RADAR

Oxford Brookes University – Research Archive and Digital Asset Repository (RADAR)

Webster, H

Power, freedom and resistance: excavating the design jury.

Webster, H (2006) Power, freedom and resistance: excavating the design jury. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 25 (3). pp. 286-296.
Doi: 10.1111/j.1476-8070.2006.00495.x

This version is available: http://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/items/78a0bad5-170d-aa1f-a0b4-26705261fc59/1/
Available in the RADAR: January 2010
Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's final version of the journal article without illustrations. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

www.brookes.ac.uk/go/radar

OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY

Directorate of **Learning Resources**

Power, Freedom and Resistance – Excavating the Design Jury

Abstract

There can be little argument that the design jury features as a key symbolic event in the education of the architect. However, whilst the centrality of the design jury as a site for learning disciplinary skills, beliefs and values is now widely acknowledged, there continues to be considerable disagreement about what is learnt and how. While critical pedagogues argue that the design jury is a critic-centred event that coerces students into conforming to hegemonic notions of *habitus* [1], those who promote reflective practice see it as a student-centred event in which a critical dialogue with experts supports students' construction and re-construction of their own *habitus*. This paper, inspired by Michel Foucault's writings on the analytics of power, reports on the findings of a year-long ethnographic study carried out in one British school of architecture that sought to excavate 'what was really goes on' in the design jury.

Disciplinary Power versus Individual Freedom

The proposition that the design jury is one of the most important ritual events in the life of any architectural school is irrefutable. Ask any student or architect to recall the most memorable moment in their education and they are likely recall the preparation for, the experience of, or recovery from a design jury. Yet, despite its centrality, architectural educators and students appear to have a largely 'tacit', or 'folklore', understanding of its pedagogic purpose and processes that often seems riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions. For instance, it is not unusual for students to describe the purpose of design juries as an occasion for both individual learning and the collective celebration of student achievements while at the same time recalling their own experiences of design juries as

profoundly de-motivating and competitive. If one turns to theoretical readings of the design jury a similar dichotomous picture appears. On the one hand there are a set of readings, based on psychological and anthropological research paradigms, that depict the design jury as a student-centred event that supports and promotes reflective learning and thereby the construction of individual identity [2]. On the other hand there are a contrary set of readings, based on sociological research paradigms, cultural theory and critical pedagogy, that depict the design jury as site for the coercive imposition by critics onto students of hegemonic of knowledge, skills and values [3]. Whilst the first set of readings might be characterised as giving primacy to the subject over agency, that is, the student subject is totally free to critically construct his or her own understanding and identity during the pedagogic encounter, the second set of readings give primacy to the agent over the subject, that is, the student subject is totally dominated by those (in this case the critics) who seek to total control them. Anyone who has experienced design juries would tend to instinctively reject both readings as parodies of a more complex reality. Thus one is left wondering how to understand ‘what really goes on’ in the design jury. For help we might turn to the writings of Michel Foucault.

Foucault and Disciplinary Power

During the 1970s and 1980s, when critical pedagogy and reflective learning where in their ascendancy, Michel Foucault was developing the fertile space between the dichotomous intellectual paradigms of power versus agency. Foucault, largely through historical studies charting the rise of the professions in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, produced a powerful explication, what he termed ‘archaeology’, of the illusory nature of disciplinary ‘discourse’, truth’ and ‘knowledge’ [4]. Foucault went on to complement this structuralist analysis of disciplinary discourse with the notion of ‘genealogy’. Whilst Foucault’s

‘archaeology’ focused its attention on identifying the character of disciplinary discourse located at a ‘fixed’ historical moments his ‘genealogy’ attempted to uncover the ways in which both disciplinary discourse and practices had been constituted, limited and kept in circulation through history. Foucault stated that his aim was ‘to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects [5].’ In *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Modern Prison* Foucault charts a ‘genealogy’ of penal reform in France. Through this paradigmatic example Foucault makes two important points for this study. Firstly, he identifies practices, which he termed ‘micro-technologies of power’; ‘surveillance’, ‘normalisation’, ‘examination’, that were, he claimed, widely used by all the new nineteenth-century secular institutions, including schools, asylums, prisons and universities, to control entry or train individuals towards dominant disciplinary paradigm or *habitus*, thus keeping disciplinary knowledge in circulation. Secondly he describes how these ‘micro-technologies of power’[6] worked on subjects, i.e. students, prisoners, monks etc, through discursive and non-discursive practices (*Dispotif* [7]), which included the organisation of architectural space, so that subjects literally came to ‘embody’ the dominant disciplinary paradigm. A first reading of *Discipline and Punish* leaves the reader with the sense that institutions were entirely successful in manipulating, controlling and transforming individuals into narrowly-defined, docile and productive subjects (i.e. the total dominance of agency over subject) through the use of ‘micro-technologies of power’. However, closer reading reveals that Foucault repeatedly, if a little lamely, refutes such over-deterministic readings. Indeed, he continually insists that ‘there are no relations of power without resistance’ and by extension, that ‘where there is resistance there is freedom’. Thus, he surmises, the exercise of power often has unintended effects. Yet, as Bartky points out, ‘(in *Discipline and Punish*) Foucault deprives us of a vocabulary to conceptualise the nature and meaning of those periodic refusals of control that, just as much as the imposition of control,

mark the course of human history'[8]. It was not until Foucault's subsequent essays on power and knowledge and the history of sexuality that he elaborated more fully on his notions of power, freedom and resistance. For instance, in his seminal essay *The Subject and Power* Foucault wrote that 'subjects are free in so far as there is a field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions and diverse comportments may be realised'[9], thus suggesting that the freedom of subjects is always bounded by the context in which they are operating. Subsequently, in his work on sexuality and the ethics of self [10], Foucault shifted his attention from agency to subject and, again through historical examples, focused on the ways that individuals transform their circumstances, or their relationship to them, by asserting their own influence (deploying their own power). However, Foucault's writings, whilst challenging the conventional theoretical paradigms that polarised subject and agency, deliberately stopped short of a coherent, or even a consistent, theoretical position. Rather, the legacy left to us by Michel Foucault, he died of Aids in 1984, amounts to a set of 'tools' that can be used to uncover the analytics of power, that is, 'what is going on' when people interact in a particular spatial and temporal location. Thus Foucault's writings on power and the making of the modern subject and his insistence on a problem-based historiography (that all problems are unique and therefore new problems throw up new accounts) provided inspiration and direction for this study.

Researching the Design Jury

Although Foucault did not focus on education in any detail in his writings he repeatedly mentioned educational institutions as sites *par excellence* for the creation of the modern subject. As some of the new nineteenth-century institutions of power, Foucault inferred that schools, colleges and universities employed the generic 'micro-technologies of power' ('surveillance', 'normalisation' and 'examination') to transform subjects from one state to

another. By extension it seems entirely plausible to conceive of architectural education as a set of contingencies: regulations, spatial organisations, pedagogic encounters, etc, that work on students over a period of time to socialise and acculturate them into ‘architects’. However, as numerous commentators from Rayner Banham [12] to Jeremy Till [13] have pointed out, architectural education is a bit like a ‘black box’ in so far as students enter as lay persons and exit as architects, but what happens within the black box is little understood. Unravelling all the mysteries of the black box was beyond the scope of this study. However, the design jury, a key pedagogic event in architectural education, seemed to offer an anthropological window into the black box that might reveal at least some of its secrets.

Any research project that hopes to provide a detailed and nuanced picture of real events has to focus on a small sample. In this case the researcher looked at design juries in one British school of architecture. The school, housing about five hundred students, offered both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes within which design formed the integrating curriculum ‘core’. The school also operated a lively design atelier system that resulted in students being exposed to a highly diverse range of architectural paradigms. The design jury was used throughout the school for formative feedback at the end of every design project and often involved external critics, whereas summative assessment was carried out through portfolio examination at the end of each academic year. Thus, the design jury figured as a key pedagogic event in the school and students experienced the event repeatedly throughout their five years of full-time architectural education (a three year undergraduate degree and a further two years in graduate education).

The cross-sectional case study was carried out over a period of one year and utilised ethnographic-type research tools to access authentic student and critic experiences. The researcher observed (as a non-participant) three juries from the first, third and sixth years

(involving a total of sixty students) and carried out pre- and post-jury semi-structured interviews with three students from each jury (a total of twenty seven students). The researcher also interviewed a number of critics involved in the juries that were observed. Other contextual data was obtained from documents such as the student programme handbooks, design briefs and written feedback sheets. The aim was to collect data that allowed comparison between the reified, observed, and lived accounts of each jury that would, through detailed analysis using Grounded Theory [13], allow a new, more nuanced, reading of the design jury.

The Design Jury Ritual

Interviews with students and critics produced a picture of the design jury as a stable and highly-valued ritual in the life of the school and its purpose and practices were commonly understood. Verbal descriptions aligned closely with the reified accounts in student programme handbooks and the school's Jury Guide, in suggesting that the jury was a formalised event, consisting of distinctive discursive and non-discursive practices, for collective celebration of the end of a design project and to provide students with individual feedback from expert critics on their design projects, although institutional memory vaguely recalled that the present jury system had evolved from a system of design assessment by proxy introduced in the nineteenth-century École des Beaux Arts in which a panel of 'experts' who would make a collective judgement about the quality of students' work based on the studio master's verbal presentation of his students work. Yet, while the design jury was certainly 'understood' as an individual and collective learning event by the school community, the research findings suggested a considerable degree of mis-recognition. The data emerging from observations and interviews suggested that, rather than a simple pedagogic event that allowed students to reflect on the quality of their designs with expert

others (resulting in deep transformative learning), the design jury's ritualistic practices had the effect of objectifying a power differential between critic and student, and that this asymmetry of power profoundly distorted the pedagogic outcomes. Just how this power differential was constructed and its effect on the student learning experience will be explored in detail below.

The Staging of Power/Authority

Observations of both student preparations for juries and the jury events themselves revealed that many of the practices that constituted the jury system served as powerful socialising tools in and of themselves. For instance, the long hours of preparations before the jury had the effect of socialising the students into the long hours culture and 'total' vocational commitment. In addition, and more clandestinely, the jury practices were found to construct a symbolic differentiation between those who embodied disciplinary 'truth': the critics, and those who aspired to embody the 'truth': the students. This asymmetrical construction of power was seen to be effected in the following ways:

Periodicity: There was little doubt that 'folklore' recollections of juries of old, including a story of Mies van der Rohe ripping students' drawings off the walls, together with students' personal experiences of critics, had the effect of building up and legitimising the symbolic power and authority of 'the critic'.

Constituency: The specially constituted group of external critics, usually drawn from internal and external academics and practising architects, were perceived by both tutors and staff as representing the values of the external architectural world and, as such, their role was to legitimise the work of both the individual student and the ateliers' work in general.

Spatiality: The spatial configuration of the jury event reinforced the symbolic power of the critics. Although most of the juries observed were held in design studios, as opposed to special jury rooms, in all cases a distinctive formal spatiality was created through the arrangement of chairs. Chairs would be placed in a fanning arch in front of the work of each student to be reviewed with the front row of chairs being "understood" as designated for the critics and the rows behind for the student's peers. This directionality and hierarchical assignment of chairs, which one student said 'puts you on public display – it's a scary thing because you are so open', clearly signalled the symbolic power of the critics.

Choreography: The choreographic pattern of all the juries observed involved a sequence of individual student presentation followed by critic response. This sequence of defence followed by interrogation ascribed the power of 'judgement' to the critics. Although the student being reviewed and the student audience were often encouraged by the critics to join in the post-presentation discussions they rarely did so. In the final part of the jury event, that occurred after all the students had had their work reviewed, critics provided a 'summing up' providing the design tutors and students of the atelier with a view of the strengths and weaknesses of their collective work. Thus the critics were given the power to 'judge' the currency of the atelier's work within the contemporary discourse of architecture.

Language: Architectural discourse works through special drawn and oral codes. These codes are more than technical terms or methods of representation; they are akin to a private language. So, to communicate effectively in a jury situation participants had to be conversant with the atelier's distinctive discourse. Thus the symbolic power of the critics was signalled by their ability to 'talk the talk', that is, to define the words that can be used to describe and define architecture.

Thus far the research findings suggested that the non-discursive tendencies of the design juries studied (periodicy, constituency, spatiality, choreography, language) served to objectify both the symbolic power of the critics and the powerlessness of the students: a kind of ‘staging’ of power. By extension, it would seem plausible to suggest, as previous critical readings of the design jury have done, that such a ‘staging’ allows critics to exercise the power bestowed on them to judge student performance against, and steer students’ development towards, the critics’ personal pardigms of disciplinary *habitus*. However, such a homogeneous model fails to acknowledge that subjects, both critics and students, bring their own histories to the pedagogic encounter and this results in a set of unique actions and reactions. Indeed, if the temptation to sift the research data for examples of coercion and sublimation is resisted, a more nuanced picture of the dynamics of power might emerge. In the case of the juries studied this new picture revealed that critics exercised their symbolic power variously and equally, that students responded to the exercise of power variously.

The Performance of Power/Authority

Although the above statement goes some way to question Critical Pedagogies characterisation of the critic as ‘hegemonic overlord,’ [14] it does not mean that this model of action did not exist. Indeed, the researcher often found a startling schism between the official, or declared, intentions of the critics and their actions. Whilst the critics, without exception, insisted that their role was to support student learning through a reflective dialogue, thus helping students to develop their own notion of architecture within the accepted bounds of the discipline rather than to judge or direct students, the evidence provided by the observations suggested the reverse was generally true. Yet, critics were not entirely consistent either in the way they exercised their symbolic power or in the scope of

their concern. For instance, almost without exception, critics were observed suppressing their symbolic power when reviewing the work of the best students, those who already possessed an architectural *habitus* or 'feeling for the game' that included particular constructions of knowledge, skills, deportment, linguistic and graphic acuity, language, demeanour, deference and taste. These students were treated by the critics as colleagues or co-researchers and they spent considerable time and energy working with the students' ideas with a view to developing a closer alignment between the design 'idea' and its 'representation'. In stark contrast many critics were seen to exercise their symbolic power with full force when reviewing the work of the least able students. In these cases critics interrupted student presentations, used harsh, dismissive language such as 'wrong', 'bad' 'rubbish', 'incompetent', and were highly directive both verbally and somatically. In one case a critic was observed 'correcting' the drawings of a third-year student with a red pen. Clearly, in these cases the actions of the critics were primarily judgemental and were unlikely to empower, motivate or help the reflective learning process of the students concerned. In only a few instances, out of the sixty individual reviews observed, critics were seen to support weak students through diagnostic questioning, the suggestion of tangible remedies and encouragement. These caring critics tended to be academics who had spent time studying how students learn and who were committed to supporting all students in their learning. This was contrasted to other academics and invited practitioner critics who were happy to declare that their primarily interest was in taking part in conversations about design and the nature of architecture. For these critics their unofficial view was that 'weak students were students who should not be studying architecture at all'.

Thus, while the oft-mentioned characterisation of the critic as a power wielding ego-centric, eager for personal display and personal gratification, and intent on the coercion of student

towards their personal notion of professional *habitus,* was not consistently true, it was worrying that most critics did conform to this model at least some of the time (particularly in relation to reviewing the work of the weaker students). It was also worrying that the model of 'hegemonic overlord' was more prevalent than that of the caring pedagogue.

The Experience and Negotiation of Power

Thus far, it has been suggested that the design juries observed produced and objectified a power differential between the student and the critic merely through their participation in a set of formalised procedures. It has also been suggested that critics exercised the symbolic power, or authority, bestowed on them in a number of different ways, from coercively through to nurturing, depending on their ability or motivation to support student learning at the various levels of student ability. But how did the students respond to the jury ritual and the actions of the critics? There was little doubt from observing and talking to students in different year groups that, despite the powerful prevailing rhetoric in the school that extolled the virtues of the design jury as event for reflection and transformative learning, the asymmetry of power constructed by the design jury ritual resulted in the student perception of the design jury as primarily 'judgemental.' Furthermore, it was this understanding that informed the strategies they adopted when preparing and presenting their work. Thus, through repeated design jury experiences, students seemed to develop strategies that they believed would guarantee them the best outcome possible, which sometimes meant, as one student exclaimed, merely 'not getting killed'. In effect, students were found to develop a type of 'ritual mastery' which involved firstly developing an understanding of the ritual norms and practices, through a mixture of instruction and observation, and then acting accordingly. These practices included the pre-ritual norms of long days and nights preparing special drawings and models, presenting designs to the critics in the accepted manner, and

even unwinding with the critics in the pub after the jury. Obviously the students studied displayed varying degrees of compliance, for instance some students certainly worked harder than others. However, there was little doubt that through repetition students began to embody many of the accepted norms of an architectural *habitus* including hard work, disciplinary commitment, competition and communal solidarity.

If the research findings suggested that students accepted the non-discursive practices of the jury process and by extension, the norms they inculcated as legitimate, then it might be reasonable to assume that they would also accept the legitimacy of the critics' comments whatever their form or content. Further, it might be expected, as Critical Pedagogy suggests, that the objectification of the authority of the critic together with the exercise of that authority, often in directive ways, would prove highly effective as a means to inculcate students with the values and discourse of the dominant architectural *habitus* (as represented by the critics). Indeed, students were observed time and time again delivering their oral presentations and then passively accepting, although sometimes with pained or quizzical expressions, the barrage of critics' comments that followed. Yet, the student interviews often revealed that their 'front stage' [15] acceptance of critics' comments rarely aligned with their 'backstage' response. Students repeatedly said that the judgemental formality of the jury ritual encouraged them to present their work as confidently as possible and to 'be seen' to understand the critics' discourse and comments. Such strategies clearly negated the possibilities of deep, transformative learning because they suppressed honest reflection, self-doubt and any admission of not knowing or not understanding. On many occasions students were observed agreeing with critics and revealing afterwards that they did not understand the comments because of the complexity of the critics' discourse. Only the most acculturated students, those with a fully formed architectural *habitus*, were seen to enter into a

constructive reflective dialogue with critics, either in defence of their work or to ask for clarification or help. For these students the jury appeared to be a constructive learning experience. Yet, even the most able students admitted that they took a strategic approach to jury presentations with the aim of 'doing well' as opposed to honestly reflecting on their learning. Indeed, the notion of 'gaining the best possible outcome' seemed to underpin every student 'game plan', whatever their ability. However, it is critical that what seems at first like compliance should not be mistaken for consent. The following examples describe the ways in which students were able to accept, negotiate, or even resist consenting to the values and norms modelled by the critics.

Passive Compliance: Low-level learners, those not able to operate on the discursive level of the critics, and who generally received the harshest criticism, explained that they operated a strategic form 'passive resistance' within the jury situation. Although they rarely understood what was being said about their work, they would adopt a demeanour that suggested acceptance and/or agreement with the critics with a view to avoid 'being shown up' or 'just to get it over with'. This group of students explained that they survived by following their tutors' instructions from week to week whilst admitting that they did not really 'understand'. In some ways these students were making the strategic decision that the best way to negotiate their way through the programme was through surface learning (imitation and following instruction) rather than through deep learning (internalising their experiences towards a restructuring of their architectural *habitus*). They calculated that adopting strategies of passivity suggestive of compliance might just get them through juries in the short term and the programme in the longer term. This attitude might seem cynical but in the absence of truly student-centred learning low-level learners often have few options.

Active Compliance: Those students for whom juries were observed to be constructive and dialogical experiences tended to be high-level learners (i.e. those who knew how to learn). Post-jury interviews revealed that these students understood that their engagement with the atelier and jury system was a kind of pedagogic 'game'. They explained that to do well meant embracing the disciplinary *habitus* of the atelier tutors, even if one didn't wholly agree or believe in it, although sometimes this strategy didn't work if an invited critic was antagonistic towards the ateliers stance. This form of compliance might seem a little calculated or cynical but one final year student explained that 'there was always something valuable to be learnt by following your atelier tutor'. This group also took a longer term perspective on their learning. They believed that the experience of several different atelier tutors, and several different *habitus*', would allow them to construct their own *habitus* as a kind of collage of the 'best bits'.

Active Resistance: Students were occasionally observed arguing with critics, but very rarely. Argument tended to be adopted by students who either had very little understanding that the critics had the authority to define the architecture and architectural *habitus* or just enjoyed questioning that authority. In one instance a third-year student attempted to justify her design on the basis of Feng Shui and was told by a critic that Feng Shui was 'mystical mumbo jumbo' and was 'not relevant to western architecture'. Despite the student's attempts to justify her position the critics used their authority to dismiss the student's arguments. Clearly, in another atelier or another school of architecture the student's ideas might have been praised. In this case the student was unaware that Feng Shui did not fall within the critics' construction of acceptable generators for architecture.

The above examples are paradigmatic and are not intended to deny the uniqueness of every interaction, that is, that every critic and student brings their individual personal history to each pedagogic encounter. Yet, this fact does not deny the reality that all pedagogic encounters are located in social settings and therefore the rules of encounter as well as the possible outcomes are bounded by this setting. In this case study the students and critics were free to act within the boundaries of the discursive field of architecture. Thus, although the findings suggested that students had considerable freedom to accept, negotiate or resist the critics' directions after the juries the way they chose to reconstruct their individual identities was, in reality, conceptually and materially constrained by the *habitus* (the curriculum, rules, regulations, rituals, spatial configurations, constituencies, values and beliefs) of the school of architecture. Further, the fact that students want to become architects provides an overarching incentive for students to choose to acquire, or in some cases learn to imitate, the notions of architectural *habitus* that are promoted by their teachers, critics and school.

Conclusions

The reader might or might not recognise something of their own experiences of juries in the descriptions above. Certainly, both the form of the design jury ritual and many of the student experiences quoted parallel those described in other contemporary reports [16], suggesting that the findings are not unusual or unique. Yet, beyond confirming that the findings of this study are to some extent 'common', what has this study added to our existing understanding of the design jury? Firstly, the study presented the design jury as a ritual whose formal characteristics, periodicy, constituency, spatiality, choreography, and language, worked together to make the jury a special collective occasion for celebrating the end of a design project. However, the study also found that these same characteristics had the additional effect of ascribing critics with a considerable amount of symbolic power, power that the

critics could decide, either consciously or unconsciously, how to exercise during the jury performance. In reality the majority of critics were seen to use their symbolic power to impose their notions of architectural *habitus* on students, although there were certainly instances where critics took a more student-centred approach. Additionally, it was found that the asymmetrical construction of power created by the jury ritual encouraged students to adopt surface strategies that were likely to result in 'a good judgement' rather than leading to deep, transformative learning. By demonstrating the centrality of power these findings challenge the existing readings of the jury as an exemplary site of reflective learning.

Secondly, the study looked in detail at the performative stage of the design jury, where subject (student) and agency (the discipline of architecture- as represented by the critics) actually interact. The results suggested that, even in the most coercive situations, the outcomes of this interaction could not be totally controlled by the critics. Indeed, students certainly thought that they had considerable freedom outside the jury event to decide whether to conform, negotiate or resist the critics' comments. Yet, the students' perception of their freedom to construct their own notions of architecture and what it was to be an architect was limited. In reality students' options were bounded in the short term by the norms and values of their immediate environment: the school of architecture and in the long term by the norms and values of the field of architecture. In this respect Foucault's notion of the freedom of the subject to determine their own identity, which appeared in his later works such as *The Care of the Self* [17], has to be tempered by the reality that subjects construct and re-construct their identities within social settings and these settings are inevitably both conceptually and materially constraining.

Thus the findings suggest that the jury system should be understood as a rich and complex ritual that is neither essentially 'bad' - constraining the subjectivities of the students by placing limits on oppositional discourse, reflective dialogue and critique- nor essentially 'good'- enabling students to individually and collectively critically reflect on the way reality is perceived and understood. Rather, the jury system is a ritual that can be used to elicit conformity or to promote freedom. However, the fact that the findings of this study suggested that the former is much more common than the latter should worry those involved in architectural education.

So, what is to be done? Should the jury system be abandoned? The jury system should be capable of providing a student-centred learning experience as well as displaying a sense of community solidarity. However, to achieve this requires a more explicit understanding of how the formal and performative aspects of the design jury work. Clearly there were certain formal tendencies of the jury system in the school studied, such as the spatial arrangements, choreography and constituency, that objectified the symbolic power of critics and resulted in students adopting strategic tactics that ensured survival but did not necessarily result in learning. Several commentators, including Anthony [17], Cuff [18] and Doidge [19], have made sensible suggestions for reducing the homogeneous power of the architectural critics, such as inviting more stakeholders, involving students more directly in reviewing each others' work, and re-presenting the jury as an exhibition. These suggestions should be carefully considered. But it is perhaps reforms in the way critics exercise their symbolic power that are more pressing and present more of a challenge. For architectural critics to begin to support students in learning to construct their own architectural identities requires them to understand more about the learning process *per se* i.e. it is not about 'filling the empty vessels' with pre-determined architectural paradigms. However, such an

understanding inevitably questions the continued existence of the atelier system in which students are encouraged to mimic their charismatic leaders. Perhaps now is the time! If critics begin to see themselves as co-learners engaged in a collective project to continually question and reconstruct the architectural *habitus* rather than as prophets whose role is to convert students into disciples then the jury system might begin to perform a more radical and constructive role in architectural education.

References

1. Bourdieu, P. and J. P. Passeron (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Sage.

2. Schön, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*, Jossey-Bass.

3. Crysler, G. C. (1995) "Critical Pedagogy and Architectural Education," *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol 48, No. 4, pp. 208-217; Stevens, G. (2002) *The Favoured Circle*. MIT Press; Willenbrook, L. (1991) "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education," in Dutton, T. A. [Ed], *Voices in Architectural Education*. Bergin and Garvey. pp. 97-119.

4. Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. A. Sheridan), Penguin; Foucault, M. (1975) *The Birth of the Clinic*. Vintage.

5. Foucault, M. (1982) "Afterword: The Subject and Power," in Dreyfus, H. P and P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. The University of Chicago Press, p. 208.

6. Foucault. M.(1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. A. Sheridan). Penguin, pp. 170-195.

7. Dreyfus, H. L. and P. Rabinow (1982) *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* The University of Chicago Press, p. 121.

8. Sandra Bartky quoted in Mills, S. (2003) *Michel Foucault*. Routledge, p. 45.

9. Foucault, M. (1982) “Afterword: The Subject and Power,” in Dreyfus, H. L. and P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. The University of Chicago Press, pp. 221.

10. Foucault, M. (1884) *The History of Sexuality: Volumes I-3.* (trans. R. Hurley) Penguin.

11. Banham, R. (1996) *Reyner Baham, A Critic Writes*. University of California Press. pp. 292-299.

12. Till, J. (2005) “Lost Judgement”, *European Association for Architectural Education Transactions of Architectural Education* 26: pp. 164-181.

13. Glaser, B. G. and A. L. Strauss (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies or Qualitative Research.* Aldine.

14. McLaren, P. (1986) *Schooling as Ritual Performance*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

15. Goffman,E. (1971) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Penguin.

16. AIAS Studio Culture Task Force (2002) *Redesign of Studio Culture: AIAS Studio Culture Task Force Report*. American Institute of Architecture Students and Anthony, K. (1991) *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio*. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

17. Foucault, M. (1986) *The History of Sexuality: Volume III: The Care of the Self.* Allen Lane/Penguin.

18. Doidge, C., Sara, R. and R. Parnell (2000) *Crit- An Architectural Student’s Handbook.* Architectural Press. pp. 90-114.

19. Anthony, K. (1991) *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio*. Van Nostrand Reinhold. pp. 167

20. Cuff, D. (1998) *Architecture: The Story of Practice*. MIT Press. p. 252.

Bibliography

AIAS Studio Culture Task Force (2002) *Redesign of Studio Culture: AIAS Studio Culture Task Force Report*. Washington D.C.: American Institute of Architecture Students.

Anthony, K. (1991) Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Anthony, K. (2004) "Sex, Stars and Studios: A look at Gendered Education Practices in Architecture," *Journal of Architectural Education*, September: pp.11-29.

Banham, R. (1996) "A Black Box: The Secret Profession of Architecture," in *Reyner Baham, A Critic Writes. Berkeley*: University of California Press. pp. 292-299.

Becker, H. (1987) *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bell, C. (1992) *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, C. (1997) *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and J. P. Passeron (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (trans. R. Nice) (1977) *An Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crysler, G. (1995) "Critical Pedagogy and Architectural Education," *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol 48, No. 4, pp. 208-217.

Cuff, D. (1998) *Architecture: The Story of Practice*. Camb, Mass: MIT Press.

Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

Doidge, C., Sara, R. and R. Parnell (2000) *Crit- An Architectural Student's Handbook*. London: Architectural Press.

Dutton, T. A., [Ed] (1991) *Voices in Architectural Education*. New York; London: Bergin and Garvey.

Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (trans. A. Sheridan). Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1884) *The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction* (trans. R. Hurley). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1986) *The History of Sexuality: Volume III: The Care of the Self.* London: Allen Lane/Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1997) 'Space, Knowledge and Power' in N. Leach, *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. London: Routledge. pp. 367-380.

Giroux, H. (1991) 'Cultural politics of Architectural Education' in T. A. Dutton, [Ed], *Voices in Architectural Education.* New York; London: Bergin and Garvey, pp. x-xii.

Goffman, E. (1991) *Asylums*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Goffman, E. (1971) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goody, J. (1977) 'Against 'Ritual': Loosely Structured Thoughts on a Loosely Defined Topic' in S. Moore and B. Myerhoff eds., *Secular Ritual*. Amsterdam: Van Gorum.

Joyce, P. (2003) *The Rule of Freedom: Liberation and the Modern City*. London: Verso.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti (1993) *Behind the Postmodern Façade: Architectural Change in Late –twentieth Century America*. Berkely: University of California Press.

McLaren, P. (1986) *Schooling as Ritual Performance*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McWhorter, L. (2004) 'Rites of Passing' in K. Schilbrack [Ed], *Thinking Through Rituals: philosophical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Mills, S. (2003) *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.

Rhodes, L. A. (2004) *Total Confinement: Madness and Reason in the Maximum Security Prison*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schön, D. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. (1985) *The Design Studio - An Exploration of its Traditions and Potential*. London: Royal Institute of British Architects.

Schön, D. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stevens, G. (1995) "Struggle in Studio: A Bourdivian look at Architectural Pedagogy," *Journal of Architectural Education,* Vol 49, No. 2, pp. 105-123.

Stevens, G. (2002) *The Favoured Circle*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Till, J. (2005) "Lost Judgement", *European Association for Architectural Education Transactions of Architectural Education* 26: pp. 164-181.

Upton, D. (2002) "Architecture in Everyday Life," *New Literary History* 33, pp. 707-723.

Van Gennep, A. (1960) *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Vowles, H. (2000) "The Crit as ritualised legitimisation procedure in architectural education," in D. Nicol and S. Pilling [Eds], *Changing Architectural Education.* London: E. and F. N. Spon. pp. 259-264.

Webster, H. (2005) "The Architectural Review: ritual, acculturation and reproduction in architectural education," *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*. Vol 4 No 3. pp. 265-282.

Willenbrook, L. (1991) "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education," in T. A. Dutton [ed], *Voices in Architectural Education*. New York: London: Bergin and Garvey. pp. 97-119.

List of Figures