RADAR

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

www.brookes.ac.uk/go/radar

OXFORD
BROOKES
UNIVERSITY

Directorate of **Learning Resources**

Title: A Foucauldian look at the Design Jury

A Foucauldian look at 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 critiques based on Critical Pedagogy argue that the design jury is a critic-centred event that coerces students into conforming to hegemonic notions of professional identity, the commonly held conception is that the jury is a student-centred event in which a dialogue with experts supports students' passage from novice to expert. This paper, inspired by Michel Foucault's genealogical studies of relationship between knowledge, power and the formation of the modern subject, reports on the findings of a year-long ethnographic study carried out in a British school of architecture that sought to explicate the workings of the design jury as specific form of pedagogic practice. The study uncovered a set a complex set of spatial, temporal and dialogical contingencies that combined in unexpected ways to heighten the judgemental aspects of the jury and as a consequence resulted in certain unexpected and undesirable learning outcomes. Given that the form of the jury described is very common the research findings suggest that there may be a widespread schism between current espoused theory and theory in practice that needs to be addressed by architectural design tutors.

Keywords: Design Jury, Michael Foucault, Power, Pedagogy, Freedom, Resistance, Student, Critic.

DICHOTOMOUS READINGS OF THE DESIGN JURY

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 seem 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 achievement while at the same time recalling their experiences of design juries as profoundly de-motivating and competitive.[i] 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 (Schön, 1987). 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 of hegemonic of knowledge, skills and values by critics onto students (Anthony, 2004;Crysler, 1995; Stevens, 1995; Willenbrook, 1991). 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 their 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 who seek to total control them, in this case the critics. 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 THE DISCIPLINARY POWER

Foucault's work was largely concerned with the relation between social structures and institutions and the individual. Throughout his career , in works such as *The History of Sexuality* (1978), *The Birth of the Clinic* (1980) and *Discipline and Punish* (1977) Foucault focused on the historical analysis of the effects of various institutions on groups of people and the role that those people play in affirming or resisting

those effects. Central to his concern with institutions is his analysis of power. In his work *Discipline and Punish* (1977) he uses the development punishment in the eighteenth century, from public torture to incarceration, surveillance and discipline, to illustrate a paradigmatic shift in the way that power was exercised in pre-modern and modern society. Correlating with this shift in punishment, for Foucault, there was a corresponding shift in the way power circulated in society. From a pre-modern system where the king and queen were seen as the embodiment of the nation and power is dispensed from above, to a modern system where power is exercised within a social body. Foucault argued that it was the growth in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of new localised institutions of power, such as prisons, schools, factories, professions, which made the monarchy redundant. Foucault's early structuralist inspired 'archaeological' writings, such as *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (??) were concerned with identifying the ways in which the new disciplines created particular discourses that reified particular but illusory notions of 'truth' and 'knowledge' at fixed historical moments. Discourse defines what is right and what is wrong, what is normal and what is deviant. Thus within a particular belief system the discourse defines a particular way of seeing the world, and the particular way of life associated with such "truths" becomes normalized. Yet Foucault's archaeologies made no attempt to account for change. It in his later post-structuralist writings, or 'genealogies', that he attempted to uncover the ways in which disciplinary practices were developed to constitute, limited and keep particular discourses in circulation through history. Foucault later wrote that the aim of his genealogies was 'to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects.' (Foucault, 1982:208). Discipline and Punish is perhaps Foucault's best known genealogy. Through his studies of modern institutions, including the prison, the hospital, the clinic and the school, Foucault identifies a number of common practices, which he termed 'micro-technologies of power' ('surveillance', 'normalisation', 'examination'), that were, he claimed, used to control entry and train individuals towards dominant disciplinary paradigms, thus keeping disciplinary knowledge in circulation. Foucault also describes how these 'micro-technologies of power' worked, through discursive and non-discursive practices (e.g. institutions, architectural

arrangements, regulations, laws, administrative measures, morality), what Foucault termed '*Dispotif*' (Dreyfus & Rabinow:121), to transform subjects. Although *Discipline and Punish* focuses on these mechanisms of power as both a constraining and constituting force Foucault did not intend this to mean that the subject was as a mere effect or outcome of the exercise of power. For Foucault the exercise of power would be force if there was no possibility of ???? and as a consequence resistance must be a condition of possibility of power: 'Power and knowledge directly imply one another: that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a filed of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (Foucault, 1977:27). This explanation accounts for the many unintended effects resulting from the exercise of power. 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'(Bartky, 2003:45). The focus of *Discipline and Punish* is the institutional mechanisms that fabricate subjects rather than the ways in which subject constitute themselves. However, in his last writings on the history of sexuality (Foucault, 1982, 1984, 1986) that Foucault turned to proposing the ways in which subjects are free to constitute themselves. Foucault was wedded to the idea that the subject possessed certain freedoms to constitute themselves he was careful to place contextual limits on individual freedom. 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.'(1982:221). So, instead of the notions of "constitution" and "fabrication" being two *distinct* phenomena it might be argued that, as Sebastian Harrer does, that 'Foucault himself seems always to have thought of the moral self-constitution as a derivative of, or a complement to, the constitution of subjects through normalizing power and subjugation. The genesis of the subject essentially includes these two sides: subjection and self-constitution' (2005: 78). The study reported on in this paper aimed to explore both the mechanisms of normalisation and genesis of the student architect through the contemporary design jury. But first let us

consider the genesis of architecture and architectural education in relation to Foucault notions of modern disciplines and micro-technologies of power.

THE ORIGINS OF ARCHITECTURAL PEDAGOGY

The architectural profession was one of the significant new institutions of power that was borne out of nineteenth-century economic growth. As markets increased during the nineteenth century so did specialisation and this resulted in the formation of new disciplinary groups including doctors, solicitors, surveyors, and of course architects. However, with specialisation came competition and as a consequence new disciplinary groups adopted practices, not unlike those commonly associated with guilds in the pre-industrial period, that were designed to capture and protect their market share. These new disciplines also became increasingly concerned with controlling entry to their disciplinary field, thereby ensuring that 'standards' would be maintained and more importantly that supply would never exceed demand. A professional body, the Royal Institute for British Architects (RIBA), representing architects in Britain, was formed in 1834, proclaiming that its role was to secure the 'uniformity and respectability of practice in the profession'(Saint, 1985: 1). Subsequently the RIBA made moves to control entry to the profession. It adopted registration through examination as its official policy in 1890, although this was not actually achieved until 1931. As a consequence of the RIBA's push towards registration through examination, new schools of architecture were founded to prepare students for the professional examination. Hence, the education of the architect gradually shifted from apprenticeship to professional education in schools of architecture over the course of the nineteenth and early-twentieth century. The first programme established in England for architectural students was founded in 1830 at the Architectural Association, London, this was followed shortly afterwards by a programme at University College London, and large number of provincial schools were founded in the Edwardian period. This shift in the locus of training for architects required the translation of the office-based master-apprentice form of learning into a pedagogy that was appropriate for the education of large groups of students. Indeed it is somewhat remarkable that

the new programmes managed to almost literally reproduce the 'learning by doing' method employed in the apprenticeship method. However, the change in the scale of operation resulted in principles of architecture being taught in lecture theatres by academics rather than by master architects in the drawing office and those principles were now applied to the designing of theoretical projects in the design studio, or atelier, rather than to the design of real projects in the drawing office. Yet, methods of design instruction hardly changed. Within the design studio, the replacement for the drawing office, the tutor, or studio master, almost literally mirrored the role of the master architect by literally 'coaching' the students individually on their design projects. Thus, in Foucault's terms both the locus of 'surveillance' (the observation of subjects that directly controls and induces self-control) and the practices of 'normalisation' (the processes by which a disciplinary culture encourages its subjects to regulate and achieve their own conformity with the established rules) had been transformed into what we know as the design studio pedagogy. In addition to the metamorphosis of pre-existing practices the translation of the apprenticeship model into an educational institutional framework required a new practice that would allow the state of students' development to be disclosed, measured against norms and standards, and ranking against peers. Foucault observed this process of 'examination' as common to all institutions that were charged with transforming subjects into disciplinary norms be it soldier, craftsman, madman, citizen or architect. He writes of the examination as combining:

> the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalising judgement. It is a normalising gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates and judges them. That is why, in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualised. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth.
>
> (Foucault, 1991: 184)

In architecture this new practice became reified in the design jury, or *charette*, in which students design projects would be displayed in front of a panel of experts who would, as representatives of the profession,

collectively judge its worth. This practice of judging the product of designing became the way principle way students' progress towards becoming a fully fledged member of the architectural community was judged and is the antecedent of the contemporary design jury.

FOUCAULT'S METHODS

Although it was tempting to use the Foucauldian definition of the 'examination' to scrutinise contemporary design jury practice this approach would contradict Foucault notion of historical specificity. Foucault's genealogical method insists that all problems are unique and therefore new problems were bound to throw up new accounts. As a consequence his research focused on exposing the contingencies that provided the background to specific historical events. Thus, as Kendall and Wickham have pointed out, it is not possible to just 'apply' Foucault's historical findings to the present (1999:117). However, Foucault's 'genealogical' method, as used most famously in *Discipline and Punish*, does provide a new approach to studying the contemporary design jury. Inspired by Lorna Rhodes seminal study of Maximum Security prisons in North America (2004) the research carried out for this paper adopted an ethnographic approach in an attempt to disclose the effect of design jury practice, i.e. what the design jury practice does to those students who participate in it.

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

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, students experienced the design juries repeatedly throughout their five years of full-time architectural education and as a result they were perceived as key pedagogic event in the school. The research design consisted of cross-sectional case study carried out over a period of one year that 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 (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), allow a new, more nuanced, reading of contemporary design jury practice.

ESPOUSED NOTIONS OF THE DESIGN JURY

Interviews with students and critics produced a picture of the design jury as a stable and highly-valued event whose 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. Both critics and students understood that the present jury system had a long lineage and had evolved from the system of examination by proxy introduced in the nineteenth-century École des Beaux Arts. It was notable that there was a substantial 'folklore' attached to the design jury that circulated among staff and students, such as accounts of a jury when Mies van der Rohe tore down student drawings in disgust, that provided it with a legitimising 'lineage.' These folklore accounts of jury brutality created a dichotomous conception of the function of contemporary design juries

in the minds of students. Whilst official accounts characterised the design jury as primarily a site of individual and peer learning; the student handbook notes 'the design jury is intended to provide you with feedback and help you to improve your designs', the institutional folklore characterised it as primarily a site of examination and legitimisation. A third-year student's captured the collective student feeling by explaining that:

> the review is brilliant in some respects and scary in others…it feels exciting because it is like an end – you present your work saying 'that's the best I can do' and that is it. But that's also scary because it's a big judgemental process.

It is also significant that the term 'jury' or 'crit', words that suggest something adversarial, continue to be used by staff and students to describe an event whose espoused purpose reflection and learning. Thus, even though the reified and espoused pedagogic purpose of the design jury had evolved considerably from its historical antecedent in response to the liberal demands for more a explicit and student-centred pedagogy, when students talked about their conception of the design jury the examination model invariably dominated over the learning model. The dominating conception of the jury as examination affected students' approaches. Invariably students said that their preparations for and approach to the design jury event itself were geared towards getting the best mark possible or outcome possible rather than a disclosure or reflection on their weaknesses or learning needs. Hence, even before the event itself the espoused purpose of the design jury, student reflective learning, was being considerably undermined by the strategic approach taken by students for whom the jury was primarily a judgmental occasion. The following section looks more carefully at the results of observing design jury practice.

THE DESIGN JURY SETTING

In following Foucault's 'genealogical' method the research aimed at identifying the contingencies that, together, produced an effect in those students who participate in the design juries observed. The section above identified one contingency, that of student conception of the design jury and its effect on approach.

There were also a set of common contingencies found within the design jury events that were observed. These consisted of both discursive and non-discursive practices that included dialogue, periodicity, special preparations, constituency, spatiality, and choreography (Bell, 1992). The following section outlines the characteristics of the non-discursive practices that provide a setting or staging for the discursive practices.

Preparations:

If we are to understand the effects of the design jury we must start by considering its sphere of influence on students beyond the time and spatial specificities of the event itself. The periodicity of the design jury, being repeated at the end of each design project throughout a student's education, meant that it figured as one of the most important symbolic events in students' lives. Indeed, the knowledge of a looming design jury had the effect of altering students' behaviour. This pre-jury behaviour included working excessively hard (Figure 1.), withdrawing from connections with the outside world, eating baldy, drinking too much alcohol and coffee, and viewing their peers as competitors rather than comrades. It seemed to be a combination of the student fear of the expert judgement, together with the notion that projects could never be finished; 'I could always have done more… there are always holes', that drove students to act in such unhealthy and arguably unproductive ways. However, these working practices, which were understood as being those required in architectural practice, were deeply ingrained in the culture of the school. They were handed down from generation to generation through stories, by example, and were positively encouraged by design tutors. Hence, even in the preparations for a design jury, students were found to be developing both their temporal (their total commitment to, and belief in, the cause of architecture and a competitive nature) and corporeal (their ability to push their bodies by work excessive hours) aspects of their professional 'being'.

Constituency:

In all three cases there was a specially convened constituency for the juries. In addition to the atelier students and their tutors, external critics from outside the school were invited to attend. These critics were generally known figures drawn from architectural practice or other schools of architecture and they were perceived by students as providing an 'objective' critique of their individual work as well as the overall output of the atelier (we might interpret 'objective' as 'professionally constructed').

Spatial and Choreographic Arrangements:

On the day of the jury the constituencies gathered in a specially organised space, either the school's 'Jury Room' or a design studio. The spaces were 'set up' for a design jury by arranging the chairs in a fanning arc in front of the work of the first student to be reviewed (Figure 2.). The front rows of chairs were implicitly 'understood' by all as being designated for the jury members and the subsequent rows were allocated for the students (Figure 3.). Each student in turn verbally presented their design project (5-10 minutes), illustrating their ideas with drawings and models and each presentation was followed by question and answer session (10-15minutes). As the reviews progressed the arc of chairs would move to face the student being reviewed. A sixth year student explained that he thought the spatial arrangements of the jury 'puts you on public display – it's a scary thing because you are so open'. Clearly, the spatial and choreographic arrangements required students to present both their embodied selves as well as their work to the audience for scrutiny. Although students rarely recalled having been taught how to present themselves to others, for instance first year undergraduate students talked about 'not knowing what to do or say' in their first reviews, they appeared to quickly learn that they were required to act as embryonic architects; action being characterised by confidence, assuredness, competence and artistic exuberance. They were expected to sell and defend their work with confidence in front of jury members even if they were inwardly hesitant, and aware of their project's shortcoming. A particularly shy sixth-year student who was interviewed after refusing to defend his work in front of a jury said that he thought that the insistency on a particularly masculine model of professional deportment was:

antithetical to learning, both because it encouraged students to cover up their weaknesses and discriminated against those students who didn't want to or couldn't, for reasons of gender, race or culture, conform to the professional model.

This scenario seemed to be a long way from the notion of an inclusive, open and collaborative learning experience suggested by some of the rhetoric surrounding the design jury. Yet, the power of the choreographic event makes resistance to the accepted paradigm virtually impossible. For many of the students interviewed, especially those who were less able or introverted, the requirement to present in front of an audience caused anxiety and in some cases profound distress.

The jury members, when asked about students' levels of pre-jury anxiety generally thought that stress was both 'a necessary condition for architects to cope with in real life' and that 'it made students work harder'. None of the jury members were aware of the educational research that suggests that anxiety provoking assessment has negative effects on student learning (Biggs, 2003:15; Jackson, 1995:154).

The spatial and temporal characteristics of the design jury practices observed cannot be claimed to hold any intrinsic or embodied meaning. However, just as Foucault observed in Bentham's Panoptican (1991: 195-228), the research found that the spatial and temporal characteristics of the design jury functioned as a supporting 'setting', or 'stage,' for social interaction, in this case the student-critic dialog. Thus, for students who conceived the design jury as primarily judgemental or corrective, which tended to be the average and weak students, the non-discursive characteristics of the design jury, such as the objectifying of individual by the arrangement of chairs, were perceived as supporting or heightening their perceptions; 'it puts the whole of you on show'. However, for a few of the high achieving students, those who perceived the jury as an opportunity to show off their achievements and/or engage in a critically reflective discussion with experts, the non-discursive characteristics of the design jury were perceived as either benign or helpful; 'the arrangement allows the critics to comment on how successfully I had transferred my ideas into architectural form'.

THE DESIGN JURY DIALOGUE

The findings above clearly suggests that there are a set of contingencies that are present before the discursive element of the jury takes place that will effect the nature and outcomes of individual dialogical exchanges. This section of the paper looks at the nature and content of the student-critic dialogue in the juries observed and its effect on students learning.

In all the design juries observed the learning outcomes against which the students' design projects were to be assessed were clearly stated on the assessment forms. The list of learning outcomes invariably consisted of an 'objective' range of professional process and transferable skills, such as, 'the ability to critically appraise one's own design process' and 'the ability to communicate designs effectively using appropriate media'. The official aims of the design jury and reified in the student *Jury Guide* suggested that design jury dialogue would focus on assessing to what extend students were achieving the stated learning outcomes and providing an opportunity for experts to give guidance on how to narrow the gap between current and expected performance. However, the researcher's observations found that the official aims failed to recognise the inherent complexities involved in talking about levels of 'objective' achievement when the definition of what is and is not architecture is culturally constructed and is a contested concept inside architectural schools. The observations found that each of the critics brought with them their personal definitions of both 'what architecture is' and 'what qualities architects should possess' and these notions had a profound effect on the nature and content of the dialogue they had with students. Whilst the observations of the first year jury revealed an open and pluralist approach from the critics, the critics in the third and sixth year atelier-based juries were seen to operate very specific architectural positions or 'paradigms'. It was clear from the jury observations that students who failed to conform to the specific atelier 'paradigm', which included specific aesthetic, procedural, communication (both graphic and language) preferences, or well fell short of the required standards, were castigated. For instance, when a quiet third year Asian student tried to justify her design on the basis of Feng Shui she was told by a jury member that Feng Shui was 'mystical mumbo jumbo and was not relevant to western

architecture'. Indeed, it was not unusual for extraordinarily harsh epithets, such as 'mumbo jumbo', 'ugly', 'shit', 'rubbish' and 'unacceptable' to be used by critics who's work was below standard or failed to conform to the ateliers paradigm. In these cases students were seen to be visibly distressed and passive. Dialogue was rarely achieved in such circumstances. Post-jury interviews with students suggested that experiencing such events was profoundly distressing and de-motivating; 'it's a kind of public humiliation'. Furthermore, in the face of harsh verbal responses from critics to student presentations many students admitted that they did not feel able to be open about either the learning difficulties or their problems in understanding any critic advice (often couched in the complex private language of the atelier) for reasons such as; 'not wanting to look stupid', 'fear of breaking down in front of the reviewers', 'wanting to get the review over' and rather cynically 'what's the point because the reviewers are always right because they mark my work'.

Although some students were treated very harshly in the juries observed the majority of students received comments from the critics (Figure 4.) that were clearly meant to be encouraging and supportive of student learning these comments were often highly directive, delivered in the critic's argot and rarely dialogical. Critics were observed focusing on the merits demerits of the students' design (the object) rather than the difficulties students might be having with their learning (the subject). Hence most of the individual student juries were a series on monologues rather than a dialogue between students and the critics. The majority of the twenty seven student interviewed confirmed the validity of these observation. One student said they thought that the jury was 'really just a place where critics could show off'. Several students explained that their jury experiences resulted in them taking a strategic approach to their future design work. One student explained that they thought that their best strategy for survival at the next jury was literally to 'draw up their tutor's weekly tutorial sketches'. In these cases students' willingness to explore ideas and take risks was significantly reduced by their jury experiences.

However, the findings indicated that not all students experienced the design jury as disempowering. The most able students, those who were able to align the presentation of themselves and their work with the

paradigm of the atelier, were observed to enter into a truly constructive dialogue with the critics. The impression was of a group of co-designers working to narrow the gap between a concept and its objectification in architectural form. Not surprisingly, students who experienced these events found them profoundly stimulating and useful and resulted in them feeling that they were close to being fully acculturated members of the architectural community. Yet, even these students admitted that, to some extent, they suppressed their own architectural predilections in favour of the ateliers 'paradigm' so that they would achieve good marks – in effect these students were taking a strategic approach to their learning 'playing the game'. In the view of these students their own architectural identity would emerge from a series of different experiences over the five years of architectural education. The notion that architectural education might focus supporting the construction of individual student's architectural paradigms rather acculturating students into their tutors' architectural paradigms was not a model considered or experienced by any of the students interviewed.

CONCLUSIONS

There can be little doubt that both the declared aims and the form of the Design Jury have altered considerably from its nineteenth century antecedent. Firstly, the notion of 'examination' of the design object as representing the level of student learning has been replaced with the notion of 'feedback' form experts with the primarily intention of supporting student learning. Secondly, the exclusive and private 'examination' has evolved into an open and inclusive dialogical arena. However, as the findings above suggest, contemporary jury practice has neither liberated itself entirely from the judgemental 'examination' model nor fully achieved the student-centred 'feedback' model. In reality the design juries studies proved to consist of a complex set of discursive and non-discursive practices that, when 'lived' by individual students and critics, produced a wide range of experiences and outcomes. What is particularly important for educators are the findings that suggest that the design jury rarely produced the learning intended learning outcomes – i.e. individual and collective student reflective learning. Indeed it was quite

16

shocking to the researcher how often students' experiences of the design jury as a site of judgement against rigid architectural paradigms resulted in de-motivation and strategic learning. It was also a surprise to find the degree to which students failed to understand the critic's language.

Although the findings did not support the often-cited notion (Dutton, 1991; Willenbrook, 1991) that the design jury is a site of coercion; control was far too loose to ensure the production of pre-conceived student learning outcomes, it was clear that there was a considerable schism between the espoused design jury theory and the theory in practice. This new understanding of design jury practice and its effect on those students who participate in it should help the school to consider to what extend the current design jury practices should be maintained, modified or dismantled. The findings are currently being discussed by the design staff with a view to modifying practice in the coming academic year.

Clearly the findings of such a focused study cannot claim any kind of generalisability. However, from the researchers knowledge of practices in other schools and the existing literature (Anthony, 2004; Doidge et al; 2000; A.I.A.S., 2002) it appears that the findings of this particular case school are not uncommon. Only a larger study would confirm this point. However, in the sprit of Foucault notion of the contingent nature of events, it is clearly up to individual school communities to formulate their own responses to the specificities of their own contexts, an exercise that the findings of this study suggests is urgently needed.

Works cited

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

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

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

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

Biggs, J. (2003) *Teaching for Quality at University*. Miadenhead: Open University Press.

Crysler, G. (1995) 'Critical Pedagogy and Architectural Education'. *Journal of Architectural Education,* 48: 4: pp. 208-217.

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

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

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

Foucault, M. (1982) 'Afterword: The Subject and Power' in Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (Eds) *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. p. 208-226.

Foucault, M. (1984) (Trans R. Hurley) *The History of Sexuality: Volume I: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

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

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1976) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies or Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Harrer, S. (2005) 'The Theme of Subjectivity in Foucault's Lecture Series'. *Foucault Studies*, No.2 May, pp. 75-96.

Jackson, B. (1995) 'Assessment practices in art and design: a contribution to student learning?' in Gibbs, G. (ed.) *Improving Student Learning - Through Assessment and Evaluation.* Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Development.

Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: Sage.

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

Saint, A. (1985) *The Image of the Architect*. Yale and London: Yale University Press.

Stevens, G. (1995) 'Struggle in Studio: A Bourdivian look at Architectural Pedagogy'. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 49: 2, pp. 105-123.

Willenbrook, L. (1991), 'An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education' in Dutton, T. A. (Ed) *Voices in Architectural Education.* New York; London: Bergin & Garvey, pp. 97-119.