



**Manchester
Metropolitan
University**

Sookhoo, Dhruv ORCID logo ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2401-3298>
(2023) Views from Others (Duty to the Profession). In: RIBA Ethical Practice
Guide. RIBA Publishing, London, pp. 131-132. ISBN 9781914124723

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/632365/>

Version: Accepted Version

Publisher: RIBA Publishing

Please cite the published version

<https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk>

Publication: Sookhoo, DA. (2023) 'Views from Others (Duty to the Profession)', in Rowlands, C., and Dixon, AB. (2023) *RIBA Ethical Practice Guide*, London: RIBA Publishing, pp.131-132.

Architects entering the profession and joining its membership bodies today can do so because previous generations of architects have nurtured the profession by promoting its standards, advancing its knowledge, and developing its capacity to compete and collaborate with others for opportunities to produce architecture nationally and internationally.¹ Our duty to our profession extends from the fundamental responsibility to maintain public assent by avoiding detrimental practices that fall short of requirements within our shared codes of conduct, to fulfilling more proactive expectations to contribute to the advancement of professional knowledge and to create practice contexts that enable other architects to flourish now and in the future.

Dilemmas concerning our duty to our profession arise when our immediate interests or actions appear counter to the long-term, collective interests of other architects. Simple dilemmas relate to architects breaching codes of conduct for reasons of expedience or due to compromised practice, when resulting negative publicity causes potential clients and the public to question the standing of other architects by association. However, more complex dilemmas relating to our duty to the profession are difficult to conceptualise because they require us to consider the impact of our actions on architects outside our immediate circle, and also challenge us to advance the wider professional project of architecture where the implications of our practice are harder to gauge.

One issue with far-reaching implications is that while the profession benefits collectively from all architects bearing their equal responsibility for ethical practice, the relative cost required to meet our shared codes of conduct or exceed them (e.g. through a stronger commitment to public service) are not borne evenly across a profession composed of individuals and practices with varying amounts and forms of resources at their disposal.² For example, the implications for a new entrant to the profession openly criticising or confidentially reporting colleagues for substandard practice to protect the public, safeguard the quality of the profession, and secure their own claims to ethical practice, are likely to be personally more costly than for a retiree after many years of successful practice.

Likewise, while all architects have a responsibility to adapt their practice in response to new evidence and beneficial approaches, opportunities and capacities to advance professional knowledge by conducting original practice-based research are not evenly distributed within the profession. Arguably, this places an onus on those with the resources necessary to overcome barriers to practice-based research to offer leadership to others through collaboration during projects or open dissemination afterwards.³ Such transparency appears at odds with the competitive character of our profession. All architects considering practice-based research must reconcile the potential benefits of guarding existing and new expert practice for direct commercial advantage, with the potential to demonstrate commitment to advancing professional knowledge collectively and gaining esteem within it. Ultimately, this requires a clear vision about how a practice's research strategy furthers its commercial objectives.⁴ It is also worth noting that practice-based research requires careful planning and execution to ensure it meets both the ethical expectations of researchers and avoids replicating exploitative forms of architectural practice (e.g. failure to recognise authorship).⁵

Our profession belongs to all of its members, and the reputation of its institutions are built on both the accumulated contributions of its most pioneering practitioners and the routine, highly competent, and often unsung practice of the majority of architects. Uncomfortably perhaps, some argue that it is the consistent, ethical practice of ordinary architects operating in relatively mundane practice contexts that disproportionately supplies the public respectability and trust necessary to create the autonomy that enables a minority of practitioners to promote innovative architecture and by extension lead the profession and its institutions.⁶ For all architects, and these leading architects in particular, our duty to the profession extends to resisting the temptation to use the profession and collective resources of its

¹ F. Duffy & L. Hutton, *Architectural Knowledge: The Idea of a Profession* (London: E&FN Spon, 1998); F. Samuel, *Why Architects Matter: Evidencing and Communicating the Value of Architects* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018).

² T. Spector, 'Codes of ethics and coercion', in N. Ray, ed., *Architecture and its ethical dilemmas* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2005), 101-111.

³ KA. Martindale, *Research for Architectural Practice* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2022); Samuel, *Why Architects Matter*, 74-89; DA. Sookhoo, 'Strategies for Collaborative Research in Architectural Practice: Communicating Metropolitan Workshop's A New Kind of Suburbia', in K. Buchanan, M. Haward, and R. Fiehn, (eds.), *The Power Collaboration and Co-Design in Architecture* (London: RIBA Publishing, 2023).

⁴ A. Akšamija, *Research Methods for the Architectural Profession* (New York: Routledge, 2021), 24-29.

⁵ Sookhoo 'Strategies for Collaborative Research in Architectural Practice'.

⁶ T. Spector, 'Codes of ethics and coercion', 107-109.

institutions for our own ends (e.g. knowingly promoting agendas that could foreseeably harm or unnecessarily disadvantage other architects).

Dilemmas related to the use of professional institutions are likely experienced by those in a position to advance the profession through their academic practice, leadership of esteemed studios, or direct engagement with the professional bodies. While the continued success of the architecture profession requires architects of vision and action, it is imperative that leading practitioners fulfil their duty to the profession by encouraging broad participation in decision-making about our shared trajectory and accommodating perspectives and interests potentially at variance with their own. Otherwise progress, however necessary or urgent, may result from the coercion or manipulation of architects without sufficient autonomy to resist and the single-minded use of institutions whose reputation and value was developed collectively by generations of architects, and which represents our shared inheritance.