own independent of my agency. The dilemma here is moral: there is an invitation to present the research in a way that makes the subject of oppression palatable to
the mostly male readers, a move which may ensure wider readership, but which is questionable ethically.

Linda Brodkey (1987) is concerned with the difficulty of the project of "negative critique" (she defines the critical ethnographic project as "at once the story of cultural hegemony and an argument for social change" (p.69)) if "researchers must satisfy the expectation of systematic protest against cultural hegemony in a narrative written to meet the conventional expectation that scholarship is, by definition, an unbiased account of events told by a disinterested researcher" (p.68). She continues that "it is, of course, the explicit use of research to advocate for change that makes critical research academically suspect, for it is widely believed that scholarship and advocacy either are or should be kept distinct (p.69).

"Fortunately", Brodkey says, "it is not necessary that all readers be persuaded by critical ethnographies, only that they accept them as a viable form of scholarship" (p.69, my italics). She believes that readers who have become accustomed to reading and writing ethnographic narratives in which the author's value system was implied, rather than stated, "will need to be shown how explicit cultural critique is possible inside academic discourse" (p.69). Brodkey says:

Critical narrators, then, are narrators whose self consciousness about ideology makes it necessary for them to point out that all stories, including their own, are told from a vantage point, and to call attention to the voice in which the story is told. In critical narratives, it is from the narrative stance or conceptual vantage point of critical theory that a story of cultural hegemony is generated. That means that the events related have been conceptualized by a narrator who sees, organizes, interprets, and narrates social events in terms of critical theory. Where another ethnographer might "see" a particular social event as worth relating because it illustrates how conflict was resolved or provides an interesting case for discourse analysis of language interaction in the classroom, the critical ethnographer will consider an event worth recording and reporting because it exemplifies a hegemonic practice. (Brodkey, 1987, 71)

In the actual data gathering process there is a difficulty separating the role of "researcher" and "researched" which becomes even more difficult for the feminist researcher who has eschewed all notions of disinterest, and who is available to the students as a friend and who earnestly seeks transformative outcomes for the students. This, as Stacey says, makes leave-

---

4. In 1989, there were approximately 7% of women employed as architects in academic positions in Schools of Architecture in Australia, yet there were 37% of female enrolments in architecture courses. (RAIA, 1991)
taking very difficult. Lather mentions too that the tendency to voyeurism is always there where the intimacy with the researcher encourages self-disclosure (Lather, 1993b).

The textual construction becomes difficult too if there is a "power" differential between the "researcher" and the "researched". The opportunity for reciprocity must be promoted and yet the students may never feel that they can say "no" to a researcher-participant request for the opportunity to attend, observe, and construct narratives around their critiques because the researcher and the researched are situated in different discourses of power.

There are other dilemmas with the reporting.

I have argued that there is a socially constructed reality I have observed: that it is a subjective view of the life in a School which has been in part mediated by negotiated understandings and member checks. A dilemma arises when examples of breathtaking injustice are recorded by the observers' eye: female students being short-changed in favour of male students; favoured students - teacher's "pets" - receiving preferential treatment; a refusal by some teachers to consider the teaching and learning needs of NESB students separately. How does the feminist ethnographer committed to a platform of self-knowledge and emancipation fare then? The dilemmas of social interaction again arise. Should I advise the Head about really poor teaching practices or does my Code of Ethics prevent me from so doing as I must maintain confidentiality and anonymity before any other demands? Should I rally disempowered students to report their grievances to the Head of the Department? From the privileged position of researcher-participant what reasonable avenues are open? As the data is observation based and constructed by my realities is the reporting then different?

I claim that it is. The reporting back to teachers and students through dissemination of the critical narratives is not value free. It may change students' perceptions of themselves and their academic potential. It may infuriate a staff member who then becomes obstructive. As the relationship between researcher and researched is based on a very great degree of trust any breach of that trust will compound the relationship.
The last dilemma considered in this paper is that relating to the textual outcome and privileging the voice of the researched. It is difficult to contemplate privileging the voice of the participants where the ethnography is constructed as narrative followed by critical analysis, as happens in a traditional ethnography (Brodkey, 1987). My voice wants to locate itself amongst the data, in the "thick" description of the everyday, to ask about the exchanges between students and their critics:

- What kind of context are the participants creating for each other?
- How are they positioning each other in that context?
- Where does the authority lie?...
- How is experience made relevant?
- What binary or dualistic thinking [is present] in this text?
- Are gender relations visible in this text? What forms of masculinity and femininity are being made available here?
- What storylines are being made relevant?
- What discourses are mobilised:
  - a in the content of the teacher's talk
  - b in the teacher's choice of pedagogical and interactive practices?
- Whose interests are being served by each of these discourses?

(Davies, 1994b, 45)

Davies further refers to Foucault in relation to the authorial positioning in the text:

An analysis of discourse or discursive practices must include information about who it is that is speaking, the site from which or out of which they speak and the set of positions available to them as speakers within any particular context or set of relations. (Davies, 1994, 47 citing Foucault 1972, 51-53)

saying that "...I must do that of myself and my own discourse as well as in relation to the teacher and the students in the classroom to be analysed" (Davies, 1994a, 47). Therefore the critical narrative has been constructed as an interplay of the participant's voices and my authorial voice, seeking to deconstruct their stated realities through my subjectivity as an
architect, a teacher and a researcher. An indication of my intent is given in the following textual example:

Excerpt from Interviews and Critical Analysis, as Narrative.

Rhianna, as in many other instances, disrupts the status quo in her non-conforming stance. She compliantly listens, and admits that there is some assessment benefit in the tutor having an in-depth knowledge of her scheme, but she does not intend to demonstrate a response to Peter's critique in her work. She recognises, in so naming her own practice as "naughty" in relation to the critique proffered by Bryan and Peter that she has created a space for herself outside the dominant discourse which calls for architecture students to show response to critique in their work.

Nick adopts another subject position - that of compliant adopter of critical views and had developed a facility unparalleled amongst his class-mates for making anything work. He can maintain cordial status with all critics through this ability to adapt his scheme to their criticism.

Excerpt from Interview on 6-8-199

Nick: Well for me there are two ways that I work. If I've got a gut feeling...it's a feeling - you feel good about your work, you get excited about it, you get motivated, you work harder on them. And if someone comes and gives you a bad critique about it that makes you even stronger in some respects and you work even more to make it work. Now if you've spent so much time and it doesn't work and you realise there is a mistake so you either put it aside, start again or take the merits of that project and incorporate them.

Not so Rhianna who knows that her mode of working to produce her best work relies heavily on her own self-judgement.

Excerpt from Interview on 6-8-199

Rhianna: That's right. Yes. What Nick said, it is a gut feeling. The projects that I have tended to do best in are the ones where I have got onto something early and gone out on a limb with.

Nick's behaviour in relation to critique is congruent, conforming behaviour for an architecture student, behaviour which reflects the standing of a student within the dominant discourse. Rhianna exhibits, and knows she exhibits, disruptive behaviour which challenges the dominant discourse. And yet she is acutely aware of what happens when everyone exhibits non-conforming behaviour which disrupts the dominant discourse.

Interview excerpt from 18-8-199. Talking about a public critique and exhibition session on the same day that they had handed-in the work - they were very tired.

Rhianna: [The session] It was quite good. Actually I was just going to say and I think that I am going to discredit my own argument...Can I just say that I am rarely as tired as every one else and I am looking at it from my own opinion because I am rarely stay up as late as anyone else and I do things in half the time.
Would you agree with that [Jason]?

**Jason:** Generally

**Rhianna:** I rarely... I mean I've had one all-nighter in this Degree... and that's not fair [for me to be the one saying that tiredness wasn't a major factor] ... and the other thing that I do that maybe discounts or puts me in a different position from most of the students who don't... is that I can't stand it when someone's arranged to get consultants there and no-one is doing anything... I just like... I get this rage inside me... I just feel awful, I feel that it's all my fault...I've got to be the one who instigates the conversation... and I do this all the time...in the Studio...when people are saying there is a problem but no-one's prepared to say it... I say it because I sit there seething and I think that we can't let this opportunity pass.

**Susan Shannon:** So that you're a fairly impatient person and you don't tolerate that level of failing to engage with the situation that other people do...?

**Rhianna:** But I am just embarrassed fairly easily...absolutely embarrassed...That's what I was saying. If I'm in a situation even socially and I feel that someone is on the outer or someone is uncomfortable I just cringe because I feel embarrassed for that person. That is something, to me, I can overcome my tiredness for that by just getting so enraged that I do something whether I'm tired or not.

---

**Conclusion**

What exactly could a feminist ethnography look like? How would it differ from the ethnographies which are not driven by an understanding that "gender is a phenomenon that helps to shape our society...[where]...women are located unequally in that social formation, often devalued, exploited and oppressed" (Kenway and Modra, 1992, 139).

Stacey posits that there are several features to a feminist ethnography. First she bemoans the fact that as there has been very little dialogue between feminist scholarship and "postmodern" or "poststructural" ethnography there has been a failure to recognise that "postmodern ethnography is concerned with quite similar issues as those that concern feminist scholars" (p.24). The "new" ethnographers "like feminist scholars...tear the veil from scientific pretensions of neutral observation or description. They attempt to bring to their research an awareness that ethnographic writing is not cultural reportage, but cultural construction, and always of self as well as of the other". Stacey argues that only "at rare moments do critical ethnographers incorporate feminist insights into their reflexive critiques" (p.24). She repeats the calls from feminists for "an egalitarian research process,
full collaboration, and even multiple authorship..." which give rise, she believes, to the possibility for a "fruitful dialogue between feminism and critical ethnography [which] might address their complementary sensitivities and naïvetés about the inherent inequalities and the possibilities for relationships in the definition, study, and representation of the Other" (p.26).

Stacey concludes her paper leaving the dialogue open:

...believing that an uneasy fusion of feminist and critical ethnographic consciousness may allow us to construct cultural accounts that, however partial and idiosyncratic, can achieve the contextuality, depth, and nuance I consider to be unattainable through less dangerous, but more remote research methods" (p.26).

The dilemmas I have dealt with in this paper are methodological, textual and moral. I accept that in the approach of feminist post-structuralism may be:

...a theory of the relation between language, subjectivity, social organization and power [which] w[W]e need to understand why women tolerate social relations which subordinate their interests to those of men and the mechanisms whereby women and men adopt particular discursive positions as representative of their interests (Weedon, 1987,12).

through which the discourse of power, which is at the base of the construction of these dilemmas, may be eroded.
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Abstract

My educational research using a critical approach has been hosted by the Department of Architecture at the University of Adelaide since 1992. It is research which presents some of the many research transitions in higher education for reflection. It concerns transitions:

- from research on student learning by researchers to research with students and teachers about student learning driven by the questions of the students and teachers;

- from research by discipline teachers about discipline knowledge to research about how to learn in a discipline, carried out by discipline teachers;

- from research which presumes equality amongst students to research which presumes inequality of opportunity, of educational background, and in particular, of equitable distribution of power in the educational institution.

In this paper I will discuss the critical research methodology critical ethnography, which, whilst considered non-participatory, has nevertheless been an empowering research methodology through the transformative outcomes for students and staff as a result of praxis - informed practice based in self-reflection.

The paper recaps the boundaries of the research project which concerned architectural critique in its roles in assessment and teaching. It recalls why the research was necessary in order to look again at the notion of architectural education embedded in the habitus of a profession which has strong links with patriarchy.

This paper is directed towards those who seek to change and transform teaching practices through their research. Whilst the example used is from architectural education, the opportunities for transformative outcomes for students through critical research transcend discipline boundaries.

Introduction

In this paper I address a number of questions: in fact they are the questions which "drew" my research from the beginning. In addressing these questions, I hope to impart something of the vigour with which I have pursued my educational research topic, through the critical methodology known as critical ethnography, to achieve transformative outcomes for students and staff through praxis - which Smith (1990) defines as informed practice based on self-reflection.

My research concerns change and transformation in architectural education.

At the micro-scale, it is concerned with single events in students' lives (Bassey, 1981) which cause self-reflection; at the macro-scale it is concerned with the notion of an architectural education embedded in a culture of architecture which has a strong tradition of male domination (patriarchy: defined as a social system characterized by the "systematic domination of men over women" (Lewis, 1993,126)).

The mode of study is a detailed examination of architectural critique - the critical analysis of students' work. Critique is the most widely used protocol for both formative and summative assessments in Schools of Architecture in Australia; it functions as a teaching method in architectural design and the presentation of material for critique is used to model presentation skills for professional practice. In its commonly constituted forms from private "over the drawing board" critiques engaging the student and the teacher (the "tutor") in a possibly reciprocal discussion through to the public "jury" involving distinguished members
of the Faculty as well as practising "expert" architects, the critique is a powerful force in
the life of any student of architecture and a force shaped by a long history of hierarchy and
patriarchy in architectural education.

What is educational research?

This question at the simplest level can be answered by saying that educational research is
about improving outcomes for students and their teachers, about knowledge related to
teaching and learning, and about setting, evaluating and achieving Australia's educational
goals in the late twentieth century. Some of these educational goals relate to gender
inclusivity in schooling, retention to Year 12, literacy and numeracy levels, learning
languages other than English, and, in the tertiary sector, to maintaining inclusivity,
preparing students for life long learning, and ascertaining the link between work-place
competencies and tertiary achievements.

Frequently the value system which underlies these goals, which themselves are frequently
enshrined in legislation, national curriculum goals, or mission statements, is unstated.
Educational research, which, from the 1970s has been conducted using qualitative as well
as quantitative modes of enquiry, has most often been driven, I would argue, by questions
which are not stated in a straight-forward way in the research. There is often a sense of
"wondering", of "filling in the gaps in our knowledge" about much educational research
which I claim is in fact driven by questions just as politically motivated as questions which
are posed in the more overtly political critical research methodologies.

What is critical research?

Smith states that the "moral imperative of critical research is human emancipation and
social justice" (Smith, 1993b). Braybrooke states that critical research is concerned with
"emancipation - emancipation of social classes, from oppression or contempt; emancipation
of people throughout society, from ideas that inhibit rationality" (Robinson, 1993, 226

The critical research methodology I am using is critical ethnography, which refers to
studies which use a basically anthropological, qualitative, participant-observer methodology
but which rely for their theoretical formulation on a body of theory deriving from critical
sociology and philosophy. (Masemann, 1982, 1)

Whilst ethnography has traditionally been the preserve of cultural anthropologists, who
have seen ethnography as a commitment to provide a cultural account of a given group
(Van Maanen, 1990), their core methodology of participant observations, open ended
interviews and review of documents has now been widely used in education research
(Lather, 1986a,b). The term ethnography refers both to a research methodology and to a

Ethnography becomes critical when it is openly ideological, socially critical, overtly
political, and emancipatory in orientation (Smith, 1990, 1993b; Lather, 1986a,b, 1991a,b;
Simon and Dippo, 1986). It is the active emancipatory intent of the researcher, who as a
participant observer eschews the notion of disinterest and value neutrality espoused by the
empiricist and interpretive approaches to educational research, which marks the critical
researcher. The research is critical in the sense of disrupting the hegemonic readings of the
day-to-day life in a School of Architecture, and in looking for the underlying political and
institutional structures which act to shape the researchers' understandings of the research
outcomes.

The critical methodology has transformative action as its desirable outcome; the success of
the research project can be measured both in the self-reflection of the participants who
question the institutional power and hegemonic discourse of the profession, and also in the
transformative outcomes which may then be forthcoming as a result of the self-reflection of
students and teachers. However, the difference between critical ethnography and the many
other critical research approaches is their empowerment potentials (Smith, 1993b), and in
the case of critical ethnography, Smith argues that "the politics of the method intrinsic to
critical ethnography will delimit its empowerment potentials to political consciousness raising”.

What are the stages in critical ethnographic research?

The stages of my critical ethnography research project, informed by the conventional critical ethnography, would include (Smith, 1993b):

1. **Negotiated attendance** at studio critique sessions - for participant observations, open ended interviews and review of documents.


2. **Validating interview transcripts** for a negotiated understanding.

(Lather, 1986a; Walker, 1985; Willis, 1977; Bullough and Gitlin, 1985).

3. **Critical analysis** acknowledging the socio-political context being researched.

(Le Compte and Goetz, 1982; Richards and Richards, 1987; Fleet and Cambourne, 1989; Davies, 1994)

4. **The production of a critical narrative.**

(Brookley, 1987; Lewis and Simon, 1986).

5. **Researcher self reflection** leading to a further cycling of negotiating access, participant observation, critical analysis and critical narratives.

(Simon and Dippo, 1986)

Participant reflection and transformation are **hoped for, but not methodologically essential** outcomes.

The research methodology is *not* a value free methodology. It rests upon an assumption that its location within emancipatory praxis research and feminist ideology will make it difficult to separate argument and polemic. There is a long history in academic feminist research of "oppositions to and subversions of feminist work" (Luke and Gore, 1992, 193) where the researcher is called upon not only to support the research outcomes against discredit and disbelief, but also to argue the right to employ other than a positivist, empiric, quantifiable research methodology from which data can be extrapolated independent of the argument. This research constitutes the understandings discursively - as an outcome of the subjectivity of both the researcher and the researched.

At all times there has been an attempt to minimise the apartness of the researcher and the researched: through means of reciprocity relating to research data and findings both with students and staff I have endeavoured to position myself less as an 'observer' and more and more as 'researcher-participant' in acknowledging that there is no value free role for the 'observer'. I have endeavoured to retell stories rather than to remake them, although the stories are often in my voice due to the pencil and paper approach to data gathering that was conscientiously adopted as a means of diminishing the apartness of the observer’s role (Walker, 1985). I am intensely aware of the questioning of the ethics of the ethnographic stance from feminists (Stacey, 1988; Shannon 1994a) and have sought as a response to this critique to promote reciprocity and minimise the intrusion of my presence and to, whenever possible, privilege the 'voice' of the participants in the text to obviate criticism that despite earlier collaboration, the eventual 'voice' of the text is mine. As a result of the desire to privilege the participants' voices, whilst collecting many observations using a paper and pencil approach, the narrative and critique are a collection of the students' voices spearheading the critical analysis.
I have acted as an advocate for the least empowered in the research process - arguably the students - through the quest for more democratic in-School structures. I have, in my advocacy for democracy through my legitimate in-School role of researcher-participant (as a tutor in the studios of the School), focused on the transformative possibilities in practical, day-to-day situations in the School; believing that transformative outcomes are often the result of incremental changes rather than major ideological shifts.

However, in the critical analysis phase of the project, currently being undertaken, I view the data through the organising problematic (Simon and Dippo, 1986) of the view of architectural education dominated by an outmoded conception of the profession where the architect is the team leader, and which seeks to socialise students into a profession which is predominantly male, white and middle-class. Through post-structural analysis (Davies, 1994), I seek "to explain the relations and forces of power from the discursive evidence available" (Weedon, 1987,115).

**How can the empowerment potentials of critical ethnographic research be realised?**

In summary, the empowerment potentials of critical ethnography, whilst being limited to political consciousness raising, have the potential to be realised in critical research projects that:

- collect participants' interpretations of reality
- reinterpret participants' interpretations using such critical tools as:
  - social reproduction and resistance
  - situating the micro in the macro socio-cultural setting of 'raced', classed and gendered relations
  - values and interests identified as being served by such understandings
- report back the reinterpretation to participants. (Smith, 1993b)

**Why does critical educational research need to be hosted?**

The answer to this question comes in a consideration of the hoped for outcomes from critical educational research. Clearly as critical research projects typically have a thesis pointing to some perceived injustice which needs exploring and theorising, there is a stage in the design of a critical research project which is the political action or transformative action stage. The research outcomes in participatory critical research will be enmeshed with such a political action phase; in non-participatory research the transformative outcomes come as a result of self-reflection on the part of the researcher and the researched.

Thus a critical researcher cannot theorise out of context of political and praxis action about an educational research project. By its very nature the research design involves a cycling of action and reflection leading to further action and reflection both informing, and informed by, political action and praxis.

The researcher's reflection in and on action are always a part of a critical research design, as Simon and Dippo (1986) argue - saying that the researcher has to reflect on the situation of the research within a historically constructed world of a classed, gendered and raced society.

I think this answers the question about why critical educational research is hosted - it involves a political consciousness raising stage which hopefully comes about as a result of the participants' consideration of, and engagement with, the vivid and finely tuned focus of the critical ethnographic account - the narrative - and the reinterpretations of the participants' interpretations of reality through the researcher's organising problematic - the critique.

For work to warrant the label *critical* it must meet three fundamental conditions:

1. the work must employ an organising problematic that defines one's data and analytic procedures in a way consistent with its project;
2. the work must be situated, in part, within a public sphere that allows it to become the starting point for the critique and transformation of the conditions of the oppressive and inequitable moral and social regulation;

3. the work must address the limits of its own claims by a consideration of how, as a form of social practice, it too is constituted and regulated through historical relations of power and existing material conditions. (Simon and Dippo, 1986, 197, my italics).

The situation of the project within a public sphere, which may be an educational institution in the case of educational research, contributes through the praxis possibilities thus empowered, to changes within the public sphere.

**How does a research methodology become participatory?**

There are many other differences between participatory and non-participatory research as well as the difference between the political action stage that is the outcome of a so-called participatory critical research design and the transformative outcomes through praxis which are the (hoped for) outcomes from so-called non-participatory research methods.

The question of Who participates? underlines some of the differences. In participatory research the researcher and the researched are as one. Patti Lather calls for both the researcher and the researched to become the "changer and the changed" (Lather, 1991b, 56).

The critical researcher has a research design which from the outset is designed to involve and inform oppressed groups. Carr and Kemmis (1983) argue that whilst in conventional social research the researcher is disinterested and value neutral, in emancipatory praxis research there is no distinction between the interests of the researcher and those of the researched.

**Is critical ethnography an empowering research methodology?**

I claim that, in my research project, which, since 1992 has been a critical ethnography of the activity critique in a School of Architecture the adoption of this methodology has been empowering for students and staff. Some students have wanted to have a greater involvement in the research design than I had originally envisaged. They also asked to read the narratives concerning critiques in which their class had participated and to view the critical analyses "to see who I was, and what your observations of me revealed, and how I fitted into the literature" in a way which indicated their desire not only to contribute to the project, but to benefit from the findings.

*Interview excerpt 13-8-199 with a group of final year students as a member check.*

**Rhianna:** I would like to get something more out of all your studies over the last three years, and I would be very interested to see who I was, and what your observations of me revealed, and how I fitted into the literature, I'd be fascinated.

**Jason:** You're Michael!

**Susan Shannon:** Who's Michael?

**Jason:** You change their names!

**Susan:** Oh, no, I never change their sex! As I said, if ethics is central [to all our considerations] and in the next circle out is reciprocity, I long to give you this [narrative]. As the person who's in charge of your studio has had [the narrative] for months...I take it to mean that it is basically O.K. from his point of view...as you know, we've had a word for word discussion about what everything means...it's not so much raising issues about you but raising issues about what were actually the most important things in the studio.
And he completely disagrees with what I thought were the most important things in that studio.

Reciprocity means that I am not researching "on you" and "about you" and that you are actually the subject - it means that together we are seeking ways to...to change things around here.

One of the things that I hate, is that in order to discharge that role that I have undertaken to discharge with the studio master or coordinator, is that it prevents me from having a more reciprocal relationship with the students because they [the studio masters] are the ones who get to see the text first.

So Rhianna, I'll bring it on Monday.

Rhianna: I'd love to see it.

Susan: I'll bring it on Monday. You can show it to whoever you want because unless you say to someone "That's me" no-one would ever know.

Rhianna: But they'd work it out.

Jason: Apart from a little bit of fun about who you are in the research, who you are in the research is irrelevant, it's that you've contributed to it is one of the nice things about it. To read what is important about the subject...

Rhianna: Or what you can stand to learn.

What have the transformative outcomes been for the students?

I consider, for example, that a class meeting of students requesting an end to "whole-of-class" critiques in first year as a result of three days of anxiety whilst each student presented their first ever architectural project to the assembled class of 35 other students and three staff members is empowered political action as an outcome of reflection on their own position in the School. (Shannon, 1992)

The students knew that I had looked closely at the alternatives to "whole-of-class" critiques, and trialled some of them, they knew that my research was concerned with the students whose outcomes did not match the expectations of the Department. They knew that I had carried out lead-up quantitative and qualitative research investigating why some students were not achieving the Department's assessment goals. They knew that this research had shown that with the exception of "one-on-one at the drawing board" critiques, which have no formal assessment outcomes, that all other critique contexts were found to be confidence reducing for some students. They knew that the results of the lead-in research work showed that the more public the critique sphere, the more likely were students, particularly female students, to rate that critique scenario as confidence decreasing.

Eventually I focussed, in this critical research project not on confidence as a measure of success, but on the ability of some critique contexts to contribute to the students' empowerment by removing the authority/dependency hierarchy which exists in all conventional critique situations. My argument was that students would be empowered through critiques which allowed them to show their knowledge, and to do this in a way which did not rely on the re-perpetuation of the master/apprentice model which had defined the access to the profession ever since architecture moved into the Universities from the tutelage system: a move that did little to diminish the authority of the (usually) male "master" over the student (Shannon, 1993a).

A further example of a transformative outcome for students concerns the political action taken by the final year students in calling a class meeting and inviting the staff and Head of the School to attend to discuss the students' proposal that the traditional 'closed' end-of-year "juries" (formal critiques with visiting "experts") be 'open' juries in the same way that
all their juries had been until that time. The students' persuasive arguments in favour of abandoning the 'closed' jury model, which they claimed allowed favouritism, and lack of accountability to go unchecked, resulted in a request to me to develop a discussion paper around this topic presenting the benefits and disadvantages of the public jury for further discussion. The outcome of this process was that the students had a choice of remaining in a private, 'closed' jury, or selecting an public, 'open' jury for their summative final year critique.

A final example concerns peer critique and peer assessment. Although there was very considerable initial resistance to the introduction in final year of the expectation that, as preparation for immanent professional practice, students would engage in self, and peer assessment and peer critique, the constant refusal of the particular staff member to be directive in proffering staff critique eventually obliged a critical response in the students. This process has affected the students in that they now know that they have the skills to give critique, and to respond to the critique of their peers; and that they can now see what their studio co-ordinator was trying to do in steadfastly refusing to step in and constantly provide expert critique. The transformation for the students here from "final year student" to "beginning professional" has been wrought by a parallel transformation in a staff member reapprising his role as "teacher" and "expert" in favour of "facilitator" and "co-ordinator".

The knowledge that there was educational research carried out in their classes for three years alongside them as they learnt, that the researcher's aims were made clear to them, that the results of the research were distributed and discussed (particularly with staff) at a very early stage of the process and the emerging theories discussed with groups of students, empowered the students through a reflexive stance on their own activities in critique, their relationship with their critics and their peers.

I believe, that the transformation is that some students have become, as a group, more empowered to ask for and in fact demand, good critique practice, so that critique becomes a time for the designer and her peers as well as staff and visiting critics, to reflect critically on the work and to comment in a way that is critical and constructive. I believe that this has led to changes in the practice of critique in the professional degree Bachelor of Architecture, so that some of the students' demands that critique is a more open and accountable process have been met.

**What have the transformative outcomes been for the staff?**

They have, I believe, related not only to the outcomes in terms of reflections on critique processes, but also on the process of educational research. In the sense that the School hosted my research, and this required the research proposal to go before a Departmental Committee Meeting, for formal acceptance of the research within a proposed Code of Ethics, the staff members had taken upon themselves de facto the role of facilitators of my educational research.

Whilst there was general acceptance to my proposals for educational research in the School, there were understandably some staff extremely resistant to the notion of educational research itself. I found that only by demonstrating the useful - that is the transformative - outcomes from the early research in terms of my understandings about student's learning being enhanced in certain critique situations, and by my steadfast belief in the inherent rightness of my project, were the pockets of resistance finally eroded. In fact some of the most significantly changed outcomes from the project were in relation to the changed practices of the staff members initially most oppositional. Whether this is a reflection of how far they had to come, or the power of students' voices, I do not know, but I can relate the enormous elation I felt when I was called on as a researcher to develop an Options Paper on a critique protocol under review by a staff member who had previously expressed considerable doubt about there being any benefits from educational research.

Amongst other staff my research project was welcomed and their teaching practices soon reflected research outcomes about preferred modes for critique; about privileging peer critique over expert critique so as not to completely silence novices; and about how to enhance excellence through rigorous self and peer critique at upper levels of the School as
a means of preparation for lifelong learning through collaboration, in comparison with the commonly adopted protocol of promoting excellence solely through competition.

How can staff empower students through their own research?

I believe that as there are more than enough "real" problems to tackle, no-one needs to be engaged in "knowledge" production in educational research. I adhere to the call of the women's movement that research be contextually and historically specific. Going on from this, then, I don't believe that generalised research questions are answered in a way that produces useful outcomes for teachers, students or administrators (Bassey, 1981). I understand that most research, whether it be empirical, interpretive, critical, or indeed post-critical, starts with a question, and that it is in the pursuit of the "answer" that many other questions are asked. In critical research the question is likely to concern micro-issues viewed from a macro-perspective of the inequitable distribution of resources and power and of the unquestioned acceptance of "how things are the way they are". In critical research there is acknowledgement that the research outcomes do not uncover truths, but are rather, as Simon and Dippo (1986, 196) assert, a particular kind of knowledge production concerned with seeking transformative outcomes through political awareness and political action as a result of that awareness.

In unpacking the notions of micro-issues viewed through a macro-perspective, I find it useful to consider that the research essentially concerns the "everyday", and the "taken-for-granted" in the students' education in the School under observation. The unproblematic "everyday" happenings I consider to be cumulatively the micro-issues, viewed through the lens of the inequitable distribution of power, and pre-existing hierarchy, which I perceive as the macro-perspective.

Through a finely tuned focus on the everyday, the critical ethnographer's accounts encourage reflection on everyday, and taken for granted practices. The outcomes may be praxis outcomes based on that self-reflection, in the case of non-participatory research, or in the case of participatory research, political action.

The political action may be as seemingly simple as an architecture student questioning: "Why don't the best students get the best marks?" or, in questioning the final "jury" behind closed doors which had for many years been the final assessment mode: "Why can't we be present at our peers' critiques as we have been for the past five years?" Students voices are strong when collective, when informed by self-reflection, and when driven by a sense of equity.

For staff wanting transformative outcomes for their students through research I believe that the question driving the research should be one the students are asking, not one the staff are asking. The question which drove me was: "Why aren't some students achieving up to the Department's expectations of them when they receive exactly the same amount of everything - teacher's time, resources, library services and administration - as the person at the next drawing board?" This question could well have been asked by the students themselves: "Why am I failing to learn?" or just "Why am I failing?"

Getting alongside the students themselves, wanting the same outcomes that they want for themselves and designing a research project to uncover some of the reasons for, in my case, their failure to achieve through proposing better ways of teaching and learning, may mean that, through the cyclical stages of the critical research project, the students are ultimately empowered.

Footnotes

1. There were three stages of approval for the research topic and methodology. The first was the approval of the Departmental Committee comprising academic staff members and other elected members of the Department including student representation; the second was approval by the Faculty which comprises, as well as academic members of the Department, representatives from the profession and elsewhere in the University as well as student representation; and the third was the approval of the Board of Graduate Studies which,
under the Chair of a Dean of Graduate Studies, comprises appointed and elected members of the University including student representatives.
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The Argument

This paper seeks to challenge the conventional wisdom about 'equity' for women within architectural education and access to the architectural profession.

It argues that the solution to achieving graduate gender balance does not lie simply in admitting more women to architecture courses initially and eliminating gender bias in their teaching; and that ensuring women's equal access to the profession as practitioners will not necessarily eventuate as the greater numbers of graduating women become registered architects.

Whilst the number of women as a percentage of all graduates from architecture schools has risen steadily in the last fifteen years, the more worrying statistics are those for registrations after women have graduated from their degree courses. Women, on the whole, are not going on to take their registration exams, the Australian Practice Examination (A.P.E.), after graduation, and are thereby precluded from practise under the title of 'architects' in Australia. Unregistered graduates cannot hold themselves to be architects, call themselves architects and are restricted in becoming architect company directors.

Women remain vastly under-represented as a proportion of all registered architects in Australia. In 1990 6.45% of all registered architects in Australia were women, despite forming 30% of all graduating architects, 39% of all architecture school enrolments, and 18% of all successful A.P.E.candidates.

Despite there being a "catch up" factor at work (only 10 years ago, in 1984, 19.5% of graduates, 23% of architecture enrolments and 7% of successful A.P.E.candidates were women, whilst in 1975 9.6% of graduates and 14.3% of enrolments were women) this does not wholly account for the low representation of women.

Other hypotheses which may account for more men than women seeking professional registration are:

That more women than men are unable to gain suitable post-graduation employment in order to fulfill the practice requirements for registration, particularly in recessionary times.

That fewer women than men intend to practise architecture as a registered architect so therefore do not see the necessity for professional registration.

That more women than men are precluded by the length of undergraduate studies from a further one or two years (minimum) of further full-time commitment essential before registration.

That more women than men view the patriarchal institution "registration" as oppressive, hierarchical and controlling access to the profession through exclusion instead of promoting inclusion.

That more women than men do not see themselves during their studies, and upon graduation as practising, professional architects.

This paper will discuss the supporting evidence for each of the hypotheses and conclude by focusing on gender affirmative critique processes within architectural education.
The Discussion

That more women than men are unable to gain suitable post-graduation employment in order to fulfill the practice requirements for registration, particularly in recessionary times.

The Architects Accreditation Council of Australia (AACA) has determined the nature and length of suitable post-graduation employment in terms of Level of Experience and Categories of Experience. They have stated in Clauses 5.2-5.3 of their Logbook in relation to the Level of Experience and Categories of Experience that the candidate must have experience at Levels C and D (exhibiting autonomy and self-judgment, as well as directing the work of others) in a minimum of four of the eight designated practical experience categories. (1)

The difficulty in gaining a range of experience over different project types discharging different activities at a significant level of autonomy is particularly important when considering that women are less likely to be involved in contract administration, office administration and job getting/marketing than men; women are less likely to work on industrial, commercial and community projects; women are less likely to work on high value projects. (Olley, 1990)

Together with the statistics the RAIA (1992) has gathered on the type of work and the value of work discharged by women there is a basis for suggesting that women may also have more difficulty achieving employment at the Level of Experience demanded by the Board because, whilst women were as likely as men to work on residential projects, they are less likely than men to have worked on industrial, commercial or community projects; and whilst women were as likely as men to work on low value projects (less than $100,000), they were less likely than men to work on high value projects (more than $25m). Inferentially women’s work in architecture may be confined to smaller, lower value projects where there are less challenges, less likelihood of directing a subordinate team or of working as part of a larger team, and less ability to become involved in some aspects of contract administration. Women therefore may have less opportunity to work at the required Level of Experience.

There is no recognition of this difficulty (2) by the examiners of the Australian Practice Examination (Combe, 1993)(3) or by practitioners. The stance of the Examination body that the type, length and level of autonomy in practical experience should be the same for everyone is an imperative in order to discharge its legal role of protecting the public from unscrupulous or unqualified architects. The State Registration Boards have a duty of care to ensure that the public is served by qualified and experienced practitioners. Their primary role, they believe, is in the protection of the public.

That less women than men do not intend to practise architecture as a registered architect so therefore do not see the necessity for professional registration.

Professional registration as an architect is required by graduates wanting to call themselves architects, wanting to practise as an architect and wanting to become Directors of an architects company. Whilst all unregistered people are prevented by the various Architects Acts from calling themselves architects, there is no restriction in Australia on any unregistered person designing or superintending the erection of a building. However, there is restriction over the use of the words "architect", "architectural" and over who may be directors of registered architects companies which preserves these titles for the use of registered architects.

If women intend to practise in employee positions, or in sole practice, or in freelance or contract positions (as an employee), or in the State or Commonwealth public service as long as they do not hold themselves to be architects, whilst being entitled to describe themselves as graduates of an architecture degree course, they are doing nothing illegal. Women graduates may be more attracted to the practice of architecture within the public service with its enlightened affirmative action attitudes and more flexible work practices. Although entitled to describe themselves as an "architect" within the public service without being registered, no statistics for national registration record their work. Similarly excluded from registration, unless
previously registered, by the definition of registration as administered through eligibility for the A.P.E., are academics, architectural authors, heritage architects and architects in the employment of large corporations. (Combe, 1993) All these avenues to practice in which both women and men participate exclude these practitioners from registration through the narrow categories for suitable experience, the type of experience deemed suitable under the Act, the need for all experience to be supervised by a registered practitioner and the focus of the professional examination on administration of Contracts. Women are more likely to be either not working as architects at all (RAIA, 1992), or to be in employee positions, working as sole architects or in freelance or contract positions (Olley, 1990) many of which are seen as "supporting" roles and which do not require registration.

That more women than men are precluded by the length of undergraduate studies from a further one or two years (minimum) of further full-time commitment essential before registration.

An academic, a practical architectural experience component and a practice examination component are the three main requirements for the registration of an architect.

All architecture courses approved for the academic requirement in Australia are a minimum of five years in duration.

The requirements for the practical experience component for registration are that the candidate for the A.P.E. must provide evidence of at least two years of approved practical experience, one year of which must be gained subsequent to the completion of the academic requirement. Therefore the minimum time from commencement of an architecture course until eligibility for the A.P.E. is six years. This minimum is exceptional; it would only be possible in circumstances where the candidate had already gained substantial approved experience as an undergraduate and had, upon graduation, assumed a position in a firm of architects where the graduate was able to gain very substantial experience.

The AACA has defined this experience as working at Level D in two Categories of Experience, and working at Level C, or higher, for at least three months in each of two other Categories of Experience. Both Levels of Experience demand substantial responsibility and the ability to direct a subordinate team with minimal supervision.

In short these work practices are not a job description fitting any but the most able graduate; indeed it has been suggested that no graduate can do these things! Whilst no AACA statistics are kept on the age of A.P.E. candidates, anecdotal evidence is that the average age is around twenty-seven to twenty-eight which is unsurprising considering the expectations for postgraduate experience.

This age coincides for women with the median age for the birth of the first child (ABS, 1993); therefore a further difficulty affecting women in their combination of the role of care-giver and practitioner is the discretionary admittance of part-time work experience by the A.P.E. examiners. The 1988 RAIA Survey (Olley, 1990) showed that 25% of the female respondents worked part-time compared with 3% of male respondents. The discretionary admittance of part-time work experience by the A.P.E. examiners even when gained in the required rigid categories conspires to preclude access particularly for candidates with family responsibilities to candidature.

More women than men are leaving the profession at this time for family reasons and then either do not re-enter the profession, or do so in a supporting role that does not require registration. There are no profession sponsored re-entry schemes in Australia; the national accreditation authority has the same registration requirements for all candidates regardless of any other circumstances. Whilst not promoting the concept of registration for under-experienced candidates what I am saying is that once women have left the profession after graduation and prior to registration they are very unlikely to re-enter it as there is no formal path for so doing; and that particularly in recessionary times when there is high unemployment amongst registered
and experienced architects as well as recent graduates the informal path to re-entry - that of becoming an employee in a practice and gaining the requisite experience - is nothing but a dream for women who have left the profession without gaining substantial graduate experience and registration.

That more women than men view the patriarchal institution "registration" as oppressive, hierarchical and controlling access to the profession through exclusion instead of promoting inclusion.

More and more women are looking at the institutions within which they work; institutions which were set up by men, often for men at a time when women had very little impact on the professions and very little expectation of pursuing a profession even at the conclusion of tertiary study. Men's expectation of women, and indeed women's expectation of themselves, was as home-makers and care-givers.

The gap between the significant number of female graduates and the low number of female candidates for the A.P.E. may be partially understood by seeing "registration" through the eyes of a female graduate who has been educated in a tertiary environment that was notionally gender affirmative and gender inclusive; in short one where she was given to believe, in her education to take her place in the profession, that the profession would want her. Sadly that is not the case. At every turn in her quest to gain suitable employment as a graduate she is confounded in comparison with her male peers. Why then would she suddenly embrace, as her salvation, the institution "registration"? With its emphasis on sameness and its rigorous exclusion of non-conformity "registration" becomes a tool of the patriarchy limiting practice as an architect to the chosen (male, white and middle class) who conform absolutely to the current image of a practitioner. Diversity of expression as a architect has no place in qualifying for registration; neither does non-conformity in practice. Where are the categories for graduate architects as housing co-operative participants; graduate architects as members of design collectives; graduate architects who practise in any way unrepresented in traditional architectural practice where the outmoded view of the architect as team director is still enshrined? In this context the female graduate may see "registration" as hierarchical as it supports and promotes the view, out of favour with many women, that the profession leads; others follow; that the profession dictates, others do; the profession knows, others don't. A rejection of the role of the architect as leader, dictator and source of knowledge in favour of a view of people ultimately able to make architect facilitated decisions about matters affecting their own lives removes the 'space' long claimed for occupation by architects as professionals.

A final point some female graduates may find rubs against the grain of their feminist belief system is that of the institution controlling access through exclusion (of non-conforming profiles of practical experience, of part-time work; of low profile building work - residential and low value) rather than promoting inclusion through a broader view of practice which embraces the whole gamut of post-education experience of graduates. The institution, I hypothesise, has no credibility outside the mainstream practice of architecture so why would those marginalised from mainstream practice by their pursuance of alternatives, or excluded through unemployment, seek the legitimacy conferred by "registration" when it has no place in their world view? If they believe they are already making a significant contribution and using their professional skills, the issue of the legitimacy of registration is irrelevant.

Some graduates, and I contend more women than men, reject the patriarchal instution "registration" which has down-played accountability by its institutional and legislative legitimization of the actions of registered architects.

That more women than men do not see themselves during their studies, and upon graduation as practising, professional architects.

This paper argues that the conventional architectural education is characterized by competitive, dependent learning which rewards convergent thinking through the critique (Anthony,1991). Women's ways of knowing and learning are characterized by a greater desire
for co-operation than competition. (Belenky et al. (1986)) Traditional critique practices discriminate against women inasmuch as they do not encourage and promote alternative modes of thinking and working (Anthony, 1991).

The centre of architectural education is criticism (Dinham, 1986). The studio based critique in a range of forms from the "desk crit" through to the public "whole-of-class critique" is the means of teaching and providing formative and summative assessment for architecture students.

Architectural studio based critique, in order to support women, should forefront one of its lesser known roles - that of modelling professional behaviour through showing the informed criticism of a skillful professional. It is through modelling that self-judgement, which it is argued is the primary role for critique, is empowered. It is important for women to be able to identify with their critics and to enhance their own professional judgement by modelling their critics' reflective, artistic, analytic and eloquent (Dinham, 1986) expressions of self-judgement.

Until the epistemological underpinnings of critique alter to reflect this different purpose for critique - its primary role of empowering self judgement - the 7% of female academics in schools of architecture in Australia will not succeed in encouraging women to see themselves as practising architects, equipped with a sense of professional self worth which derives from their strong abilities at self judgement.

I concur largely with Anthony (1991) about the life-long havoc that the critique process can wreak.

There is a growing awareness that through a flaw in the education process architects may be shooting themselves in the foot - and in doing, crippling their chances for career success...improper delivery of criticism in architecture schools undermines rather than builds self-worth...few will contest the generalisation that 90 percent of the graduates of the leading business schools seem to go out into the world confident of their eventual success, while a very high percentage of architectural school graduates come out with doubts about whether they will ever have a chance to succeed...If misguided criticism during the studio education process is at fault... the tragedy is that it is entirely unnecessary... There is growing evidence that overall, a large percentage of architects lack desirable self-confidence about their careers and are being limited as a consequence...The result is often a demoralized profession that continues to have great doubts about its ability to achieve lofty goals. (p.40)

As we know that women more than men (Anthony, 1991) suffer emotionally at the hands of harsh and negative criticism, and that traditional critique practices discriminate against women in that they do not promote alternative ways of thinking and working, it is not difficult to conclude that some of the practices of critique may be very central to the worrisome fact of the poor rate of registration for women, contributing as they do to their poor self-worth, and in turn to notions of lack of ability with self judgment.

How can critique fore-front its role of promoting self-judgement? I contend that independent learning outcomes are partly the result of a professional education which seeks to break the already established pattern of dependent learning by involving students in the assessment task. If student learning styles are established by the assessment task (Boud, 1990) the learning task must therefore involve self and peer critique and evaluation as a means of involving students as adult, independent learners in their own learning outcomes. Boud says:

If students learn to look always to their teachers...they are learning to be dependent. They are not encouraged to develop the skills of learning how to learn, how to monitor their own work, how to establish their own criteria and how to make judgements about the worth of their own achievements, all of which are necessary elements of professional practice.(p.104)
When female graduates are empowered through reliance on their own self-judgement my thesis is that they are already more than half-way to seeing themselves as practising professionals. The obstacles as discussed will continue to impede their progress but the biggest obstacle of all - not believing that they can do it without constant support is removed and the profession could be revitalized by an influx of women commensurate with the number of graduates! Any changes in Architecture School education programmes which support women through promoting empowerment are also likely to support other marginalised groups; students from different cultural, social, ethnic and learning style backgrounds, many of whom are also under-represented in the profile of Australian Registered Architects.

FOOTNOTES

1. The AACA Architectural Practice Committee has set up a Working Party to review the Log Book of Experience in Architectural Practice; their draft recommendations for amendments to the Log Book for recording practical experience include substituting two levels of experience for the existing six levels; these would be executive (similar to Level D) and non-executive (for all other actual work experience). Their further recommendation is that experience as an observer be accepted for site, and contract administration experience. Their recommendations are a move in the right direction but may not go far enough to redress the gender imbalance.

2. Nor is there any recognition of other documented precluding factors such as cost and emotional hardship. The expense of the Australian Practice Examination (1993 costs: $300-00 per candidate; $150-00 for an Appeals Examination and $50-00 per annum to maintain registration) for the lesser means of women (average taxable income for female architects was $15,000-00 less than for males in the 1989-90 financial year) is ignored. Women also have more to lose emotionally as well as financially in failing a candidature (Faludi, Susan (1992) Backlash: The Undeclared War Against Women Chatto and Windus: London).

3. John Combe, Chair of the Architectural Practice Committee of the AACA; member of the Architects Board of South Australia and their Examinations Coordinator.
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Abstract

The paper explores the notion that women from an early age are socialised into a gendered role which, by the time they reach tertiary education, has a powerful outcome on their self esteem and reliance on their own self-judgement. This learning socialisation conspires to preclude many female graduates from professional schools from exhibiting self-confidence and self-determination to enter their profession, and to seek realistic financial and promotional rewards for their professional expertise.

Most of what I say is uncontested by the feminist writings on gender and education - but what I will claim and argue in the paper is that women are complicit in these outcomes. The paper will conclude by proposing changes in professional tertiary education designed to involve women more in their own outcomes and break the dependency cycle which by then is so well established. It will also focus on the means of support established professional women can offer their younger or less well established colleagues.
CHALLENGING COMPLICITY: THE VOICE OF PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

Susan Shannon
Department of Architecture
University of Adelaide  Adelaide  South Australia 5005

Introduction

Throughout their babyhood, kindergarten and primary schooling to a consolidation in high school, girls are, through a range of cultural artifices, introduced to the powerful constructions of gender stereo-types which contribute to the separation of their "sex role and sex character" (Connell, 1987, 16).

By the time they reach University, the area in which I have the greatest interest and possibly the greatest opportunity to challenge the existing and conventional paradigms for professional education, their quietness, passivity and separation of the expectations of home and school from their 'breaking out' of their leisure time have been "adopted as a strategy of apparent retreat" (Woods and Hammersley, 1993, 3) from the dominant culture of boys.

For a long time whilst Universities enrolled very few women in professional courses such as architecture, the odd female enrolment was not an occasion for a consideration of gendered aspects of the curriculum or the teaching. The low number of practising women made hardly a dent in the nature of practice and had little "voice" in the academy. The arrival of many women into professional courses has caused changes as the courses either actively resist, undertake, or actively promote change related to achieving equity for all participants in their tertiary education.

The Culture of Architecture

My research is concerned with the ability of architectural education to promote change, and the means by which these changes, which are avowedly present in all Higher Education, are promoted in a professional education which is male dominated.

In order to research this field, for three years I have been carrying out an ethnographic study looking at architecture students' learning embedded in the dominant culture of a profession which has strong links with the patriarchy and a long male tradition of actively excluding non-conformity through certain regulatory procedures, which I argue, have sought to keep in place an outmoded habitus of the profession (Churchman, 1992) "constructed historically as a form of masculinity: emotionally flat, centred on a specialised skill, insistent on professional esteem and technically based dominance over other workers, and requiring for its highest (specialist) development the complete freedom from childcare and domestic work provided by having wives and maids to do it" (Connell, 1987, 181).

What can be argued is that many beginning University students, and here I am talking about the 81 % of 16-18 year olds who are enrolling in their first year of architecture at the School I am studying (SATAC,1992), who exhibit a learning style which I would name as learning dependency. The desirable learning orientation for a tertiary student is as an independent learner, seeking rather to construct their own knowledge linked back to their prior learning and forward to their own areas of specialisation and fields of interest than to validate the teachers' knowledge through the assessment process.
Freirian Education

The South American liberationist educator Paulo Freire has encapsulated the qualities of the education which produces learning dependency in his famous 'banking' metaphor in which he describes traditional education in banking-style classrooms where knowledge is a gift bestowed by the 'master' for the future, uncritical use of the student 'receptor' (Freire, 1979, 58,60 cited by Shor in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, 26).

Freire has counterposed to the 'banking method' "'problem-posing education' where men [sic] develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality but as a reality in the process of transformation" (Aronowitz in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, 11).

What is wrong with being a dependent learner?

Learning Dependence

I claim that learning dependency posits itself on a stance of passivity and dependence in general. This gives rise to questions about the agency of the student in her own education - her ability to shape her own meanings, to develop her own interests and to "develop the impatience and vivacity which characterize search and invention" (Freire, 1973, 43 cited by Shor in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, 27).

Freirian educators posit that in their critical pedagogy "students experience education as something they do, not as something done to them" - that is they are actively engaged in their education (Shor in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, 26).

In Schools of Architecture where only 7% of the academics Australia wide are women, and 6.5% of registered professional architects are women, what dependence further implies is dependence on men: as teachers, as professional role models, as the providers of the vast majority of the built form and textual examples studied at University, and eventually as their employers and would be mentors.

Is learning dependence, and the stance of dependence on men in particular, forced by the dynamic of the low number of practising and academic women in architecture, a problem? Yes, and no.

Yes, because women have strongly gendered learning characteristics which derive from learnt behaviours. In Women's Ways of Knowing (Belenky et al, 1987) women's learning is characterised more by co-operation than by competition. If women are always in a position of dependency on men their gendered learning characteristics are possibly underplayed, given no outlet, and undervalued in the academy and particularly in the workplace. These environments, if structured by men, for men, are likely to forefront other models than the co-operative democracy favoured by women's characteristics - models usually involving a considerable notion of hierarchy, control and competition. This is problematic as women daily struggle to make their contribution within an environment which is structured unfavourably for their gendered learning characteristics.

Ingleton's (1993) work throws light upon "the struggle." She reports that "women's success gained at the expense of another's failure generates considerable anxiety about competitive behaviour" (p.43). A further insight is that this is not because "fear of success is due to fear of loss of femininity; rather, the emotional cost of success
through competition is too great for most women to sustain" (Ingleton, 1993, 43). She reports that "Chodorow (1974) states that women are more oriented towards fostering and preserving relationships than towards winning" and that this is "supported by Lever's (1976) description of differences between girls' and boys' play: girls subordinates the continuation of the game to the continuation of relationships" (p.43).

Connell (1987) questions Chodorow’s assumptions about a unitary model of sexual characteristics underlying her argument (p. 167) and reports that Maccoby and Jacklin (1976), in The Psychology of Sex Difference (p. 169) found that there was a consistent significant difference between men and women in studies of the traits "verbal ability, visual/spatial ability, mathematical ability and aggressiveness" but no significant difference in "rather more of the traits: sociability, suggestibility, self-esteem, types of learning, cognitive styles, achievement motivation, sensory modality". The authors concluded no consistent pattern on another range of traits: "tactile sensitivity, timidity, activity level, competitiveness, dominance, compliance, nurturance". However, Connell concluded that "Recent research has not shown that Maccoby and Jacklin systematically underestimated sex differences" (p.170) and that "Both femininity and masculinity vary, and understanding their variety is central to the psychology of gender" (p. 171).

Gendered Characteristics of Architectural Practice

There is a strong link, I claim, between the desirable, and gendered characteristic of co-operation in contrast with the more aggressive notion of competition and the attributes required in this decade for leadership in excellent architectural practice.

The architectural profession has changed markedly over twenty years - it is no longer the norm for one "name" or "star" architect to design and superintend the construction of a building, acting at the same time as the head of the team of consultants and the manager of the building process. The picture developed by writers on the current structure of leading practices (Cuff, 1989; Coxe, 1989; Scott Brown, 1990) reveals that excellent buildings are designed by co-operative team approach where the team may have a leader who may make autocratic decisions but where there are strongly developed intra-team tasks, cross checking, and devolvement of key tasks "to senior associates and project directors" (Scott Brown, 1990). In short, the maintenance of relationships within the team is critical to the execution of excellent buildings.

This claim can be illustrated with some detailed and interesting insights from women in architecture into the qualities that make the team "work".

Jaquelin Robertson, a panellist in Architectural Record's 1991 Education Roundtable (Kliment, 1991) reports that:

Best on teams are those with the most design confidence. Those without it get very nervous because they're worried their contribution will get lost in the mix. They are also the most combative. Good people are relaxed about working with other people. (Kliment, 1991, 189)

Denise Scott Brown, a practitioner, in her now widely published essay 'Room at the Top? Sexism and the Star System in Architecture' in Architecture: A Place for Women (Berkeley, 1989) says that:

As in all firms, our ideas are translated and added to by our co-workers, particularly our associates of long standing. Principals and assistants may alternate in the role of creator and critic. The star system, which sees the firm
as a pyramid with a designer on top, has little to do with today’s complex
relations in architecture and construction. But, as sexism defined me as a
scribe, typist, and photographer to my husband, [Robert Venturi], so the star
system defines our associates as 'second bananas' and our staff as pencils.
(Scott Brown, 1990)

Anne Vytacil (1989) makes pertinent observations about the conflict created for
women "between the professional and personal self-image. Social standards of
feminine behaviour must be reconciled with the expression of ego necessary for the
development of personal creativity". Her essay 'The Studio Experience differences for
Women Students' in Architecture: A Place for Women (Berkeley, 1989) concludes that:

Compared with the individualistic and competitive academic view of
architecture, women's tendency to approach design issues with greater
flexibility and greater aesthetic tolerance for social implications seems clearly
more appropriate to contemporary practice. The responsiveness and design
accommodation that may be perceived as liabilities in the traditional studio
may become advantages when applied to the practical realities of the
profession.... Paradoxically, the use of their [women's] particular ability to
adapt and accommodate may offer women precisely the competitive edge
needed for success in a field constantly subject to change. (Vytacil, 1990)

The other side of the argument is that the dependence is not a problem because
women may need to conform to the dominant culture in order to survive. Scott Brown
reveals that she wrote her strident essay 'Room at the Top? Sexism and the Star
System in Architecture', which was first published in Berkeley, 1989, in 1975 which she:

...decided not to publish at the time, because I judged that strong sentiments
on feminism in the world of architecture would ensure my ideas a hostile
reception, which could hurt my career and the prospects of my firm. (Scott
Brown, 1990)

Some of my own colleagues are unwilling to support the importance of my research
outcomes about disadvantage for students resultant from gender or cultural bias or
professional 'colonisation' by men because occasionally a female student exhibits a
competitive, assertive stance. One present final year student "Rhianna" could not
possibly be described as being quiet - she is very assertive - and is not oppressed by
the dominant male hierarchy. She actively rebels against it and pulls her fellow
students along with her. Some colleagues claim that my 'in principle' arguments have
no weight at all because one student fails to exhibit the oppression of her peers!

My considered response is that first, methodologically, the exception has never
proved the rule in any scientific paradigm so it is the more questionable to use this
rationale in the decidedly non-scientific paradigm of critical ethnographic research
which methodologically eschews generalisations; and secondly, that after six years in
a learning environment, students can be expected to have adopted some of the
characteristics of the dominant culture which is male if that is necessary for their
success in terms established by men.

Denise Scott Brown comments on the same phenomenon in architectural critics.
Young women critics, as they enter the fray, become as macho as the men and for the same reasons - to survive and win in the competitive world of critics. (Scott Brown, 1990)

**Complicity in the learning environment**

Is Rhianna *complicit* in assisting the maintenance of the status quo in her learning environment by adopting the male stance? There are arguments for and against her complicity.

Yes, she has been complicit because she could refuse to participate in the competitive learning which is a feature of the culture of architecture schools all over the world - but in so doing would risk the outcome she is so close to achieving as a sixth year student - namely her well earned degree. There is, I believe, a strategic and achievement learning orientation in any final year student no matter how strong their independent and intrinsic learning orientation!

Lewis (1992) said that there are risks attendant on speaking out "... especially in professional schools, where students' aspirations for future employment often govern their willingness to challenge the existing status quo, there are pressures to conform to the dominant social text (which are shared by lesbians and heterosexual women alike) (p.175).

No, she has fought complicity because by seeking changes to the system to make the learning environment more equitable she has 'taken on' the hierarchy with a view to interrupting the prevailing social order.

She is behaving in a way which is consistent with the expectations of the literature on gender: whilst her actions on behalf of the year were driven partly by self-interest (she is after all in the significant minority group of 25% women in the year) nevertheless her requests also empowered some of the least able students in the year who were powerless in their voicelessness, and also supported her classmates in bids aiming to maintain relationships and build the team.

**Complicity in the Architectural Profession**

Rhianna and her classmates will graduate, the product of a school which was avowedly gender affirmative and gender inclusive; a school which has, through the challenge of project and problem based learning, and peer review, weaned her from high school learning dependency to a mature, independent learning style where she takes responsibility now, as in the future, for her own outcomes through reliance on her professional self-judgement which is a combination of theoretical knowledge and technical expertise.

She has adopted some of the "norms" of her chosen profession in order to achieve well by their standards, which could be seen as a form of complicity. Whilst she rails inwardly against the standards of the profession, outwardly her persona is as one of the most positive, professional presenters of her own, and her team's work in critiques - an example of adopting the "competitive edge" so necessary to win jobs and clients and initially to convince an employer to take her on in a recession. As she said to me: "If anyone in this year can get a job, I can" (pers. comment 18-11-199_).

Magda Lewis (1992) said, in contrasting 'speaking out' with 'silence taken as assent', that women know that "over and over again culture tells her that men abandon women who speak too loudly, or who are too present" (p.183). She said:
For women in professional schools specifically, compliance with particular displays of femininity can mean the difference between having and not having a job. (Lewis, 1992, 183)

Rhianna's education in her School of Architecture has been based on the profession valuing her skills, knowledges and attributes and actively engaging her trained and independent mind. The School seeks to graduate students who are equipped to take their place under supervision in practice.

Scott Brown reflects on the different paths of men, and women graduates in the north American situation:

...although school is a not a non-discriminatory environment, it is probably the least discriminatory one they [women] will encounter in their careers. By the same token the early years in practice bring little differentiation between men and women, it is as they advance that difficulties arise, when firms shy away from entrusting high level responsibility to women. On seeing their male colleagues draw out in front of them, women who lack a feminist awareness are likely to feel that their failure to achieve is their own fault. Scott Brown, 1990)

Unless Rhianna is already politically attuned to the systemic discrimination against women in architecture, and has understood this from a feminist stance, she is in for a shock.

In Australia women graduates are disadvantaged in comparison with their male peers (Olley, 1990). They will find it harder to get a job as an architect, and then, having found one, are likely to work on projects of lower value, and projects which are restricted to domestic, low value commercial and institutional types instead of working on the whole range of projects (Olley, 1990). Women will be much more likely to be in the "not working" category (3-19%) than their male peers (1-3%) (RAIA, 1992, 11); if they are employed in the profession their average income bracket is $15,000 less per annum than their male peers (RAIA, 1992, 16); if they work part-time they will be in the company of far more women than men (Olley, 1990); and if they seek to have that part-time work experience contribute to the two years minimum experience which must be acquired under the direct supervision of a registered architect prior to sitting for their professional registration examinations they will find that the part-time work is admitted only on a discretionary basis (Architects Board of South Australia, 1991; Shannon, 1993).

If they leave the profession for any reason, but particularly for family reasons, before passing their registration examinations, and having several more years experience after registration to concrete their position in the profession, they will find it almost impossible to re-enter the profession except in a supporting role which does not require registration as there are no profession sponsored re-entry schemes available in Australia (Shannon, 1993). In leaving the profession before they have gained the requisite experience in order to continue to practise as a registered architect are women graduates complicit in their own eventual outcomes? Or statistically is 'nature' set against them - the mean age for birth of the first child in South Australia at 27.7 years (ABS, 1993) is exactly the same age as the average age for candidates for the architectural registration examinations. As Magda Lewis (1992) humourously quotes Duchen:
the tailoring of desire to the logic of politics is not always possible or
acceptable. (p.182)

Given the dichotomy, for women, of their inward, and outward, values clashing in
the struggle to achieve in a traditional School of Architecture which promotes a
competitive model of achievement, who would jeopardise six years of tertiary study
by not completing their registration examinations and thereby being entitled to
practice as an architect? The answer is most women: 11.8% of the 'eligible' female
graduates from the three previous years compared with 25.2% of the 'eligible' male
graduates were successful candidates in 1991.

My point here is that women, for many reasons, are rejecting their chosen career even
after graduation. It may be an active rejection in favour of other options in the work-
place or a more passive rejection as a result of inability to find pertinent work
experience, and the obstacles to particularly women with family responsibilities, put
in place by the restrictions of the profession.

What role has the mature professional woman to play in the acculturization of female
graduates into the professions? How can she assist younger women to assert their
rightful place in their chosen profession without the lingering doubts they carry from
their early socialisation, their education, and their active complicity in keeping
themselves out?

First and foremost I contend that role modelling is the most powerful teacher. For a
graduate at the entry point to a profession her apprenticeship in the profession is just
beginning. She has so much to learn about the demeanour, the unwritten standards
and codes, and the power of collegiality. She will not learn these things in a text book
and nor in exactly the same way from a male colleague. She will learn the women's
ways of knowing, the ability of women to be absolutely professional and emotional at
the same time and that others join her in the struggle to comprehend "contradictory
practices in order to secure their own survival" (Lewis, 1992, 188).

These knowledges are imparted informally and are the powerful lessons which only
mentorship can advance. Men have long recognised the informal path to professional
acculturization which mentorship has offered in terms of acculturizing younger men
into the dominant characteristics of the profession. There are formal paths for
mentorship established in some professions and informal situations in others from
which I contend women are, perhaps unwittingly due to their sports or bar locations,
excluded.

Thirdly, I believe that women of some professional standing can ease the passage for
commencing professionals by setting the standards for gender affirmative and gender
inclusive behaviour. It is daunting for a beginning professional to have to deal with a
workplace which carries an undercurrent of sexual innuendo as well as perform up to
her professional ability. If she complains she is can be labelled as different and
humourless. If she doesn't complain and her acquiescence is confused with assent, she
may risk rumour and innuendo as well as her job. It is essential that women of some
professional standing in the firm are inflexibly rigid in promoting amongst all staff the
highest standards for ethical personal behaviour.

Fourthly, I believe that active professional women should be deeply reflective about
the extent to which they foster and encourage younger professional women as opposed
to putting in place a glass ceiling more indestructible than any put in place by a man.
Professional women can be so active in empowering other, often younger, women
that clearly there comes a point when some fear for their own position. In regard to
this situation Gore (1992) has insightful commentary when she proposes that power
does not reside, cannot be given away and therefore is never given up. Instead she argues for the Foucaultian notion of power as circulating; always creating subjectivity and agency in individuals who "are the vehicles of power, not its points of application" (Foucault, 1980, 98 cited in Gore, 1992, 58).

Women architects can be empowered, through a range of social, and educational changes, to achieve their own goals but these are very long term aims for structural social change. The promotion of a co-operative, collaborative workplace without a hierarchical management structure would revitalise many existing firms of architects. One such architectural practice comprising all women, Cunningham and Keddie, in Melbourne, which has completely flexible work practices to accommodate the family responsibilities of their staff of some thirteen, was last year named the Small Business of the Year in Victoria. Excellent practice can look different from the practice to which we are accustomed and attract significant accolades.

Lastly, in agitating for structural changes to their profession to remove the obstacles to full participation for women I believe professional women can be particularly proactive in their contribution to their profession. The practices which women in management positions could engage I have mentioned; the equal value for part-time work and flexible job sharing; re-entry skilling and mentoring programmes; and adoption of co-operative democratic management styles.

The most valuable contribution professional women can make is to inculcate in the next generation of women that they can do it: not just get into University; not just graduate from University; not just get a professional job; but that they will achieve their own lofty goals and will be represented at every level of management in numbers commensurate with their 52% makeup of the population.

This is, however, a simplistic and determinist notion in a consideration of complicity as a "partnership in evil action" (Concise Oxford Dictionary, 6th edition, 1976). The implication here is of knowing consent to professional subjugation. A consideration of the notion of power in the construction of complicity is worthwhile to argue that the subjugating is not a knowing partnership but the result of a power imbalance which sees professional women compliantly yielding to expressed or unexpressed power.

**Power in the Construction of Complicity**

Foucault exposed the "operations of power at the micro-level" in arguing that it "was at these local sites that the practices of power were perfected; that it is because of this that power can have its global effects "(Epston and White, 1992, 137).

In particular, through his discussion of the Panopticon, a circular prison with the jailer at the centre in which surveillance and scrutiny had to be constantly presumed therefore resulting in a type of self-policing by the inmates, Foucault invites the consideration of the self-policing nature of many of our activities. It is a short step, I claim, from self-policing to complicity in self-subjugation.

Epston and White (1992) make this proposition about Foucault's writings and the nature of self-participation in subjugation:

This analysis of power...suggests that many aspects of our individual modes of behaviour that we assume to be an expression of our free will, or that we assume to be always transgressive, are not yet what they might at first appear. In fact, this analysis would suggest that many of our modes of behaviour reflect our collaboration in the control or the policing of our own lives, as well
as the lives of others; our collusion in the specification of lives according to
the dominant knowledges of the cultures. (p.139, my italics)

Women may be unable to cast off the shackles of patriarchy, of gendered roles and of
systemised oppression in the workplace as claimed by Connell (1987) in the work-
place, where "face-to-face relations are strongly conditioned by the general power
situation between employers and employees" (p. 180). He defines a taxonomy of sex-
role compliant ('emphasized femininity') and sex role resistant or non-compliant
forms of femininity where women are not complicit in their orientation to
accommodating the interests and desires of men "within the global subordination of
women" (p. 183). My argument about Rhianna and her subtle, complex motives for
compliance and non-compliance are supported by a further taxonomic differentia-
tion of "complex strategic combinations of compliance, resistance and co-operation" (p.
184).

Connell argues that, from a male stance where, whilst there is notable individual
distancing from the cultural oppression of women, there are various reasons for the
male complicity in collaborating in sustaining patriarchic hegemony, but that the
major reason is that "most men benefit from the subordination of women" (p.185, my
italics).

Women, Foucault argues, may also be unable to step outside the very nature of
complicity in that they actively collaborate in maintaining their own subjectivity,
(Foucault, 1980), thinking that, they are being transformed, not by the effects of
power "but instead as the effect of something like fulfilment, of liberation" (Epston
and White, 1992, 139).

Ingleton described the same notion when she said that "in choosing out of the
profession, women are choosing even more powerfully into something else. In
choosing out women are selecting the other dominant models; by acknowledging that
there are choices women make to keep their self-esteem intact by selecting out of
competitiveness" (pers. comment 25-10-199_).

If transformation is the goal, self-knowledge is the tool, the building bricks are role-
modelling, mentorship, gender affirmative stances, empowering strategies and the
removal of structural obstacles to full participation for women in the profession, then
complicity can be cast as the enemy. Transformation may be built one brick at a time
- the desired for outcome is a profession where graduates are employed on the basis of
their knowledge and attributes and not their sex - and where the power of patriachal
hegemony does not assert itself in the complicity of women in adopting their stance or
just getting out altogether.

There is a movement in even a more affirmative action direction. The editor of
Progressive Architecture in reviewing Architecture: A Place for Women (Berkeley,
1989) says that a profession which "subscribes to the "mystique of the expert" whose
identity is determined by subjective, male dominated standards"... and which stresses
"total commitment", to the exclusion of the family concerns, a commitment women
are not expected to maintain" creates for itself an ironic situation in which the very
attributes architects display in relation to their clients ("they are sensitive, artistically
creative, and malleable") are "typically female attributes" (Doubilet, 1989, 7). The
confident assertion of their attributes even over those of a man is, as I have argued, a
truly transformative outcome, as women will, even in the absence of men, maintain
the "woman-as-care-taker ideology...as long as women believe their interests to be
served by maintaining existing relations" (Lewis, 1992, 174).
It is therefore necessary, I would claim, in the task of feminist pedagogy within the
academy and the profession, to propose, as we move forward into an educational
environment of the 1990s which will see equal numbers of men and women enrolling
in architecture courses, to promote new teaching paradigms based on reciprocity
which give "voice" to students and lessen the control of the male 'master narrative'
with its inevitable outcome in the willing complicity of many women to maintain the
hegemonic influence of the patriarchy in the architectural profession.
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This paper will address architectural critique when used as a means of formative evaluation. It will focus on why some current design critique procedures - particularly "whole-of-class" critiques - contribute to lowered confidence and increased anxiety in some students. It will argue that whilst no amount of situational improvement in alteration of group sizes for critiques will increase the student's knowledge, the demonstration of the knowledge may well be inhibited by a situational increase in anxiety resultant from "whole-of-class" critiques.

The student profile in the intake for the professional Bachelor of Architecture degree at the University of Adelaide is changing rapidly in terms of cultural, social, economic and educational backgrounds. This has contributed to a gap between the stated objectives of the Degree and the acquisition by some students of key skills in thinking, designing and communication. Many of these key skills are taught, learnt and modelled during architectural critique sessions.

The architectural critique (critical analysis of students' work) is the most widely used protocol for both formative and summative assessment in Australian schools of architecture. The critique also performs as a teaching method for architectural design and models presentation skills for professional practice. Its commonly constituted forms are:

- one-on-one at a drawing board
- within small group discussion
- as a public critique with a small group
- as a public critique with the whole-of-class
- in the "jury" situation with a panel of experts.

The critique is a powerful force in the life of a student of architecture.

The vehicle for this case study is an eight week project "The Tea House" in which thirty-six first year students participated as their first Studio based design project in the professional Bachelor of Architecture degree. Thirty-two of the students had gained entry to the degree from the three year Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree, which has, in its core subjects, a focus on developing the graduates' ability to form and express deep criticism of architectural objects from a broad perspective. The structure of the BArchSt degree also allows undergraduates to take a second major from any other Faculty, or to complete their degree with elective subjects offered in the Faculty of Architecture. The remaining four enrolled students had gained access from other degrees (law, interior design, fine art and arts) through a bridging year. Therefore, from their academic backgrounds alone, the students represented a great richness and variety of assumed knowledge, learning styles and familiarity with assessment modes.

Two weeks into the Tea House design process a preliminary pin-up resulted in approximately half the class submitting their work to their peers and staff assessors for consideration (in a small group process with one staff assessor per group) and receiving feedback for the course they were pursuing.
There was, however, non participation of two types:
a. Those who failed to pin-up preliminary work for consideration.
b. Those who failed to attend at all.

The consequences of this early risk taking behaviour were evident later. Moreover, when reference was made to the relevance and perceived benefits of this preliminary pin-up at the time of the final critique feedback, some students stated quite openly that they had not taken this opportunity seriously as "it didn't count for any marks".

Two speculations arise from this observation:
a. That BArch students coming, in the majority, straight from the background of the three year BArchSt degree, reflect a certain concern of the higher education debate regarding the relationship between assessment and learning: that a thing is only worth doing well, or even at all, if it is assessed (Boud, 1990)
b. The students had not yet encompassed the "Studio experience" (Mcleod, 1992) in their learning style.

However, those students who did produce preliminary sketch designs for consideration moved with, it is assumed, a clearer idea of the strengths and weaknesses of their design thinking, to the next stage of design.

The second occasion on which students were invited to submit preliminary sketch designs was five weeks into the sketch design process. By this time (possibly due to the 10% assessment inducement) the majority had developed a design to a point where it could be critically analysed. The format for the critique was that the whole of the class would convene, with three staff assessors, over four sessions, to critique each student's work.

General issues relating to staff and student expectations of the critique were discussed in a class meeting before the critiques commenced. The students were advised to:
- be comfortable
- take notes
- contribute
- be self reflective
- question the veracity of their own work
- question the authority of the comments of the tutors

This tutor/student exchange was followed by a discussion about what both students and staff hoped to derive from the critique. The staff wanted to be made aware of the processes which had led each student to the present design - for the "pariti" (the student's design hypothesis) to be made explicit - and to use the critique time to raise general issues which could be illustrated in various schemes. Many students wanted to receive an affirmation from the staff that their present design development direction was acceptable, and that further pursuit of the same direction for the remaining weeks of the project would lead to a satisfactory pass.

The stated expectation was that each student would address the class and assessors for approximately five minutes on her/his work, emphasizing the design process perhaps more than the product, and in particular addressing the following criteria:
- the functional analysis
- the "pariti"
- the ground/object relationship
- site planning
- the formal language
- materials selection and usage
- communication

The class and staff assessors would then respond with questions, comments and criticism which would seek to involve the designer in a discussion of her/his work at a meaningful level. Allowing fifteen minutes per student the whole class could be critiqued in the nine hours available.
This model proved to be very unwieldy. It is difficult to participate in meaningful dialogue with a group of almost forty people. (1) Some of the class consequently marginalised themselves physically in the group, and, whilst sitting at the back of the class, detracted from the mainstream critique by carrying out other discussions - which could well have been related to the scheme under consideration - but which were not shared with the rest of the class even after repeated invitation to do so.

Additionally the unwieldiness related to the time frame. It is difficult to retain focused attention for nine hours of critiques over a period of four days - even to retain it absolutely in the same way from the start to the finish of a three hour session is difficult!

There was a huge temptation on the part of tutors, in the case of students with poor oral communication skills, or unprepared dialogue, or who were generally grasping for something to say about a scheme which was self evident to them, to step in early and prompt, question, cue or interpret for the sake of expediency alone! This intervention was possibly viewed by students and staff as being of value if only to "keep the thing going" or to "keep to the time schedule" but was criticised subsequently by some of the recipient students as being interventionist in a negative way.

Some students giving an interrupted presentation perceived this early intervention rather than prompting, to be critical; rather than "have you thought about this?", to be fault finding; and commented that "student x (confident with oral skills and well prepared with critical vocabulary) had 10 minutes and I only had 2 or 5 or whatever". Thus raises the ugly spectre of equity as perceived through some eyes. No matter if a topic prompted by x's dialogue or design broadened out into a discussion of value to the whole class, the fact is that student x is perceived as having a disproportionate amount of the class's and assessors' time.

The unwieldiness related also to the response to the messages the students seemed to be deriving from the critiques. By the fourth day, when there were only six students remaining to be critiqued, the participant class number had fallen substantially. It is my contention that students were still operating under a belief system which suggested to them that the validity of the process of critique - the critical analysis of designs - had an impact only where it concerned the critique of their own design work. They "waited" until their own critique; and (the class attrition would indicate) failed to attend the last session when they believed nothing of relevance to their own work might be discussed.

The last point related to this type of critique with the whole of class and staff assessor focusing on one student's work is that it puts that student absolutely on centre stage. For some this is a fearsome experience. (2) For others, particularly women, (Shannon, 1991) it is a situation described by them as confidence decreasing.

The common defences for "whole-of-class" critique, that:
1. it is public
2. the equity of the occasion is defensible
3. it "has some value in preparing students for similar situations in practice"
   (Maitland(1991)P.251)
do not justify a process which I suggest is not valuable educationally. In fact, I would take issue even with the three common defences above.

1. It is public. It is public, but the very nature of its publicness is seen as its weakness, not its strength. When "whole-of-class" critiques are defended as being "public" I take this to mean that everything that is said is out in the open for everyone to hear. This is true, but set this against the fatigue and attrition factors already discussed and it leads to some valid questions about the claim that "everyone hears everything".

2. The equity of the occasion is defensible. When this defence is used I take it to mean that what happens to one student happens to the next and thereby to the whole class - no one student can therefore respond that her/his critique was somehow lesser than anyone else's. And yet this is exactly what did happen. Students could perceive in the early intervention by staff tutors in some student's presentations (for quite valid, pragmatic reasons) that
simply giving thirty six students equal time before their peers and staff assessors does not in itself produce equity.

3. That "it has some value in preparing students for similar situations in practice". An undervalued role for critique is that of exemplar for real life experience. However, far from denying students the opportunity to gather skills, confidence and techniques to make a really professional presentation by the time they graduate BAch in three years time I would reinforce the moderate risk status which should accompany the novice with mastery of a new skill.(Chi et al (1988)) One does not learn a complex process best by standing up and doing it inadequately in front of a group of forty. One learns it best by acquiring the necessary skills and understandings, practising them and then applying them in a moderate risk situation. Moderate risk may be promoted by being:
- assessed for a low value mark or
- by minimising the "nerve-wracking experience" of "presenting and defending one's work...traditional to architectural courses"(Maitland(1991)P.251) by doing so within a supportive atmosphere - perhaps a smaller group of one's peers with whom one naturally shares.

At a class meeting, (convened by the Year Coordinator and attended by the class and three staff assessors) soon after the last of the "whole-of-class" critiques and the posting of the marks, many of these concerns were raised. The students acknowledged their unpreparedness for a "whole-of-class" critique in terms of:
- staff expectation of student preparation and input
- student expectation of the nature of the critical analysis and feedback
- their subsequent poor assessment outcomes (more than half the class achieved a mark of 55% or less for the 10% formative assessment attributed to this assessment.)

The class were keen to support a different protocol for the next critique to be held at the end of the project. In discussion as a group it was proposed by a student and well received by her peers that the small group technique be adopted for this critique.

A subsequent class meeting immediately after the final hand-in in the eighth week of the project allowed for random selection of the four groups and random allocation of a studio tutor as staff assessor to each group. One outcome of the earlier meeting was the strong interest expressed by the students in participating in the derivation of design objectives on which their work would be critiqued, and thereafter used as criteria for assessment. This task became the focus of the first of the small group meetings. The group members spent a two hour session generating a list of design objectives for consideration in the critiques.

I must now describe only what happened in Group 3 to which I was allocated as staff tutor. The afternoon of the critiques was absolutely enjoyable from my point of view as I "let the students do the work" by:
- maintaining a role as a group member (not one of interventionist)(Collier(1985)P.7)
- appointing a student "chair" for each discussion/critique to keep the process going.
(Collier(1985)P.10)

The group of eight supported a protocol similar to the "whole-of-class" critique but with twenty minutes per student and time for a break. The group interaction and dialogue between students indicated that the students found the small group critique experience to be a valuable format which contributed to their learning. A full range of student competences was represented in the group and yet there was no opportunity for the more competent students to be dismissive of the work of the less competent; the group dynamic forced a critical analysis of everyone's work by all group members. As MacKenzie is cited in Collier(1985) says:

'a student's colleagues often represent the least recognised, least used and possibly the most important of all resources available to him'. Thus we see the evolution of a discussion strategy in which the tutor promotes student/student interaction and himself adopts a more recessive role.(P.7)

It is interesting that Collier(1985) reports that not the least of the advantages of the syndicate system where assignments are carried out by syndicates working as a team is "that
one finds a greater willingness of students to attend carefully to one another." (P.9) This willingness was a feature of the afternoon.

The group reconvened the next day to consider how best to report back their group experiences to the class. After considering several options the playful proposal to present a piece of "role playing" was adopted by the group. It was decided to repeat one of the group member's critiques:
- as an exemplar of group interactivity
- to demonstrate the criteria for the critique discussion (the design objectives) in the context of a piece of work
- to gain a wider contribution from the whole of the class on their critique criteria.

As there was a two hour session for four groups to report back it was accepted that each group should assume half an hour; Group 3 volunteered to commence the process. A student, Sarah, stood to address the whole class on her work and the remainder of Group 3 expected to prompt her, question her and analyse her strategies. However, the role playing in the context of the whole class lost its momentum for three main reasons.

1. *Sarah's presentation was not the same.* She had responded positively to the critique of the day before from her group, and when representing had made such an excellent presentation incorporating the comments of her peers that she preempted many of their discussion points. She had also, in reflecting on her critique of the day before, developed more refined ways of saying the same thing. (This presents another consideration - that students may benefit greatly in their preparation for larger group or "whole-of-class" critiques by having a "crit before the crit". The normal sequence of events with the final design coalescing on the drawing board or in the model shop in an all night session before hand-in effectively prevents the meaningful, final, one-on-one drawing board critique prior to commencement of final presentation drawings or models. At this time the rigorous questioning of the studio tutor and the equally rigorous defence by the student, should approximate a group or even a "whole-of-class" critique in its ability to pinpoint the critical issues. Frequently this rigorous interaction is denied by the student's inability to assemble all the information to communicate her/his design intention prior to the final hand-in.)

2. *Group 3's response to Sarah's presentation within the context of the assemblage of the whole class was not the same.* The group dynamic had altered completely in the context of a "group within a group". In the new situation where thirty people outside Group 3 were present as well as the members of Group 3 the "trusting" nature of the small group interaction evaporated. Previously vocal group members did not participate in any critiquing in the whole class context even though the risk was minimal as they had effectively rehearsed their question and heard the response only the day before. Sarah also seemed more nervous.

3. *The studio tutors' response to the presentation was not the same as my "let the group do the work" policy with Group 3.* The other studio tutors wanted to participate in Sarah's critique immediately, disallowing Group 3 the opportunity to role play their critique of the day before as planned. This led to a certain bewilderment or "double-take" from Sarah who could not instantly relate to this "outside" intervention in her small group context. Sarah had adequately reframed her role as a student relating to the tutor in the small group interaction. (Collier(1985)P.8) She had come to rely on her peers for comment. When on this second occasion the hierarchical nature of her relationship with the tutors was reinforced by the tutors and an authority-dependency mode was being sought by the tutor she could not instantly reframe her own position.

The feedback from the students participating in the three other small group critiques supported its worthiness as a learning mode; many spoke enthusiastically of their increased sense of ease speaking within a small group.

One class member commented, such was the extended time available per student (20-30 minutes for her group), that for once, even though she hadn't received feedback from three of the four staff tutors, she felt that she really knew *exactly* what her group tutor thought of her design. A second female group member commented that it was a very thorough critique
from the group's tutor whereas she had found the presence of three tutors on the previous occasion "confusing". Nevertheless she commented that she couldn't see how this small group critique with a tutor differed from a one-on-one drawing board critique. This led me to surmise that it was possible that this small group maintained an interactive groupwork model of a different kind - with the emergence of the studio tutor as the dominant group member the critique was generally of the student's work by the tutor. The tutor responded to this student by saying, in defence of the three tutors interactively critiquing a student's work in the context of the "whole-of-class" critique, that it "was nicer to have juicer interaction" between the tutors. This comment may indicate that the tutor was more concerned with the needs of teaching - representing a pluralist architectural culture - than with the needs of the learners - who wanted to receive detailed feedback on their designs.

Another student reported that they had adopted a presentation protocol in their group in which each presenter took the group members on a walk through their building describing factors influencing its design and the weighting that the views and opinions of the client would have. He volunteered that although he finds one-on-one drawing board critiques to be a confidence increasing situation personally, he felt that he had a "contract" with his group to share what he was doing -and to show how his design could be traced back to the "parti". He also believed that in situations where his peers are able to give a fluent oral presentation in the critique situation they are able to "fill in the holes in their graphic work". This is a valid consideration, particularly for first year students on their first design project in the professional degree where there is a demonstrated lack of ability and confidence with a range of graphic skills across the class. A student from the third group recalled that she thought it was "amazing when you see the good designs - you can see how having a strong "parti" and theory informs your design - it makes it easier, not harder." She went on to say that she felt the programme for the small group critiques was enabling to this process, and that as a class from their first pinup to the small group critique "they had learnt a lot about how to talk about their designs." A mature age student reported back that the process aided self reflective analysis.

In retrospect I regret that neither self assessment nor peer assessment was trialled at the conclusion of the small group critiques to further reaffirm the sense of realistic self judgement and appraisal of peer's work. This could be claimed as one of the outcomes of small group critiques, along with the increase in student opportunity to engage in discourse related to the design problem and ways of designing as a means of developing critical vocabulary, which is a key communication skill in an architectural education and in architectural practice.

The criteria for the critiques (from the staff point of view) were the same in the "whole-of-class" and in the "small group" critique i.e. to facilitate a teaching/learning situation in which the student could show what she/he knew about their design and about the thinking which had led to its production. Whilst it can be argued that no amount of situational improvement of increasing comfort or decreasing anxiety will have any effect on the amount of knowledge the reverse is not true as a situational increase in anxiety or decrease in comfort may well inhibit the demonstration of the knowledge.

Furthermore as one of the valued roles for critique, particularly at the earlier stages of design development, is that of performing in the role of formative assessment - reflecting back to the student a critical analysis of their own design development to enable them to become more effective in their learning - this crucial role seems most at risk when critique takes place in an atmosphere which increases student anxiety.

The benefit of small group critiques is clearly highlighted in the students’ response to the two varying situations. As Boud (1990) says "it is not what teachers believe assessment to be testing which governs student behaviour, but their own perceptions." (P.107) When assessment is seen as serving the needs of learning, as it can be in small group critiques, it is perceived in an altogether different way than when it is seen to be serving the needs of the teaching as observed in the "whole of class critique."
Footnotes


2. Faludi, Susan (1992) *Backlash: the Undeclared War Against Women* London: Chatto and Windus, in *The Weekend Australian May 9-10, 1992* Faludi was quoted as saying that "While both sexes fear public speaking (pollsters tell us it is the public's greatest fear, rivalling even death), women - particularly women challenging the status quo - seem to be more afraid, and with good reason. We do have more at stake. Men risk a loss of face; women a loss of femininity. Men are chagrined if they blunder at the podium, women face humiliation either way. If we come across as commanding our womanhood is called into question. If we reveal emotion we are too hormonally driven to be taken seriously."
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