A Bourdieusian Lens on to Professions

A Case Study of Architecture

Melahat Sahin-Dikmen

PhD

University of York

Sociology

September 2013

Abstract

This study explores the potential of Bourdieu's sociology for re-orienting the sociology of professions. Despite differences in methodology and theoretical priorities, neither classical theories nor the contemporary studies completely break with the view that professions are autonomous and elite occupational groups driven by the common objective of achieving monopoly over given service markets. This unifying and externally oppositional view does not provide an adequate framework for understanding the internal dynamics or the embeddedness of professional areas of practice within the social world. This study argues that Bourdieu's sociology could help address some of these difficulties by enabling us to re-define professions as historically constituted, semi-autonomous fields structured around struggles over specific capitals that are instrumental both in their specific production and in internal struggles over authority and power. An examination of architecture as a case study suggests that the architectural profession can be thought of as a field driven by the ideals of design originality and a field ridden with permanent conflicts between its autonomous ideals and external demands, between creative and symbolic capital on the one hand and technical-managerial capital on the other, and between the competing narratives of its realities. The architectural field is divided and its dominant representation is contested, but architects are also united by their shared experiences and belief in architectural ideals. The study gives us an insight into the architectural universe and suggests that a field approach yields an understanding of its complexities not permitted by the notion of profession. However, as an exploratory investigation based on in-depth interviews, this is a first step in instigating a field mode of thinking on professions and needs to be supplemented with further research on architecture and the applications of the field concept to other professions.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Preface

This study began with questions about the meaning and significance of work in relation to professions. My fascination with work as an activity that takes up a great part of our lives is tied, partly, to humanist and left-libertarian concerns with the alienation of labour and the centrality of work to the constitution of the self. All things to do with work fascinate me; why we work, how we work, how we cope with doing the same job for years, unpaid work, women's work, the interplay of the private and the professional selves or even the symbolism of a uniform we might be required to wear to work. Originally, based on personal observations, two things intrigued me: on the one hand, professional lines of work seemed to involve several dissatisfactions including intense competition for jobs, large amounts of routine tasks, extremely long hours, demanding work loads and resultant high levels of stress. On the other hand, professionals were presumed to have rewarding careers, which required the application of higher skills and were seen and saw themselves as idealists in pursuit of advancement, application of knowledge for the greater good and somewhat above the 'average' man and woman. In other words, what I empirically observed did not match what I thought I knew about professionals and I was particularly struck by the contrast between the 'elitist' self projections and the difficulty, or near impossibility of realising those aspirations in reality.

Sometimes during my PhD I was also astonished to remember a 1989 lecture by the late Turkish sociologist Professor Unsal Oskay[1], who first introduced me to sociology, whilst studying for a degree in journalism. Oskay was an intellectual in the tradition of Frankfurt School, with Walter Benjamin the only 'compulsory' reading for his course. His major contribution was to the sociology of music and popular culture, but his now legendary lectures were delightful wanderings across the history of the Middle Ages, the Enlightenment and the Ottoman Empire, the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, Sappho's poetry, French philosophy, musings on Cervantes' Don Quixote, analysis of popular music, women in Islamic societies and these would often end with him urging us to go out and find a boy/girl friend to enjoy the spring weather, instead of sitting in a stuffy hall and listening to an old man. I remember him in one of these lectures, warning against 'professionals' whom he described as something like "efficient rule followers with no soul". His target was the then newly elected Turkish prime minister who was an economist and Oskay, with typical sensitivity, was incensed as he believed that a 'superficial' economist without an appreciation of history, art and philosophy could only be an administrator, which is not, presumably, what one would want in a prime minister. What I must have joined together is Oskay's description of professionals as 'soulless administrators' and my perception that working as a professional is not quite what it is presumed to be in terms of its idealist projections. But why was this?

The study is also charged by an interest, perhaps disproportionately, in the philosophy of social sciences, which I trace back to the influence of Professor Nicos Mouzelis[2], who taught me at the LSE in mid-90s. The structure-agency debate pre-occupied me throughout my undergraduate degree and beyond, and I still find myself drawn to appraising different sociological traditions in terms of their take and position on the fundamentals of ontology

---

[1] Unsal Oskay (1939-1999). Music and Alienation (Muzik ve Yabancilasma, 1995), A Modern Phantasy (Cagdas Fantazya, ?). All published in Turkish.
[2] Nicos Mouzelis (1939-). Back to Sociological Theory: the construction of social orders (1991), Sociological Theory, What Went Wrong?: diagnosis and remedies (1995)

and epistemology. As a naïve undergraduate, what I found most intriguing in this debate was that the inseparability of agency and structure was so obvious, yet we did not have the concepts to express the completely enmeshed nature of the relationship between the two in a satisfactory way. I remember concluding my essays with the argument that without getting the fundamentals right, the questions posed, the methods followed and the answers provided would be partial, unsatisfactory or wrong. It was another 10 years before I took up academic study again, but my fascination with the philosophy of social sciences endures to this day and it is probably this interest in philosophy that first 'converted' me to Bourdieu, who, as is well known, starts by rejecting these classical dichotomies as based on false conceptions. This explains the methodological positioning with which my evaluation of the existing literature begins, as I share Bourdieu's call for a 'wholesale' new start, new questions and new agendas.

In the event, my search for a theoretical framework that could inform and guide an empirical investigation into a professional area of work turned into an unsatisfactory trek across several branches of sociology. My dissatisfaction with the partial understandings of different aspects of professions, each one framed by and situated in a different theoretical tradition, and the almost compulsory and unavoidable attendant separation between studies of their subjective and objective dimensions was based on more than theoretical arguments. My increasingly pressing difficulty was that neither of these perspectives were helpful in making sense of my data. I was familiar with Bourdieu's class analysis, but it is at this point that I took a closer look at the field concept, and so I've found myself, halfway through my PhD, going back to the beginning in some ways, studying Bourdieu, throwing two-thirds of my original literature review in the recyling bin and re-analysing my data. It is a miracle that this Phd has finished in four years!

A Phd is often described as a journey and this one is no exception. It has been a journey in pursuit of my supervisor Professor Mike Savage across England, from London to Manchester to York and back to London, an intellectual journey across the sociological landscape, but has also been set against the background of a personal journey in motherhood. My children were 2 and 5 years old when I started and 'mummy's project', I have no doubt, left an indelible mark on their early years. This 'experiment' in combining motherhood with a full-time PhD and the attendant relentless balancing of responsibilities, time and energy is, no doubt, what every working mother lives with. Patterns of work dictated by endless rounds of sickness, sleepless nights and school holidays are not particularly conducive to the liberty and immersion demanded by academic work. Suffice it to say that it has given me enough to contemplate writing a book about the whole experience.

I don't claim that I now have the answer to my question, which seems to have been maturing in my subconscious for a long time, but this study has been a valuable step in that direction.

Acknowledgements

The convention has it that 'support acts' should come last in acknowledgements, but I feel that I must begin with those who supported me personally, for if it was not for their unconditional support, this project would not even have begun. I am indebted to Huriser Dikmen for her motherly sacrifices. She enabled me to combine the PhD with childcare 'choices' that I was happy with. Umur did more than his fair share of childcare and household chores and I am grateful to his egalitarian instincts. My children Alize and Noyan have been very patient, even though they did not like it, in letting me disappear into my study endlessly.

I am grateful to my supervisor Professor Mike Savage for his understanding of my child-centred life and study patterns. I would also like to thank him for encouraging me to find my own voice and supporting my 'off script' and experimental approach to the subject. Dr. Wendy Bottero (University of Manchester), Dr. Nick Gane (University of York) and Dr. David Beer (University of York) commented on the progress of the project at different stages of its development. David John and Joanna Bailey introduced me to architecture and had to endure my ignorance of their field. The discussion with my examiners Professor Fran Tonkiss and Dr. Laurie Hanquinett was instrumental in consolidating the conclusions.

I also would like to thank friends who lent an ear, proof-read chapters, helped with recruitment, shared childcare and made sure I had a social life! Impossible to mention them all, but thanks to Helen M, Anthony, Rachael, Yossi, Necla, Helen B, Dave, Maria, Kara, Penny, Alan, Ann, Selen, Rebecca, Lucy, Andre and Ruth for sharing the journey.

Without the candid interviews given by all 37 participants this research would not have been possible.

Author's Declaration

I hereby declare that the contents of this thesis are based on my original research and analysis and have not been presented for examination elsewhere or another award before.

Chapter 1

1 Introduction

This study is an exercise in thinking about professions with Bourdieu and a sociological analysis of the architectural practice from a field analysis perspective. My thesis is that Bourdieu's concept of field provides the means for re-orienting the conventional sociology of professions, which has tended to essentialise them around certain core attributes or features and view their complexities in terms of divergence with an ideal-typical model of professionalisation. I suggest that by reconceptualising professions as semi-autonomous and historically constituted fields, structured around inextricably linked struggles over capitals and narratives, we can develop a framework that is able to account for their internal conflicts and dynamics and their relationship with the broader web of social, political and economic processes. I will argue that this field based perspective also enables us to explicate more fully the individual professionals' views and lived experiences in relation to the constraints and possibilities that issue from the structure of their field of practice. A field approach, hence, permits us to render an account of professional life, which is more attuned to the values and concerns of professionals themselves. I develop this thesis through a critical appraisal the classical theories of professions in the context of an engagement with Bourdieu's ideas and an exploration of architectural practice as a case study.

This research originated from general questions about what working as a 'professional' entails and means and how best to make sense of their lived experiences. The sociology of professions is the usual starting point for such a study, but this has become a near-defunct field of research with studies of different aspects of professional work and employment now dispersed across disparate areas of sociology, including, though not exclusively, industrial and organisational sociology, the sociology of work and employment and the sociology of class. Why, then, go back to this 'old' literature which has been driven out of fashion by the changing face of professional occupations which have expanded, multiplied

and adapted to times of restructuring, liberalisation, globalisation and radical technological developments, as well as being undermined by evidence from other corners of sociology?

For two reasons: *The first* is that studies of the specific aspects of professions in different branches of sociology permit only a partial understanding of the experience of working as a professional as these are not framed by conceptual concerns about studying professional domains of work. *Secondly,* studies both outside and within the sociology of professions tend to use the concept of profession without questioning its underlying assumptions such as autonomy, internal homogeneity or a common culture, which, I will argue, prevent us from engaging with the complex world of professional areas of practice beyond concerns about their fit with an ideal model. I do not plan to engage directly with these different strands of research within the scope of this study and neither is the intention to criticise their distinctive theoretical priorities. I briefly refer to some to illustrate my point. Studies of professions outside the sociology of professions seek to analyse, for example, the emergence of new forms of management and control in the professional labour process (Derber, 1982; Smith et al., 1991); the position of professionals in the changing class structure (Goldthorpe, 1982; Wright, 1985, 2005); mechanisms of class formation (Savage et al, 1992); trends in professional employment, the impact of economic restructuring on public sector professions and changing professional ideologies (Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Brint, 1994 & 2001; Reed, 2007; Broadbent et al. (eds)) or the dominance of large bureaucratic organisations in professional lines of work (Muzio and Kirkpatrick, 2011). These are valid lines of investigation that make valuable contributions to our understanding of professional work and employment, but they are not concerned with questions of how to conceptualise and study professions and consequently, tell us more about any of these trends than the complexities of professional areas of work.

The main difficulty, however, is a conceptual one and this is the second reason why we need to go back to the classical literature and re-think the concept of profession. What remains unquestioned in these investigations is the idea that professions should be studied as homogenous occupational groups. This idea persists even with the recent loss of interest

in the sociology of professions and new research tends to use the old notion of profession either without much reflection (Pickard, 2009; Leicht and Fennell, 2001) or proposes to update it with a new one to reflect contemporary realities. Yet, as I will extrapolate in the following chapters, the notion of profession itself is problematic. The result is that any attempt to study professions is faced both with a highly fragmented knowledge base and a theoretical heritage that has not completely broken its ties with the classical literature. My proposition in this study is that, as Bourdieu argued (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1989a, p.38), the concept of profession does not permit us to account for the complex processes and dynamics of professions, and the classical literature does not offer a critical stance against a notion that reflects the historical self-projections of professional occupational groups. My argument, therefore, is that by breaking away from this static conception and acknowledging that professionals are agents situated within a web of relations constituted around specific stakes and struggles, we can instigate a field mode of thinking and revive the sociology of professions.

I therefore engage with the classical sociology of professions in the context of a conceptual and methodological renewal offered by Bourdieu's sociology and aim to explore the potential of the field notion in developing a new framework of analysis. In the following, I provide an overview of the study and summarise my arguments against conventional theories and in relation to the studies of the architectural profession. I end this chapter by setting out the aims of the research and outlining the contents of the chapters.

1.1 The classical theories of professions and Bourdieu: Professions or fields?

The classical sociology of professions was characterised by concerns with occupational boundaries and an opposition between the analysis of the structural and the phenomenological aspects of professions. Theories on either side of this methodological divide begin with a definition based on their organisational and institutional attributes,

culture and values (Carr-Saunders and Wilson, 1933; Caplow, 1954; Wilensky, 1964; Etzioni, 1969). Functionalist thinkers added to this definition the altruistic 'role' professions play in the division of labour; the provision of essential services that are based on expert knowledge and framed by rational systems of work and organisation (Parsons, 1954).

The 'power approaches' that followed (Johnson, 1972; Larson, 1977; Freidson, 1970) were dismissive of the uncritical adoption of professions' self-projections by these early accounts and argued that professions were driven by self-interest. They also represent a shift away from the emphasis on 'structural' position and role to the subjective formation of professions as collective agents. Nevertheless, the original definition of professions was imported into the studies of their strategies of closure, ideologies and role in the capitalist economy. The 'occupational closure thesis', inspired by Weber's ideas about market closure and interest groups, defined professions as groups driven to monopolise a given service market to secure economic and status rewards and sought to examine their strategies of monopoly and status protection (Murphy, 1988). Professions' strategies of closure were argued to be based on knowledge expertise and skills, and pursued against both internal and external 'challenges' from other occupational groups (Larkin, 1983; Witz, 1991). The Chicago School writers emphasised the role of the ideology of professionalism and also the expertise based power exercised by professionals, both in protecting their domain and in relations with clients, and studied its construction through everyday interactions (Hughes, 1958; Freidson, 1983). Both strands of research relied heavily on analysis of the medical profession and the negotiation of boundaries between occupations allied to medicine (Becker, 1961; Freidson, 1970, 1975; Larkin, 1983). Similarly, in both, the importance of the culture of a profession was emphasised as they argued that claims of distinction form an essential part of the ideology of professionalism and the construction of professions as distinct groups (Collins, 1990; Bledstein, 1976).

Whilst a positive step in developing a critical look at professions and in bringing the active pursuit of interest into the picture, both approaches overemphasise the collective strategies

and ideologies of professionals and reduce the analysis of professions to studies of their 'subjective' construction. The significance of the strategies of closure and the ideology of professionalism as an instrument of that are not challenged here, but an exclusive focus on these explains the 'success' or the 'failure' of a profession in terms of the effectiveness of such strategies, presumed to be symbolised by the activities of the leaders or of the professional association. This has several implications: Firstly, it means taking for granted the static and attribute based definition of professions and importing it into theories of occupational closure without reflecting on their historical origins in views based on the self-projections of professions themselves. Secondly, there is little sense of *individual* agency as the presumed 'collective' aims and interests are also imparted to the individual members of a profession. The process of individuals' professionalization is often viewed as a matter of socialisation through education, which does not leave space for considering differences in views or experiences. Thirdly, the social, political and economic context within which professions operate and their strategies are forged and advanced is excluded from these explanations. The description of professions as 'autonomous' also seems to reflect professional groups' self-projection of themselves as 'independent' practitioners and this lead to a neglect of their connections with the wider social processes. Fourth, the presumption of 'competition' between professions leads to a pre-occupation with the 'external' boundaries of a professional domain and studies of closure strategies effectively describe the responses of the professional association to the shifts in the division of labour. Finally, the emphasis on 'common' interests and culture leaves little scope for exploring internal dynamics beyond an interest in presumed 'challenges' that may be mounted by occupations considered to be auxiliary or subordinate to the leading profession.

Attempts to move away from reductionist accounts and definitions based on institutional attributes came from two different angles. One of these can be seen as an attempt to synthesise NeoMarxist and NeoWeberian ideas and was developed by Larson (1977). She proposed a theory of "professionalisation" which emphasised the social and economic context, but without neglecting the collective agency involved in achieving closure and status. By relating the emergence of professions to the rise of capitalism, the increasing division of labour, specialisation and the expansion of scientific knowledge, she distanced herself from definitional debates tied to formal attributes. Larson was also the only writer

to address the question of class and related the ideology of professionalism to the rising middle class. This conceptualisation is a powerful attempt to link the ideology, strategies and the power of professions to wider social and economic dynamics, such as capitalism, the rise of scientific rationality and to the class structure. It also countered 'elitist' notions that represented professions as 'independent' of the social and economic processes.

A second major revision was developed by Abbott (1988), whose treatise on the professional division of labour was published as the sociology of professions entered a period of decline. Underpinned by the theoretical concerns of the Chicago School, Abbott's project involves two steps that aimed to break with the traditional approaches: With the first, he moved away from static conceptions of professions and dismissed the debates about definitions based on formal organisational and institutional characteristics. With the second, he extended Hughes' (1958) idea of "occupational ecology" to the professions and argued that they cannot be studied as single cases, because they exist as part of an 'ecology', as an interdependent "system of professions". This formulation allowed Abbott to look at the actual work of a profession, which he examined by analysing the logic of "professional judgement" involved in solving the problems presented by clients. The underlining of "inference" as the defining characteristic of professional work in a three stage model ("diagnosis, inference and treatment") also returns to the ideas about the distinctiveness of professional expertise and its significance as a basis of professional authority. By defining professional areas of "jurisdiction" as dynamic, he also devised a way of bringing in the wider social world; the 'external' sources of change in the boundaries of professional areas of work include, for example, technological changes or the expanding knowledge base and with this, Abbot lifts the focus of Chicago School on everyday construction from the level of individuals and institutions, to the level of the professional division of labour.

Methodologically, Larson and Abbott occupy different positions within the oppositional terrain of the sociological landscape, but both could be seen to have built on the early studies of professions do develop a more historical and dynamic approach. However, both

leave their two main difficulties unaddressed. Both Larson and Abbott continued to view professions as homogenous groups and as driven by the common objective of occupational closure. There is little attention given to internal struggles and differentiation beyond an acknowledgement of the conflicts involved in the early stages of professionalization, which are presumed to be resolved with the acquisition of professional status. Larson begins with the broader trends in the capitalist political economy and looks for the professions' place, role and activities within its social and economic structures. As a macro-historical approach, this approach does not provide the tools for exploring the connections between the 'external' processes and structures and the 'internal' construction of a profession at the micro level and the professions are 'read off' the capitalist economy and the division of labour. The idea of an actively pursued 'professionalization project' nods to the agency involved, but this is restricted to presumed collective strategies. Abbott also operates with the same assumption that professions are active as groups, but his starting point is the opposite end of the pole between professions and the social world; he begins with the work and the boundaries of a professional occupation, which he views as a changing entity in response to shifts in the division of labour as a whole. But his conceptualisation of the relations between the professional division of labour and the wider social dynamics is also problematic. With the idea of the 'external' sources of change Abbott nods to the broader context of professional work, but their interface is limited to impact on the division of labour and on jurisdictional boundaries. In other words, the social, political and economic processes and structures only seem to exist in so far as they impact on the boundaries of professional jurisdictions. This is also related to Abbott's conception of the relationship between professions and other ecologies. Each ecology is argued to be driven to make a given task its own or to construct it in its own vision and to preserve the space that it constitutes as its own, which brings them into conflict with other ecologies but the outcomes of their interactions are viewed as indeterminate or fluid (Abbott, 2005). The emphasis on the contingency of possibilities in social outcomes means that the more continuous and structural patterns of relations between professions and broader systems and processes are left out of view. For both Abbott and Larson, these difficulties reflect the conceptual assumptions that are built into the notion of profession, that is, internal homogeneity, a drive to achieve collective occupational closure and an oppositional view of the dynamics between the professions and the broader social dynamics. I suggest that this is what we need to address first as these assumptions limit the

horizons of sociological thinking on professional domains of work and the concept of field can enable us to sidestep the numerous difficulties that arise from its utilisation.

The concept of field rests on a radically different sociological vision and methodology and challenges both the idea of a profession and the way it has been studied hitherto. Bourdieu did not directly engage with the sociology of professions apart from some brief comments on the notion of profession in a discussion about the importance of the construction of the object of enquiry. What we can borrow from him is not just these comments, but his relational methodology and the conceptual tools he developed for activating his unique sociological vision. Bourdieu's grand-theoretical position aims to bridge the structuralist and phenomenological approaches to social phenomena (Bourdieu, 1989). The concepts of field, habitus and capital express the inseparability of the objective and subjective dimensions of the social world and are intended to facilitate the analysis of their relational construction. Bourdieu defined the social world as a space of struggles over different types of capitals and it is these struggles and the agents' positions within it what give the social world a structure. This is paralleled by a struggle of ideas as the power that comes with the possession of capitals is also expressed as the authority, the symbolic power, to set the rules of engagement and to provide a narrative for the existing divisions and struggles.

The same principles of construction apply not only to the social world in toto, but to the specific fields within it. Bourdieu argued that each of these fields is a specific microcosm with its own logic and it is characterised by a specific illusio, a game constructed around struggles for specific capitals and by ideas, rules and beliefs that constitute the field as a distinct universe. For Bourdieu, the emergence of these semi-autonomous fields was synonymous with the rise of modernity, which, he argued, involved their formal separation from religious and political authorities. The idea of semi-autonomy expresses the permanent tension between the autonomous stakes in a field and the external demands that may constrain the pursuit of these claims and ideals. Whilst in the classical sociology of professions the right to self-regulate and self-employment came to be enmeshed with ideas of 'independence' from social processes which also became a part of their definition,

Bourdieu emphasised the emergence of distinct struggles and logics without breaking their link with the wider social world. He also underlined the significance of the symbolic representations of a field and argued that its dominant view represents the powerful groups in the field, but this comes to be taken for granted by all. The symbolic violence contained in their dominance goes unrecognised as the vision of the powerful becomes doxic, it rules the field by becoming ingrained in agents' habitus; their perceptions, understandings and practices (Bourdieu, 1993, 1996,1997,2002; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992)

My thesis is that professional areas of practice can similarly be thought as specific fields and this would have several advantages over the notion of profession. Firstly, Bourdieu's meta-theoretical challenge to the classical sociology provides a way of bridging the divide between accounts of either the structural or the phenomenological aspects of professions. Secondly, the conception of fields as historical entities that are constantly being remade contrasts with static perceptions and introduces a more dynamic approach. Thirdly, the notion of struggle *within* the field and competition over field specific resources provide a way of understanding internal differentiation beyond the division of labour and the assumptions of occupational competition. Fourth, the definition of fields as semi-autonomous acknowledges the influence of both autonomous and heteronomous forces, which shifts the attention to their relationality and enables us to consider 'autonomy' beyond formal 'independence'. Fifth, the culture, ideology or the strategies of a profession can be understood in relation to internal divisions and also as 'instruments' of power in internal struggles. Finally, and to return to my original concerns about what being a professional entails and means and how to make sense of the lived experiences of individuals, the field concept implies that these need to be understood in relation to the constraints that stem from the internal dynamics of their field of practice. In other words, if we are to make adequate sense of agents' lived experiences, we need to look beyond everyday actions and interactions and subjective accounts of their experiences. We need to understand how their 'professional' field is structured, how it functions, what its rules and requirements are and where these agents are positioned in the field.

Thus, the concept of field could allow us to unpick the internal dynamics of a professional domain and examine the practices that constitute it, both material and ideational, without assumptions of a collective occupational competition drive. In contrast to Abbott's abstract description of the nature of professional work, we can explore the full range of practices that constitute the practicing of a professional trade. A focus on what drives the activities that take place within a professional field and the attention to its internal rules and requirements of participation enable us to conceive it as a set of relations and practices that also act as constraints which frame individual professionals' everyday experiences. In contrast to Larson's macro structural explanation of the link between professions and the socio-economic context, the notion of semi-autonomy conceives a permanently open interface between the two and permits its investigation. This means that we can ask about all the mechanisms of *how* a professional field relates to broader systems and structural relations. Abbott has a more open approach than Larson to the relationship between 'ecologies', but his emphasis on 'fluidity' of social processes and the 'limitless possibilities' make it difficult to pinpoint the structural continuities in their relations that Bourdieu highlights. The linking of the dominant beliefs and ideas as well as the rules and requirements of the game with the structural power divisions in a field also sets Bourdieu apart from the theories of 'common' culture and professional ideology advanced by the phenomenological schools of thought. For Bourdieu, the culture of a profession *is* a construction, but one that expresses the interests and the vision of the powerful groups in a field. In other words, perceptions, views and actions are seen to have a social foundation, which means that we can and should ask *who* the holders of particular views and beliefs are and where they are situated in different fields of the social world.

With the concept of field, therefore, the internal processes of a professional field, *how* it is constructed and reproduced and the dynamics of this process open to investigation. Visualising a professional area of practice as a field, therefore, means viewing individuals as players who partake in its game, which both enables and constraints them as they go about their daily work. I put this proposition to 'test' by approaching the architectural profession with a field lens.

1.2 Case Study: Architecture

Architecture is an understudied case in the sociology of professions, but it's the only one that's also been analysed from a Bourdieusian perspective. The classical studies of architecture in Britain and US reflect, to a large extent, the debates that dominated the classical sociology of professions. Architecture is viewed as an internally homogenous professional occupation with common interests in gaining and protecting its own market against competing professions and as a status group characterised by a distinctive life-style, values and culture. The more theoretically oriented studies of architectural practice can be seen to fall into three broad strands. The first considered the history of the emergence of architecture as a profession in the 19th century and suggested that architecture's professionalisation diverged from the 'ideal' type because it does not have a body of knowledge and market that can be defined as its exclusive territory, and its dependency on clients, the economy and other 'technical' experts raises questions about its 'autonomy' (Kaye, 1960; Larson, 1983). The second strand looked at the post-war period and considered the impact of economic cycles and the changes in the structure of architectural markets on architects' role and the domain of authority (Gutman, 1988; Symes et al, 1995). The third strand highlights the culture of architecture and notes the contrast between, on the one hand, the discourses of the profession which presents it as an individual and artistic endeavour independent from construction or financial concerns, and on the other, its reality as a collaborative process subject to legal, budgetary and technical constraints (Cuff, 1991; Caven and Diop, 2012).

The issues highlighted by these accounts are informed by the classical assumptions of internal homogeneity, autonomy, occupational competition and exclusive control over clearly delineated domains of expertise, and leave us with familiar problems. Both historical and contemporary evidence undermines the assumptions of 'ideal type' profession and professionalisation, but rather than question its validity, studies of architecture present it as a case of 'failed professionalisation'; one that has not been as 'successful' as medicine or law in protecting its "jurisdiction" from competitors. Empirical

studies repeatedly highlight the complexities of architecture; its production, the impossibility of 'autonomy', differences between types of firms and sectors, the presence of a highly select elite or the idealist projections by the architectural education are not new topics in architecture. However, partly as a result of the decline of the sociology of professions and partly as a result of the fragmentation of the studies of architecture between architectural history, cultural analysis and urban studies these insights have not been brought together as a basis for re-considering its definition as a profession. What dominates the literature on the architectural profession is the theme of 'paradox', contrasts between the discourses of the profession and what seems to be happening in practice. As discussed above, the conventional theories do not provide an adequate explanation and often end with advice that the 'problems' of architecture could be solved with more effective strategies by the professional association.

Stevens (1998), whose work informs my in-depth analysis of architecture, offers another explanation and suggests that the structural divisions of the architectural field lie at the root of the mismatch observed by earlier writers. His work is an application of Bourdieu's thinking on fields of cultural production to architecture and considers its history, structure and main divisions, and the mechanisms of reproduction. He defines it as a field structured around a competition for "intellectual capital" which symbolises the recognition for one's original design style. Looking at the structure of the field, he identifies its main division as between the "restricted" and the "mass" production fields; the former driven by design oriented production, the latter restricted by functional requirements and budget concerns. His detailed description shows that certain kinds of clients, architects and buildings go together and he argues that the self-narrative of the field celebrates design oriented production and the designers of aesthetically distinctive buildings. Defining architecture as a semi-autonomous field, he rejects conceptions of technical and economic dependencies as 'constraints', but also indicates that the restricted field has more 'autonomy' to resist the non-architectural demands placed on it. In considering the mechanisms of the field's reproduction, he highlights the role played by architectural education, which, he argues inculcate and idealise the dominant view of architecture and contribute to the continuity of its existing divisions.

In this view, architecture's 'dependencies', 'idealist' or 'unrealistic' self-perceptions, the contrast between this image and the realities of practice are all seen as part of its reality, not as a diversion from an ideal type or as the unfortunate consequences of its 'weak' strategies as a profession. In other words, his analysis exemplifies how, with a field approach, the entire architectural universe and its reproduction with all the struggles and conflicts involved in this process become the object of investigation.

Thus, as Stevens demonstrates, in contrast to the idea of a profession, the field concept permits us to look at the internal processes and dynamics that frame the experiences of individual practitioners. This 'theoretical' description of the field informs my analysis, but I carry out a more in-depth exploration of the intensely conflictual and dynamic nature of the field's ongoing reproduction.

1.3   Research focus and aims

This study aims to do two things. On one level, it is an analysis of architecture as a field and on another level, it 'tests' the proposition that professions can be studied as fields. Bourdieu's studies of the fields of cultural production focus on their constitution and reproduction in the symbolic realm. My use of the concept to analyse architecture is directed at the sites of architectural production and examines whether and how the divisions and the power struggles of the field are constituted in practices involved in making architecture. The analysis, therefore, looks for the 'marks' left by the field on everyday understandings and activities, and I argue that these everyday perceptions, beliefs and practices constitute the field, and reproduce its existing divisions. In this way, the study focuses on the 'work' of a profession, but attempts to locate the material and mental processes of 'working' as an architect within field processes. It seeks to understand the everyday work of architects in relation to the workings of the field. The research also seeks to illuminate the ways in which the dynamics of the broader social world find their way

into the practices of architects engaged in making buildings; how processes not situated within the immediate world of a profession are mediated by the day-to-day practices that constitute and sustain the field.

In framing my analysis, I begin with Bourdieu's core assumptions about fields, but whilst Bourdieu's studies of the cultural fields focus on the reconstruction of divisions and power relations in the symbolic realm, in this study, the relational thinking allowed by the field concept guides an analysis of the processes involved in the *production* of architecture. Thus, this study does not analyse divisions as represented by architectural styles, products or their perceived and constructed meanings, but in terms of the different kinds of production that take place in the field. It pays special attention to the material processes and relations involved in making architecture and the kinds of capitals that requires, and suggests that these also act as platforms, like the symbolic struggles do, where the structural divisions of the field are constructed and reproduced. These 'actual' practices of production are also analysed in relation to the dominant narrative of the field that defines the legitimate architecture and architect, which illustrates the multiple tensions that arise in the field, and for the individual practitioners.

Bourdieu's field analysis is associated with mapping field structures, though he advocated, as exemplified by his empirically rich studies of the fields of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993; 1996), an open approach to methods and data. I explore the architectural field through an examination of individual architects' views and reported experiences, based on analysis of data gathered from in-depth interviews with 37 architects. I suggest that these subjective renderings give an insight into the internal struggles and processes of the field; their experiences enable us to 'see' how these are enacted in everyday practice and what kinds of conflicts and tensions the field divisions give rise to. However, this is not a representative sample and these subjective accounts are not claimed to describe the field's 'objective' reality. The study should be seen as an exploratory step that enables us to discover the architectural universe, generates evidence that initiates the construction of a

picture of the field divisions in the making and lays the ground for better informed future research.

I borrow from Stevens the outline of the structure of the field, but in contrast to this 'global' overview, I carry out an in depth analysis of architecture in contemporary Britain. This exploration also builds on Stevens' description of the divisions in the field. Starting with the open proposition of exploring the dynamics of the architectural field, the exact focus of the thesis was developed inductively and constitutes an interpretation of the evidence with the field lens. The analysis addresses four questions: First, I ask what is at stake in the architectural game and what are its perceived ideals, beliefs and necessities. This draws a picture of the architectural illusio as it is perceived by architects and enables us to begin to understand what kinds of investments architectural practice demands from those willing to enter the field. Secondly, I ask how 'external' pressures affect the prioritisation of architectural ideals and values in everyday practice. In this way, I seek to explore the obstacles that stand between architects and their ability to apply their expertise, to pursue architectural ideals, and to consider what this means for the notion of 'autonomy'. Thirdly, I ask what architects do and examine the different kinds of buildings they make, the patterns of involvement in the architectural process and contrast this with the taken for granted descriptions of architectural practice. My aim here is to develop an understanding of the different kinds of architecture produced and to highlight the tensions that arise from the contrast between actual practices and the dominant narrative that celebrates aesthetic distinction. Fourth, I continue to probe deeper into architectural production and examine the kinds of expertise it requires. The aim is to further our understanding of its divisions in relation to the capitals operational in the field.

This exploration brings out the tensions between architecture's autonomous claims and heteronomous pressures; between the doxic vision of architecture and its contestations, and between the doxa of creativity and the reality of technical and managerial expertise. In this way, I also develop an understanding of the constraints and opportunities that individual architects meet and negotiate.

1.4 Chapters

The first part of the thesis includes a critical evaluation of the classical sociology of professions (Chapter 2) and an introduction to Bourdieu's ideas and the concept field (Chapter 3), followed by an appraisal of the studies of architectural practice (Chapter 4). The second, empirical part of the thesis explores the dynamics of the architectural field. I begin by setting out the research strategy and methods of data collection and analysis, describe the fieldwork and the participants (Chapter 5). In Chapter 6, I describe the perceived ideals, rules and requirements of architectural practice and introduce the architectural world. I show that the architectural game is perceived to be about pursuing design ideals and making a social contribution, values to which participants express a strong degree of commitment. Practicing architecture is also suggested to entail participation in a competitive culture that prizes individuality, unconditional dedication and embodying the values and practices of the game. In Chapter 7, I explore the tension between the 'external' pressures and the 'autonomous' claims of architecture and demonstrate the ways in which dependency on clients and economy impact on 'design' decisions, the quality of buildings and architects' ability to apply their expertise, but also that the impact of 'external' demands are felt more strongly in the mass production sector. In Chapter 8, I begin by exploring the contestations of the dominant symbolic representations of the field. Critical reflections by participants suggest that the celebration of grand and iconic works of architecture neglects the kinds of buildings made by the majority; defines legitimate architecture with reference to its aesthetic qualities; and the 'true' architect as the designer who conceives the idea of a building. I counter-pose this with an analysis of the reported experiences of practice that participants refer to in their critique of the dominant narrative. I illustrate that against this singular image, there are different types of architecture and architect and experiences are differentiated between the restricted and the mass field, with further differences by practice size. In Chapter 9, I continue this theme by exploring the different kinds of expertise required in the making of architecture, pointing out technical and managerial knowledge and skills, against a narrative that values creativity. I further consider the hierarchical organisation of the

architectural process, which preserves the creative role for the founder of a practice and demonstrate the close link between creative, economic and symbolic capital.

Chapter 2

2   A critical review: The Sociology of Professions

An account of the sociology of the professions mirrors the shifting of emphasis between structuralist and phenomenological methodologies and the debates between the competing paradigms of the field, broadly the Durkheimian, NeoWeberian and NeoMarxist approaches to society. My aim in this chapter is to critically appraise the classical literature and lay the ground for a contrast with Bourdieu's concept of field. My argument is that despite their differences, classical theories approach their subject with similar assumptions. The early socio-historical definitions of professions with reference to their organisational and institutional attributes created an 'ideal type' that was also imported into sociological thinking. Professions are conceived as homogenous groups with common objectives of occupational closure and an ideology which is instrumental in achieving authority over a given service market. This unifying view restricts the understanding of professions to institutional strategies and ideologies with little attention to their internal processes or the connections with the broader social and economic systems. Attempts to develop a more historical and dynamic approach sensitive to the social and economic context represent significant improvements on earlier approaches, but continuing assumptions of occupational competition and internal unity prevent an appreciation of within-profession differentiation and conflict, obscures the social foundations of professional ideologies and continues to neglect individual agency. My conclusion is that the classical sociology of professions does not provide an adequate framework for capturing the complex realities of professional areas of work and for making sense of individual professionals' lived experiences.

2.1   The classical sociology of professions

The core period of theoretical development under the disciplinary banner of the sociology of professions took place in the post-war period, between 1950s and late 1980s. It could be argued that the classical theories were all driven by the question of what made professions different from other occupations and this, undoubtedly, reflects one of the central concerns of sociology; the division of labour and the changing occupational structure. Perhaps not entirely independently of this, all take their unit of analysis as an occupational group and professions are studied as collective entities with a distinctive position in the occupational division of labour. Beginning with this definition, the early socio-historical studies by the 'traits approach' sought to identify the defining attributes of professions (Carr-Saunders and Wilson, 1933); Functionalist writers looked at the normative dimensions of professional occupations and their role in society (Parsons, 1954); NeoWeberian perspectives analysed professions as status groups and focused on strategies of occupational closure (Dingwall and Lewis, 1983; Murphy, 1988; MacDonald, 1995; Larkin, 1983); the symbolic interactionist tradition considered the subjective nature of the ideology of professionalism (Hughes, 1958; Freidson, 1983 and 1986); NeoMarxist approaches emphasised the social, economic and political foundations of the rise of professions (Larson, 1977; Johnson, 1972 & 1982); and Abbott (1988), describing professions as parts of a dynamic and inter-dependent ecology, focused on shifts in boundaries of professional "jurisdictions".

2.1.1 Defining professions

Interest in professions, originally, was of a historical nature not sociological. The first studies about professions were often commissioned by leaders of exclusive groups of legal and medical practitioners and consisted of chronicling the significant events in the institutional life of the group, their activities and occupational associations (Burrage and Torstendahl (eds), 1990). This period contains the origins of some of the fundamental assumptions of sociological thinking on professions.

On the basis of these historical descriptions, Carr-Saunders & Wilson (1933) set out to identify what distinguished professions from other occupations and to describe their path to professionalisation (Caplow, 1954). The 'essential' attributes of a profession were described as a long period of education, collegial forms of collective organisation, adherence to a code of conduct, licensure, autonomy and altruistic service that is concerned with the welfare of clients (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1933; Lewis, 1983; Wilensky, 1964; McDonald, 1995; Burrage & Torstendahl (eds), 1990). This led to attempts to classify other occupations according to the same criteria and to establish the differences between occupations, for example within the same field (e.g. nurses and the medical profession) or to ascertain the status of the newly emerging occupations of the post-war period (e.g. social workers). Some professions such as teaching, nursing and social work were described as "semi-professional" (Etzioni, 1969). Others attempted to develop an "occupation-profession continuum" which included categories such as "established" (e.g. medicine, law), "marginal or in process" (e.g. nursing), "new" (e.g. city planning, hospital administration) and "doubtful" (e.g. advertising) (Pavalko, 1971, p.15 & 29).

Rigid concerns with establishing their distinctive characteristics also underpin the debate about the origins of professions and, arguably, shaped the historical boundaries of sociological research. Carr-Saunders and Wilson took the developments in the 19th century as a threshold as several groups established professional associations during this period. Other writers similarly emphasised the differences between the pre and post industrialisation forms of professional work organisation and institutions. The "occupational" or the "middle class professions" (Larson, 1977) were argued to be based on knowledge and expertise, rational forms of work organisation and autonomy from political and religious authorities and to have replaced the patronage and lineage based foundations of "status professions" of the pre-industrial era (Elliott, 1972). By contrast, historical evidence traced the emergence of some professions to middle ages and emphasized the continuities in forms of institutionalisation, monopolistic and protectionist strategies and alliances with the elites (Prest, 1984; Krause, 1996; Malatesta, 2005). Johnson (1970), drawing on similar historical analysis, described professions as a form of "occupational control", not as an occupation and emphasized the historical specificity of these formal attributes. Despite the more complex picture painted by historical evidence,

the concept of profession was defined with reference to the 19th century developments and for sociological literature this is when the history of professions begins.

The term profession also had moral connotations and implied a particular orientation and set of values. Being a professional implied having a commitment to provide a service to the community, being motivated not by financial gain but by a desire to make a contribution to society, an emphasis that finds its meaning in relation to the services provided by the medical and legal professions. The description of a profession as 'gentlemanly' has come to indicate its historical lineage, social origins of its practitioners, as well as the mode of their relationship to professional practice; a gentleman practiced with altruistic motives, as an 'amateur' and not to make a living, which implied being free from economic concerns and dedication to their vocation (Freidson, 1986, pp. 21-26). Finally, professions were also described as social groups with higher values, a distinct life-style, culture and identity, which was argued to set them apart in society (Carr-Saunders and Wilson, 1933; Pavalko, 1971; Dingwall and Lewis (eds),1983; Freidson, 1986).

Starting with the definition provided by the 'traits approach', the Functionalist thinkers were interested in the role professions played in the division of labour. The question was to identify their role in an increasingly competitive free market society, dominated by the self-interest seeking ethos of capitalist businesses. It was suggested that the "positivity" of professional groups lie in their 'altruistic' service provision to meet social needs, their higher work ethic and values. The practices of professions were seen as the source of a new moral order and a "co-operative society", which could balance the utilitarian and competitive strains of capitalism. This view also emphasised their expert status and described professions as occupations based on specialisation, technical competence and scientific knowledge (Parsons, 1954; Elliott, 1972; Dingwall, 2008).

As many later critiques argued, much of the early functionalist literature and the 'traits approach' were based on the formal organisational and institutional characteristics of law and medicine in the Anglo-Saxon world and simply reiterated their self-perceptions without much critical reflection. Thus, attributes of a few cases, specific to a time and place, were reified and raised to the status of an ideal type. Furthermore, the search for the 'essential' attributes of professions divorced their emergence from their historical context and neglected the social, economic and political conditions of their evolution. Profession and professionalisation were treated as universal categories without historical precedent or possibility of future change. Functionalist views were criticised for failing to recognise the conflictual nature of the relations between professions, the state and the market. The social ideals of professionalism were dismissed by later writers as a distraction from the 'real' motives of status, power and monetary rewards and described as a self-serving ideology or as the self-pronounced vision of the rising middle-class (Johnson, 1972; Larson, 1977; Freidson, 1983; Dingwall and Lewis (eds), 1983; Burrage and Torstendahl (eds), 1990).

A more critical thinking that sought to move beyond definitions based on self-projections developed in 1970s and the focus shifted to the causes, processes and implications of the emergence of professions as powerful groups with control over knowledge, expertise and the markets in which these are put to use and service.

2.1.2 Strategies of occupational closure and the ideology of professionalism

The 'closure theory' and the Chicago school writers share a methodological affinity in interpretive sociology and similarly emphasise the subjective aspects of professions construction as distinct occupations. The 'closure theory' considered collective strategies of professionalisation and the emergence of professions as groups brought together with 'common' interests. The emphasis on the strategies of occupational closure is underpinned by Weber's theory that social closure is a general trend in society and, that such strategies

are pursued by status groups in all areas of social life (Murphy, 1988; Macdonald, 1995). It is suggested that, all occupations are driven by the same objective and those that succeed in controlling a specific market become professions. Thus, professions are viewed as status groups formed within the division of labour and their distinctive position is seen to rest on knowledge expertise and skills. By monopolising an area of practice, professionals also gain control of education and the process of knowledge creation, which further strengthens their position (Murphy, 1988; Collins, 1990; Dingwall & Lewis (eds), 1983). With this, the early historical and Functionalist emphasis on 'altruistic' motives was replaced by a portrait of groups driven to protect their authority against challenges, which also shifted the attention to 'competition' between occupations. Empirical studies considered the ways in which professional groups seek to monitor entry into their profession, establish themselves as self-regulating bodies, and most significantly, maintain control of their domain. For instance, Larkin (1983) studied the monopolisation strategies of the medical profession, noted the different kinds of strategies pursued against inter and intra-occupational competition. Collins (1990), also drawing on Bourdieu and Passeron's work on education, looked at how professions also build a culture around ritualistic practices and symbols and argued that this is an intrinsic part of their professionalisation strategies and the closure process. Thus, brought together by 'common' economic interests, professions are also defined as a community with a distinctive life style, shared values, standards and ideals.

This externally oriented approach that focuses on inter-occupational divisions is also found in the work of Chicago School writers (Hughes, 1958) and informed analysis of the ideology of professionalism as an instrument of the process of establishing and legitimising control over service markets. In this vein, they argued that the professed values and aims of a profession represent their own interests and serve to legitimise their power and authority. This authority is argued to be based on knowledge expertise, but it is also 'won' by actively constructing an idea of a profession and legitimising its power. In other words, professions achieve domination and status by also defining themselves as such and imposing their self-definition, which is an ongoing process "accomplished" through the everyday actions and interactions of its members. This process includes negotiations with other agents and institutions active in the same market as well as official

agencies and social scientists, who define and legitimise occupational categories. In this way, the sociology of professions was redefined as "the study of the phenomenological world of occupations" (Freidson, 1983, p.29-32). This led to an empirical focus on how distinction from other occupations is negotiated and maintained in the everyday. Here, we also see a continuing interest in the cognitive dimension of professions. Professions' ability and authority to define and maintain their own "mandate" was based on knowledge expertise, which also gave them the power to construct an occupational ideology. Influenced by Foucault's views on power, Freidson emphasised the power professions had over their clients and the auxiliary occupations allied to the same area of practice (Freidson, 1975). He drew attention to the esoteric nature of professional knowledge and argued that knowledge constitutes the basis of professional power and legitimises their independence from interference from outsiders. (Freidson, 1975,1986; MacDonald, 1995). Through ethnographic studies of the medical profession in hospital settings, writers within this tradition presented accounts of everyday struggles between doctors, patients and other hospital staff (Freidson, 1975; Becker, 1961).

By describing professionalisation as a process of struggle against competitors fought by individuals who group together and act with the objective of advancing their interests, the 'closure thesis' and the conception of professionalism as an ideology introduce a sense of collective agency to theories of professions. However, in an attempt to emphasise the subjective aspects of professions, these risk reducing the reality of a profession to the phenomenological world of everyday actions and interactions. In Bourdieu's terms, methodologically, this is a 'subjectivist' understanding of the subjective dimension of the making of a profession, because the individual or collective agents' views and actions are interpreted in isolation from the social foundations of their construction. As a consequence, the exclusive focus on closure strategies or the ideology of a profession as the main mechanism of its making pre-defines their explanation, and sets the objective of sociological analysis to describing the ways in which professions advance their interests. But the changes in the division of labour and their consequences are mediated through the various interfaces of economic relations, political cultures and social dynamics and the responses of the professional association are but one element in the formation of occupations. As Halliday (1985) argued, the line between the day-to-day work of

professionals and the responses of the professional association to shifts in the division of labour appear to be completely blurred in both approaches. Halliday also challenged the empirical basis of the claims that professions are driven by closure objectives, especially of studies based on secondary historical sources, and argued that professionals spend very little of their time pursuing strategies of monopolization.

This exclusive focus on inter-occupational competition also obscures the fact that 'problems' presented by clients may not fall neatly into the domain of one occupation. A much noted difficulty is the generalisation of findings from medicine in the Anglo-American world. Larkin's (1983) much cited study of closure strategies and much of the work by Chicago School writers rely heavily on the medical profession, which, as Dingwall argued, provides the "perfect case of an occupational ecology" (Dingwall, 2008, p. 5-7). A crucial omission in both approaches is any attention to individual agency as individual professionals are assumed to be driven by the same objectives. But perhaps, the most significant absence in both approaches is the 'context' of professions - the social, economic and political structures and relations within which professions are embedded. This link was restored by Larson, who related the emergence of professions to the rise of capitalism but without abandoning the collective agency exercised by professional groups.

2.1.3 The political economy of professions

Larson's theory of professionalisation is an attempt to incorporate a structuralist Marxist perspective with an understanding of the collective subjectivity involved in achieving professional status. She was critical of the early attempts to define professions with reference to their cognitive, normative and institutional attributes and argued that professions should be seen as a product of their times; groups that emerged from the changes in the division of labour, but in mediation with the rising capitalist system, expansion of scientific knowledge and the emergence of new service markets. She was also an exception for dealing with the question of class and positioned professions in the

middle and upper middle levels of the class system. This attempt to root professions in the economic and social structure of capitalist societies constitutes the first leg of Larson's framework (Larson, 1977, 136-158). Secondly, she sought to account for the strategies of occupational groups to achieve professional status, described as a "professionalisation project" and with this, she nods to the collective agency involved in the process. She argued that a "professionalisation project" involves transferring abstract knowledge to practical application in a specific market, controlling and standardising both the knowledge and its application, maintaining the control of that market and restricting access to their ranks. Larson describes this as a "collective act of constituting and controlling a market, special social status and upward social mobility" (ibid: Introduction).

Thirdly, she argued that professions emerged as the guardians and practitioners of science, which enhanced their status and contributed to the emergence of a powerful and elitist ideology of professionalism. She highlighted the role of modern university as the key institution in the generation, teaching and certification of professional expertise (ibid: pp. 40-52). Conceiving professionals as part of the class structure, she linked the ideology of professionalism with the values of the rising middle class and the dominant ideology of bourgeois society (ibid: p.219). Her historical analysis of the emergence of professions also draws attention to internal divisions but suggests that standardised training and the promotion of a common ideology and culture promoted internal unification. By incorporating Weberian ideas of social closure and rationalisation, the Chicago School's sensitivity to the ideology of professions, as well as the Marxist insights into capitalism and class structure, she took a bold step to move beyond the traditional division between structuralist and interactionist approaches. Her model is very strong on the connections of professions with the wider context of historical and political-economic dynamics and appreciates the social foundations of professions' status and power beyond their self-projections.

However, in this formulation of the relationship between professions and the social world, there is a sense of inevitability to the way in which the trends of the capitalist economy and

the ideology of the rising middle class are reproduced at the level of the professional division of labour. The conception of professions as inseparable from economic and social processes is similar to Bourdieu's view of fields as semi-autonomous, but while specific fields are seen to contain broader social processes in mediated form, Larson sees a tight overlap between the logic of capitalism and the logic of professions. Professionalisation is perceived as a "generalised trend" linked to the development of corporate capitalism and professions as middle class occupations that fulfill the needs of the capitalist economy (ibid: p.190). Professional expertise is seen as a 'commodity', the rising currency of the new economic order, and professions as groups that capitalise on their advantaged status. In contrast to interactionist perspectives, the strategies and ideologies of professions are not analysed in isolation, but Larson doesn't quite break with the perception of professions as part of the occupational milieu. A further difficulty is that she doesn't quite extend her critical lens to the assumptions of inter-professional competition with the result that the internal reproduction of the profession is marginalised in her accounts. While she notes the conflicts present in the emergence of professions, internal struggles appear to be taken as 'resolved' with professionalisation and its unifying ideology. In other words, her macro-historical and structuralist approach does not have the space or the tools for exploring the connections between the 'external' dynamics and the internal construction of a profession as a continuous relationship and at different levels. In a later piece, informed by Foucault's ideas on knowledge, expertise and power, Larson argued that the question of professions should be understood as a form of knowledge construction and described professions as "discursive fields", an idea also developed in dialogue, albeit very limited, with Bourdieu's work on scientific fields (Larson, 1990). This can be seen as a shift in emphasis from external determinations by capitalist dynamics to the internal processes of professions, but it was not developed further to replace her earlier formulation of their connections.

Here, it might also be helpful to consider the issue of 'autonomy' which, I suggest, can be seen as a prism for reflecting on the contrasts between the classical views and Bourdieu's understanding of the relationship between specific fields and the broader social processes. To a large extent, with the exception of Marxism informed approaches such as Larson and Johnson, classical theories of professions did not problematise this relationship and

implicit assumptions of 'independence' have remained unpacked. Evidence from other branches of sociology indirectly undermine the assumption of autonomy, but with the decline of the sociology of professions these have not found their way into the theories of professions.

2.1.4 Professions and autonomy

The notion of autonomy is ambiguous in the early literature, but it can be seen to connote professional authority and control on two levels: self-regulation of own affairs and freedom from control in the workplace. In other words, it gives expression to the 'formal' independence gained from political and religious authorities in the 19th century and provision of services by pre-dominantly self-employed practitioners. The definition of professions as autonomous from political authorities was challenged by Johnson (1982), who showed that the right to self-regulate was achieved with the support of the British state, not against it, and indicated that the state continues to guarantee this right. The relationship between professions and the powerful elites was also noted by Freidson (1970 and 1975) and Larson (1977), and evidenced by historical studies (Burrage and Torstendahl (eds), 1990; Prest, 1984; Krause, 1996) raising questions about the meaning of 'independence', but this insight did not lead to re-appraisals of the idea of autonomy as the sociological literature begins with the 'fully formed' groups of the 19th century. Consequently, 'institutional' autonomy is taken for granted and is seen to be secure as long as a profession has licensure, but this also led to a static understanding of the relationship between professions and the broader social processes.

Theories of threats to professions' autonomy stemmed from observations of the employment of previously self-employed practitioners such as doctors, lawyers and accountants in large public and private organisations in the post-war period. The idea of an autonomous profession came in for criticism under the influence of debates on the rise of bureaucracy and assumptions of conflict between hierarchical, standardising and control

oriented structures of bureaucratic organisations and the 'self-control' sought by 'independent' practitioners. Research in this vein was framed, broadly, by Weber's theories on the rise of bureaucratisation and rationalisation in modern societies and involved analysis of compatibilities and conflicts between professional and bureaucratic modes of work organisation, including the degree and the nature of individual autonomy and the overlap between the priorities of professionals and organisations (Larson, 1977). These studies were increasingly accompanied by calls to abandon the "conflict model" of their relationship and pointed out the possibilities for autonomy in large organisations (Davies, 1983; Murphy, 1990). Larson, similarly, pointed out the parallels between the two as "rational systems of administration", and the 'bureaucratisation' of the oldest professions of medicine, law and accountancy in particular, led to the conceptions of this pattern as an inevitable trend linked to the development of capitalism and to the descriptions of post-war formations as "organisational professionals" (Larson, 1977, pp.178-207).

The debate within the sociology of professions petered out with the decline of the discipline, but the theme of professions and large organisations was developed, from the early 90s, in organisational sociology. This literature does not address the question of 'autonomy' directly, but it provides further proof, if it was needed, that the assumptions of autonomy by the classical theories were based on historically specific cases of a handful of professions and describes a particular way of organising professional work and providing professional services. Studies of professionals in large organisations also came to form the basis of calls for an organisational definition of professions. It is argued that professions' strategies, ideologies and professional identities are shaped by organisational priorities and logics, not with reference to occupational ideologies and strategies (Current Sociology Monograph, 2011). The aim here is not to evaluate the organisational literature as this is beyond the remit of this study, but it is worth noting that this literature illustrates, indirectly, that conceptions of autonomy based on forms of work organisation fundamentally restricts the appreciation of the relations between the social and economic processes and the professions. To some extent, this emphasis on the organisational context reverses Larson's contribution, which interprets organisational changes in relation to shifts in the economy. Although this assumption hovers in the background of organisational

studies, the link between organisations and *their* context is marginalised in research that examines the experiences of professionals within the boundaries of the workplace. As we will see in the analysis of Architecture, practices within organisations or firms also need to be analysed in relation to the specific structure and dynamics of the field of production within which they are situated and broad assumptions about the impact of political or economic trends, while relevant, are not sufficient for explaining how these are then filtered through a professional field's own mechanisms of reproduction.

There is, also, a missed opportunity here to reconsider the parameters of the notion of autonomy and the scope of thinking on the interface of professions and society. This limiting of horizons to the rise and dominance of large bureaucratic organisations obscures the wide sweep of social, economic and political processes and their influences on professional areas of practice. Abbott, the last major theoretical contributor to the classical sociology of professions conceived a more multifaceted relationship between professions and the social world. He also argued for a dynamic conception of professions, distancing himself from definitions that will need to be updated as times change.

2.1.5 Professions as an ecological system

Abbott's (1988) theory rests on the rejection of static definitions that reify organisational and institutional attributes. Although he does not share the focus on the subjective construction of professional ideologies, the inspiration for his ecology metaphor is, nevertheless, typically Chicago School. The idea that professions should be studied as parts of a co-dependent system can be seen as an extension of the notion of "occupational ecology" used by Hughes (1958), to describe the division of labour as a competitive yet dependent structure of hierarchical relations between occupations.

Hughes looked at the consequences of changes in the division of labour, which he argued means a shift in occupational "mandates", and suggested that these give rise to "jurisdictional disputes" and create a need to re-negotiate occupational boundaries. Looking at the professional division of labour as an ecology, Abbott argued that the evolution of professions cannot be studied on the basis of single cases, because they exist in an interdependent "system of professions" and they are in constant conflict with each other to define, legitimise and preserve their own "jurisdiction". The term "jurisdiction" describes the area of work that is the specialism of a profession. According to Abbott, a study of how professions evolve should examine how the boundaries with other professions shift, because changing boundaries of work brings professions into conflict with each other, which means that their evolution cannot be understood in isolation. Similarly, internal divisions result from differentiation in the work of a profession and are indicative of prospective shifts in jurisdiction boundaries.

He suggests, therefore, that the main thing to understand is the content of a professions' work, which, he argued, earlier theories failed to examine. Describing the nature of professional work, he considers the sources of professional tasks and the properties of professional work. Professions define and establish their jurisdictions through defining new problems and issues as their own. Solving these problems involves the three stages of "diagnosis, inference and treatment" (ibid, p.40) and "inference" is identified as the defining characteristic of professional work; the part that cannot be codified, standardised or delegated and reliant on the application of "professional judgement". With this, Abbott attempts to decode the logic of professional work, which is different from an emphasis on the knowledge base of a profession's authority. What matters is its abstract nature and application, which involves strictly 'professional' tasks as well as more routine ones, seen as a source of internal differentiation. In explaining how jurisdictional boundaries change, Abbott acknowledges that professions become recognised jurisdictions through actively claiming and achieving legitimacy. He also looks beyond their strategies and conceives the system of professions as an internally dynamic organism that is open to the influence of external processes. The sources of change in boundaries could be internal (e.g. expanding knowledge base, attempts of professionalisation from subordinate groups) or external (e.g.

technological changes turned artisans into engineers) or organisational (e.g. teaching is dependent on organizational dynamics).

In describing professional work, Abbott abstracts from the activities involved in solving a problem and describes the steps involved in completing a task, but what does this tell us about working as a professional, without the context of relations and structures that frame those practices? This difficulty relates to Abbott's conception of the social world and how the professions relate to it. As Abbott himself puts it, in contrast to Larson's structuralist take on the relationship between the emergence of professions and capitalism, he proposes that changes in professional jurisdictions are open to unlimited possibilities and emerge from multiple and multi-level interactions and relations (1988: p.113, also see 2005) with other ecologies. By considering the sources of change, Abbott's model nods to the processes external to the system of professions, but the internal and external sources of change considered include only the factors that have a direct impact on jurisdictional boundaries. In other words, the 'external' sources of change seem to exist in so far as they have an impact on professional ecologies. To use Abbott's terminology, it is not clear whether there is a 'super ecology' that includes the system of professions, as well as the web of broader social and economic processes and structures. This model is silent on questions of economy, politics and class and it is not clear how the dynamics of these systems relate to the "system of professions" in a more structured and continuous way. As it will be discussed in the next chapter, this contrasts with Bourdieu's understanding of fields, which are similarly viewed as dynamic entities, but Bourdieu also emphasises the structural continuities between and within fields. Abbott responds to similar criticisms in a more recent paper, but here he reiterates and further substantiates his argument that these relations are contingent and indeterminate (2005).

A further difficulty that he shares with Larson is that Abbott's approach does not take us very far from concerns with occupational monopoly and does not help with understanding the internal dynamics and processes that shape the practice of a professional trade. Internal divisions and conflicts are interpreted as jurisdictional disputes (ibid, p.20), but with this,

we are back to the classical assumption that what makes a profession is its bid for monopoly over a market. This imparting of an objective to a group is a fundamental barrier to asking questions about individual practitioners and understanding internal differences in terms that might be more critical and attentive to divisions and relations of power than describing the changes in the division of labour. Abbott's (1991) later interest in the potential influences of the "organizational mode of institutionalising professional expertise" is similar to the arguments pursued in organizational sociology in that it is a retrospective update on changing forms of organising professional services, but once again, this supplements his earlier theory of professional ecologies and the oppositional perceptions of their relations.

As with Larson then, in Abbott's model, the difficulties lie not in the focus of his analysis but the boundaries set to his investigation by the concept of profession. The assumptions of group strategies, inter-professional competition, the shifts in the division of labour as the locust of life and the engine of change within professional domains and the wider social world does not leave any space for a critical examination of other processes and structures, internal or external. My argument is that this pre-occupation with occupational divisions, groups and presumed competition between them completely distracts from the realities of professionals, their work and relations to the social world, and as the above review shows, without a radical re-think of *how* we define and approach professions, these concerns seep into seemingly different theories which, in fact, all begin with very similar assumptions. This is also exemplified by the more recent approaches to professions that attempt to formulate a 'new' definition.

2.2   Recent developments in the sociology of professions

Since late 1980s, the classical sociology of professions has declined and there have been few similarly theoretically oriented studies of professions within this tradition. In these there is a return to the emphasis on the knowledge based expertise of professionals which

led some to describe them as a global force, active across national boundaries and with the power to influence the direction of global society (Crompton, 1990; Perkin, 2002; Freidson, 2001). These studies contain a familiar appeal to the independent 'logic of professionalism' as a potential counter-force against the influence of politically and profit driven groups and policies, which is reminiscent of the early 'positivist' receptions of professions as 'altruistic' service providers.

There has also been a return to the debates about the definition of professions. To a large extent these new debates relate to the differences between the Continental professions and the 'liberal' professions of the Anglo-American world (Burrage and Torstendahl (eds), 1990). More recent studies in this vein attempted to develop a model that could apply to professions on both sides of the Atlantic, with yet more typologies emerging in the process. There have been also calls to develop typologies based on characteristics other than formal institutional and organisational attributes. These include attempts to synthesise traditional definitions with the continental bürgertum approach to middle classes (Kocka, 1990); typologies that seek to include all the different elements previously emphasised by different theories such as the self-perceptions of professions, relations with their clients, the role of the state and professions' authority over the reproduction of their knowledge base (Burrage, Jarausch and Siegrist, 1990); a return to the traditional emphasis on ethics and organisational 'autonomy' (Sciulli, 2005) and calls to include the subjective social psychological understanding of professions.

Despite recognising the 'traits-Functionalist' tinge in any attempt to devise a typology, new models are argued to be needed for reasons of 'operationalisation' in empirical research (Burrage, Jarausch and Siegrist, 1990). The continuing interest in capturing the 'essence' of a profession in more complex and contemporary typologies applicable across time and place suggests that the continental attempts have not moved away from definitional debates and the classical notion of profession (Sciulli, 2005, Malatesta, 2005, Tornstendahl, 2005).

More recent attempts to revive the sociology of professions show that unless this is accompanied by a shift in our conceptions of the professions and the methodological approaches that guide our investigations, the concept will be re-incarnated in different shapes and forms and it will continue to hamper the attempts to develop a more critical understanding of the complexities that make the reality of a professional domain of practice.

2.3   Summary and Conclusions

A review of the theories of professions is like holding a mirror on the classical debates of sociology. In traits-functionalist and interactionist accounts, professions are defined, respectively, with reference to their structural position and 'role' in the division of labour and society, or with reference to their collective strategies and ideologies of closure, each producing a one-sided account whilst both of these aspects re relevant to our understanding. Larson and Abbott's attempts to overcome reductionist accounts are significant and influential contributions, but the tension between the different levels of understanding remains unresolved. For Larson, professions collectively respond to the opportunities and constraints a capitalist economy presents, which has a deterministic undertone and does not provide the tools for a micro analysis of a profession's making. For Abbott, the key is to understand the changing boundaries of a profession's domain of work that follows no determined path, but proceeds in a process shaped by any number of actors and variables. The difficulty here is to see the ways in which social relations envelopes and mediates the changes in the division of labour and consequently an overemphasis on 'conscious' strategies that are presumed to be developed in response to its transformations.

At the same time, classical theories have a lot in common. The traits theory' was neither historical nor sociological enough, but the idea of a profession as an elite occupational group with common objectives and interests appear to have found its way into later thinking. The classical sociology of professions is underpinned by a pre-occupation with

the occupational division of labour, inter and intra-professional competition, and the organisational aspects of professional work. A profession is pre-defined as a collective entity in pursuit of monopoly, status and power. The activities, strategies and ideologies of institutions are not insignificant, but these tend to replace individuals in accounts of professionalisation. The emergence of collective strategies and ideologies as representations of a profession are rightly noted, but the relations involved in their construction remain unquestioned; the construction, significance and the meaning of outwardly directed strategies in terms of the own making of a professional domain. Professions or the ecological system of professions are attributed objectives and strategies, and therefore personified, but this sense of agency does not extend to individual professionals who are assumed to identify with these aims and drives. This assumption of unity between the profession and its members pre-judges the relationship professionals have with their field of practice and leaves no space for exploring what practising a profession entails and means for practitioners. The description of professions as groups with common ideals, values and beliefs is also indicative of a unifying vision and is unable to account for internal differentiation.

New research that seeks to update the profile and the definition of professions in light of contemporary changes in professional work and its organization does not challenge its underlying assumptions and falls back on 'old' ideas about how to define and study professions and my argument is that this is the fundamental question that needs to be asked: how can we study a professional area of practice in a way that does not reduce it to its position in the division of labour, the capitalist economy or to the presumed strategies and ideologies pursued by the professional association? How can me make space for questions about what practicing a profession actually involves, the paths, constraints and opportunities it presents and how it comes to form as a domain with established ideas and practices that facilitate its everyday construction and ensures its continuity? My argument here is not that the lines of investigation pursued by earlier writers are unnecessary or wrong, but that these need to be incorporated into an analytical framework that is sensitive to the practicing of a professional trade at different levels, by individual and collective actors, and in connection to organisational, social, political and economic structures and relations. These are all part of the complex reality that makes a professional area of

practice what it is, but the difficulty faced by the classical theories is not just that they provide partial accounts. It is the very idea of profession that we need to re-think if we are to avoid static and essentialist models pre-occupied with occupational divisions, and not be hampered by a dichotomous thinking engendered by a priori assumptions about what a profession is.

In the next chapter, I consider how the concept of field can facilitate a re-formulation and help address some of these difficulties.

Chapter 3

3 Rethinking professions with Bourdieu: a field approach

In this chapter, I introduce Bourdieu's ideas and consider how the concept of field can help to reorient studies of professions. I take my inspiration from Bourdieu's own positioning of himself against the competing paradigms of sociology and argue that as yet another site of the entrenched divisions between structuralist and phenomenological approaches, Bourdieu offers the sociology of professions the tools to renew itself. I suggest that Bourdieu's 'field analysis' provides a framework for developing a historically specific analysis of professions as relational spaces and it shifts the attention away from presumed essential characteristics and inter-professional competition, to their making, internal dynamics, and the interface with the social world.

Bourdieu's work involves no direct engagement with the sociology of professions but his empirical investigations into specific fields can also be seen as studies of collectivities, similar to professional occupational groups such as writers (1993), artists (1996), legal practitioners (1987) or academics (1988), as agents active in various fields of cultural production. A brief reference to the notion of profession was made in the Preface to the Homo Academicus (1984), which Bourdieu argued tacitly rejects the idea of profession and its analysis by the Chicago school writers. He expatiated on this comment in a discussion about reflexivity (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1989a, p.38; 1992, pp. 241-246). Commenting on the consequences of adapting self-definitions of groups as sociological concepts, Bourdieu uses the term profession as an example and argues that it hides the conflicts and struggles involved in its construction and therefore obscures the role this construction plays in sustaining the status quo:

"The notion of profession is a dangerous one, because it has all the appearances of neutrality in its favor. Profession is a folk concept which has been uncritically smuggled into scientific language and which imports into it a whole social unconscious. It is the product of a historical work of construction and representation of a group which has slipped into the very science of this group. ... All this social work of construction of the category must be undone and analysed so that a rigorous sociological construct can be built that accounts for its success.....to accept the preconstructed notion of profession is to lock oneself up in the alternative of celebration (as do so many American studies of "professions") and partial objectivation."

He concludes his comments by arguing that the idea of a profession needs to be replaced by that of ***field*** if one is to be able to account for the "full reality it pretends to capture*"* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1989a, p.38). As these comments indicate, Bourdieu's critique of the appropriation of professions as an object of study by sociologists is predicated on a more fundamental challenge to the classical heritage of sociology. Bourdieu developed his approach through a critical appraisal of the dominant intellectual traditions of his time and this critique is directly relevant to the sociology of professions, as it was yet another site of the debates between the 'subjectivist' and 'structuralist' philosophies and the Marxist, Weberian and Durkhemian approaches to society (Brubaker, 1985). I, therefore, begin by outlining the core principles of his thinking as a means of locating the field notion within his broader vision. I then introduce and evaluate the concept of field, in comparison with the classical theories of professions and consider the potential that a field analysis framework offers.

3.1   The point of departure: methodological beginnings

Bourdieu's sociological vision rests on a critique of the dichotomous perceptions of social phenomena, which he saw as a fundamental barrier to the development of sociology adequate for the complex nature of reality. He sought to transcend the reductionist approaches of

structuralist and phenomenological sociology by breaking away from both. What he termed the "double rupture" is achieved by re-defining the objective and subjective dimensions of reality as "relational" constructs (Bourdieu, 1997, pp.52-65), and this distinctive ontology constitutes the philosophical origins of his way out of the agency-structure conundrum. He proposed that the dichotomy between objective and subjective aspects of social reality is a false one, because agency and structure are formed in relation to each other: Agents construct social reality through their understanding and actions, their practice. At the same time, they are structured by social reality and formed under certain "conditions of existence". He described this as the "double structuration of the social world".

Accordingly, 'subjectivist' studies of observed actions and reported accounts "perceive the world as self evident" (Bourdieu, 1972, p.3 and pp.1-16), reduce the social world to its representations and fail to see that immediately observable interactions "mask the structures that are realised in them" (Bourdieu, 1989b, p.16). By a reverse logic, 'objectivist' approaches fail to account for the active construction of the social world by agents who perceive, internalise or contest the observed regularities and structures of social life, and therefore reduce actions and interactions to structures (Bourdieu, 1989b, p.17). For Bourdieu, both of these are essential for capturing the truth of a phenomenon: "Social reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in fields and habitus, outside and inside of agents." (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 127), and we need to include in our accounts both the 'subjectivist' and the 'objectivist' moments of sociological analysis. The object of analysis is, thus, recast as the "relational" study of the construction of the social world through the multifarious and two-way structuring between agents and the social space (Bourdieu, 1972; 1989a; 1989b; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992).

Thinking relationally about social phenomena is, therefore, the linchpin of Bourdieu's methodology. It is for this reason that Bourdieu described the rejection of "naturalised preconstructions" (Bourdieu, 1992, p.241) such as the concept of profession and the

construction of the object of study as the most important stage of research. It follows that, by celebrating their self-projections, analysis of social groups such as professions by the traits theory and the Functionalist accounts contribute to their constructions as ahistorical entities with 'essential' characteristics. In Bourdieu's description of 'profession' as a 'pre-construct', we see a parallel with the symbolic interactionist criticism that 'profession' is a subjective construction but for Bourdieu, this step is not sufficient without an understanding of the field specific and wider social divisions and structures that are hidden in it. Later and more critical approaches claim to see beyond the self-projections of professions, but the break with the idea of an occupational group is half-hearted. As discussed in the previous chapter, early descriptions are not completely abandoned but are imported into theories about professions' strategies and ideologies of 'social closure', construction in the everyday, position in capitalism and class structure or the place in the division of labour. Underscored by subjectivist or objectivist ontologies, in Bourdieu's terms, these are "half truths", that reduce the understanding of professions to one or the other aspect of their reality, an approach, methodologically, only one step away from 'essentialist' definitions. Larson's (1977) model seeks to include both aspects, but she continues to work with the notion of profession as an occupational group whose subjectivity is expressed in the collective agency involved in achieving professionalization. Abbott (1988) changes the unit of analysis to the entire 'system of professions', an inter-dependent ecology with field like qualities, but in a bid to emphasise the 'emergent' nature of social reality, neither the subjective nor the objective aspects of the system's making or how they relate to each other are clearly articulated. The emphasis on the 'fluidity' of social processes captures something of the complexity and the uncertainties of the social world, but this neglects continuities, established patterns of relations, divisions and structures that feed into social processes and agents' practices. But what this detailed comparison of philosophical origins really highlights is that we cannot 'fix' the sociology of professions by mixing subjective and objective aspects together in the recipe and without completely breaking with the idea of a profession as an occupational group. My argument here is that Bourdieu's relational social ontology, that is the proposition that social groups can be understood within the context of the space of relationships that they occupy (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.228-230), can help make the qualitative leap that is needed to leave the classical concept of profession behind.

51

I now consider Bourdieu's view of the social world briefly and introduce the analytical tools that he developed to give expression to his vision, which he described as "constructivist structuralism or structuralist constructivism" (Bourdieu, 1989b, p.14).

3.2   Conceptual tools for understanding the social world: field, capital and habitus

The concept of *field* is used by Bourdieu to describe the social world as a whole and the sub-spaces within it and intends to give expression to its structure. To be clear, the social space is not an 'objective' structure that exists 'out there', but it does have a structure that is subjectively constructed by agents' (individual and collective) practices. One of the concerns guiding his sociology was the divisions within society and he sought to uncover the mechanisms of differentiation. Bourdieu argued that the lines of division that we observe, such as class, indicate differences in possession of different kinds of resources that he termed *capitals*. He suggested that agents' practices are aimed at accumulating the capitals that are at play in society. Positions within the social space denote possession of different amounts, types and combinations of capital and the social space is hierarchically structured as agents have comparatively more or less of the necessary resources; it has dominant and dominated poles as indicated by different degrees of capital embodied in these positions. This, therefore, defines the social space as a field of power relations between agents (Bourdieu, 1985; 1989b; 1992).

Bourdieu identified *economic and cultural capital* as the main types of resources with the most potential for generating differentiation into distinct social classes (Bourdieu, 1984). *Economic capital* refers to material resources and was largely seen as self-explanatory by Bourdieu. **Cultural capital** was developed in detail and refers to a wide range of cultivated dispositions, capabilities and competencies acquired in the family and inculcated in the education system. Thus, cultural capital exists both in embodied state and in objectified form,

for example as certified qualifications. Different kinds of capital are also convertible to each other; economic capital, for instance, owned by family, enables access to educational and other opportunities of achievement and the cultivation of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984; 1986; 1989b, p.17; 1992).

The conception of society as a class divided space is also fundamental to his notion of **habitus,** which refers to the subjective dimension of social reality, but which breaks with the subjectivist notions of agency. Habitus is a "structured system of dispositions" that is formed in relation to agents' conditions of existence. It, therefore, is not a random collection of attributes or inherent characteristics, but rather a mediative frame of reference that has the imprint of objective social structures and generates the observed views and practices of agents (Bourdieu, 1972, p.72). The "primary" or class habitus is formed in the early years of life, within the family and in the education system which inculcate a way of being, living and knowing and give the habitus its' core structure. Whilst the class habitus is carried into future practices, agents have the adaptability to continue to develop the capabilities and dispositions necessary to take part in specific fields (Bourdieu, 1972; 1992; 1997).

I end this brief overview of Bourdieu's key concepts by introducing the notions of **symbolic capital** *and* **symbolic power** for these express the emphasis Bourdieu put on the 'ideational' aspects of the making of the social world. Further, within specific fields, the 'autonomous' stakes of the game tend to be expressed in and through the symbolic systems so it is central to understanding the social world and the fields within it. Symbolic capital was defined as the form economic or cultural capital assume, when agents "misrecognise the arbitrariness of its possession and accumulation" (Bourdieu, 1992, p.119). He argued that symbolic interests, that is, the drive to gain recognition and prestige are related to economic interests, but are not reducible to them. The struggle for symbolic capital have a logic of its own and it is fought in the symbolic realm, and by examining the symbolic struggles and systems, Bourdieu provides a way of incorporating non-material struggles, resources and powers into the very construction

of the social world. Just like cultural capital, symbolic capital can also be objectified through titles that guarantee recognition, institutionalised through regulations and legislation and can generate further cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1992). Significantly, it also gives agents the authority and the power to present and impose a certain description of the divisions of the social world; it acts as "a power of constitution" or "a power of world making" (1989b, p.22). As symbolic power comes to be objectified through representations that define and prescribe the written and unwritten rules and regulations of the world and internalised by agents, it becomes a "collective belief" (1972:43) and accepted as legitimate authority. This also hides the *"symbolic violence"* inherent in the imposition of particular differentiations and visions, on agents who do not have a 'choice' over accepting those representations. An example from Bourdieu's own work is his description of how socially expected and acceptable routines around "gift giving" are informed by positions in relations of power and contribute to the concealment of what is economically an exploitative relationship between peasant and landowner (Bourdieu, 1972). It is the symbolic realm where struggles over the narrative of the world takes place and symbolic capital and power serve to ensure the continuity of material and power divisions in favour of the dominant. Thus, the distinctiveness of Bourdieu's thinking lies in exposing the relationship between such struggles over authority and underlying divisions over material interests and illustrating the significance of symbolic representations in the construction and the maintenance of an apparent consensus in the social world. The idea of symbolic capital both tightens the link between symbolic power and underlying structural advantages and at the same time appreciates the very real force it exercises by freeing symbolic struggles from the shackles of economic determinism.

Let me re-cap briefly before I elaborate on Bourdieu's application of these ideas to specific fields of production. First, Bourdieu proposes to bridge the subjectivist - objectivist divide with a relational understanding of the social world. Secondly, he puts agents centre stage and it is through agents that we can appreciate the inseparability of perceptions, views, 'lived' experiences <u>and </u>the objectively existing structural relations. Thirdly, and by implication, the aim of sociological analysis is to understand the relations that constitute the social world. In

contrast to phenomenological approaches that consider subjective accounts or observed interactions as the 'ultimate truth' of a situation, Bourdieu insists that agents' views and practices need to be understood in relation to the social structural relations that orient their actions; as an outcome of the "meeting" between individual's preferences, capacities and resources and the constraints and possibilities that the social world presents. The classical theories have no space for talking about the experiences of individual professionals. Bourdieu's framework provides the tools for exploring their practices without assumptions of a commitment to a professional ideology. Similarly, the observed strategies, interactions and self-projected discourses of a profession are important to understand, but for Bourdieu, these need to be analysed in relation to the divisions within the 'profession'; collectively held beliefs and ideas represent particular positions within the social world and cannot be conceived of as the 'common' ideals of an undifferentiated mass.

I now turn to examining Bourdieu's analysis of specific fields of production, which are underpinned by the theoretical and methodological principles outlined above. Studies of specific fields also exemplify 'field analysis' and provide further conceptual tools that can be utilised in the context of professional areas of practice.

3.3   Understanding fields: struggle for capitals and structural divisions

For Bourdieu, the social world itself comprises of hierarchically situated fields, each structured around a struggle fought over specific capitals. Bourdieu wanted to develop a model that is able to account for the complex differentiation of the social world into distinct spheres and a model capable of probing into these domains without reference to an original source of conflict that lies in the economy or class divisions. Just as he rejects the agency-structure dichotomy, Bourdieu also rejects oppositional conceptions of economy, politics and culture.

In Bourdieu's thinking, the economic and political fields are themselves distinctive fields and his model can be described as a theory of fields within fields, each with a struggle fought over specific capitals, which at the same time, contain the struggles of political and economic fields. To contrast with the sociology of professions, Bourdieu does not analyse writers or scientists or judges as occupational groups, but rather, he examines the fields of literary production, the juridicial field or the field of academia/science (Bourdieu, 1987, 1988, 1993, 1996). The focus is therefore the entire 'literary world' or the 'world of academia' as a space of relationships within which agents, who might also call themselves professional, are positioned. In the literary field for example, this would be not just authors, but also schools/universities, publishers and literary journals, organisers of literary festivals and awards, literary products and their consumers.

Bourdieu described specific fields as "***structurally homologous'*** to the social space as a whole, which means that they are constructed according to the same principles. Each field is a divided space of relationships with a hierarchical structure and objectively identifiable lines of division. However, to say that there are struggles over resources in every field does not indicate anything about the divisions and conflicts specific to a field. For Bourdieu, these are empirical questions. The struggles in each field take a specific form and are fought over capitals that are only meaningful in that field. ***The specific capital of the field*** can be material or embodied and it constitutes the instrument of production. Only through utilising these resources that agents would be able to take part in it. Economic capital, for instance may represent the financial resource, or material resources necessary to set oneself up in the field. Cultural capital in the form of embodied knowledge or skills or certified qualifications may also function as an instrument of production and might be a pre-requisite for entering a field. Agents accumulate the capitals required, the currency of its game, and the differential distribution of these resources forms the basis of the field's divisions. We might note here the difference between Bourdieu's definition of 'interest' and the view that professions are groups driven by self-interest. Classical theories attribute to groups a drive to achieve market monopoly and status, which this leads from assumptions of inter-occupational competition and

theories of closure, and these objectives are also imparted to individual professionals. This presumed drive to seek interest, in other words, does not have a social basis or a sociological explanation. For Bourdieu, there is interest at the heart of all practice, but this is not interest in economic terms. The term is used to describe what drives agents' practices; finding a position within the social world by accumulating the kinds of capitals necessary to achieve and maintain one's presence. And it can take different forms, as exemplified by different kinds of capitals. Thus, interests pursued by individuals overlap with the necessities of the social world. Bourdieu rejects assumptions of 'rational', calculating individuals seeking to maximise their opportunities and rewards (Bourdieu and Wacquant; 1992: p.115-120; 2000: 183-184) such as the 'objectives' and 'strategies' attributed to the members of a profession. Rather, he talks about agents with a 'practical' understanding of what is required of them and whose interest lies in responding to the constraints and possibilities presented by the structural conditions of a field.

The structure of the field is, then, shaped by the distribution of agents according to the degree and composition of their capital resources and powers, but these capitals and the powers they generate do not operate completely exclusively of each other. As Bourdieu describes in relation to "academic capital and power" and "intellectual authority" within the university field, "they are both competitive and complementary" (1988:112-118). Although the bearers of different kinds of capital will be in competition and "hostile" to each other, functionally they work together to ensure that the field operates as it should. Another example is the division between "theorists" and "practitioners" in the juridicial field, whose activities together maintain the dominance of law (1987: 823-824). Nevertheless, these different capitals have differential weights and lead agents to different positions in the field. Fields are also multi-structured: divisions within a field are expressed as distinctions between groups that are positioned at different locations, between kinds of production (e.g. large scale or pure production), different narratives of the field (e.g. pure art or political/realist art), genres, consumers, institutions and individuals operative in the field at a given point in time (Bourdieu, 1993; 1996). Thus, whilst the orthodox approaches to professions see a division of

labour between 'higher' professions and 'supporting' occupations or by stage of career or between organisations/firms, Bourdieu sees a division between different capitals, powers and views of the field. For instance, in the fields of cultural production, Bourdieu noted a division between high art and mass/popular culture and suggested that the former is ruled by "disinterestedness", while the latter is ruled by economic imperatives. The symbolic power of high art is further sustained by institutions such as the education system, galleries, museums and art journals which are different platforms through which the legitimate forms of art are consecrated. The divisions between styles, then, express differences based on the autonomous logic of the field, in this case aesthetic principles (Bourdieu, 1993). A crucial point here is that these capitals and divisions take a specific form that is only meaningful in relation to the internal logic of the field. For instance, a distinction between 'high' and 'low art' may symbolise all kinds of material and ideational differences in the field of artistic production, but would have no meaning in the juridicial field.

Bourdieu describes the specificity of each field like a ***game, or an 'illusio'***. So, while they all operate by the same logic, each field is a distinct universe, a ***'microcosm'*** with a distinct ethos (Bourdieu, 1989a, 1992). The structure of the field, the relations within it and its discourses all emanate from this specificity. In the literary field for example, what is at stake is not economic or political capital, but agents need cultural and symbolic capital to be able to participate in literary production and contestations are expressed and decided according to literary criteria, not economic or political position or resources. (Bourdieu, 1993,1996). Bourdieu emphasised the importance of understanding expressions of **"*symbolic interest*"** and the significance of symbolic capital such as prestige as the foundation of the authority and power to take part in struggles over the direction of the field, the power to impose own vision (Bourdieu, 1989b). Thus, the struggle for symbolic capital is part of the game, indeed, is perceived and presented to be what the game is all about. To give some examples, he argued that in the field of cultural production, the struggle is stated to be about establishing "the legitimate mode of cultural production" (Bourdieu, 1993, p.41); in the literary field, the struggle is expressed as a debate over acceptable forms of literary expression and the definition of 'writer' (Bourdieu, 1996); in

the scientific field, the symbolic form taken by the specific capital is the authority to define what is 'scientific' and therefore to establish the dominant scientific paradigm (Bourdieu, 1975); and in the juridicial field, it is the authority to determine law (Bourdieu, 1987). It is, therefore, by focusing on the internal processes of a field that we can make sense of its symbolic struggles, which express the stakes of the game in terms of field's autonomous principles.

With the definition of fields as structured space of objective relations set around struggles for specific capitals, we note the basic "properties of fields" and begin to establish the principles of 'field thinking' (Bourdieu, 1989b, pp.105-107; 1996) on professions. This understanding of the specific production that is accomplished in a field, the capitals necessary to take part in this production, and power divisions that arise out of the accumulation of the required capitals describe what the world inside the field is like; how it works. We might contrast this with Abbott's description of the 'work' of a profession, which seeks to identify what makes professional labour qualitatively different (i.e. inference) and highlights the changes in professionals' domain (e.g. new specialisations emerging in medical practice) but there is little to be understood with this view, about, for instance, what being a doctor, being a lawyer or an architect entails and means to practitioners; what it is that meets individuals as they enter a field of practice. Questions of divisions between fields are not insignificant for Bourdieu. An often raised criticism is the difficulty of establishing a field's boundaries (Thomson, 2008), to which Bourdieu responds by defining it as part of a field's making; subject of its symbolic representations, always at stake and contested, for the narrative of a field also defines the legitimate types of practice and practitioner, tacitly implying who is in, who is out. The entry criteria for professions, such as the required education and qualifications also indicate a boundary, but this does not account for the perennially contested nature of a profession's definition from within, not as a response to presumed challenges from without.

Seeing fields as internally divided spaces also allows us to account for internal differentiation beyond conflicts between a profession and auxiliary occupations or division by specialisation. The idea of a unified profession loses sight of the constraints that issue from the structure of a field. Internal conflicts and struggles also raise questions about to what extent one can talk about the 'culture' or the 'ideology' of a profession as representing the 'interests' of the group as a whole. This brings us to the tension between consensus and continuity on the one hand and conflict and change on the other. For Bourdieu, fields are conflictual, divided and contested spaces, but they also present themselves as 'united' and stable. But how is this different from the internally unifying look characteristic of classical theories? To answer that, we need to understand the role of *doxa* as an active force in the making of a field.

3.4   Symbolic struggles and the work of doxa

For Bourdieu, the 'culture' and the 'ideology' of a profession is the vision imposed by the dominant groups in the field and it is critically important to understand, not because it sustains distinction over other occupations, but because it defines the field; it provides a narrative of field divisions and struggles and indicates the rules and requirements of the game. As such, it acts as a 'force' upon those entering the field and comes to be taken for granted by all entrants. Whilst the possession of other resources enables participation in the game, it is the symbolic capital that opens the door to power and authority to impose a vision. Thus, the stakes of the game are decided in symbolic struggles and it is the symbolic capital that agents understand to be the purpose of their practices, not to accumulate material resources. For example, in a way similar to the *miscognition* of labour as a voluntary activity (Bourdieu, 1972), economic interests inherent in artistic, creative or intellectual labour are not recognised, but are expressed as an interest in the work itself (Bourdieu, 1993, pp. 29-34; 1996, p.148).

We might reflect, at this point, on the similarity between the idea of seeking 'status' and symbolic capital. In the classical literature, professions are presumed to be driven to maintain their privileged status and life-style as well as their financial advantages and, 'status' can be seen as a kind of symbolic reward. The idea of status is an elitist notion that speaks for difference from other occupations and to some extent reflects professions' self-perceptions of their elevated position in society. Symbolic capital, by contrast, expresses the authority to provide a narrative for the divisions of the social world. Whilst the classical literature describes 'status' as a 'just' reward for providing essential services and knowledge expertise, Bourdieu seeks to uncover how symbolic power returns to impact on agents and society as an instrument of domination. Whilst status, as a kind of symbolic gain, is seen to be enjoyed by all professions by virtue of their position in the division of labour and role in society, symbolic capital takes a specific form in each field. It lies at the heart of the symbolic struggles over the autonomous stakes of the game and bestows upon its holders the authority to write the 'story' of the field. Status in the wider social world is likely to be an outcome too, but the path to social status does not have to go through symbolic recognition in the field. The title of a profession can ensure *that* kind of status, but not the recognition and power held, for example, by a "literary god" that leads and dominates his field.

Returning to the significance of symbolic power, what is crucial here is that the dominant narrative of the field is advanced by those whose power and authority is based on possession of symbolic capital and they define the autonomous stakes, the ideals, rules and requirements of the game. **Doxa**, therefore, describes the norms that are taken on board and accepted by all because of the conditioning of agents by field structures and narratives, the ***"collective beliefs"*** that do not need justifying or enforcement. Bourdieu emphasised the role played by the doxic vision of the field and how it becomes institutionalised through its representations by collective agents or the mechanisms of officialising, which are, in turn, efficacious in the reconstruction of the field.

This conception of a field as 'ruled' by a certain narrative seems to be similar to the idea of a 'common' culture, but this a superficial parallel that belies deep running differences. In the classical theories, the culture and the ideology of a profession is seen to set it apart from other professions and represent the interests, values and the beliefs of the group as a whole. For Bourdieu, doxa is associated with the dominant groups and it is not directed externally, although boundaries are implicitly indicated, primarily, it provides a narrative for the field. The appearances of 'consensus' as signalled by the presence of a dominant narrative that is recognised by all and that guides agents' practices hides, at the same time, the internal conflicts, which arise from ongoing struggles over capitals. Thus, whilst the ideology of professionalism appears to be an unchanging set of ideas that justify and protect domains of practice, doxa can be seen as a contested account of the field with its divisions, necessities and beliefs and serves to maintain the existing order (Bourdieu, 1984, p.113). Thus, classical theories paint a picture whereby a profession is in consensus internally, but in permanent competition externally and the ideology of a profession, its 'common' culture and values represent this presumed 'unity'. Bourdieu described fields as "durable" and also as inherently uncertain; there is both consensus and conflict in a field. Agents are pulled apart by the competition over capitals, positions and narratives of the field and pushed together by their belief in the value and the stakes of the game and the fact that they 'share' the experience of partaking which engenders a kind of "solidarity" regardless of field positions (Bourdieu, 1988, p.113).

With this conception of agents as active participants of the field, we can introduce a sense of individual agency to our understanding of professional areas of practice and open up space for uncovering individual professionals' motivations, expectations and ambitions. In Bourdieu, individuals enter a field because they commit to its self-declared ideals; "belief is an inherent part of belonging to a field" (Bourdieu, 1990, pp.66-68). Agents willing to enter the field and make a claim on the stakes involved, develop a "practical sense" for the "game". They *'invest'* in the game, learn its' rules and requirements, and the specific culture, the ethos of the field. This involves both acquiring the knowledge and the expertise necessary, that is the capitals

that are at play, and also embodying a particular 'gaze', for instance a "juridicial sense" (Bourdieu, 1987), developing a capacity to take part in the game. Habitus, therefore, comes to embody the field, its' structure and requirements and enables agents to act appropriately and in response to the opportunities and constraints that operate in the field (Bourdieu, 1989a; 1990; 1992). With the perception of agents as actively involved in a game whose ideals overlap, feed into and are validated by individuals who engage and identify with it, the conception of the relationship between agents and their professional field is extended beyond descriptions of qualification and entry and presumed conflict with other occupations. It is this need to comply with the necessities of the game that gives the dominant symbolic representation of the field the stronghold it has on participants of the field and ensures compliance with the doxa. However, Bourdieu also describes ongoing strife and conflict between field structures and agents' habitus, and talks about "surviving" the structuring of the field. Agents are endowed with the 'power' to interact with the field, to contest and challenge it, as well as the ability to develop an understanding of its necessities and respond to its demands. With this emphasis on the role of agency, we come full circle. Just as Bourdieu links the structuralist and phenomenological views of the social reality by putting at the centre of his vision agents' practices defined as subjectively directed <u>and</u> also objectively structured, he captures the tensions in the reproduction of specific fields by designating the (already) 'socially' conditioned agents as made by the field and also as makers of the field. This gives voice to the tension between a 'top-down' understanding of fields as 'dominated' by certain groups and ideas, and as constructed 'bottom-up', by agents struggling to find a place within them.

But fields do not exist as isolated spaces, self-contained worlds that run on the power of their internal dynamics; to the contrary, they are firmly embedded within the social world and how fields function and change takes shape under the influence of both 'autonomous' and 'external' or *"heteronomous"* pressures. This brings Bourdieu into conflict, once again, with classical theories and I end my evaluation of the field notion by contrasting the idea of 'semi-autonomy' with that of 'free' or 'autonomous' professions and I argue that it enables a better

purchase on the complex inter-relatedness of professional fields of practice and the social world.

3.5   The double logic of fields: semi-autonomy

Much of Bourdieu's empirical works were analyses of the cultural fields of production. He described them as semi-autonomous and suggested that the struggles within them are "overdetermined" or they have a "double logic" (Bourdieu, 1992). They contain the struggles of the fields of economy and politics, but these bear on the field through the mediation afforded by the field's specificity (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 1989a). With this, he defines specific fields as open to ***"heteronomous"***, that is, 'external' pressures. At the same time, the specific universe of the field, its operation according to internally ascertained and maintained rules is a proof of the autonomy attained from the world of political and economic power. He therefore pursued an approach that recognised the 'autonomous' operation of distinct fields, but without severing their ties with the political and economic fields, which act like a terrain on which different games are played. A field is never completely autonomous, for Bourdieu, in the sense of not being exposed to or affected by wider social processes. Rather, 'external' struggles are both refracted and obscured through the field's own mirror. Bourdieu considers the claims of 'independence', advanced during the separation of distinct fields from political and economic powers, as an illusion that has paradoxically become part of professional ideology (1989), no doubt, also with the contribution of social scientific approval.

As discussed in the previous chapter, in the classical theories, the term 'autonomy' describes institutional separation of a profession's regulation, 'independent' organisation of professional work and it also connotes the idea that professions operate somewhat independently of wider social processes. Bourdieu, by contrast, considers the differentiation of a field around non-economic and non-political struggles, its distance from these divisions. He defines the degree

of the autonomy of a field as a measure of its specificity; a field is autonomous to the extent that practices (of production) and the lines of differentiation within it are subject to rules that are not economic or political, but make sense according to a logic specific each field (Bourdieu, 1993, pp.112-113; 1996, pp. 47-112 and pp.214-217). As described above, in the literary or cultural fields of production, for instance, the products and within field-divisions are subject to stylistic, aesthetic or technical principles (1993, pp. 115-116). Bourdieu does not deny that a field's autonomy gets institutionalised and exercised through rules of entry. His focus is on what lies behind the formal right to 'self-regulate'; how the principles of the autonomous production gets to be institutionalised and accepted as the norm. Thus, in this view, the right to self-regulate can be seen as a formal expression of the emergence of a field and as a mechanism of regulation, but the exercise of autonomy rests on the increasing specialisation and the development of distinct rules of production and evaluation. We might compare Bourdieu's description of the autonomous principles of a field to the emphasis on the esoteric knowledge base of a profession in the classical literature. Knowledge expertise was seen as an 'essential' quality that distinguishes professions from other occupations, as yet another instrument to be wielded in the interests of monopolisation and became part of both their self narrative and 'sociological' descriptions, marginalising any interest in what may be described, from a field perspective, the totality of the production that takes place in a field (e.g. Literary, juridicial, scientific, artistic), of which, knowledge can be seen as a necessarily specific instrument; the cultural capital acquired and embodied by agents. Knowledge expertise, or in Bourdieu's language the field specific cultural capital separates practitioners from 'outsiders' and contributes to the sense of 'autonomy' (Bourdieu, 1987), but this is not a sign of 'neutrality' or a symbol for being above and over social and economic 'banalities'. For Bourdieu, the degree of autonomy of a field is socially conditioned and can only be understood in relation to the political and economic struggles and transformations (Bourdieu, 1987).

The classical definition of professions as 'autonomous' cannot account for the interface of a field with the broader social processes. Although her later work (1990 and 1994) is more

focused on the internal and discursive construction of professions, Larson's original model (1977) has the strongest emphasis on these connections, but the macro-structuralist model expresses this relationship at the "system level" (Mouzelis, 1991, 1995) and reads professions off the capitalist division of labour and the class structure. In contrast to Larson's deterministic tones, Abbott proposes a relationship similar to the open interface Bourdieu proposes, but there are important differences. First, in Abbott's (2005) perception all ecologies are 'equal' and it is difficult to glean a sense of a social world or the economic and political fields as being permanently present and as enveloping all other ecologies. Bourdieu defines political and economic spheres as separate fields with their own logic, but at the same there is a sense that these act like a terrain on which all other fields are situated. To put another way, while Abbott's ecologies are spread and overlap and interact randomly, Bourdieu has this picture of fields within fields. Secondly, the relationship between ecologies is described to be so "fluid" and contingent that this "emergentism" makes it difficult to account for structural continuities and patterns of connections between them, which is what Bourdieu emphasises in analysing, for instance, the class imprint that agents bring into their practices in specific fields. And thirdly, there is a circulatory tone to the argument that begins with assumptions of jurisdictional competition and ends with looking for the impact of external processes on jurisdictional competition. Although the interface of ecologies are described to be open, the presumption of a collective competitive spirit as the driving force that sustains ecologies closes the door on investigations that might examine the effects of 'external' forces on the internal world of an ecology, beyond shifts in its boundaries.

It might be useful to consider a few examples from Bourdieu's work. In his study of the emergence of the literary field in the 19th century (Bourdieu, 1996, pp.47-140) and the process by which it comes to be established as a "world apart", he considers the connections between the rising bourgeoisie and the leading figures of the literary enterprise; the continuous inter-relations between these 'externalities' and the 'internal' struggles over the definition of literature, art and culture. For instance, he understands the emergence of 'pure art' and the claims of "disinterestedness" as an outcome of a complex process shaped by autonomous and

heteronomous dynamics. Bourdieu also considers this relationship at the emergence of the cultural fields of production and therefore there is greater emphasis on the early phases of the separation between political and economic elites and distinct spheres of activity, but my point is that what is useful here is the *idea* that a field is relatively autonomous; Bourdieu's model is alive to the connections between society and the specific fields. In other words, it is the break it facilitates with the idea of a 'free professions' that I suggest can be useful and this, in a nutshell, is also my argument for the 'field' concept; not to replicate Bourdieu's analysis of the fields of cultural production, but to work with the field idea to reorient our thinking on professions.

3.6   Summary and Conclusions

In the above, through a comparative exposition of Bourdieu's analysis of specific fields with the classical theories of professions, I argued that the concept of field can facilitate a re-think of the classical approaches by acting as a mediating concept between 'subjectivist' and 'structuralist' accounts, shifting the attention to the making of a professional domain and enabling us to locate agents, organisations and institutions in the web of structures and relations that constitute the field. For the classical tradition, whatever their methodological differences and theoretical priorities, the object of study is professions as occupational groups. With Bourdieu, the label of profession becomes a problem; or rather it becomes irrelevant as it denotes the self-perception of a group that is engaged in a specific production, a group whose self-beliefs have been raised to the status of theoretical constructs. The label of 'professional' and the ideology of professionalism are important to understand, but as expressions of the self-beliefs and projections of agents who are in a dominant position in a field.

Right from the start, fields are perceived as historical constructs that evolve as spaces where autonomous and heteronomous dynamics intermingle and the parameters of the relationship between the two are perceived to be an empirical question not to be decided a priori or their interface limited by theoretical priorities. As opposed to the internally unifying view of classical theories, Bourdieu directs our attention to the conflicts and struggles involved in the making and ongoing reconstruction of a field. With no assumptions of an ideal type or essential qualities or theoretical constructions that reduce the field to externally directed ideologies or strategies of competition and closure, the entire field of relationships opens up for investigation. As opposed to the unifying notion of the culture or the ideology of a profession, ideas and beliefs about a field are perceived as both the outcome and the instruments of a field's functioning, which highlight the symbolic representation of a field as a force in its own right and efficacious in the construction and the maintenance of the existing order. This emphasis put on the ideational aspects of a field's making reflects the centre role agency has in Bourdieu's thinking, which also permits us to examine the experiences of individual professionals, but in relation to the divisions and struggles operational in their field.

In other words, replacing the term profession with the concept of field enables us to redefine the object of study as the whole field of production and allows us to ask questions about how it works, what its rules are, what it claims to achieve, what the principles of differentiation are, where the lines of power divisions lie, how it is reproduced, what the tensions and struggles that arise out of those divisions are and how these internal dynamics relate to broader social processes. This allows us to acknowledge the power relations involved and to understand the construction of professional strategies and ideologies also in relation to internal power struggles. This means being able to construct a professional field as a set of ideas, practices and relations that act as a framework for individuals who enter it, and which are also reproduced or challenged by those individuals' everyday activities. Finally, the conception of fields as multi-structured spaces implies and enables the analysis of internal divisions and power struggles at different levels; individuals and other collective agents in the field, its narratives, products and their consumers and the different kinds of production are seen to have

a place and meaning in relation to the field's dynamics and can be shown to express and reproduce its divisions.

In the following chapters, I put this proposition to test by approaching a case study 'profession', architecture, with the field lens. In this study, this thinking guides an exploration of field divisions in terms of the kinds of architecture and architect that exist and the kinds of capital operational in the field. These are also considered in relation to the ideals and beliefs that affirm or contest the architectural game. I begin the presentation of the case study in the next chapter by appraising the studies of architectural practice as a profession in comparison to a Bourdieusian analysis as a field, and set out the focus of the empirical analysis.

Chapter 4

4   Architecture: profession or field?

In this chapter, I evaluate the sociological literature on the architectural 'profession', whether examined as a case study to demonstrate applications of classical approaches or a Bourdieusian analysis as a field of production. I argue that empirically rich studies of architecture are compromised by a commitment to the orthodox notion of profession, which results in explanations of its complex reality as a diversion from the 'ideal' model of professionalization. I propose that Stevens' (1998) attempt to re-define architecture as a Bourdieusian field constitutes a step in developing a framework that can enable us to make sense of the 'paradoxes' of architecture. I conclude by indicating the new lines of research engendered by this analytical shift.

I begin with a brief profile of the profession in numbers, with an eye on relevance for the analysis to come in the following chapters. In Britain, there are 33,456 registered architects with 29,945 resident in the UK and the rest overseas (ARB, 2011)[3]. According to the 2010-11 survey of the UK based members of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), 80 per cent of architects are male and 20 per cent are female. Fifty six per cent work in London and the South East. Looking at employment status, 47 per cent of those in work were recorded as self-employed and 53 per cent as salaried architects. Considering practice size, over 50 per cent work in small practices with less than 10 staff, under a quarter in large practices of 50 or

---

[3] Registration with the Architects Registration Board (ARB) is a requirement for all practicing architects. Membership of The Royal Institute of British Architects is voluntary. The survey is based on a sample of members of the RIBA.

more and the remaining in medium size firms of 11-50 architects[4]. Just under ten per cent are employed in the public sector. With the latest recession, the rates of unemployment have been rising since the close to full-employment levels of 2008, to 4 per cent (RIBA 2009), then almost doubling to 7-8 per cent in 2011 (RIBA, 2010-11). The survey of 2011 also notes high levels of underemployment, reported by nearly a third of sole practitioners.

Architecture is often cited as one of the original 'status' professions alongside medicine and law, but it remains an understudied case in the sociology of professions with only a few studies directly engaged in theoretical debates[5]. In reviewing the classical approaches, I distinguish between studies concerned with understanding the professionalization of architecture (Kaye, 1960; Larson, 1983; Abbott, 1988); studies of the economic changes that had an impact on the architect's role and markets (Symes et al, 1995; Gutman, 1988); and the studies that focus on the culture of the profession (Cuff, 1991). Other research have tended to take the architectural firm as their unit of analysis and examined firm strategies and structures and their adaptability to changing times and markets (Blau, 1984; Larson, 1983). More recent research considered issues of ethnic (Barnes et al 2004) and gender equality and sought to explain women's exodus from the profession (Graft-Johnson, 2003; Fowler and Wilson, 2004; Caven, 2004, 2006a, 2006b). The few contemporary studies with a more theoretical orientation hail from business and management schools and pursue questions of the rewards of a career in architecture or the discourses of the profession, through analysis of architects' experiences and subjective interpretations of their working lives (Caven and Diop, 2012; Cohen at al, 2005). Interestingly, architecture is also the only profession to have been subjected to a Bourdieusian analysis, by an Australian architect-turned sociologist (Stevens, 1998), whose work has had a limited audience in the UK. The review below risks some repetition of the comparative evaluation of the notions of profession and field undertaken in

---

[4] The sampling and fieldwork for the research took place during 2010-11 and for comparability figures cited here are based on the ARB Register of 2011 and the RIBA Survey of Employment and Earnings of the same year.
[5] There is, otherwise, an extensive literature on Architecture which, to a large extent, is concerned with architecture as an art form, its historical evolution (Architectural History) or role in the making of places and identities (Urban Studies). The focus in this study is on the sociological studies of architecture a profession.

Chapters 1 and 2, but it is necessary to consider the questions that arise in relation to architecture and this also sets the context for the empirical part of the thesis.

4.1 Distinguishing architecture: art, construction and professionalization

Early accounts of architecture sought to distinguish it from other professions by way of establishing its 'essential' attributes and to describe its professionalisation process and strategies, which were evaluated against the 'ideal' type developed by the 'traits theory' and the Functionalist school of thought. In Carr-Saunders & Wilson's anthology of professions, architecture was described as a profession that combines technical and aesthetic elements but with the emphasis on the latter, and architects as artists with a unique vision and the ability to co-ordinate the input of technical experts and builders to realise that vision in the built form. Their definition also reflected the profession's self projection as a source of trust, protector of clients' interests and the guardian of the integrity of the design of a building, particularly against builders presumed to be driven by financial concerns, rather than architectural priorities and values (Carr Saunders and Wilson, quoted in Kaye, 1960, p. 23).

 Borrowing this uncritical description of architects' self-perception of their role, Kaye studied architecture in Britain. Proposing to present a more sociological account, he sought to define architecture by its "functional characteristics". Professionalisation described the "institutionalisation of an occupation" and was argued to guarantee the *"integrity"* and *"competence"* of its registered practitioners (Kaye, 1960, p.21). He examined the stages of professionalisation, the debates leading up to the acquisition of Royal Charter in 1837 and the closure of the profession with the establishment of the Architects Registration Board in 1931. Here, I note his reflections that architects' professionalisation diverged from the 'ideal path' as this is the first, but not the last time we will be confronted by the 'paradoxes' of architecture.

He made two significant observations: the first is that there appears to be a conflict between the primacy given to artistic insight and the fact that the artistic vision can only be realised with technical input; and the second is that architecture does not appear to be 'autonomous' as the design vision can only be realised if a client is prepared to fund it. He also suggested that the professionalisation movement in the 19th century was driven by an impetus to articulate and formalise the distinction of architects from craftsmen and it defined architects' role with reference to the creative aspects of building construction. This observation highlights the conflictual nature of the professionalization process, often neglected in the classical theories of professions.

Although she later revised her emphasis on 'market control' and competition (1993), Larson's description of architects' "professionalisation project" in US (1983) is an application of her earlier, general theory of professions (1977). Architects' professionalisation project is argued to involve the formation of a professional association that symbolises its autonomy to monopolise and regulate the architectural market, standardise education and skills, assess competence and set service standards. The architects' professionalisation movement was based on claims of distinction from builders and engineers, but she argued that their professionalisation strategies had not fully succeeded because architecture is not easy to identify with a body of knowledge and a domain of practice that can be fenced off as its exclusive territory. In addition, Larson suggested that having to seek work in the private sector and being dependent on commissions, architects did not have the ready-made market that medicine has and had thus found it difficult to achieve a similar status and monopoly.

As discussed in Chapter 3, for Bourdieu, debates about the definition of architecture would be seen as part of its making as a field and reflect its internal struggles, but in these accounts the contradictions of architecture are perceived as peculiarities that diverge from an ideal model. Kaye and Larson note that architecture does not quite fit the ideal type, but they do not reflect on the implications of their observations for theories of professions. Kaye notes the 'internal'

tensions between the craft and art oriented schools of thought, also documented by architectural historians (Shaw and Jackson, 1892; Jenkins, 1961; Kostof, 1977), and argued to mark the 'class elevation' of architecture (Saint, 1983; Fowler and Wilson, 2004), but does not return to question assumptions of internal unity. Larson (1994), in her later study of aesthetic shifts in architecture follows her move away from a structuralist to a more processual analysis in general (1990) and emphasises that architecture cannot be autonomous as long as it is dependent on client commissions, but this is not discussed in relation to theories of professions. Thus, both note the dependence on clients and other professions and the difficulty of identifying an exclusive domain of control, but do not re-evaluate the idea of independent artist as a defining characteristic or reflect on the descriptions of the nature of professional knowledge (Drain, 1991). The theme of 'failed professionalisation' is also present in Abbott (1988) who considers architecture as a case that kept its domain of expertise too narrow, leaving various elements of building construction to be poached by other professions. In all three cases, relations with clients and other professionals, and the knowledge and expertise that make architecture what it is are perceived as factors that jeopardised architecture's closure strategies.

Writers who focus on the impact of economic trends and highlight the changes in architectural markets, similarly, do not engage with the theories of professions despite providing evidence that undermines perceptions of autonomy and internal unity.

4.2   Architecture and economy: restructuring and architects' role

The next strand of sociological research on architecture considered the impact of economic cycles, construction industry trends and other social and political changes on the profession's position, monopoly and prospects. Two notable studies were carried out by Symes et al (1995)

and Gutman (1988) who looked at the post-war period in Britain[6] and the US respectively and examined social economic trends, changes in the provision and organisation of architectural and design services, and reflected on institutional responses to changing times. Although not engaged with theoretical debates, Symes et al explicitly position themselves "between functionalist and critical approaches to professions" (page ix). Drawing on Durkheim (1984) and Parson's (1954) views, they describe architecture as representing "higher values", with the potential to defend the "moral autonomy of the individual through the values of professionalism against the threat of unrestrained capitalism'' (ibid, pp.10-11). Architects are suggested to "claim financial rewards" and "respect" for their knowledge, skills and services in protecting the "public interest" (ibid, p.4). Their description of the profession evokes an image of architects as a small and homogenous group with a similar 'life style':

> *"...Architects often live together, choosing the same towns, suburbs and villages, buying or renting similar houses, shopping at the same stores or even supermarkets. They and their companions or families drink in certain pubs, holiday on the same coasts or in the same mountain resorts." (ibid, p.11)*

All of which, it is suggested, indicates their "special place in our culture". I cite this description of architecture for it is strikingly similar to the one by Carr-Saunders & Wilson (1933) and shows the uncritical import of elitist and unifying notions into more contemporary studies. Gutman's (1988) work is entirely empirical, but similarly guided by the notion of profession. The definition of architecture as a monopoly seeking profession is a constant, and they are seen to operate in a world that presents challenges to their status and authority. Symes et al's (1995) is a multi-stranded study that combines analysis of structural shifts in economy, the professions' responses to changing markets, case studies of firms and their strategies of survival and a large survey of principal architects[7]. Analysis of the changes in the organisation

---

[6] In Britain, the RIBA commissioned two surveys of its members: The Architect and his Office (1962) and The Strategic Study of the Profession culminated in two publications: The Burton Report (1992) and The Latham Report (1994) (see Duffy and Hutton, 1998, for further details). In addition, three annual surveys are commissioned to report on trends in architectural markets and employment: "Architects' Earnings and Benefits", "Architects Performance" and Architects Markets".

[7] This suggests a bias in the sample as principal architects are likely to be owner-practitioners or senior partners/directors and this excludes salaried architects.

and provision of architectural services between 1970s and 1990s highlights the liberalisation of architectural markets; the decline of public architecture; emergence of large, multi-disciplinary practices; increased competition and differentiation in a market traditionally dominated by small architectural firms; and increased 'incursions' into the architect's domain, particularly by construction managers. Quoting Harvey (1989), they describe the latest trends as a consequence of the restructuring of the economy in 1980s and argue that 'architect-entrepreneur' emerged as the new face of the profession in difficult and competitive times.

Gutman (1988) carried out a similar study of architecture in post-war America, though taking a broader overview of social trends, and sought to identify the social and economic changes that had an impact on the profession. As well as noting the increased complexity in the technological and legislative aspects of construction and architects' changing relationship with the public and their clients, he also identified similar patterns of liberalisation and competition in the architectural markets, emergence of large multi-disciplinary firms, and increased fragmentation in the architectural process. He interpreted these trends in terms of their implications for architects' role, and argued that the new procurement methods[8] undermine their authority and independence from builders by removing their right to manage the construction of their design. Although he notes the emergence of new specialisations and their necessary involvement in the making of buildings as a result of increased complexity, he suggested that some of these new 'occupations' such as architect-developers and building construction experts could emerge as new professions with a claim on the architectural market.

---

[8] The new procurement methods are associated with different types of contract and contract type defines architects' role in the building process vis a vis the other experts and the contractors. In Britain, the 'Traditional Contract' was the standard contract issued by the RIBA and used exclusively until late 70s. This defined architects' role as the leader of the building process and with contractual liability for the design, construction and completion of works. The Design and Build contract came onto the scene in 1980s. It describes the contractor/builder as the lead with responsibility for putting together a team of experts including architects, and for delivering the project on time and budget. See Chapter 7 for the differential impact of these changes across the field and Chapter 8 for a further discussion of the implications of working with Design and Build contracts.

The key themes in both analyses are liberalisation and threats to the architect's authority. Analysis of the impact of the economic recession and the increasingly competitive and fragmented provision and organisation of architectural services highlights the changing position of architects in building construction. It is suggested that with the spread of 'Design and Build' contracts, which began to be used by large, multi-disciplinary construction firms to manage the provision of architectural services, architects' authority over the architectural process has been undermined. Both approaches, therefore, set out by assumptions of monopoly seeking and inter-occupational competition and are based on an oppositional view of architecture as a profession and the social and economic context within which it is practiced. But architecture's dependency on other experts is not new as historical studies are full of the accounts of the shifts in the division of labour between architects and, in historical order, craftsmen, engineers, surveyors, town planners and now construction managers. Neither is its dependency on clients, in particular the relations between wealthy and powerful individuals and celebrated architects (Jenkins, 1961; Richards, 1974; Saint, 1983; Jones, 2011; Sklair, 2005). These may have emerged as 'new professions' but this does not change the fact that making architecture is unavoidably dependent on their expert input and this could only be seen as a 'problem' if one is concerned with maintaining architects' monopoly over building construction. Thus, both contemporary and historical evidence fundamentally contradict the claims of 'independence' but neither author draws out the implications of their findings for the presumptions of autonomy. Furthermore, the effects of economic trends are assumed to be uniform across all segments of the profession and procurement and design management methods of large multi-disciplinary firms and construction companies appear to be the norm.

Both writers also focus on the responses of the professional association to the changing context, which suggest that the 'solution' to architecture's recent difficulties is expected to be found in its strategies. Symes et al's (1995) analysis[9] suggests that the recession led contraction in demand and increased competition encouraged the profession to emphasise

---

[9] The analysis is stated to be based on a review of the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Vols 75-95 (1968-1988). No further information is provided on this part of the study.

marketing, business acumen, management and diversification. The lifting of the ban on advertising in 1977 and the abolishment of fee scales in 1986 are seen as efforts to broaden architecture's domain of practice and increase their competitiveness against construction companies who entered the market with the liberalisation in 1980s[10].

We are confronted here, once again, with the 'paradoxes' of architecture. Symes et al (1995) note that despite the significantly altered terrain and the efforts to encourage architects to pay attention to management, finance and marketing, architects still believe in their design role, independence and responsibility for the building process. They conclude that "architects have contradictory attitudes" and evidence does not indicate a major shift in architect's perception of their role (ibid, p.24). A similar contrast between self-projections and actual experiences is also noted by Gutman (1988), albeit very briefly, in his introductory remarks. Thus, the contradiction between the self-perceptions of the profession as an independent and artistic enterprise with lead responsibility for the built environment and its reality as a client dependent, private business which operates within technical, legal and financial constraints is noted, but as with the examination of the economic 'context' of architecture, evidence on the 'ideology' of the profession is not reflected upon any further.

We are reminded here of the importance Bourdieu placed on the ideational aspects of a field's making, but let us first consider a Chicago School influenced study of the culture of architecture in US. Cuff's (1991) research is the most extensive analysis of the mismatch between the ideals and the reality of architectural practice, but stops short of making connections between the artistic ideal and the divisions in the field.

---

[10] The code of professional conduct was revised to consider the ban on advertising and competition for business, both of which were previously banned for being counter to the artistic and professional spirit of architecture. The advertising ban was lifted in 1977. The mandatory fee scale, which standardised architects' fees, was also abolished in 1986. Both of these changes were implemented following a long period of debate within the profession. Symes et al (1995) also discuss the relevance of pressure from the Government.

4.3   The culture of architecture: disjuncture between ideals and reality

Although critical of the 'traits approach', Cuff's work starts with a similar assumption that "professions are special occupations because they impart knowledge and skills related to tasks of high social value" (1991, p.23). Borrowing Larson's model of professionalisation, she emphasises the process whereby professions "evolve from occupations striving for social status, autonomy and control over a market for their labour" (ibid, p.23). Her main focus however, is "the cultural system of architectural production" and in contrast to the reviews of structural trends and institutional strategies, Cuff concentrates on the daily practice of architecture[11]. To this end, she explores the role of architectural education in inculcating the beliefs, ideas and practices that come to constitute a common culture and also emphasises how the architectural firm, with its organisation, established routines and rituals create and reinforce the ethos of the profession.

Cuff observes that architectural discourse defines design as a stage independent from the concerns of construction, client or budget, as an individual effort and as the product of an inspirational process. She argues that this vision contradicts the reality; design is a collaborative process requiring the input of several experts as well as clients and it is subject to financial constraints. This view of practice is then traced back to architectural education and drawing on the Chicago School's work on the culture of professionalism in the 1960s and 70s, she describes education as the site of professional socialisation and enculturation into architectural values. She argues that architectural education teaches design in isolation from technical, financial and social concerns; promotes individual ability at the expense of the collaborative nature of architectural production; presents the other parties involved in construction as 'constraints' on design; reinforces the 'myth' of autonomy and the ideal of

---

[11] Cuff's study is based on extensive ethnographic research, observations, in-depth interviews and group discussions.

79

making a social contribution; and it promotes leading a practice as an ideal, all of which contradict the lived experiences of architects. The majority of Symes et al's survey respondents[12] also note the disconnection between architectural education and practice and argue that the primacy given to the artistic aspects of architectural production does not reflect the full range of architectural process and the competencies it demands. Cuff suggests that in most firms, the ethos closely resembles that of the schools of architecture and the ideal vision of architecture instilled during education continues to frame the socialisation of new architects into the profession.

What we have in Cuff, then, is an appreciation of the dominant ideals and beliefs and the force they exert on the members of the profession, but without an understanding of their social foundations. She captures the spirit of, what Bourdieu describes as the dominant symbolic representation, or the doxic vision of the field, but without breaking with the notion of profession as a unified group, she is not able to bring into view the connections between these ideas and practices and the interests of the dominant groups. The enduring appeal of the idea that architects are independent artists is confirmed by accounts that trace it back to the 16th and 17th century (Kostof, 1977), through to debates on professionalisation (Shaw and Jackson, 1892) and the contemporary curriculum of architectural education (Crinson and Lubbock, 1994; Stevens, 1998). Stevens argues that seeing this mismatch as a failure on the part of the profession misses the point, and I would argue that this is exactly what Cuff does. Rather than question why such a contrast exists and has survived for over a century, concerned with the consequences for individual practitioners, she calls on the profession to review and modernise the teaching of architecture and the organisation of architectural firms and to close the gap between its ideology and practice.

---

[12] The study involved a large survey of 610 principal architects and seven case studies of different size and type firms. The survey explored work content, employment patterns, skills and the challenges of practice and case studies covered operational and managerial aspects of practice as well as the strategies of survival at times of recession.

A more recent study suggests the presence of not one, but three different discourses within architecture, which emphasise, respectively, creativity, public service or the business aspects of architects' role (Cohen et al, 2005). These are the different interpretations individuals make of both architecture and their own situation. Cohen et al note some parallels between respondents' current role and views but not a one to one relationship, or an exclusive commitment to either narrative. Their analysis is very much focused on the subjective discourses of the profession, but from a field lens, we can see these as reflecting the contested nature of architecture's definition. Caven and Diop's (2012) study of the "intrinsic rewards" of architecture parallels Cuff's (1991) and Symes et al's (1995) argument that architects continue to believe in and find satisfaction in the promises of their profession as art and public service, even when these are under pressure and cannot be achieved as expected. We might see this as evidence of the shaping of individual's habitus under the influence of the field's divisions and practices, but once again, the authors go no further than a description of the tension between attachment to architecture and its perceived decline as a financially rewarding, high-status profession.

The difficulty we have here is that the contradictory nature of architectural beliefs and the contrast between architects' self-perceptions and the realities of everyday practice are noted by all, but no satisfactory explanation of why these tensions arise can be provided beyond references to the profession's presumed ineffective strategies. Indeed, the same contrast was reported by the participants of this study (see Chapter 8) and my proposition is that, as Stevens (1998) also argues, the answer lies in the 'internal' dynamics and processes of architectural practice where the ideals and the beliefs of the profession find a place and meaning. Let me now draw together my evaluation of the classical literature before I discuss Stevens' (1998) Bourdieu inspired work, which provides an alternative explanation to the 'paradoxes' of architecture.

4.4 Problems with the classical literature

Both historical and more contemporary examinations of architecture paint a picture that is at odds with the 'ideal type' model of professions and also as ridden with enduring conflicts, which have puzzled sociologists looking at it from different angles. Architecture is, in many ways, a case that epitomises everything that is wrong with the classical literature; descriptions of its complex 'realities' are undermined by a commitment to the idea of profession, which does not permit a critical sociological explanation of the observed divisions and conflicts. Evidence on the professionalisation, knowledge base and the dependency of architecture on clients, economy and the other professions contradict assumptions of internal unity, autonomy, market monopoly and commitment to social ideals, but rather than leading to a critical appraisal of the underlying assumptions, these persistent 'paradoxes' are explained away as peculiarities of the profession, or as a consequence of its weak strategies of professionalization and therefore, as 'problems' to be solved by the professional association.

Critical insights that could inform a challenge to the theoretical underpinnings of classical approaches are mobilised to support suggestions on how to resolve these conflicts. This seems to be guided by the assumption that the professional associations' strategies are the main mechanism of its construction and reproduction. Gutman (1984) argues that holding onto out dated views prevents the profession from dealing with the problems it faces and suggests that architects should look to the more successful professions of medicine and law, and that increased competition could be tackled by reducing the student intake as oversupply of architects restricts opportunities. Cuff (1991) recommends that it should review and modernise architectural education and the organisation of architectural firms to reflect the reality of architectural practice better. Symes et al (1995) advise architectural firms to diversify and urge architects to consider applying their design skills and knowledge in a wider range of contexts and follow the 'more successful' professions of medicine, law and engineering in developing the new skills necessary to be able to "seize those opportunities" (Symes et al, 1995: p.184).

Thus, the game of architecture is accepted as it is and the issue is presented as being about making it less painful for individuals, the practice more efficient, the professional ideology more effective and therefore the profession more successful.

These views are not positioned at a sociologically critical distance from the concerns of the profession itself, or indeed, from the cases of architecture in Britain and the US. Assumptions of 'autonomy' mean that 'external' shifts and changes in architects' role are viewed as a threat to the boundaries of their domain. The unifying view cannot make sense of the contrast between beliefs and the realities of individual members because dominant ideas are believed to represent the profession as a whole. Gutman (1988 and 1992) for instance, refers to differences between firms, although his description of the domain of the elite as the "natural market" for architects might be seen to point to what Bourdieu describes as "production for producers". But he interprets this as a difference between firms who were more or less successful and as a segment of the market that architects successfully protected from intrusions. Critically, there is no way of accounting for the experiences of individual professionals and the internal differentiation of the field. A simple example is the differences between a well-known architect working on famous buildings and another working on small residential projects such as extensions and conversions. Could these practitioners be said to have similar experiences, motivations, be subject to similar constraints, operate in the same market or have their projects assessed by the same aesthetic criteria? We have very little understanding of what making architecture involves and what individuals encounter as they enter practice, beyond evidence of a 'disconnect' between education and practice. Research on the discourses and the perceived rewards of architecture are notable attempts to unpack the 'happy' picture of privilege and status, but do not relate the observed diversity in 'discourses' of architecture and the architects' attachment to the profession to the structural forces that shape the field, and frame and feed into individuals' beliefs and discourses. The continuing influence of the idea of 'independent artist' and architects' belief in a role defined by an 'idealist' picture also show the importance of unmasking both self-projections and sociological descriptions. As with the classical theories of professions, these exemplify the

implications of continuing to work with the traditional notion of profession and the crucial importance of getting the "object of study" right (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Once defined as a profession in the conventional sense, frustratingly, this seems to become a hindrance to 'seeing' what the data actually presents, for debates about lack of autonomy in architecture, the contrast between architectural education and practice and the views that architecture has an unrealistic image are not new, especially to architects themselves (Filson, 1985; Saint, 1983). We must also note the significance of the decline of the sociology of professions and the fragmentation that ensued because in the absence of a disciplinary base, evidence and insights generated both within and outside architecture have not been incorporated its sociological accounts.

My point, therefore, is that the 'paradox' of architecture is no puzzle at all; it constitutes the reality of architecture, but the conceptual framework enforced by the notion of profession and the assumptions that entails, such as internal homogeneity and unity and external competition prevent a more 'realistic' appreciation of its complexities. If we conceive it as a field, then its 'peculiarities' will be seen as what makes it unique. In the next section I consider how Stevens side steps these difficulties and reflect on the new research avenues this vision opens up.

4.5   A Bourdieusian analysis of architecture

Stevens' work is an application of Bourdieu's notion of field to architecture[13]. My critique of the sociology of professions is advanced in more general terms, but we are in agreement about

---

[13] There have been other appropriations of Bourdieu's concepts in studies of Architecture, but concerns there relate to the social foundations of architectural aesthetics (Larson, 1995 and 2004); the role and the mobilisation of its products in constructing collective ideologies and the role architecture plays in reproducing power relations (Jones, 2010, 2011). An engagement with this literature would be relevant in building on this analysis of architecture as a field, but it falls outside the immediate remit of this project. Fowler and Wilson (2004) also

the potential that Bourdieu's sociology and specifically the field concept offers for an analysis of architecture[14]. With the field lens, the focus of analysis shifts to the architectural universe and its internal differentiation; its mechanisms of reproduction, the structures and systems that constrain, shape and guide individuals who take part in its game. Architecture is also perceived to be formed in relation to social, political and economic dynamics that feed into its processes, so we also leave behind the idea of 'autonomous' profession or independent artist, and the focus moves to the relationality between 'internal' and 'external' processes.

Stevens produced a comprehensive analysis that sketches the structure of the field, its evolution over time, its divisions, the characteristics of the main subfields, and explores the link between the dominant symbolic representations of architecture and the elite of the field. It also includes a rich examination of architectural education as a site of the reproduction of the doxic vision of architecture[15]. My in-depth exploration of the field's dynamics are framed by this outline of its structure and in this inevitably brief review, I focus on three aspects of his analysis, which are relevant to the empirical part of this study: the outline of the field's structure and the main divisions between the restricted and the mass fields of production; the description of the semi-autonomous position of the field; and the account of the doxic vision of architecture as a force effective in ensuring the continuity of field divisions and the dominance of the elite.

---

worked with Bourdieu's concepts in making sense of women architects' experiences, but it is a very selective adoption of his ideas not directly relevant to the aims of this study.

[14] Architecture was selected as a case study before the discovery of Stevens' book towards the end of fieldwork. His excellent application of the concept of field and knowledge of architecture, unfortunately, did not inform the research strategy in this study, but it is used to frame and support the analysis of interview data.

[15] The insightful analysis presented benefits from Stevens' background as an architect and educator. Stevens played the 'architectural game' and talks about having been ostracised by the profession and his department following the publication of his book.

4.5.1 The structural divisions of architecture

Following Bourdieu's description of the fields of cultural production, Steven looks to sketch the main lines of division within architecture and the different kinds of practices and products associated with each. He describes architecture as divided between the "restricted" and the "mass" fields of production. The restricted field describes the sub-field of architecture which is characterised by design oriented production; here, buildings are designed by a renowned architect and often for a wealthy client, assessed according to aesthetic criteria and produced more for other architects' consumption than the clients' or the public's reception; what Bourdieu called "production for producers" (Bourdieu, 1993, 1996). This could be a home designed for a wealthy client or a privately or publicly owned large and iconic structure designed by a star architect. Stevens defines the legitimate form of capital in this part of the field as "intellectual capital" which describes the prestige and status that comes with achieving recognition for one's original style. What matters here is to be recognised for one's artistic/design abilities, as a producer of great architecture. As Bourdieu finds for artists in other fields of cultural production, the architects engaged with 'restricted production' claim not to be interested in financial gain - architecture is claimed to be about aesthetic concerns and not about meeting financial or social objectives: "A distaste for vulgar money goes hand in hand with aesthetic pretension." (p.90). Thus, architectural success is not measured by economic capital, but rather the glory comes with being recognised as an artist. The legitimate form of practice, therefore, is the one driven by a design vision and this is why, being a good designer and being recognised for having the ability and the talent to achieve recognition by other architects is the reward sought after: the symbolic capital associated with being an authority in architecture.

The mass field refers to the making of buildings where the aesthetic criteria come secondary to economic and functional concerns and the designer is likely to be anonymous. These could be mass housing projects, office buildings, supermarkets, schools, industrial buildings, hospitals

or other commercial developments not noticeable for their design attributes. (Stevens, 1999, pp.83-87). In the field of mass production, it's the "professional/temporal capital" that is required and valued. This indicates being professionally successful and depends on being in a position to accumulate economic capital, but does not guarantee the symbolic capital associated with being recognised. The great majority of architects are positioned in the mass field, which is characterised by concerns over budgets and subject to the impact of economic pressures. This is also a reflection of the orientation of their clients, who are likely to have smaller budgets and may not be interested in aesthetically distinctive designs. Architects in the mass field do not give up on their ambitions, but their pursuit is more constrained and achievements are likely to be more modest and expressed in terms of producing good design that meets the needs of a client, rather than developing a unique, signature style.

This division is overlaid by several other distinctions such as those between architectural schools, firms, architects, buildings, aesthetic styles, magazines, competitions and clients but the restricted-mass distinction is the main principle of stratification within the field (ibid, pp. 88-90). He also notes a shift in the balance between the two sectors. In a longitudinal analysis of how the field's structure has evolved, he notes the expansion of the mass production sector and suggests that the restricted field now comprises a very small group. He argues that this structural change is likely to lead to increased tensions because large numbers of architects are now educated to pursue a limited number of 'dream' opportunities in the restricted section of the field.

As Stevens argues, this approach sharply contrast with the classical views of professions; if the field is divided, then the individual and collective agents and architectural firms within it need to be understood in relation to their structural positions because they will be operating within differently structured sub-fields and be subject to different constraints and requirements. Thus, in contrast to the unified vision of professions, we have a picture of competition and conflict within the field whereby agents strive to accumulate the capitals

required to succeed in the architectural game. Two things follow from this: we need to re-think the contrast between the self-perceptions of the profession and the reality; and architecture's relationship to the social world. First, the tension between the autonomous claims of architecture and the wider social and economic processes.

4.5.2 Autonomous claims and 'external' pressures

Following Bourdieu, architecture is defined as a semi-autonomous field and Stevens argues that the so-called 'constraints' on architectural production, such as economic, technical, legal and client requirements are inseparable from its making and should not be described as 'external' to it. Architecture cannot be made without a client's money, or as 'pure art', like painting for instance, and there is therefore, an inherent conflict between artistic ambitions and the economic and social foundations of its production. The very formation of architecture as a field takes shape both in relation to these 'constraints' and also to economic, political and social processes. The degree of its autonomy expresses its distance to such pressures and the extent to which it manages to establish itself as a sphere whose production is ruled by architectural criteria. Its autonomy is never 'absolute' however, as the production of architecture is still subject to constraints that may thwart the pursuit of architectural ideals. Stevens suggests that architecture is a weakly autonomous field, compared to other cultural fields, and only those in the small, restricted sector have the opportunity to claim to have some independence (ibid: 91-94).

In other words, the extent to which the effects of the 'external' pressures felt will vary between the restricted and the mass sectors. The restricted field constitutes the autonomous pole of the field and it operates according to a logic that is more distant from economic and political concerns and its products are designed to meet the field's own aesthetic criteria,

produced for other architects. By contrast, those in the mass field cannot afford to prioritise design ambitions, as they are more likely to be bound by budget constraints and feel the effects of economic trends more strongly. Thus, Stevens notes the 'conflict' observed in previous studies between perceptions of independence and the 'reality' of dependence on many levels, but argues that this arises out of architecture's semi-autonomous position. This brings us onto the role and significance of the symbolic representations of architecture as independent artists; contrary to accounts that end with advice to professional body to update its traditional outlook, Stevens sees the construction and the promotion of this doxic view of architecture as part of its making, not a consequence of the professional association falling behind the times. Perceived as art and subject to aesthetic criteria, making architecture is believed to be independent of financial, social or political concerns. But it is this particular representation of the field, together with the development of field specific capitals and a specific system of production only accessible to other architects that construct it as an autonomous space and sets it apart from economy and politics, as well as other specific fields.

With the definition of architecture as a semi-autonomous field and an outline of its structure and specific capitals Stevens establishes the core principles of field thinking on architecture. I complete this broad framework by considering descriptions of the doxic vision of architecture, critical for understanding the enduring self-perceptions of architects in the face of a much-changed world.

4.5.3 The doxic vision of architecture

The doxa refers to the taken for granted views and practices of the field. The doxic view of the field is the vision of the dominant groups enforced on all entrants by way of its rules and requirements of participation. It also provides an explanation for its divisions and struggles, a

narrative of the architectural game. It states and legitimates forms of practice and practitioner (grand designs by visionary individuals); the capitals at stake (recognition for individual style) and therefore indicates the written and unwritten rules and requirements of taking part in the field. The leading members of the field with the symbolic capital and the authority to set the rules of the game will express the definition and the boundaries of the field in aesthetic terms, as a struggle between styles, which obscures the struggle over capitals and the subjective nature of their vision, which is presented as the 'universal' truth of architecture. In other words, the ideas of the elite positioned in the restricted field about the definition of architect and architecture and the established ways of practice, come to be seen as self-evident and to be accepted by all.

Thus, the doxic view is not just a collection of empty idealist pronouncements; these are the ambitions architects pursue and claim to achieve and are taken on board by all, but at the same time they correspond to the interests and the views of those positioned at the autonomous end. This is why the experiences and the views of 'everyday practitioners' positioned in the mass field find that the dominant view of practice does not reflect *their* experiences. The doxa also includes the tacit requirements of the game such as the ways of thinking and being as well as the investment one needs to make to be allowed to enter the game. Stevens argues that the 'real' investment required of prospective candidates is to acquire the legitimate architectural habitus, not learning to design or build buildings (ibid, pp.90-92). In exploring the reconstruction of the doxic view of architecture, he returns to its teaching and the role played by its history and the schools of architecture in perpetuating the discourses of the elite of the field and inculcating an architectural habitus.

Seen as agents situated in this context, the 'contradictory' views and experiences of individual architects can therefore be viewed as indicative of the structural tensions of the field and illustrate how these work themselves out in and through individuals' views and practices. The three discourses noted by Cohen et al (2005) and the critique of the idealist picture of the

profession by Cuff (1991) and Symes et al's (1995) respondents' may be viewed as contestations of the dominant narrative of the field or as alternative takes on architecture's definition. But these interpretations are not permitted by the notion of profession. Stevens' description of the field's internal divisions, struggles and conflicts and its inseparability from broader social processes illustrate the potential that the field concept offers for understanding these contrasts and conflicts as part of architecture's reality. In the second, empirical part of the thesis, I build on this picture and develop my argument through an empirical exploration of architecture in Britain. Let me first draw together my evaluation of the sociological literature on architectural practice.

4.6   Conclusions: new directions for empirical research

In effect, and to put it very simply, the field idea reverses the assumptions of classical thinking on architecture as a profession. Set against an autonomous and unified profession, we find a field that is semi-autonomous and divided. Stevens does not explore the external relationality of architecture in detail, for instance with the economic field, but the idea establishes the principle and so we can ask how those relationships are enacted, and explore the tensions arise in the process. Similarly, if the field is divided, we can explore what lies at the root of those divisions and what is at stake in the material and ideational struggles that shape the field. We can query what the dominant narrative preaches and what role it plays in the reproduction of the field. The idea here is not to establish a standard set of analysis but to exemplify field thinking and illustrate how the entire world of architecture, its history and contemporary practice, production and products, agents and structure, ideals, beliefs and their contestations, images and realities and the means and mechanisms of its ongoing reproduction open up to exploration.

In the empirical part of this study I similarly approach architecture with a field lens, which contributes to the development of this new research agenda. But there are differences of focus and method. Stevens' analysis is not country-specific but looks at architecture in the Western Hemisphere. It is a largely theoretical application of Bourdieu's analysis of the fields of cultural production, which draws on architectural literature, history, analysis of secondary data such as the MacMillan Encyclopaedia of Architects and first hand experience. His focus is on drawing a global outline of the field's structure, evolution, and the mechanisms of reproduction, in particular, the role played by the architectural education.

This study looks at architecture in contemporary Britain. The analysis is informed by Stevens' outline of the field's structure and benefits greatly from his insights, but it also substantiates his theoretical 'model'. In-depth exploration of the field enables us to observe how the internal divisions and conflicts identified by Stevens, work themselves out and what these imply for those taking part in the architectural game. The next chapter sets out the research strategy, describes the fieldwork and introduces the participants. It is followed by a presentation of findings in Chapters 6 to 9.

Chapter 5

5 Research Objectives and Methodology

In this chapter, I outline the aims of the study, the research strategy and the methods used in collecting and analysing the data. I discuss the implications of studying a single case and working with in-depth interviews in Bourdieusian field analysis. This is followed by a report on fieldwork and a description of data analysis procedures. I end by introducing the participants of the study.

5.1 Research objectives

This research has two related aims. The broader, theoretical aim is to explore the potential of applying the field concept to the sociology of the professions. The project can be seen as 'testing' the proposition that professions can be analysed as fields. To this end, it explores the internal dynamics and processes of architecture in contemporary Britain. The focus of this exploration was developed inductively and it has three main strands; analysis of the perceived stakes, rules and requirements of the architectural game which enables us to 'see' the architectural universe as experienced by architects; analysis of the interplay of architectural ideals and priorities and the factors situated 'outside' architectural production; and examining the differentiation between the kinds of architecture, architect and architectural expertise in relation to the structural divisions and the dominant narrative of the field.

In this way, I seek to build an understanding of the architectural field and the constraints that frame individuals' experiences; the stakes that drive the game, the capitals instrumental in their pursuit, the taken for granted ideas and practices, the contestations of its dominant vision and the tensions that its reproduction generates. Thus, on one level, the project seeks to develop an understanding of how the world of architecture works and on another, it addresses the question of what can be learned from this investigation for developing a field mode of thinking in the sociology of professions.

5.2   Research strategy

The aim of the thesis is to analyse architecture as a field, but how does one 'do' field analysis? In one description, which comes closest to providing a 'guide', Bourdieu suggested that a field should be analysed in its "totality", and include the following "three inter-connected moments" of sociological analysis: consideration of the position of the field vis a vis the political field, mapping of the structure of the field, and analysis of the strategies and trajectories of agents (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp.104-105). But this was not intended to be a blueprint and indeed, does not do justice to the historically informed and richly detailed analyses contained in his own empirical work for example on literary, scientific and juridicial fields (Bourdieu, 1975, 1987 and 1993). Field mapping can be carried out with the aid of multiple correspondence analysis, but historical sources, documents, works of literature and art, ethnography and in-depth interviews were also used by Bourdieu.

However, none of this amounts to a 'prescription' and as Grenfell (2008) notes, Bourdieu's formulation does not indicate a sequence either. On the contrary, Bourdieu insisted that, if we are to reconstruct a field, that is, to capture its 'reality' as completely as possible, all three of these levels should be included in the analysis (Bourdieu, 1992). Thus, a 'complete'

examination of a field will include several investigations, which Bourdieu described as posing "immense practical difficulties"[16]. The construction of a field is "a protracted and exacting task that is accomplished little by little", not a priori, but through a difficult and open-ended process between theoretical propositions and empirical observations, that is, by rejecting the traditional divisions between theory and empirical research and "abandoning dominant appearances of scientificity" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp. 228 and 246). Here, we can see the striking contrast with studies that seek to explain professions with reference to a single aspect such as their organisational attributes, position in the division of labour or the capitalist economy, or the strategies and ideology. The aim in field analysis is not to identify some key variables or causes, but to examine complex processes and dynamics in all their relationality and to do so as time and place-bound exercises.

Bourdieu's 'field analysis' has come to be associated with mapping structural relations and understanding the 'objective' constraints that bear on agents' practices. Its increasing applications[17] in a wide range of subjects including urban studies, cultural analysis, education, studies of art, journalism, literature and gender (Thomson, 2008) do not necessarily utilise the field approach to conduct a complete analysis in a way fashioned and pursued by Bourdieu himself. The utilisation of the idea ranges from field mapping exercises (Bennet et al, 2009), to its oblique uses to refer to the structural relations that constraint agents' habitus in different social fields (Fowler and Wilson, 2004), and to its adoption as a tool for complete theoretical re-orientation on a subject (on journalism see Benson and Neveu, 2005; on education and teacher training, see Grenfell, 1996). More recent explorations include applications of the field concept in cultural analysis (Cultural Sociology Special Issue, June 2013).

---

[16] Bourdieu also highlights the fundamental conflict between the demands of his approach and the requirements of 'positivist' thinking, manifest in the PhD thesis guidelines as a requirement to study "exhaustively a very precise and well-circumscribed object". He describes this as a dilemma between "the intensive analysis of a practically graspable fragment of the object and the extensive analysis of the totality of the true object" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 232-233).

[17] Although relevant for evaluations of Bourdieu's field concept in general, the growing literature on 'field analysis', with its Bourdieusian and USA based strands falls outside the remit of this project.

Thus, what we have in the field notion is an analytical framework, not a tightly defined strategy or a set of methods to accompany it. The concept of field is an "open concept" (Maton, 2008), an investigative tool that was developed for and through empirical work and has been used in a wide range of contexts (Thomson, 2008). The current application of the field idea with reference to professions should also be seen in this vein, rather than as a replication of Bourdieu's approach that pursues a 'complete' analysis. Thus, the field notion is used as a lens, to see the architectural field in a different light and ask what relationships and processes that this analytical shift brings into view. I suggest that the different kinds of questions it engenders can be pursued to instigate a shift in the way we approach analysis of professions. Thus, a 'field analysis' of architecture would involve several studies that cannot all be decided a priori and as an exploratory analysis, this project should be viewed as a small step in developing that as a new research agenda.

I approach architecture as a 'case' of field analysis and data was collected on views and experiences in semi-structured, in-depth interviews. The empirical part of the thesis was developed inductively, following a grounded analysis of data. Choice of research methods are not independent of theoretical assumptions and classical sociology is characterised by 'camps' formed around particular philosophies and associated methods (Holdaway, 2000; Gilbert, 1998), but Bourdieu's sociology stands in opposition to these divisions which are somewhat redundant in 'field analysis' (Grenfell, 2011). In the next sections, I discuss the issues that arise in relation to focusing on a single case and working with in-depth interviews.

5.2.1 Architecture as a single case study

This project can be seen as a type of case study used instrumentally in pursuing the theoretical proposition that professions can be studied as fields. Indeed, it could be suggested that, in the

sense of being an intensive and extensive study of a unique case, field analysis cannot be anything but case study research.

The 'problem' of generalisability is often raised in relation to case study research and although this tends to arise from 'positivistic' concerns that do not apply here, the issue does need to be considered in this study, in relation to the intention to move from an analysis of architecture to studies of other professions. The decision to concentrate on a single profession is a direct corollary of field thinking; it is about constructing a 'complete' picture of the architectural universe. In Bourdieu's thinking, each field is defined as a "world apart" and the aim is to understand how that world works. Thus, what is true of the architectural universe is not and cannot be argued to be true of other professional fields. The question of how each field operates is an entirely empirical matter. The aim here is to explore the theoretical proposition that professions can be seen as fields, not to reach generalisations about the operation of all professions. However, this reliance on a single case means that the study remains limited in its power to draw conclusions about carrying the field mode of thinking into the sociology of professions, which requires the application of the idea to other cases. The difficulty we have here is that, it is not possible to remedy this easily within the scope of a single project, as even the 'complete' analysis of one professional field would involve multiple investigations.

What can we then learn from this investigation? Here, it may help to distinguish between the types of data and insight generated by the study. Firstly, insights gained about architecture will help build an understanding of the architectural universe and guide the design of the next steps in constructing it as a field. Secondly, as an application of the field concept in a new context, the study can contribute to its evaluation and refinement as an analytical tool. Thirdly, methodological lessons learned can support the development of more robust strategies for studying other professions, and the patterns and relationships observed in architecture can generate proposals for analysis of other professional fields.

5.2.2 In-depth interviews: insights into field processes

In this study, I diverge from the emphasis on structural mapping associated with Bourdieu's field approach and explore the field processes through an analysis of individual architects' views and reported experiences which allows us to gain an insight into field processes and to observe the field in the making. In-depth interviews are associated with interpretive sociological currents such as symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology, schools of thought that emphasise the subjective construction of the social world through the perceptions, actions and interactions of individuals and seek to develop theoretical explanations of their 'life world'. Qualitative interviews are seen as a way to enter the subjective realm of agents' world. The role of the researcher is, then, seen as interpreting agents' own interpretations of their lived experiences with the aid of an analytical framework (Flick, 1998: Gilbert, 1993; Holdaway, 2000; Gaskell, 2000). Bourdieu set himself apart from these 'subjectivist' schools by emphasising the structured nature and the structural context of these 'subjective' accounts. He argued that these theories are nothing more than "accounts of accounts which agents produce" and described them as "pre-science" (Bourdieu, 1972, pp. 1-21). As discussed in Chapter 3, Bourdieu queries the formation of agents' subjectivities under particular conditions. In relation to field analysis, he looks at the link between agents' views and trajectories and the structural divisions in the field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1989). Bourdieu is, therefore, critical of what he saw as taking subjective accounts at face value and argued that these "reduce social reality to the awareness of agents". Their accounts need to be seen as the mechanism through which the world is perceived, made and challenged, but sociological analysis must be about seeing beyond this "primary experience of the world" (Bourdieu, 2000, p.183).

What does this mean for the interpretation of subjective accounts, such as those gathered in this study? It implies that these must be understood and interpreted in relation to the structural divisions and constraints that operate in the field, the position of respondents within that space

and also their location within the wider social world, the imprints of which are carried into the field through their habitus. In analysing participant accounts, I supplement the general field orientation with Stevens' description of architecture, which I suggest can be used as an outline of its structural divisions, a strategy similar to the remedy Bourdieu recommends to studies that cannot avoid pursuing a 'narrow' investigation rather than a 'complete' analysis (Bourdieu, 1992, pp.232-233). Getting a handle on the structure of the field in this way enables the analysis of architects' 'subjective' views and experiences in relation to its 'objective' divisions. Data on interviewees' class background could facilitate a consideration of the socially constructed nature of their views in general, but given that the research is primarily about understanding the field, not individuals' journeys within it, this was relevant only in a small number of analysis.

However, data from a small unrepresentative sample of in-depth interviews do not support conclusive descriptions of the 'objective' structure of the field. The tensions and processes evident in participant accounts are interpreted as indicative of field divisions and conflicts, but these findings need to be triangulated with further research and some of these further lines of investigation are indicated in Conclusions.

5.3   The Fieldwork

The fieldwork took place between January and May 2011. Prior preparations involved applications to the university Ethics Committee, desk and literature searches, informal discussions with personal contacts in the field and the preparation of field documents including the Interview Schedule, Research Information Sheet and the Consent Form. (See Appendix for copies of field documents). Ethics Approval was gained in December 2010

Prior to the commencement of the interviews with architects, I sought to gather the views of insiders, those with knowledge or first hand experience, to help me develop some understanding of architectural practice. Three informal discussions were carried out between October and December 2010. Insights gathered from these informal discussions fed into the development of the Interview Schedule. Issues highlighted include the priorities of schools, the elitist culture of the profession, conflict between design ideals and technical, legal and financial constraints, effects of the latest recession and the incursions of construction companies into the architectural markets.

5.3.1 Sampling and recruitment

Recruitment of research participants began in December 2010 and fieldwork in late January 2011. All participants were recruited through personal recommendation and by "snowballing" (Arber, 1993) from existing interviewees. Consideration of early impressions and field observations indicated 'saturation' in terms of the themes and issues raised, after about 25 interviews. Recruitment attempts were stopped after securing 30 interviews, but the final sample size reached 37, as unexpected numbers responded positively to interview requests.

Although the sampling criteria could not be fully enforced during recruitment, a set of characteristics was identified as potential indicators of variation in experiences. These included demographic characteristics such as age, gender and ethnicity, as well as employment and firm characteristics such as firm type and size and specialisation by sector. The aim was to account for the range of experiences and views that could potentially be found among architects. Attempts to randomly contact architects chosen through internet searches proved

unproductive and existing interviewees and personal contacts were the main sources of recruitment. This, together with the pressure to complete the interviews within a given time period, limited the ability to influence the selection of participants. On the other hand, personal recommendation, particularly by architects who had already participated in the research increased the chances of obtaining further interviews. Without taking advantage of personal recommendations it is unlikely that senior architects from well-known practices could have been recruited. However, with snowballing, there is the risk that the sample might include clusters of participants with similar views (Arber, 1993, p.74). In this sample, there was a small group of four architects with similar views about 'public architecture', but their views were also echoed by others. Snowballing also resulted in the recruitment of participants who work for the same firm or had done so in the past. Consequently, the total of 37 participants were recruited from 22 firms. The biggest cluster is of nine architects who worked for one very large, international design practice, though they were involved in different projects and worked at different grades.

5.3.2 The interview schedule, procedures and dynamics

The Interview Schedule was designed to encourage an open-ended discussion about practice. It included sections on personal background, architectural education, work history, current employment, work organisation, computerisation, perceived challenges and rewards of practice, future plans and views on the meaning of professionalism and its perceived relationship to class identification (See the Appendix). The Interview Schedule acted as a guide for directing discussions, but the interviews were partly led by the interviewees. The schedule looks very detailed, in hindsight, but I very rarely needed to ask all the questions, or in this order. Not all questions were asked in every interview and sometimes sections had to be left out, as some participants only had time for a short interview.

Most interviews were conducted in public places, such as cafes, art galleries and some in participants' homes, with a small number in places of work. Most participants described their practice as open plan, with no private space for a lengthy interview. Senior architects based in large practices were more able to meet in their offices. Most interviews lasted between 1.5 and 2.5 hours with some conducted during lunch-breaks lasting about 45 minutes to one hour. The request to record the interview was granted by all, without a noticeable anxiety about the procedure. A few senior architects underlined small parts of their contributions as 'confidential' and asked for these not to be used and these were excluded from interview transcripts.

All potential participants received a copy of the Research Information Sheet and a covering email emphasising confidentiality and clarifying the interview process. They were asked to sign a Consent Form, often at the end of the interview. Afterwards, all were sent an email to thank for their contributions and also invited to get in touch with the researcher in case of concerns about their contributions. They were offered a copy of the summary findings and all participants were interested in receiving this.

The main challenge was to overcome the disadvantages of being a complete outsider to architecture and to understand enough of architectural process and 'language' so that the interviews could be managed effectively and productively. This was not easy and in some ways, 'learning' about architecture continued throughout the fieldwork. Looking at the transcripts, the first five interviews seem to be the least well managed and are peppered with 'learning' questions. All participants were very patient with my questions and generous with their knowledge. They described, for example, their projects in detail, sometimes by showing drawings and models or explained the differences between contract types. As I became more familiar with architecture the interviews became more productive, but continued to be demanding as the participants were highly articulate and reflexive and often with a pre-existing narrative of their lives and careers. But this also meant that there was little need for

probing or explaining the questions and this is also one of the reasons why the Interview Schedule became redundant. Simply mentioning a topic was sufficient to elicit detailed and considered responses.

In the great majority of interviews, rapport with participants was good and the feedback following the interviews was overwhelmingly positive. Several participants likened the interview to a 'career evaluation' or even a 'therapy session', and most wrote back to say that they had enjoyed the experience. My experience of the fieldwork was one of intense immersion in the worlds of participants as I tried to step into their shoes and even if temporarily, to see the architectural world from within. I found myself not only thinking about the participants and their 'stories' for days after the interviews, but also looking at buildings in a different light. I'd met the 'makers' of some of the buildings I'd walked past before and knowing the story of how they came about, beyond the headlines celebrating their aesthetic qualities, somewhat confirmed my 'hunch' that it is worth asking about the labour of architecture; that there is more to making architecture and being an architect than the design styles with which they are identified with.

5.4 The Participants

In this section, I introduce the participants. This includes description of demographic characteristics, education profile, current position and distribution by practice type and size.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics

Participant Attribute	Frequency
Sex	
Male	21
Female	16
Age	
Under 40	19
40-50	12
Over 50	6
Country of origin	
UK	24
Overseas	13
Ethnicity of UK born (24)	
English, Scottish or Irish	22
Asian (1 Indian and 1 Pakistani)	2
All participants	37

Looking at demographic characteristics (Table 1), women are over-represented (about 40 per cent of sample), relative to their presence in the population of architects (20 per cent). This is also a 'young' sample with over half under the age of 40 while about 38 per cent of practicing architects are in that age range (RIBA, 2010-11). The presence of overseas born architects is also notable. This might reflect the more international outlook of the field in London and the Southeast, but all three participants who were based outside this region were also of foreign origins. Six of them were fully overseas trained, with four from EU countries, while the rest were fully or partly trained in the UK. More relevant, all had spent most of their working lives in the UK. In terms of regional coverage, the research was restricted to London and the South East, where over half of the architects work (RIBA, 2010-11). Two interviews were carried out in the North West of England and one with an architect based in the South West.

Next, I describe participants' education profile (Table 2). Architectural education consists of three stages: Part I (3 years) and Part II (2 years) comprise the taught part of the course. Students are required to take a 'Year Out' after Part I, to gain practical experience. Part III is a combination of actual employment, part-time training on aspects of practice management and a write up on a real-life project (or a part of a large one). The title of 'Architect' can only be used after the successful completion of Part III and registration with the Architects Registration Board (ARB). Looking at qualifications, 30 participants were registered with the ARB, with a further two working towards it. Twenty four of the ARB registered participants were fully UK educated, three were partly trained overseas and three held EU qualifications accredited in the UK. The remaining five did not intend to pursue registration for a variety of reasons, including being able to practice at a senior level without UK qualifications and hesitations about continuing with architectural education. The duration of education varied between eight and 22 years, with most completing their registration within 10-12 years. The participants represent 20 schools of architecture, although information on the institution of Part III is incomplete.

Table 2 Education Profile

Participant category	Frequency	Further details
Stage of education		
ARB registered	30	Duration of education: 8-22 years
Not registered	7	
All participants	37	
Country of education, for the ARB registered participants		
Fully UK educated	24	
Part I and II overseas, Part III in the UK	3	Two from Commonwealth countries One from Latin America
EU qualified, UK accredited	3	Germany (2) and Italy (1)
Total ARB registered	30	
Participants not registered with ARB		
Working towards Part III and registration	2	1 in the process of converting overseas qualifications 1 completing UK education
Not working towards Part III	5	Hesitations about continuing with education or feels no need to obtain UK qualifications
Total not registered with ARB	7	

Table 3 Distribution of participants by current position

Job title	Frequency
Part II Assistant	2
Architect	6
Project Architect	4
Associate Architect	7
Senior Architect or Senior Associate	2
Director (sole practitioner)	5
Co-director (small)	2
Co-director/Partner (medium)	1
Associate partner/Partner (large/very large)	4
Other (Charity in the architectural field)	1
Unemployed	3
Total	37

Table 3 provides information about participants' current position. Eight participants were in 'junior' positions; two were Part II assistants and six were newly qualified. The remaining were experienced architects with responsibility for project delivery, working on a variety of projects, based in the UK or overseas, which represents a broad range of experiences at different stages of and positions within the architectural production process.

Table 4 summarises the distribution of participants by practice type and practice size. Distribution by type of practice can be indicative of position within the field and it is relevant for analysis of differences in experiences between the restricted and the mass fields. Practices which have a distinctive design ethos and that pursue projects with a significant design interest are often described as design practices. Commercial practices are firms where there isn't a distinctive design ethos or ambition. In total, 18 participants worked in design oriented practices and six in commercial. Those based in conservation and interior design practices (6) also indicated a design emphasis in the approach of their practice. Six participants worked in firms without a clear design direction and took on a mixture of work including small residential, commercial and public sector projects. Judging by these numbers, two thirds of the sample appears to be positioned in the restricted sector, but this could be misleading. Some practices are easier to classify than others; participants suggest shades of emphasis on design and there seems to be an assumption that all practices except for the explicitly commercial ones, at the end of the day, seek to develop a design ethos. Thus, some firms, regardless of the kinds of work they do, may see themselves as a design practice. Participants in small and medium size design firms (7) described taking on public sector projects or more routine residential work, whilst looking out for projects with more of a design interest. Also note that the 'elite' of the field is not included in the sample. Participants positioned in well-known design practices (13) operated at various levels, including senior positions with design responsibility, but none were the founders of these firms.

However, in the event, this did not present a difficulty for the coverage enabled by the sample, because analysis of differences between the restricted and the mass-production fields were based on analysis of data on *complete* work histories not just the current position. Participants had worked, throughout their career, in different types of practices, moving between the restricted and mass fields, and in their accounts referred to both past and current projects.

Table 4 Distribution of participants by current practice type and size

Practice attribute	Number of Participants
Practice type	
Design oriented (small)	5
Design oriented (medium)	2
Design oriented (large)	1
Design oriented (very large)	10
Commercial (large)	1
Commercial (very large)	5
Conservation (design emphasis)	5
Interior Design (design emphasis)	1
Mixed work (public sector, commercial and small residential)	6

Practice attribute	Number of Participants
Practice size	
Small (less than 10)	12 (5 sole practitioners)
Medium (11-49)	7
Large (50-100)	2
Very large (100+)	15
Total (number of participants)	36

Note: Participants were classified according to current or most recent place of employment. Total will not add up to 37 as the participant working in a charity is excluded.

Consequently, the total 'database' of experiences that the analysis drew on was much larger than suggested by current position. The number of firms, for example, increases to about 70 when all past and current places of employment are counted.

I further note distribution by firm size as it tends to correspond to project size and type, and that appears to be relevant to the nature of one's involvement in the architectural process. The practice size classification used here is based on the categorisation most recently developed by RIBA, but also adds to it the category of 'very large'[18]. Roughly the same number of participants (12 and 13) works in small or very large firms and the remainder in medium or

---

[18] These categories themselves are subject to change and it could be argued that the current categorisation is also due for another review. For instance, in 1962, practices with more than 30 staff were classified as large and this changed to 50+ in early 90s. The number of very large international firms increased in the last 30 years and the current classification does not quite reflect this growth in practice sizes.

large practices. Compared to the profile of the population of architects, those working in small practices (less than 10 staff) are under-represented (about fifty per cent in the population, but a third of participants) and those in practices of 50+ staff are over represented (about fifty per cent in the sample as opposed to a quarter in the population).

5.5   Data analysis: led by theory <u>and</u> grounded in empirical evidence

Data from interviews was transcribed by the researcher and analysed using NViVo, a qualitative data analysis software. In interpreting the data and linking empirical insights with theoretical considerations, I undertook a grounded analysis and the focus of the thesis was developed inductively. I distinguish this from 'grounded theory' (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Melia, 1997) as a research strategy. Here, I refer to grounded analysis as "a way of analysing data" (Punch, 1998: p.163). I adopted an inductive strategy with a view to being open to what the data might present. I worked with the 'field' concept as a way into data, both in selecting the focus and the lines of investigation to be pursued and in interpreting the dominant themes to emerge from it. The specific focus of the thesis emerged out of what may be best described as a circular process of movement between data and theory. Thus, the analytic categories such as 'field', 'doxa', 'and capital' were introduced externally to explore their fit to empirical observations, but these 'conceptual boxes' were filled with data collected in the field.

Qualitative interviewing produces large amounts of data and only a part of it can be used in a single project. Eliminating what does not fit in with any of the other themes and deciding which themes work together to support a single thesis is not a straightforward process. It is difficult to describe coding and analysis in detail and precisely, as it is never as neat as presented here and often involves several revisions and by the end of the analysis, the project

is full of coding themes which either failed, or did not fit into the final overall theme, and thus had to be abandoned. Here, I provide a simplified description of the process to give an idea of how the analysis proceeds and deepens by each stage.

As I conducted and transcribed the interviews myself, I was familiar with the interview content and also with the help of the Interview Schedule, I developed a Coding Framework for first stage organisation of data. This was a 'thematic' coding and some examples to the 'Tree Nodes' include 'Education', 'Work', 'The Profession' and 'Personal and Family Background'. Each of these 'Tree Nodes' was divided into 'Child Nodes', for sorting the data into smaller and more specifically defined drawers. The 'Work' node for example, was divided into several 'Child Nodes' and some examples include 'Work history', 'Current employment', 'Challenges and Difficulties', 'Rewards' and 'Work organisation'. There were also several 'Free Nodes', which did not seem to fit into any of the thematic categories. The second stage analysis involved re-organisation of the data under conceptual categories informed by theoretical concerns. By this stage, I knew the data very well and could quickly pull out the data relevant to the analytical theme I planned to pursue. One example is the question of tension between 'autonomy and heteronomous pressures' in the field. Under the heading of 'Autonomy-Heteronomy', I brought together data from several child nodes of the 'Work' node (e.g. 'Recession', 'Working with Other Experts') but also some from the 'The Profession' node (e.g. 'Social Ideals', 'Dependency on Economy', 'Decline in Status') where more general comments about architecture were originally filed and data from 'Free Nodes' such as 'Clients'. At this stage, I also worked through printed copies of transcripts as I recalled smaller extracts from 'Nodes' that were not directly relevant to the theme explored and therefore not under the 'right' node, but was useful for making links between analytical themes and often these manual checks were quicker than going through another tranche of coding. The third stage involved probing deeper into the data on the issue of 'Autonomy-Heteronomy' and looking for variations in views and experiences.

A 'map' of the developing thesis, explored through different strands of investigations (e.g. Architectural Illusio, Autonomy and Heteronomy, Creativity and Technical-Managerial, Doxa of design and actual experiences) crystallises in this process and it becomes possible, at that point, to put the mountain of data aside and get the emerging 'story' on paper. The following chapters tell the most compelling story to have emerged in this analysis.

Chapter 6

6 The architectural illusio: the ideals, beliefs and the necessities of architecture

I begin the empirical part of my thesis by exploring the autonomous claims of architecture and the taken for granted beliefs, values and practices that constitute the architectural illusio. By autonomous claims I refer to its self-declared ideals, or what the dominant symbolic representation of architecture states its' purpose to be. In other words, I seek to understand what drives those who pursue architecture, make the investments it requires of them and comply with the rules and requirements of partaking in architectural practice. This thinking is guided by Bourdieu's description of fields as spaces structured around a specific 'interest':

> *"Each field calls forth and gives life to a specific form of interest, a specific illusio as tacit recognition of the value of the stakes of the game and as practical mastery of its rules." (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:p.117).*

The object of individuals' struggle is, then, this specific interest, which defines the illusio, or the 'game' that is played in that field. The pursuit of this 'interest' will involve the acquisition of resources such as cultural or economic capital which are instrumental in the production of architecture, but the specific interest that drives a game is also expressed in symbolic terms, and the dominant narrative of the field, the doxa defines the game in terms of this symbolic capital. It is stated to be the purpose, the ultimate goal in taking part in a field; the reason why the game is pursued, what it is believed to achieve. Then, to understand the architectural field, we need to ask what is at stake in the architectural game and that is the aim of this chapter.

The competition over this specific interest means conflict and differentiation and gives rise to structural divisions that frame individual architects' experiences of practice. Thus, if we are to understand what practicing architecture involves, we need to examine these structural constraints and internal conflicts that individuals negotiate as part of their journeys in the field. At the same time, the very existence of architectural practice and its continuity presupposes individuals who value and chase the same capitals and play by the same rules and therefore are pulled together by their very participation in the field and make the field possible. These two 'realities' of the field, therefore, co-exist; it is simultaneously a conflictual and consensual space of relations between agents with different degrees of power over the direction and the representations of the field. My plan is to 'suspend' one of these 'realities' for the duration of this chapter and focus on what we might call the 'doxa', that is the dominant and the taken for granted practices and the view of architecture. I then unravel this picture in the following chapters and show the internal struggles and divisions both over capitals and the representations of the field. With this presentation, I also wish to transmit something of the fractured experience participants have of the field and the intense conflict many felt between architectural ideals and everyday realities.

I begin by asking what the architectural game is about and suggest that by examining explanations of what drives architects and their perceptions of architecture's role and significance, we can begin to develop an understanding of what is at stake in the architectural game. First, I consider participants' reasons for going into architecture. At this point, participants were not in the field and were evaluating the game as 'outsiders' and their decisions were based, almost purely, on an understanding of the game in the abstract. But they are all the more telling, I suggest, as they reflect perceptions of architecture's most commonly recognised representations. The challenges to this 'taken for granted' vision are explored in the following chapters, but I suggest that these early perceptions provide a way into the self-professed ideals of architecture in their 'pure' state, not tempered by the lens of 'real practice'.

I follow this with an analysis of expressions of belief in architecture's social role, absent in descriptions of reasons for entering architecture, but strongly defended from positions within the field. I end by analysing the practices that affirm architectural ideals, facilitate their pursuit and in this way, contribute to the reproduction of the field.

6.1   Design ideals

The notion of design ideals refers to the belief that practicing architecture is about the pursuit of original design styles, believed to be individual creations. The practice of architecture as design development takes place in the aesthetic realm and according to a system of rules that operate independently of non-architectural factors. The idea that architecture is an artistic profession took hold in interviewees' minds early on, indeed prior to entering the field and the belief in the creative promise of architecture influenced decisions to pursue it as a career. Interviewees were not always clear where this idea came from. They vaguely referred to information from schools of architecture, to a "public or media image" of what architects do, to advice from teachers and a few remembered the impressions they had formed of architects from personal or family contacts. Many said that they "just knew" it was "something to do with design", "drawing" or "great buildings". Craig's (50) comments are typical:

> "I: Where did the idea of architecture come from?
>
> R: I don't know. I've always had architecture in my head, since may be I was about early teens. I've no idea. It's just the idea of building things. ... Not clear at that stage what an architect was. I just knew that architect was someone who designed and built things."

These are vague sentiments, but may suggest that there is an image 'out there' that needs little iteration. Not all participants entered architecture with the same degree of conviction and some arrived at it after a detour through other subjects, often because those did not provide the "creative outlet" they felt they needed. For others, it was a more tentative and exploratory step. Barring youthful uncertainties about career choice, it is notable that most participants believed in this image of an architect as an artist strongly enough to embark on the long education process19. Several also described how they "knew" from an early age that they wanted to be an architect and described it as a realisation of "childhood dreams". This was also referred to by many others, as the "romantic stories" of attraction to the allures of architecture.

Detailed examination of reasons for going into architecture suggests that almost no-one reporting choosing architecture for the economic rewards it might offer. This contradicts the traditional assumption that professionals seek to preserve control of their domain for the economic rewards it brings. A few mentioned, alongside an interest in architecture, its perceived position as "one of the respected professions" with associated status and rewards and the opportunity to pursue artistic ambitions within the framework of a professional career path. These participants talked about seeking "the security of a proper trade", "a properly structured career", "parity with doctors and lawyers" and "aspiring to become a professional". Overwhelmingly though, participants talked about being attracted to it as an artistic line of work. This was followed by an interest in its technical aspects and in its "unique" capacity to "combine art and science".

The majority, therefore, had gone into architecture for the creative and artistic opportunities it promised. Most had an interest in art, though to differing degrees, and described themselves as "arty" or "creative"; they liked drawing, painting, design or photography. Others talked about how they were "fascinated by plans and maps", "just always loved buildings" or were "into

---

[19] A brief description of architectural education and the qualification profile of participants are provided in Chapter 5.

visuals" and talked about such attributes as "typical of architects" and said that they wanted to go into architecture because they "wanted to design buildings". Sunita (27) exemplifies this perception of a fit between being "arty" and being an architect:

"So basically, I've just always been really arty. Wanted to get into something creative and ... I just knew that I wanted to be something creative. And then I was kind of advised that if you go into architecture it's something arty, it's very creative but it's also ... quite academic as well ... and it's quite highly regarded...."

Alongside a creative core, architecture was also perceived to have a technical aspect. A smaller number of architects (seven), although good at drawing and interested in the arts, expressed a stronger initial attraction to the technical side of architecture, the mechanics of putting a building together. Dan (32) is one of them:

"[I was interested in] stuff like how things, buildings work. And technology.... I was always more interested in the practical things really. And I guess, I never enjoyed the theory as much. I always felt that the realisation was much more interesting actually."

This brings into view the connection between the technical and creative aspects of architecture. Its perceived position as a bridge between art and science was its main attraction for many, often because it appealed to their own personal interests and abilities and the desire to find an option that would facilitate the pursuit of both. Mansour (40) is typical of those who saw architecture as a combination of art and science:

"I've just really been naturally been driven to the construction world ... And then my cousin was an architect, the cool person! And I also, I liked to draw a lot. Just drawing, doing free hand sketching and drawing ... So I thought cool, that's a combination of both of these things. ... A doctor, an engineer, they all seemed a bit dry to me. I wanted something more artistic and fun. So architecture was a great thing. It was a combination of both and I liked drawing, I liked photography. So, it's mixing art with science and engineering, if you want."

Some of these participants described this as "connecting everything together" and avoiding a "narrow view of things". In this way, architecture was described as a production with scientific and intellectual foundations. The broad education was a big attraction for many and it was perceived to offer an intellectually grounded profession that combined arts, science and technology. For them, this added to its appeal and distinguished it from other potential options such as becoming a "graphic designer" or a "pure artist". In the same way, the technical aspects of construction were found to be framed by a more advanced understanding of engineering and technology, and therefore stood architecture apart from building construction. The following quote from Jane (40) expresses the perception of architecture's broad reach, artistic appeal and also the perceived potential to combine so many things and to be so many things:

"When I looked at architecture and when I made the decision, it fulfils, it's so, 360 degrees. Mentally, spiritually, it's emotional, it's intellectual, it's aesthetic, it's ... and you bring to it what you want. So you can be very technical, very dry, or you can be very poetic, or you can be, ah, it's just whatever you want. And that, it's constantly changing, you are never bored, there is so much being developed that's new and it's social, it's a way of ehm, it's a contribution, if you choose it to be, it can be very self-indulgent, it's also problem solving, it's contributing to good design means that life becomes effortless, and enjoyable, that's, so it just touches all those, it ticks all those boxes."

Looking at variation among participants (37), all interviewees perceived architecture as a primarily creative activity, with only seven referring to its technical aspects and 17 to its

119

"bridge position" between art and science. These different strands are present in participant accounts in different combinations and are emphasised to differing degrees. However, despite the recognition of its technical aspects by half the participants, the image of architecture as art, and architect as an artist was a constant in all 37 interviews. These sentiments cut across age, as well as gender, ethnicity and nationality, but the age aspect is worth noting here as it suggests that the image of architecture as a primarily creative profession has changed little over time. Further analysis suggests that there might be differences by class origin in terms of the reasons for initial attraction to the profession, with middle class participants more likely to cite 'artistic' aspects, and working class participants referring to its 'technical' or practical sides, but the division is not clear cut[20].

It seems that the perception of architecture as a pursuit of design ideals was reinforced by the architectural education the interviewees received. This emphasis on design came in for fierce criticism in retrospective accounts, (see Chapter 8), but I suggest that it is useful to consider the 'signals' schools of architecture send out as they don't only teach how to design, but are also the 'official' sites of the construction of its dominant narrative (Cuff, 1991; Stevens, 1998). It is not possible to analyse in detail the views and experiences of architectural education here[21], but let me summarise perceptions of the focus on design to the exclusion of the other aspects of architecture. All participants found that the emphasis was more singularly on the 'design' aspect of making buildings, to the exclusion of technical sides and this parallels previous evaluations of architectural education (Cuff, 1991; Crinson&Lubock, 1994). They indicate that during Part I and Part II, a strong emphasis is placed on the design element of the building process and on the aesthetic qualities of students' work, cultivating a

---

[20] A brief consideration suggests that these early interests do not necessarily correspond to later positions in the field. For instance, Dan, quoted above, worked in a well-known design practice and expressed a desire to develop his own style. Further exploration of this relationship would be relevant for exploring individuals' strategies and trajectories in the field and it also has implications for evaluating the class 'character' of the field, but this investigation could not be pursued here.

[21] Analysis is based on descriptions of architectural education in the UK and excludes accounts of any overseas training. Incidentally, other than those from the Commonwealth countries whose architectural education seems to have been modelled after the British system, the overseas -educated participants described a more substantial engineering component to their training, described as an advantage, particularly by senior architects in large firms.

perception that architect's role, primarily, is to come up with an original design concept. Looking back on their education, many described it as "theoretical" and focused on "developing design skills", "enhancing creative abilities" and developing an appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of buildings. Education was described as a time of "designing freely" and learning to "develop design concepts" and as "removed from the world of construction". Design briefs at university were described to be abstract and required one, for example, to "draw inspiration from the memory of a dream or a poem" and were "never something like design a house or design a restaurant". Many described designing structures that "do not have to stand" and said that they did not learn to design with regards to restrictions that constrain real life projects. Views on Part III are also telling, as many seemed to separate it from 'education' per se and said, "that's when your training really starts". An interesting distinction is made between the 'quality' of the education received and its relevance for practice. Architectural education was highly regarded by all, but regardless of original interests, the school attended to, or the current role and position in the field, the great majority argued that they left school believing that their job was to pursue design ambitions and develop their own style.

To recap, early perceptions of architecture based on its 'public image' and information from schools of architecture, and the accounts of the content of architectural education indicate design and creativity as what drives architects. This tension between the artistic and technical sides of architecture reflects a perennial debate in the profession that some participants dismissed as "artificial". The dominant narrative appears to emphasise the former, but the technical is an inseparable part of architectural production. Consequently, the divisive-and-complimentary relationship between design and construction continues to be the subject of debates about architecture's definition. As we will see in Chapter 9, this debate is also indicative of the different kinds of skills and abilities, or the capitals required in architecture and it forms the basis of struggles and divisions within the field. We must, therefore, keep in mind both the primacy allocated to design and creativity and the contested place of technical production.

In addition to design, participants also emphasised, without direct prompt, architecture's social role, described as improving the built environment and making a difference to people's lives through good design. Social ambitions did not feature in early perceptions discussed above, but came to the fore in views on the significance of architecture; why it matters and what it achieves. The extent of comments and the strength of feeling about architecture's social role suggest that whilst architectural production appears to be driven by design ambitions, architects sustain the field also with expectations and ambitions of making a social contribution. I follow this examination of the autonomous ideals of the game by examining the views on the social function of architecture and consider what these imply for the definition of architecture as driven by artistic ideals. As noted in Chapter 4, although the public sector has not disappeared as a client, architects no longer act as initiators and leaders of large public building programmes (Pepper, 2009). Literature suggests that, during this period, the commercial side of architecture has come to be emphasised more (Symes et al, 1995) but participant accounts suggest that despite the loss of public architecture as a platform from which to control the built environment, architects continue to believe in architecture's potential to make a social impact.

6.2 Architecture's social role: "It is an idealistic profession."

Commitment to making a difference and improving people's lives was a strong theme among participants. Views on architecture's social role were revealed in comments about what they found rewarding in architecture. Most commented that architecture is not just about designing and making "aesthetically nice looking buildings, or technically working buildings but also has social aspects". They argued that architects "have a social responsibility", and architecture "must be about society", about "enhancing the quality of people's lives". Architecture was described "as a job with a purpose", "an idealistic job" that is "about solving social and

environmental problems". Others described it as the "most altruistic form of design" or the "only design subject where you can make a difference". Rafael (38) expresses this "idealist" notion of architecture very well in this quote:

> *"I am an architect and I don't know anything about sociology, but I know that we affect society, with buildings and the cities we build... I don't know if it's this vain of being a dreamer or a visionary or whatever you want to call it.... I think it's more that you want to change the world in every single project. And that's, you talk to any architect, they are all like that. Oh yeah, we can transform this and that and this area will be stunning and, I mean we are not talking because we like to talk, we believe in what we say.... What I find rewarding is that you can make a difference with your work."*

But how does architecture make a difference to people's lives? Explanations of how social ambitions are realised show that it is believed to be achieved in some measure in every project, even in some small way. However, references to its value as art and culture and architectural input to urban renewal programmes also indicate a belief in their leadership of the built environment. Dan (32) indicates some of the different channels through which architects' social role is expressed:

> *"Personally, I think the role of the architect is to make someone's life better. In a way, it could be through the most beautiful gallery a person has ever seen and could reduce someone to tears... Or it could be, you know, slightly larger living room, which could actually make someone's life easier. Or better facilities in terms of the local library or things like that."*

To demonstrate the difference their work makes, participants referred to the projects they worked on, some small residential, others public sector buildings such as schools, hospitals and libraries. Conservation specialists, similarly, emphasised their role in the protection of

historical buildings. George (40) is an architect with experience of conservation and small residential projects and this is how he perceives the impact of his work:

> *"A lot of the time, being an architect, you are actually making lives a lot better for people. You know, I do church extensions and a lot of people use it, not just parishioners, but people who use it on a daily basis, mother and toddler groups and that sort of thing will get great benefit out of that ... just to do a bog standard extension at the back of a house, to a lot of people that actually is great. It increases their capacity in their own house to do things. And that's a really nice feeling...."*

Others referred to architects' contribution to urban planning and stated that they are "fanatically keen to deal with" the problems of urbanisation and cut a more significant and grand role for architecture. Susan (32) is talking about a master plan:

> *"What we are likely to achieve in doing this job... something that will make a significant improvement to other people's lives. It sounds like a very big gesture, but the kind of work I am doing at the moment.... We are shaping areas of the city, which would last hundreds of years, in some form. Even if it's just a street that you position. Everything is demolished and that street might be there forever. You know, that is something which is incredibly important."*

Although most participants believed that their work made a difference and had a social significance, some displayed a more active commitment to these ideals by trying to stay in sectors that they perceived to be less corporate, such as the public sector or conservation. Jim (47) speaks for these participants:

"I can't think of another job that [I could do], I feel that producing the built environment around us it is a fairly significant thing you do …. I can remember the first significant job that I had to run, which was a health building dedicated to kids with serious physical disabilities. So, they had the kids there with serious spinal injuries and people would come from all over Europe to get their children treated. … The brief for the building was very interesting on that level. It was one of the most worthwhile projects I worked on … Ehm, and it's just nice to be working on some architecture where people are actually trying to improve the lot of other people … you know, health, education. Or even transport. I think they are all important things to people. I've never aligned with that Thatcherite notion of commercial development, banking, offices and all that sort of stuff... So, yeah, I definitely, I can categorically say, it definitely does matter what I work on. You know, I couldn't work on nuclear power stations. I don't think I'd want to work on prisons. There are a lot of things that I'd rule out."

Looking at variation among participants, it is difficult to identify a conclusive pattern. There was a tendency for participants involved in public sector projects to express stronger views, but others working on design led projects for private clients were equally passionate. A few participants working in senior positions in very large, design oriented practices and engaged in the making of recognisable buildings for private clients were hesitant to respond affirmatively when asked to comment on the social role of architecture, and talked more about meeting client needs. By contrast though, some of the more junior architects in these firms expressed a wish to leave because they did not want to "just build houses for the rich", so the current type of practice is not necessarily an indicator of individuals' views and preferences. No notable difference by age was detected which may suggest that the decline of public architecture does not equal less of a commitment to architecture's social ideals among the younger generations.

To sum up, these accounts suggest that the autonomous claims of architecture find their expression in the pursuit of design originality <u>and</u> a belief in architecture's social contribution. The emphasis on the social significance of architecture both supports and contests the consecration of design as an ideal. The importance of design or what we may call an architectural input into building construction is reaffirmed because the social impact referred to is thought to be achieved through 'good' design. As one participant put it, "most of the

buildings we see were not built by architects" and architects argue that these "disasters" stand to make a case for the difference design makes. This is reminiscent of the descriptions of architects by early traits-functionalist accounts as 'altruistic' and providers of a service to society. We might therefore see this as an expression of the role architects assume and a reassertion of their belief in the value of design. However, I suggest that we need to strike a balance between the critique that claims of providing a public service are ideological constructions spawned in the interests of market closure and the functionalist elevation of professionals' self-projections to status of theory. What is lost in this confrontation is that individual architects do believe in their capacity to improve the built environment and argue that they are the best placed to do so. In other words, dismissing social claims as a justification of power and authority loses sight of the real force such beliefs exercise on individual architects. These accounts, therefore, also speak of the passion and the desire to put architectural expertise to use in the name of improving the built environment.

Nevertheless, this emphasis on making a social contribution is interesting because the social role of architecture has been off the agenda over the last 20-30 years; both of the political elites and of the profession itself. But we need to be careful not to assume that these views speak for the 'profession' as a whole, because I suggest that these might also be read as a different take on the role of architecture in society as they contain a mildly disguised criticism of the emphasis on the aesthetic aspects of buildings. Because what is also implied here is that architectural input is not and should not be just about 'design', design here meaning the look of a building. Commitment to design ambitions and social ideals do not need to exclude each other on a personal level, but these views might be indicative of a tension between the celebration of originality in style and the views that value the difference architectural input makes in other respects, particularly if the field's dominant narrative or the leading figures do not assent to the idea of a social function. The changing tune of the profession and its leaders was highlighted by some participants (see Chapter 7), which raises questions about whether, and how, the more grand social ambitions of architecture are pursued today. The references to the small ways in which architecture "improves people's lives" might, therefore, also be seen

as an attestation of the shift in architects' power to influence bigger decisions about the built environment. We need to understand this shift, also, in relation to the changes in the political and economic fields and that is explored in the next chapter.

I continue the exploration of architectural illusio with an examination of the evidence on individual architects' belief in and commitment to the architectural ideals exposed above. My proposition is that accounts of the 'demands' of practice and the commitment to meet those provide evidence on the practices that contribute to the reproduction of the field. By examining perceptions of what reaching the architectural ideal necessitates, we can further develop our understanding of the architectural illusio as a set of ideas and practices constituted around a competition in pursuit of design ideals and the reproduction of the game through agents' everyday activities. Bourdieu argued that belonging to a field implies a belief in its claims and compliance with the necessities of the field (Bourdieu,1990, p.66-68; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p.115-118). He did not define what the 'necessities of the field' exactly refers to[22], but his broad descriptions suggests that it could involve meeting its entry requirements, acquiring the capitals necessary and developing the ability to play the game as well as developing an understanding of its unwritten rules, requirements and values. My aim here is not to provide a comprehensive account of these systems, but to present evidence that is suggestive of two features of the necessities of architecture: the constraints it places on individuals through rules of practice and the attachment it inspires in them.

6.3   Investing in Architecture: "You have to eat, live and breathe it."

---

[22] This raises questions about the 'operationalisation' of the field concept in empirical research, which is discussed in Chapter 10, Conclusions.

Participant accounts are full of reflections on how hard it is to make it in architecture: "It is hard being an architect. You have to study very hard and you have to work very hard." They repeatedly described it as "very hard work", "ruthless" and "very competitive" and commented on the "need to be relentless or you get left by the wayside" and "to be patient and do your time" and "to work, work and work". A much used description of a career in architecture states that "you have to eat, live and breathe it", implying that one has to make "massive sacrifices" as part of their commitment to it. These descriptions applied to both architectural education and practice, highlighting the length of training before one is able to use the title architect and the demands of continuous learning, expected to last a lifetime. Let's listen to Dan:

"I: What do you think you need to make it in architecture?

R: I think you need, you need a massive level of commitment is the first thing. Because everybody tells you it takes seven years. They are lying when they say it takes seven years! It should be 12, you know. And £50,000! And bizarrely, that's just the beginning...I mean, I don't know if you know, but there is a competition called, the "Young Architect of the Year Award" and they class a young architect as an architect under 40, because most people don't qualify until in their 30s, and then you practice until you are in your seventies. Because it takes that long to learn and understand and develop all these things that are going on. So, it's completely crazy!"

The "all encompassing" nature of architecture appears to translate into putting in "very long hours" that meant "working a 60-70 hour week as a matter of routine", described as "an ethos in architecture" and working through the night or during weekends to prepare competition entries which are an opportunity to "express yourself" and the main platforms through which creative credentials are established. Working long hours is described as "unavoidable" as many thought the nature of the job made it impossible not to work long hours, but it was also felt to be a means of proving your dedication and the only way to reach a position with more opportunity to design. The long hours 'culture' was also the most unpopular aspect of being an architect, with participants talking at length about the effects of these "sacrifices" on their

motivation, health and family life, but when prompted to consider why they did not do less, most believed that, that choice did not exist. A few participants said, sarcastically, that "You don't have to do it!" but what this signals is that although there is no written rule that says you must do competitions, or work long hours, or work for a well-known design practice, or strive to develop and establish your style and name by "bringing something new to the table", everybody knows that this is part of being an architect and what one must do if they are to stand a chance of "getting anywhere". These comments highlight the on going pressures of the competitive spirit that pervades the field and also indicate the kind of person an architect should be; competitive, driven and prepared to sacrifice all else.

In describing architect the person, several described someone driven, "an egoist", someone with a strong belief in their abilities and talent and someone prepared to pursue it at all costs. Accounts also emphasise the subjective nature of design and the significance of being able to "sell your vision" and "push to be in a position to be recognised", typically by setting up your own practice. Not all participants felt comfortable with this profile; some expressed a disinterest in setting up their own place, others thought they did not have the "strong will" needed to reach the top, but all were aware of this characterisation which many identified with 'star' architects and these qualities were seen as essential for 'success' in architecture. This is how Archie (32) summed it up:

> *"There is the ego side. But you've got to be a bit egotistical. No great pieces of art will come out of people who are absolutely humble…. It can't, can it? You are not going to build St Paul's, if you are that humble. You don't, do you? You are not going to say I want to build St Paul's!"*

Accounts show that this emphasis on individuality and competition begins at school. Participants talked about having to "develop original designs" and learn to defend these in CRITICALS (CRITS), the regular reviews where students present their designs for peer

review and external assessment. Interviewees also describe the design assignments as individual endeavours whereby the outcome becomes the symbol of their talents and abilities. Most talked of a competitive environment where individual students were encouraged to develop their own styles and shine through their design and commented that early on in the course some students would become known as "future stars" and set the benchmark for their cohort. Schools with international reputation and which "attract the best and the most ambitious students" were described to have a particularly competitive ethos and an "atmosphere of fear" which made the already demanding course a very stressful experience. Interviewees also highlighted the significance of learning to defend one's design and "sell it" to others because "there is no right or wrong in design". Thus, it seems that the idea of becoming known for your style by winning competitions and awards, and establishing your name, is the criteria of success in architecture and that begins to be implanted at school. This value placed on originality also defines design as an individual achievement. Lochlan (64) puts the pressure to follow this ideal and the difficulty of achieving it very succinctly in this next quote:

"I: I have the impression that becoming a successful architect is about getting your name out.

R: Yes, it's exactly that. Front page of Architectural Journal. See, I've been there and I've been lucky. Because a bunch of architects today will probably never, never be able to do it…. Not many people will get to where he is a Foster, a Rogers … And that's always been the case. There have always been names, and I don't know really. May be it encourages a certain kind of architect. I mean you have to have a certain ego to be a good architect. You have to have a certain belief that what you are doing is successful or will be successful."

These accounts bring into focus the 'competitive' spirit of the architectural field and further support the argument that it is constructed around the struggle to establish oneself with a distinctive design style and to achieve recognition. The decision to enter architecture was driven by an interest in its creative aspects and it appears that this interest is strengthened with

130

the investment it takes to become an architect. Accounts suggest that participation in the architectural game requires intensive investment to acquire the skills and the abilities necessary and to develop and promote one's name and style. Evidence is also indicative of the embodied aspects of the requirements of the game; success in architecture is argued to require a certain personality; confidence and belief in one's originality and the drive to actively push for recognition. So we now have an account of the architectural game as driven by the ideal of design originality as well as the ambition to make a social contribution and have an indication of what it takes to succeed in it. Descriptions of the path to success are indicative of some of the practices and ideas that sustain and reproduce the game as a struggle for recognition and reputation as a great architect. But how do individual architects relate to these demands? Bourdieu talked about the 'belief' in the game as a necessary condition for the existence of a field. Early perceptions confirm a belief in the artistic promise of architecture, but how do architects view its ideals from within the field with the hindsight of experience and understanding of its' necessities? I end this chapter by exploring descriptions of what participation in the field means for individuals and show that compliance with the requirements of the game comes to be underpinned by an even stronger attachment to its promises and ideals. An architectural gaze, recognised by all, seems to emerge as the embodiment of the game.

6.4   Belief in Architecture: "Architecture is my life."

In talking about their attachment to architecture, participants invoke the notion of 'vocation' and described architecture as a life-long commitment: "I think architecture is a life style. I think you don't retire, you just die!". Participants described 'living like an architect', and "carrying that awareness" with them wherever they go and talked about looking at buildings "even when you are on holiday or eating in a restaurant", because architectural sensibilities become part of who you are and "they never leave you". Accounts therefore suggest that the state of being "taken in by the game" extends to embodying it as a person through the

development of a 'gaze', an understanding and appreciation of design and the built environment, as participants emphasised a "merge" between architecture and who they are as a person:

"My life is inextricably linked with it. There is no escaping how it IS my life in a way [laughing]! And I don't think you'll find many architects who take it seriously actually, for whom that isn't the case really... I'm thinking about it all the time. And I think you have to be an architect in terms of the way that you see and look at things, and you have to kind of become IT in a way...you have to really be a hundred per cent. You have to embody everything about it. You can't just say, oh, you know, I'll do a little bit. It's not like a normal office job. You can't just go, 'It's 5.30, I'm going now.' You have to be totally committed. Ah, this isn't the right word! I'm not sure how to describe it! ... It's not about the title and more about an attitude, an understanding ..... I go see buildings, not as a 'oh I'm going to go and see this building this weekend', but subconsciously, you know, I look around and appreciate it in some way." (Dan)

Descriptions of the importance of architecture in their lives reveal the intensity with which participants are engaged with the architectural game, with even the least enthusiastic making a distinction between "the job" and architecture as "something bigger than the job" and stating that even if they stop practicing architecture, they will never stop 'being' an architect. A strong basis for this attachment seems to be the perceived overlap of personal interests and abilities and the promises of architecture. Remember that many went into architecture because it was perceived to provide the best platform for developing and applying their abilities and talents and this only seems to have intensified in time, with architecture providing a framework for expressing and channelling those personal interests. Many did not see architecture as a 'job':

"I mean there are bits that can be tedious, but I am very lucky that my work is my hobby. I do love buildings and I like working with buildings... It's just what I love... And I'll never tire from it. Architecture is my life." (George)

132

Several others similarly saw practising architecture as a "lucky" position to be in because they believed that it enabled them to combine their personal interests with making a living. Similar views were expressed in evaluating the perceived 'unsatisfactory' financial rewards as they argued that the enjoyment and satisfaction they get out of doing something they "love" is far more important than economic gain. Sunita's thinking also reflects the dismissal of money as 'irrelevant' to their expectations from a career in architecture, a typical denouncement of non-architectural interests.

"It's not about the money, it's about, you love what you do, you love designing, it's one of those jobs. The thing is, even though I complain a lot, sometimes I'll be doing something and I'll be thinking, I can't believe actually somebody is paying me to do like drawing, sketching, something I love to do! Not like paying you a little, but an architect's salary! When I think about my salary in terms I worked a 70-hour week and I get paid for 40 hours, it's not enough. But if I think about it like it's something I love to do and somebody is actually paying me to do this, it's brilliant!"

Others also countered their various dissatisfactions with reference to their belief in the inherent value of architecture. They talked about "not dreading going into work on Monday", "not wanting to go home in the evenings if the work isn't finished" and leaving commercial practices that "don't care about architecture". There were comparisons with friends "who are bankers and earn five, may be ten times more but hate what they do" and participants claimed that they "would not change it for a million" or that they "get paid for something they would do for free anyway". Here is Lochlan giving voice to these feelings:

"Architects are rewarded in heaven I think! Not financially, no, no no, definitely not. But I'll tell you what, I still to, to this day, when a building gets finished, and I go and look at something that's been done, and it's quite modest. I still think, I

helped to do that. I'm glad I did that... I still get a kick out of it despite the fact that I've been doing this for forty years."

In explaining their attraction to architecture, they highlighted areas of specialisation, such as "working with historical buildings" or "master planning and taking the big picture", "concentrating on the finer detail of things as an interior designer". Others referred to the different aspects of the architectural process, including "design", "seeing your design built", "working on site", "working with clients", "drawing" or "bringing everything together". These accounts describe the different elements of the architectural process, all the different things involved in making architecture, from the most mundane to the most grand gesture. What unites them is the passion with which they describe their interest. I will let Jane speak for the participants as this quote exemplifies this "love for the craft of architecture" and demonstrates the strength of feeling and emotion so well:

> *"I really enjoy learning and understanding how things come together and how things can be made, different materials, I enjoy the materiality of architecture. So, how do you build a wall this tall to look that shimmery? Is it about sunlight, is it about the electric light, is it about the paint finish, is it about the angle of the wall. I love that challenge. And the construction side of it, how you make it work. I just enjoy the challenge of doing so much that's technical and difficult and reconciling the client's needs and the builder's needs and the cost equation and the time frame, I really enjoy reconciling all those variables. I love the challenge.*

The excitement and passion that exudes from this extract is not unusual as an air of 'magic' pervaded the interviews every time the conversation turned to the meaning and significance of architecture. But we have to break this spell now, because this is not the whole story; these intense feelings co-exist with equally intense disillusionment and Jane exemplifies the intense conflict felt by so many between a desire to follow the 'promise' of architecture and the barrage of obstacles that seem to prevent them from getting any close to it. It is disconcerting to think that she was actually considering leaving architecture, and unlike others who

contemplate a similar action at their most desperate times, had taken steps to move in other directions. Their accounts indicate that the perceived "idealist" picture of architecture is challenged by the realities of practice; passionate engagement with the craft of architecture is coupled with a sense of ambiguity and disappointment. I explore these tensions in the following chapters, starting with the effects of 'external' pressures on the autonomous claims of design and social contribution.

6.5   Summary and Conclusions

The analysis presented in this chapter suggests that architecture is perceived to be, primarily, a creative activity and the architectural game about the pursuit of design ideals, and the desire to achieve recognition for one's design vision. However, there is also an acknowledgement of the work involved in turning a design into a building. There is a sense that the 'technical' side is perceived to be secondary, there to support and facilitate the actualisation of the architect's vision. Similarly, the strongly voiced social ideals of architecture express a belief in architects' contribution to improving the built environment, which also re-affirms the value of design in building construction. This account parallels Stevens' (1998) description of architecture as driven by the ideal to develop a distinctive design style, but I also note a counter-emphasis on the technical side of architecture. Similarly, the emphasis on the social role of architecture is also stronger than implied by Stevens', and we might see this as an advantage of a qualitative approach, which is able to bring out these differences in perceptions of what architecture is and should try to achieve. It is worth distinguishing here between what seems to be a contest over the definition of architecture and potential non-architectural ambitions, for which, there is no evidence in participant accounts. To the contrary, economic rewards are rigorously denounced, which is reminiscent of the "disinterestedness" with which Bourdieu characterised the fields of cultural production.

135

Architecture emerges from these accounts as a competitive field constructed around a struggle to gain recognition for one's unique design vision and to make a name, but expressions of commitment to architecture show that individual architects are also drawn together by their experience of practice and belief in its values. Ideas and practices that champion competition, individuality and dedication to develop one's distinctive style, go hand in hand with the prioritisation of creativity and design. In other words, these accounts suggest that architecture displays field like qualities; that it is characterised by a set of relationships and practices formed around a competition to stand out as an architectural visionary, but one which also engenders a passionate engagement from all[23]. This analysis is not claimed to be an exhaustive description of the "rules and requirements" of the architectural game but these descriptions support the argument that architectural practice can be thought of as a field structured around a specific illusio with recognisable ideas, beliefs and practices. Accounts by everyday practitioners are indicative of some of the practices that constitute the architectural game, including the intensive investment needed to develop the necessary skills and abilities, the 'personal' qualities that underpin the drive to push for recognition, and how the schools of architecture facilitate the pursuit of these priorities. The development of an architectural gaze, the emotional engagement with architectural values such as the denouncement of economic interests, descriptions of architecture as a vocation, expressions of life-long devotion and the perceived overlap between personal ambitions and architectural ideals are telling descriptions of the relationship between individuals and the field, and how its requirements come to shape agents. With this analysis of the taken for granted beliefs, ideals and practices of the game, we begin to build a picture of architecture as a field.

We might also note the contrasts with the classical theories of professions. The classical presumption is that the objectives of occupational closure and economic rewards are what drive professional groups, but what is shown here is that different interests are at stake and what they have in common is a belief in the value of architectural practice itself and the shared experience of trying to 'succeed' as an architect. Similarly, no references to the membership of

---

[23] This reading of the shared experiences and passions as a counter force to the divisive forces in the field was suggested to me by my supervisor, Professor Mike Savage.

the professional body and very few to a professional status were made. The presence of commonalities between architects resonates with the traditional description that professions are groups with a 'common culture', but we need to note two differences. One, the conventional view assumes a common drive to achieve closure, whereas here, what they have in common are indicated to be the experience of practice and belief in its value. There is also evidence of internal conflict, which does not have a place in the orthodox theories. Secondly, and this will become more apparent in the following chapters, the ideals of architecture appear to be taken on by all entrants to the field, but we will see that there is a great deal of reflection on the part of participants. Both the dominant and apparently taken for granted ideals of architecture and the practices that ensure their dominance are challenged from within. I begin my analysis of these contestations by considering how architectural priorities and sensibilities interact with 'external' demands, and lift the suspension on the other realities of architecture; conflict, differentiation and tension are as much a part of architects' lived experiences as the shared belief in architectural ideals.

Chapter 7

7 Heteronomous pressures on architecture: clients, economy and liberalisation

The previous chapter introduced architects' ideals and beliefs and showed that it is driven by the pursuit of design ambitions and a belief in architecture's capacity to make a social contribution. The aim of this chapter is to examine the tension between these autonomous ideals and the external pressures that impact on architectural production. The starting point is that, the conflict between these two forces can be better understood if architecture is conceived of as a semi-autonomous field rather than an autonomous profession. This conception opens up the mechanisms of the interface between architecture and the social world for examination and enables us to look beyond institutional responses to presumed 'threats' or interferences from external processes. Thus, the aim is not to 'prove' that architecture is not autonomous, but to illustrate how architectural priorities form and change in relation to 'external' factors in the everyday making of architecture.

Let me begin by considering perceptions of decline and loss of status and power, a highly negative take by participants on the state of architecture in contemporary Britain. This narrative has several strands including unsatisfactory financial rewards, the effects of the latest recession, the devaluation of architecture by the media through a proliferation of DIY programmes[24], a diminished public role, the undermining of architects' authority in the building process and political threats of deregulation: all trends that participants contrast with the image of a well-respected profession which has high status and rewards. These accounts describe, on the one hand, a situation far removed from the idea of an 'elite' group with

---

[24] A hatred of Grand Designs must be what unites architects today. This came up in several interviews, with participants getting visibly upset and angry at the simplification of their job.

monopoly over a market, secure prospects and authority, and stand in contrast to claims of commitment to the pursuit of design ideals and a belief in architecture's social role, discussed in the previous chapter. On the other hand, these are also reflections on the changes that have had a significant impact on architectural practice and crystallise the influences of 'external' pressures on the field: the recession, the liberalisation of architectural markets and the decline of public architecture since the early 1980s. These perceptions and experiences of practising architecture in less than 'ideal' conditions also reveal that external pressures are a permanent feature of architectural production and they impact on architectural priorities in a number of ways. This exploration of architecture's externalities reflects participants' concerns and focus on economic relations and its three facets: clients, the latest recession and working with construction companies in a liberalised market. I consider their effects on the pursuit of artistic and social ideals, architects' perceptions of their role and status, and the differential impact of external pressures across the restricted and mass fields25 of architecture. Analyses are based on descriptions of past and current projects.

7.1 Clients

As one participant put it, architects seem to "have a love and hate relationship with their clients". At the most basic level, architectural production, by definition, is a response to a client's commission and therefore has to meet client needs and wishes. It is a 'service', but its production and delivery are subject to commissions from paying clients and design ambitions are framed by the size of a client's budget. Architects pursue design opportunities to develop their own 'signature' style, but need a client who will fund their 'dreams'. This quote from Sunita (27) captures the spirit of the interviewee's views on this relationship:

---

[25] See Chapter 4 for a description of restricted and mass fields by Stevens and Chapter 5 for explanations of how participant accounts were grouped according to information on practice type, project/building and sector.

"Have you read that book by Ayn Rand, the Fountainhead, the one about architects? It was really good, it was about an architect who has ideals and he doesn't want to be moulded to what other people want him to do… We as architects need clients to be an architect. But for him, it was like the other way around, he was like the ideal architect, like he designed to have clients.

The element of truth missing in this statement is that clients actually 'make' architects by seeking them out for their style, name and reputation. As clients fund architectural projects, architects start from a position where they need to sell their vision to a willing customer. Ahmad (42) puts this succinctly in talking about his disappointments about his chosen career:

"Other disappointments include just seeing how the architectural profession relies so much on clients. Without any clients, there is no architectural business. You can't practice as an architect, because you are not being commissioned."

The degree to which different 'external' factors interfere with design ambitions varies and this is revealed in descriptions of clients and project experiences by participants positioned at different ends of the field. Architecture is never made in an environment of nil financial restrictions, but it seems that clients and projects positioned in different sub-fields of architecture operate with different priorities and budgets. The main difference is between those engaged in restricted and mass production. Whilst tales of competition for jobs were widespread among participants placed in the mass sector, those in the restricted sector also talked about the competition to establish their names and receiving recognition rather than finding work. Similarly, the issue of budgets was not raised at all by architects working on 'exclusive' projects, but design priorities appeared to be in constant conflict with budget restrictions for those outside of the restricted sector.

Architects working on public sector projects such as schools and nurseries, as well as community buildings such as care homes and youth centres stated that "there is never enough money to spend on design". These were described as "low budget" or "standard" and with priorities that lay elsewhere, not on the look of the building. The impact of budget restrictions on the overall standards of public sector projects was a major theme and several commented on how the aesthetics is one of the first things to go when money is tight, alongside with the quality of materials used. These also illustrate the direct impact of client priorities on design decisions. For example, Rafael (38) described a public sector project, a library, where the external aesthetic was sacrificed in order to be able to improve the building's functionality and impact on the surrounding area. Another example is from Isabella (35) who described a university accommodation site where the decisions on the interior design of the building were completely decided by the budget, which did not stretch beyond meeting acceptable standards on the outside and also structurally.

In large practices in the mass sector, the client is often a statutory body rather than an individual and also the funding of the project tends to be more complicated and more liable to disruption and cancellations. Some accounts suggested "less flexibility" in negotiations, which was sometimes due to technical requirements or health and safety regulations, for example in transport projects, but participants also said that they felt like the building was "designed by a committee" and they were "not allowed to be an architect", because the design process was very closely monitored. Another group identified within the mass sector was commercial clients as several participants commented that they "don't care about architecture" and are "not interested in spending money on design". They also cited examples of practices which were "ruthlessly driven by money" as a reason for leaving a company. Lochlan (64) is describing his experience of fighting for environmentally friendly design practices in a commercial firm:

I did actually make a strong case when I was at [name of firm]. They were very much a highly conventional commercial office designer. Bearing in mind that 10 years ago, more than that, we were all knowing damn well that building a glass box is unacceptable, because it uses energy to heat it and cool. So why design a glass box? ... It's an image thing. They are sleek glass boxes, no windows will open, hellish places. But the clients don't give a shit. They are commercial animals. They either sell or rent it. They don't have the running cost either, it's somebody else. ... I didn't do it......And I said to the MD, 'You really ought not to be doing this.' And he just went, 'This is what we do.' And I thought 'I have to get out of here'.

A similar division exists in the small private residential sector between wealthy clients who are interested in a designed house and those more concerned with increasing the spatial and functional capacity of their home. The former is a smaller sector whose significance is in providing the design opportunities desired by architects seeking to establish themselves in the restricted sector. In the mass sector, however, architects work on projects with less design content and for clients with more limited finances. George (40) is one of them:

The vast majority of smaller clients would be quite happy, say with a small extension at the back. I mean, you can have a little bit of fun with it, but they haven't got the money to be able to spend on lots of nice, grand designs.

Accounts point to tensions in relations with clients, particularly between the desire to pursue the architect's own design preferences and giving the client what he or she wants, because "you are spending their money". Participants described "walking a tight-rope" between "pushing" their preferred options and listening to the client. There is a conflict here between the ambition of the architect to establish a unique vision, which can only be done within the context of a commission, and the requirements of professional ethics to heed the wishes of the client and "spend their money carefully". Although most agree that "it is part of architect's job to understand what the client wants", those in the mass sector were less able to 'push' their vision, often due to financial restrictions, whilst some did not think that their job was to

impose their own aesthetic preferences. In the next extract, George continues to describe his relationships with clients at the lower end of the small residential sector:

> "I always take the opinion of a client. They are the person living in the house…. I won't be. What is the point of me coming up with my own designs and pushing it onto them? I listen to what they want and I will come up with a design for what they actually need. Not with something I think they need. I think, again, it comes down to design. It's not about producing the most amazing design. It's producing something which will be suitable for the client."

Architects in the restricted sector, by contrast, described refusing to take on clients if design preferences did not match (e.g. "I don't do mock Tudor!") or where they felt that the client did not appreciate their input. Leonardo (40) describes his approach:

> "They say, 'well, I want a loft extension, but I know what I want, here is a sketch'. And I just go, 'well, if you know what you want, you don't need me, just call a builder'… I am very bad. I get really uptight….You know, this is where I stand. And I don't need the job…. Because you don't want something you are not going to be proud of and won't publish. I'm not going to just do every little thing … If I'm going to do something, I want to be able to photograph it and publish it…. So, if you are not interested in that, then I'm not the person you want to hire."

This was the only architect based in a small design practice who could afford to wait for the 'right' client and project, while others seeking a place in the restricted sector tended to take on a variety of jobs whilst waiting for "more interesting" work. Participants based in well-known and large design practices led by well-known architects, described clients who are after a building with the signature of the leading architect on it and a relationship strongly balanced in favour of the practice. They cited cases where the client would be 'persuaded' to go with the option preferred by the designing architect and suggested that what the "office wants is more

important than what the client wants" and described it as "controlling the brand". Mansour (40) is a Senior Partner in a 'brand practice', describing the process of 'negotiation', which illustrates the stark contrast between the mass and the restricted sectors in terms of the balance of power between the client and the architect:

The main aim is to have a design that the office is proud of. At some point we even, we try to convince, I mean we say convince, but sometimes you push the client to do what we want, because that's how we want the building to be. I mean we have our name to protect and it doesn't matter sometimes what the client wants. If we think what we are proposing is good enough for him, but it also has to be good for our name and reputation.

What these descriptions confirm is that the field is divided and if one can talk about artistic independence in relation to client wishes and priorities, that appears to be the preserve of very few: those with the reputation to command a position of authority in the process and financially not in a position of 'need', so they not only attract the 'right' kinds of clients, but can also afford to wait for them. Thus, no architect can be seen as totally 'autonomous', though the restricted sector of the field seems to enjoy a higher degree of 'autonomy' from client dependency compared to the mass sector.

I will continue to build on this picture by examining the effects of the recession, which demonstrates how architectural priorities and beliefs come under further pressure when commissions disappear.

7.2   Economy: the latest recession

This exploration is not intended to be an assessment of the impact of the latest recession on architecture, but rather gives a sense of its effects beyond figures indicating reduction in workloads and profits. It illustrates, at the micro level, the intersections of economy and architecture: the workings of economic pressures on the field, on architects and their priorities. The significance of the health of the construction industry and the economy express the client dependency on a greater scale: the better the shape of the economy, the higher the demand for architectural services is likely to be. The positioning of architecture in the private sector therefore has a significant bearing on its vulnerability to economic cycles. Looking back on the last fifty years, it is easy to see that the architectural market rose and fell with the economy and participants described this as being "hit by a recession every 10 years". It is not surprising then that the changing fortunes of architecture, in line with the economic cycle, was cited with a sense of deja vu and with undertones of resignation and despair. Older participants had memories of past recessions and talked of "always feeling uncertain as an employee" and described "literally knocking on doors with portfolio in hand in early 90s". Simon (50) is a sole practitioner but has worked as a salaried architect for most of his career. He described recurrent redundancies and cases of no fee proposals in past recessions:

> *"I was made redundant in the early 80s, then again in late 80s, then again in 90s, and here we are again! And I remember, this was in early 90s, there was a firm with which we were competing and they had put in zero fees. So, you think, 'Well, how does that work?!' We all starve!"*

Young architects talked about being unprepared for the insecurity they faced; recent graduates said they were warned about the recession and were advised that those unable to find placements for the Year Out may be allowed to continue studying and postpone undertaking practical experience[26]. Elizabeth (33) expresses the realisation of architecture's vulnerability to the ups and downs of the economy:

---

[26] See Chapter 5 for a brief description of the structure of architectural education.

But I think it did, for my kind of generation of architects, it did suddenly, because we didn't experience the last recession you see, it did suddenly expose you actually to the nature of what it is we are doing. Because I hadn't really thought about that. It's like, there would always be work.

Participants also experienced the effects of the recession first hand. Among the 37 participants, five were made redundant; only one had found a new job; one had set up his own practice, with reservations about having to do so in a "down market", and three were still unemployed. Several participants referred to redundancies in other practices, if not their own, and said they had not "heard one that hasn't been affected." Four of the redundancies were from commercial and public sector firms; one from a medium design oriented practice. The aim here is not to generalise as this is a partial snapshot based on a small sample and cannot account for medium or long term outcomes, but there is some evidence that the effects of the recession have not been uniform across the field.

Participants in the 'restricted sector' also referred to the impact of recession, but not to the severity expressed by those in the mass sector. Project cancellations were mentioned and some redundancies and a recruitment freeze, but overall, participants in design oriented firms described heavy work loads and clients not affected by the economic climate. Once again, within the restricted sector, practice size has some bearing on prospects. Architects in small and medium design practices appear to be struggling more, compared to large and established firms, led by well-known architects. Those with enough financial capital to see out the recession, or sufficient work to cushion the impact of project cancellations, appeared less worried and some had taken on public sector work whilst waiting for the market to pick up. What stands out most, however, is the large/very large, well known design firms that operate in the international markets. Their only cancellations were due not to the recession, but political instability in countries where projects were located.

Those who specialise in conservation described an almost semi-protected market within architecture. Conservation was described, generally, as having a different stream of funding and as less vulnerable to the fluctuations of the economy. In addition to work on old buildings, including restoration and refurbishment of churches and national trust properties, participants described commissions by wealthy private clients, such as houses and old mansions. Elizabeth (33), for instance, works in a small conservation practice and described their clients as "all working in the City and not bothered by the recession at all". Emily (33), an interior designer, similarly, talked about working with clients at the "high and of the market" and described no significant reduction in workloads.

By contrast, it seems that the mass field, particularly the public and the small residential and commercial sectors, have been the worst affected. Cancellation of public sector projects, particularly in education, health, and transport, were mentioned by both public sector specialists and commercial firms. Within the mass sector, practice size also seems to matter as larger places have more leverage to withstand the down turn, whilst for smaller firms and lone practitioners, it seems to have become a matter of survival. They talked about being "under immense pressure" and cited calculations regarding how long they would last if the economy did not pick up soon. Simon's experience also demonstrates how personal prospects can radically shift in line with the economic cycle. His small practice of five - six had been doing well before the recession, but he had to make redundant his entire staff as projects finished and he had no new starts. The extract below captures his shifting fortunes in line with the economic cycle:

> "R: But I had some, I got a job in, well you know, on the back of the work I'd been doing in [name of city], I got some reasonable jobs you know, well up to 14 million. A sports centre, a nursery and things like that. So, that was quite good. But unfortunately [name of country] has just gone completely, [laughing], put my eggs in the wrong basket there!
>
> I: Right, ehm, so, what is it like now, have you got any work at the moment?

R: Very little. I got some, but not much you know, it's worst I've ever, it's not very good at all. And, I don't know what's going to happen... I mean I heard some people say that [the market] is picking up, which is, you know, cheering. And then at the same time I know friends of mine are being sacked and I think, 'Oh, well, that's not the same bloody tune, is it? So, I don't know really."

For others, the recession has meant salary cuts of 10-15 per cent, pay freezes, temporary contracts for new staff, mandatory shorter working weeks, understaffing, underemployment and suspension of recruitment plans. Samira (33) works as a Project Architect in a medium size public sector specialist, which lost half of its staff and here she is talking about the effects on remaining architects:

"Well the thing is that because of the economic climate, the roles have changed, because now that we had to let people go, more junior people, we haven't got any support anymore. ..... Before the crisis started, I was purely an architect, I would sort of delegate work and stuff. Now, you have to do more drawings for example. Or, you have to play the receptionist so, you know, everybody is doing everything... The economic crisis is really bad. Just today, I signed an agreement, that comes on top, to accept a 15 per cent salary cut."

Participants believed that recession was used as an excuse not to recruit, "because the work might dry up" or that it had become "a new reason why we should all be working long hours" and talked about a climate of anxiety where "holding onto your job" became the priority. Marie (30) is an architect in a small firm of four:

"I mean, for salary, I'm quite happy with what I've got. It could be better but, I'm lucky to have a job in architecture at the moment. In November, I chose to work 4 days a week because the practice can't afford to pay two full time employees. Basically, they can't even afford to pay themselves, so, yeah, the salary, it's not relevant at the moment. I can't have any pretentions, it would be completely out of context."

An air of gloomy acceptance of the current state of affairs permeated the interviews. In this environment of reduced opportunities, job insecurity and competition for any kind of commission, design ambitions seemed diminished for many participants. Ahmad has been in the field for 19 years and talked about feeling "incredibly disappointed and let down by architecture" and said he has been considering "leaving architecture entirely", because "there is no work". Leyla (early 30s), a young architect unemployed for about a year, talked about regretting her career choice and wished she had studied medicine like her parents, "because they are not suffering at the moment". She has been getting by, with help from her parents, and has been considering a management and public relations job in an architecture-related organisation:

> "Architects are one of the unluckiest occupations. I mean, almost fifty per cent of the architects I know have been out of work since last year, which is quite sad when you think about what people go through. ... It is a very, very extraordinary time and architects are struggling a lot. I know many of my colleagues are working unbelievably long hours because no one wants to lose their job. .... And everyone is trying to grab work and people do, and that is one of the biggest mistakes, they tend to work really cheap and that I think really devalues the qualifications".

These effects on participants' perceptions of their field, their expectations and strategies, are profound; their accounts are all about survival, not about pursuing design ambitions. It seems that only those who can afford to wait for the 'right' kind of project have the scope to follow their vision while others "grab" any work or even work for free in the hope that it might generate paid work or contacts. The effects of the recession on architects and the strategies of survival cannot be fully examined within the scope of this chapter, but there is no mistaking the despair felt by so many.

Evidence also demonstrates the differential effects of the recession across the field and suggests that broader social divisions in economic power are reflected in the fortunes of

architects catering for different kinds of clients. The decline in commissions intensifies the competition and exposes the dependency of architects on clients, making it difficult to hide behind a narrative of independence and artistic priorities. When there is no work and budgets shrink, it seems that the gap between prospects at the two ends of the field becomes more apparent.

A similar differentiation is suggested in relation to the effects of the liberalisation of architectural markets, which I consider in the last section of this chapter. This also draws attention to the changes in field's autonomy over the last 20-30 years.

7.3   Architects in a more heteronomous field

The final consideration is given to comments on architects' changing role in the building process. Through an analysis of participants' experiences, I illustrate what these changes imply for design decisions and outcomes. Participant accounts indicate the prevalence of a perception that "architects do not lead construction anymore" or have "lost control of the built environment". Ahmad's comments below encapsulate these views:

> *"Unfortunately the craft for us architects has been eroded. It's been eroded from a cultural point of view, because we don't build in the same way that we did, let's say at the end of the 19th century……. Contractors build. We design, we don't build our buildings.*

This draws attention to the increasing control of construction companies over the 'building' part of the architectural process. Archie (32) describes in more detail how architects' role in the building process changed:

"The title is protected, not the role… Architects 30 years ago would almost do everything. You'd do the construction deal, you'd be the site manager, the planning adviser and engineering, you'd do basic engineering drawings. Nowadays, you just do the design and that's it."

These views reflect the effects of the liberalisation of architectural markets in 1980s. It will help to briefly describe the shift from the traditional organisation of the building process to the Design and Build model (D&B). The 1980s saw the entry of construction companies into the architectural market and the rise of large, multi-disciplinary firms which provide the full range of services, including design and construction, work across sectors and building types and provide all the expertise needed, including architectural, engineering and construction. Argued to be a result of a combination of factors, including government attempts to introduce competition into a 'protected' market, to re-start the stagnating construction industry during the recession of late 70s, and the increasing complexity and specialisation of expertise in the building construction process, one consequence of liberalisation has been to change the way architectural services are provided and procured. Traditionally, architects were seen as the leader of the architectural process from beginning (design) to end (construction). It was seen as important that they operated independently of contractors because they were expected to protect the interests and the wishes of the client against builders who were presumed to operate with commercial interests. Architectural services were provided, until 1980s, according to a traditional contract, which defined the architect as the leader of the entire process. The traditional framework assumes a set-up that begins with a brief and ends with the completion of a building on site, with the architect handing the keys over to the client. The competition from large construction companies was also accompanied by new procurement methods and the emergence of D&B contracts. With the closure of governmental architecture

departments, public sector projects, similarly, began to be procured privately, and often on D & B contracts, which were seen to offer a guaranteed 'product' at a guaranteed price. In D&B contracts, architectural firms tender for work as part of a consortium, which includes contractors and other consultants. In this scenario, a project manager is employed by the leading company to oversee the completion of work to time and budget. These shifts are thought to challenge the established notions of architect's leadership role in the building process (Duffy, 1998; Symes et al, 1995; Chapwell and Willis, 2005).

What we have in participant accounts then are descriptions of operating in a more fragmented market and building process and what this means for creative freedom and the design decisions. A critical issue is argued to be the motivations of companies not driven by design priorities as they were seen to cut prices and offer the 'same services' more cheaply, without concern for either quality, or design outcomes. Isabella's (35) description below suggests a loss of control over design decisions:

> *"With the traditional contract, you are in charge and responsible for a lot of things. With design and build, it is actually much less responsibility, because that kind of falls on the contractor. I mean they can change things as well, like materials, the specs. They need to check with us, but yeah, they can. So it takes away a lot of power from you. That's the downside of it…. So, the contract type affects your role a lot…… And whatever is the kind of contract, you just comply with it."*

Another point highlighted is that construction companies that offer D&B contracts also develop standardised designs, which tend to be used in public and commercial sectors. Ahmad suggested that it can leave architects out of the process entirely and affect the design quality of buildings:

152

"I think when you see it from the point of view of effect, especially builders have now become so important. Clients see the builder and they say, you do it for us. Then the architect comes out of the picture….. And also being able to cut corners, to provide them with a cheaper product, for example retail parks, shopping malls, the ASDA and TESCO supermarket models were effectively Design and Build. You don't need an architect. You want a McDonalds? Here is a McDonalds."

The conflict between the priorities of architecture and project managers is expressed in the next quote, which points out the nature of architectural process and how design decisions can be compromised if it is managed by someone who "does not understand architecture". He also suggests that while an architect might be prepared to put in unpaid time and effort to improve the design, a manager would be unlikely to authorise such 'deviations' from the contract:

"Architecture is a funny business: it's not a linear type thing, it goes round in circles. So, even though there is a plan of work, which says you go through these stages, each stage has a series of iterations you have to put through in order to get to the end, you keep going back and forth. Even if you get to the end and you can still go back a couple of stages and come forward again. You are constantly reviewing and rethinking things. Clients don't want to pay for that ….. They say 'well, if you want to change things, it's your time' and more often than not, we'll do it, because you can make things better. You can see the potential as you move through the design process. Project management is a discipline. It's very rigid. There is a series of stages you go through. When you get here, it stops. There is no going back. Architecture doesn't work like that!" (Craig, 50)

Once again, there are two main lines of differentiation amongst participants: the main difference here is between those engaged in restricted and mass production and within that, there are some differences by practice size. In small residential projects in the mass section of the field, a traditional model appeared to be common, but compared to small practices in the restricted field, there was more talk of being hired to produce the drawings or to obtain planning permission, with the construction aspect managed by builders. Participants suggested that once the planning permission is obtained, builders ignore the drawings and clients see it unnecessary to pay for an architect to oversee the construction of the building. In large

153

projects, however, including public sector and commercial practices, participants were more likely to describe the effects of working with D&B contracts. Examples cited include mass housing projects, care homes, student accommodation and office blocks. Another often-cited scenario is the way contractors drive down architects' fees in an attempt to cut the overall cost of the project and to increase the chances of winning in competitive tenders. Isabella, based in a commercial practice, is describing the tender she is currently working on and commenting on the selection process. Her practice is in a consortium led by a construction company and the tender is only for the design stage of the project:

Our role is to design the building. The contractor is like, between the design team and the client, checking us if we are on target with money. What's going to win is basically, 80 per cent of the score is based on cost. So, it doesn't really matter what is design [laughing]. Well, in a sense, it does matter, because it affects the cost. But it can be the best design you can think of and it's still going to lose it on cost!

Architects' fees were not the only target in the cost-cutting-driven management of a building project. Accounts suggest that particularly in D&B managed public sector projects, design and quality could slip down the list of priorities. The next quote is a long description of one such project, but it demonstrates very well what happens to design, quality and architectural priorities in a D & B mass housing project:

"I did seven or eight projects for a housing association. You would go out to tender with much less information. In simplicity terms, say, you would say we want to build a hundred houses and they'd been to the site and you have the planning permission and now give me a price. Impossible really, but a builder will do that.... The builders love it, because it's a building. But they don't understand it. So, in certain situations, you'd be novated to the builder to carry on with the design or you became the client's agent and to see that they were sticking to the scheme that was proposed. The thing is, what you get for your money isn't necessarily what you thought you would get! Housing associations love them because they got an out turn cost and they got a hundred houses. But what these houses were, I mean they may not be square! But as long as they perform and they have to meet performance

specifications. A roof has got to keep the rain out and I used to say that they should have lights as a minimum! I think that's where you lose what we call the control of the built environment because you are effectively saying to the builder, you are going to be in charge of that and you build it approximately to these planning drawings. Sure it might look broadly like that, but a builder who knew damn well that he would run out of money, something would have to go and he would cut corners. You can't do that in a traditional contract. That was the beginning of the end. And the built environment is controlled by builders, contractors, project managers whose job is cost and time management. You know the famous pie chart, time, cost and quality? Quality just disappears off the bottom " (Lochlan, 64)

The new procurement methods also mean that different stages of work in one project might be tendered separately, with the implication that an architect may be involved in only the design of a project or the construction of one designed by another. Participants described this as another ploy to cut costs by introducing competition at several points of the building process. Interviewees cited examples where the work stopped with the design stage and these are often seen as wasted efforts and caused the most dismay. In these cases, the detailed design that gained the planning application had to be handed over to the contractor, who then brought on board another firm of architects to oversee the construction, often because they did it more cheaply. In the cited examples, contractors were not under obligation to refer to the original architects, effectively taking over the ownership of the design. They then went on to make substantial changes, undermining the original design concept, for instance increasing its environmental impact or reducing the quality of the materials used. In the next extract, Rafael (38) is describing a project where the negotiations with the contractor failed because, as the leading architect, he thought that the cost-cutting measures proposed would fundamentally undermine the integrity of the design concept. The contractor decided to go with another firm who was willing to make those changes and they had to hand over the design to this new practice:

"I: So, has it been built yet, do you know?

R: It is being built now. It's almost finished.

155

I: Have you been to see it?

R: No, I refused.

I: You refused?

R: Yeah. And because, that project, I did that with a lot of effort, a lot of effort. I spent, I spent days. I spent like 3 days in this office, not going home or anything. For three days. And when I learned that they are not going to go with us. I just froze really. [Speaking in a very low voice]. What can you do?....They found somebody, a local architect, to do it cheaper."

Another example is from Lochlan (64) who still remembered the design he lost to a contractor several years ago:

"R: There is one building which I never took pictures of. It went to a D & B, the library building I was talking about. It went to a D & B contract and the contractor got it and turned it into something just appallingly awful. Just, I mean, superficially you'd think, it's the same, same size of a building on the same site, but internally it's something completely ..., I just can't go there.... Planning permission was gained by what we did, but the design was taken on board by the contractor who got another architect to make it cheaper, to make it more his view and it was just horrible. I hate it. That's the only one.

By contrast, participants in design firms, regardless of size, did not refer to contract types at all and there was no discussion of losing control of the architectural process or contractors influencing the design process in any way. Architects in small firms in the restricted sector, similarly, reported working within a traditional set up, co-ordinating the input of all the parties involved and in direct communication with the client. Those working in practices that specialise in conservation were also more likely to work to traditional contracts. George (40) has extensive experience of working on small residential projects, run according to a traditional contract and continues to operate along similar lines in a conservation specialist practice. Here, he is describing his role:

156

"...You are the main point in a big circle. I mean, it's down to you whether you get the job done. It's down to you whether you get it through planning and building regulations and down to you that you propose a design within the client's budget. It's down to you to get in on site. It's down to you to make sure it runs smoothly enough on site with the contractor and the client to get a finished product. You are the leader. You are the main, chief consultant."

Finally, I want to draw attention to the public sector as the 'loser' as it seems that under these pressures, the quality of public buildings is sacrificed and architects have limited scope for pursuing their ambitions to improve the built environment with architectural input. Participants talked about a climate where "you might not even tell your client" about your ideas, realising that they might not pay for it, often "out of corporate greed". The following quote expresses the perception that architect's ability to defend their ideals has been undermined:

"The architect had a place in society and was able to give grand social gestures. I don't think that will ever happen again, the post-war new way of living and saying we should all be surrounded by parkland and things like that. …. Architects have a huge social responsibility for what they do which has been eroded. A lot of practices in 50s and 60s were founded on very socialist principles, in terms of creating high quality architecture for the masses. And there is something quite noble about that. I think it's been lost and taken towards developing mass housing which are so small you know. I think that's a failure of society as well as architects." (Dan, 32)

Although those in the restricted field and well-known architects seem to be more able to protect their 'independence' and pursue strictly architectural ambitions, participants also highlight the changing priorities and values of the leading figures of the field, who are perceived to be less likely to champion public architecture. Some participants were, for instance, critical of 'star' architects for their disregard of the social ideals of the profession and argued that some "pay lip service to social issues but are still happy to bid for projects in

totalitarian countries". These perceptions suggest a 'culture shift' in architecture with regards to beliefs in its social role. Archie's (32) comments give voice to these concerns:

> *"A lot of architects are badly hit by Libya. Like Zaha Hadid had lots of work in Libya. What the hell do you want to do in Libya? I mean the amount of all the big name architects who work in Saudi Arabia, this appalling dictatorship, human rights record awful [struggling to find words]..... But that's where the money is, isn't it, unfortunately. I mean that's the problem with architects today. The godfathers of the modern era had a very strong social ethos, that's just gone."*

Many participants had tales of low-budget, low-quality public buildings, but Dan and Archie are part of a group (eight) with highly critical views about the decline of public architecture. They come from across the age spectrum and work in different types of practices, but what they have in common is a commitment to progressive politics and, in their accounts, they tended to relate the changes in architecture to broader social processes. Their criticism is also aimed at the profession itself and its leading figures, diverging from the themes of competition from construction companies and change in market structures. Although quite different in tone, viewed against expressions of belief in architecture's social significance (see Chapter 6), they also suggest that the dominant values of architecture are contested from within the field.

Evidence suggests a decline in the field's autonomy, the effects of which are felt more prominently in the mass sector. The fragmentation of the architectural process and the legitimation of economic interests by the leadership of construction companies seems to present a fundamental challenge to architects' ability to pursue architectural ideals and values. For those operating in the mass sector and in an environment where design decisions and outcomes are influenced by financial concerns, it seems that prioritising architectural values and principles is a challenge, let alone the pursuit of the ambition to invest in a distinctive design style. Among the participants there is both a feeling of resignation and critical reflection, particularly in relation to the increasing power of the construction companies and

the practices of an elite group of architects who are seen to have abdicated their responsibility to defend architecture as a public service. But the status quo and its representatives are criticised by many and even more fiercely for it is perceived not to reflect the realities of the majority of architects. This chapter has demonstrated the dependence of design ideals on opportunities, funds, clients, the economy and political decisions such as the opening of the field to non-architectural actors. The next chapter considers the contestations of the autonomous ideals and values of architecture in the context of a divided field between different kinds of architecture and architect and against its representations in the image of a small elite positioned in the restricted field.

7.4   Summary and conclusions

In this chapter, I considered the external pressures on architectural practice and how these constrain the pursuit of design ideals and architectural values. I examined three manifestations of the workings of external pressures on the field: clients, economic shifts and the effects of the increasing control of construction companies over the building process. Clients are important, because they fund design adventures and influence the direction of design with their preferences and priorities. The funds available to a project have a significant bearing on the prioritisation of aesthetic qualities of a building and design outcomes. The economic shifts are important as these affect demand for architectural services, architects' strategies of survival in the market and impact on the conditions of work and employment. The 'loss' of control over the entire building process has consequences for design decisions, relations with clients, and architects' ownership of their own designs. The fact that architects working on public sector projects have less scope and freedom to prioritise design also means that the aim of making a social contribution through design may be difficult to pursue in an environment where such buildings are built with cost-cutting concerns, not with the ideals of "bringing design to masses".

These accounts illustrate the conflict between the claims of artistic or creative 'independence' and the impact of 'external' pressures, and show that its representation as an 'autonomous' profession, both by architects themselves and its sociological descriptions, hides the importance of the 'economic' for its making. The autonomous claims of architecture express what architecture is and should be about, whilst perceptions of the pressures that constrain the actualisation of expectations show that it lacks the kind of autonomy assumed to underpin the power of a profession to operate independently of non-architectural concerns and influences. In contrast to approaches that define architecture with reference to the professions' responses to 'outside' processes, these accounts allow us to unpick the operation of economic forces within and outside architecture and their intersections. By focusing on the relations involved, we are able explore the mechanisms by which the logic of the economic field comes to impress itself on architecture. The classical pre-occupation with inter-occupational competition closes the door on these channels of influence and does not allow us to appreciate their permanency. The detailed exploration presented in this chapter illustrates, at the micro level, how architectural ideals and priorities respond to these pressures and shows that effects are not restricted to shifts in boundaries of authority and neither do these operate uniformly across the field.

The classical notion of profession is unable to consider internal differentiation. All too often, the measure of success in the field, or survival in a recession, is found in firm strategies, practice size or the vision of the leading architect (Blau, 1984; Symes et al, 1995; Saunders, 1996). Thus, differentiation within the field is understood to be between firms that may work on different types of building or specialise in a segment of the market such as the public sector or the commercial sector (Gutman, 1988). Evidence presented here shows that firms operate in distinct sub-fields of architecture and are subject to different pressures. Although no part of the field is completely immune to the encroachment of non-architectural values, the 'restricted' field enjoys more autonomy than the mass sector and has more power to assert the architect's leadership, as well as to direct and control architectural input in the building process.

160

In the classical literature, descriptions of how the boundaries of architectural practice shifted with the emergence of construction managers tend to blame the professional association for not defending their monopoly effectively, or architects themselves for not paying attention to financial and management sides of architecture and therefore "giving away" what used to fall within their domain of expertise. The broader shifts, such as liberalisation, is acknowledged, but then left in the background whilst the debate continues about how architects might be able to preserve their authority and autonomy under these new conditions, as well as against threats from newly- emerging occupations such as the construction managers (Symes et al, 1998). With the field concept, because the definition of architecture and architect (i.e. the boundaries of their role) are assumed to take shape in relation to these externalities, the analysis is not concerned with how architects can stay as a 'free' profession, which they never were, but with understanding how architectural priorities respond to these shifts in external processes and how architecture moves with changing times. And these accounts give an insight into how the clash between the autonomous and heteronomous forces is experienced in everyday practice today.

Finally, analysis also shows the unmistakable impact of unemployment, underemployment, inability to prioritise design or quality in public sector projects and loss of control over the architectural process on participants who show signs of fracture in their beliefs and commitment. These resonate with reports in the architectural press that paint a picture of disappointment and dejection in the wider field (Building Design, March, 2013). It also seems that those in the mass sector are more likely to be battling with these obstacles between themselves and architectural ambitions. What intensifies this conflict further is the celebration of the restricted sector by the dominant narrative of the field. I develop this point further in the next chapter, through an analysis of the contrasts between a narrative that favours the architecture produced at the 'autonomous' end of the field, and the experiences of those placed at the heteronomous end.

Chapter 8

8   The grand and the mundane: legitimising architecture

In this chapter, I analyse the views on the representation of architecture as an artistic endeavour and the celebration of grand and symbolic buildings as its legitimate artefacts. Bourdieu argued that fields are structured not only around struggles over resources but over representations of the existing divisions and relationships. He suggested that the doxic vision of a field, that is the dominant and taken for granted view, speaks for the leaders who develop and maintain a narrative that defines the legitimate forms of practice and product.

As we saw in Chapter 6, the vision promoted by the dominant comes to be accepted as the 'truth' of the field; creative accomplishment is perceived by all to be what the architectural illusio is about. The powerful influence it exercises on individuals suggests that the image of 'artist-architect' stands as an ideal to emulate; it sets a path to 'success' in architecture and exemplifies both the practical and embodied states of being an architect. However, analysis also indicates that this is a highly contested vision that describes the experiences of the elite who are engaged in the restricted section of the architectural field, that is, as Stevens described, design oriented production. Alongside a desire to practice architecture and a belief in its promises, there is a striking degree of awareness on the part of participants that this narrative paints an "idealist" picture that many will not be able to attain. I suggest that these critical views and the actual experiences of individual architects provide a lens through which conflicts over the symbolic representations can be observed at ground level. Through a close examination of actual practices we can also gain an insight into the divisions and differentiations hidden by this dominant narrative, shed light on the mechanisms of their maintenance and uncover the sources of field tensions.

I begin by exploring the views on the celebration of iconic and grand works of architecture by 'star' architects. I then present an analysis of actual experiences that the participants referred to in their critique of the "idealist" image of the field, and illustrate the different kinds of architecture that the participants were involved in. I then examine the differences between restricted and mass production fields in relation to the kinds of clients, sectors, buildings and the opportunity these provide for prioritising design. This illustrates the different kinds of architecture that exists and enables us to 'see' the contrast that the participants refer to in their accounts. I follow this by an analysis of the views on the primacy given to the design stage of the architectural process, which I contrast with the range of tasks actually involved in making architecture. In this way, I illustrate the kinds of architect and architecture that are excluded from the doxic vision of the field. The findings are based on examination of complete work histories and analysis compares the experiences of practice in the restricted and mass fields.

8.1   Different kinds of architecture

First, I consider the views on the dominant representations of architecture in relation to the types of buildings celebrated by the profession itself, the media and the public. A major theme in interviews was the contrast between the image of architecture as the making of grand, symbolic buildings by well-known architects and the actual experiences of making buildings that may not be recognised as works of art or indeed, for any architectural input at all. Participants believe that buildings that symbolise a famous architect's design vision are seen to represent the field as a whole and argue that this image is "unrealistic" as these comprise only a small part of architecture. Lochlan (64), an experienced architect close to retirement refers to these perceptions of architecture as shaped by images of 'star' architects:

> *"And people, what they see is, they see a Zaha Hadid, and they see a Norman Foster and they see a, well, kind of a flamboyant thing, which is terribly*

163

unrepresentative of what 99 per cent of the profession do. But they see all that and they think we just go round doing these kind of things."

There were some strong views and feelings about the neglect of architecture produced by the majority. Many referred to the "glamorous media image" of architecture and coverage that focus on this small group. George (40) gives voice to a disappointment felt by many that the kinds of architecture they make is not part of this narrative and appear not to be valued:

> *" All you ever hear about is X,Y,Z architects and never about ABCDEFGHIJK and all the others. .... I think that's a bit unfair. People just think about a small group of star architects and that's the only side of architecture there is. But there is such a broad range of architecture. ..... Sometimes it's too pigeon-holed into one small area."*

Participants also referred to the association between wealthy clients and famous architects. As discussed in Chapter 6, client budgets determine design horizons and Samira (33) here reflects on the relationship between the types of client, architect and architecture.

> *"It's also a budget thing, isn't it? Because those projects cost a lot of money. So when you think about who is the client of Zaha Hadid, it's not some community college down the road. It's a really high profile person who has got a lot of money and can afford that."*

What is also interesting here is that whilst this public image symbolises an 'ideal' that is not matched by the experiences of majority, architects themselves are seen as accomplices in the construction of that very image. One of the ways in which this is accomplished is indicated by Angela (38):

"Everyone wants to work on something really outstanding. I'm quite lucky, I worked on a museum, a station, a stadium. Lets say London has, I don't know, how many schools, but you have only one Millennium Dome, not that I like it, you know, it's things like that. You could say I worked on the Gherkin, I worked on the Millennium Dome, everyone would know what it is. But if you said I worked on a school in Lambeth, everyone would be 'alright, ok', no one cares. It's generally what you worked on."

Angela's comments exemplify the competition to work on buildings that are famous or with symbolic significance and suggest that architects may be colluding in the promulgation of this image simply by pursuing this goal. The difficulty for individuals is that as shown in Chapter 6, the pursuit of that ideal is the requirement for taking part in the architectural field. Others were more directly critical of the profession's silence on the 'truth' of architecture; that architecture is not all about designing "great things" and "not all buildings will be great works of art". George's reflections highlight this point well:

"I mean a lot of buildings around London or anywhere, aren't amazing. And they've been built by architects. I think we have got to see that sometimes. And it works sometimes and other times it's actually rubbish. Some of the stuff we've done over the years has been crap. I just think sometimes architects do have a rose tinted view of life."

These words, once again, turn the lens onto the profession itself and suggest that the image of architecture as grand buildings that stand out with their design attributes is not only the outwardly projection of the profession, but it is also a reflection of how architects would like to see themselves. By failing to acknowledge that not all architecture have a great deal of design input or requires the development of a unique design, and by continuing the 'pretence' that architecture is all about grand buildings, architects are suggested to contribute to the continuing power of this image.

165

Considering the different views, participants with greater involvement in small residential projects, conservation, public sector buildings and the commercial sector seemed more likely to comment, without prompt, on the contrast between the attention afforded to 'star' architects and the lack of recognition endured by everyday practitioners. In interviews with architects with experience of working on well-known and celebrated buildings, though not necessarily with their name on the design, the issue was not raised with the same passion and was not always brought up spontaneously. However, although not members of the 'elite' of the field, some of the participants who expressed the strongest views had themselves worked on well-known buildings (though not 'iconic' architecture) published in the professional press or won awards for their designs[27].

Critical reflections on the "one sided" representations of architecture were often backed up with references to the different kinds of buildings that they had worked on and the priorities associated with different kinds of architecture. Table 3 presents information on the kinds of architecture produced by the participants. Some participants were involved in the making of iconic buildings, but not as the lead or the named designer. Two worked on the same cultural building that received a prestigious award designed by a well-known architect. All 11 participants currently based in large/very large design oriented practices contribute to the making of such buildings, but the sample does not include any 'famous' architects whose names are associated with these works. One architect led the design and construction of a large and well known building, but once again under the name of a practice owned by a well-known architect, which also raises questions about ownership of design, an issue discussed in the next chapter.

---

[27] The aim here is not to generalise from this small qualitative sample. Most of the interviews by architects involved in the making of "iconic" architecture were dominated by discussions about the protection of the "brand style" of the practice and the organisation of large projects, so the 'silence' of these participants cannot reliably be taken as an indication of their endorsement of the dominant narrative.

Table 5: Types of architecture produced by participants

Architectural sector	Building types
Housing (public and private)	Private residential Luxury developments Large scale social housing
Community sector	Youth centre, training sites
Commercial	Offices, hotels, retail spaces such as supermarkets, shopping malls, department stores, restaurant chains, coffee shops, phone company stores, small catering establishments
Cultural	Libraries, theatres, art galleries, museums
Education	Nurseries, schools, colleges, university buildings and accommodation, children's centres
Health	Hospitals, health and specialist care centres, care homes
Interior Design	Design and re-fitting of interior layout of retail spaces, offices, residential developments
Conservation	Restoration, listed buildings, churches, cathedrals, palaces, mansions, private schools with historical buildings, old houses, work on museums located in historical buildings and sites, national trust houses
Urban design	Major area/town re-developments, re-design of large public housing estates, master planning
Transport and infrastructure	Railway projects, train and underground stations, airports, large industrial projects
Other public buildings	Prisons, military sites, leisure centres, sports venues, visitor centres for public attractions and sites, public administration buildings
Other private	Mixed use developments with residential and commercial spaces, training or accommodation sites for private companies

Note: Information is based on analysis of complete work histories, not only current projects. Work in all sectors includes new build, refurbishments, extensions and conversions.

Analysis of work histories support their perception that whilst the dominant narrative focuses on symbolic buildings by a small minority, the majority of everyday practitioners are engaged in making the kinds of architecture that are not built to make a statement for the client or the architect and may not be recognised for their architectural qualities. This finding parallels Stevens' (1998) point that only the architecture produced by the 'elite' is valued, and indeed defined and celebrated as architecture, despite the fact that their work comprises a small part of architecture. Similarly, participants' accounts of making architecture in the restricted or the mass field corroborate his descriptions of their differences in terms of clients, budgets and the opportunity to design and accrue the legitimate capital of the field.

The previous chapter examined the differences in client priorities and the relevance of budget restrictions and demonstrated the division between the restricted and the mass fields, which are characterised by different client groups and financial resources. Participants also distinguish between clients in terms of their knowledge and appreciation of architectural values, priorities and motivations in commissioning an architect. Architects placed in the restricted sector, including those in conservation and interior design firms refer to "exclusive" or "high end" clients, interested in making a statement with a bespoke design. Those in the mass sector, refer to "functional requirements" and the marginalisation of design concerns. Participants suggested that clients at the "lower end" of the market "do not understand design" or appreciate their input and often require a product built to minimum standards.

In addition, there also seems to be differences between buildings in terms of their scope for allowing a notable emphasis on its look. Participants described working on different kinds of buildings as "very different prospects" as buildings varied by their scope for design input and technical requirements. Some architectural work was described as removed from design concerns. For instance, urban design was described as more about solving town planning problems and architects with expertise in urban design referred to a need to understand issues of urban development and planning and stated that their work is more about the "big picture"

168

rather than the design of single buildings. Examples include master plans for regenerated urban spaces, large housing developments and town planning. Large transport and infrastructure projects such as railways, stations and bridges were described as "very complex" and to have very tightly defined design briefs, often due to health and safety regulations and technical specifications. Another such sector is interior design, which was described to be more about planning and decorating the internal space of a building rather than its external aesthetic. Furthermore, the interior planning of some commercial developments such as retail spaces for store or restaurant chains were described as implementations of the same design idea in different spaces and with slight adjustments, which means that not all projects provided an opportunity to make a design input. Conservation was described as concerned with protecting and preserving old and historical buildings, rather than developing original designs. Some examples are restoration of historical buildings such as churches as well as refurbishments, extensions or conversions of old private residences.

Other architecture was seen as "unchallenging", "standard" and as not allowing or requiring a great deal of original design input. Large scale public sector housing was described as "formulaic" while offices were described as "dry and standard", with little room for creative experimentation. Marie (30) described a care home for a private company, where the design was "pretty much decided by the client, down to the detail of room sizes":

> *"And they've got one model. And they do this almost everywhere. So as an architect, you do a bit of thinking for special sites, if you do elevations and stuff. But they've got the concept, they already know what they want to do. You don't really come with new ideas."*

Small scale private residential work such as back extensions and conversions were described as "fairly routine" and "all the same". George (40) had eight years of experience in the small private residential sector:

"You know, a lot of architecture is just mundane, it honestly is. Extensions at the back of a house. It's basic. You can't spend loads of money on a job and make it amazing."

This exploration substantiates participants' perception that the 'image' of architecture is not realistic and also shows us what the image does not, that is, majority of architects are involved in the making of buildings that are not necessarily distinguished by their aesthetic qualities. This raises questions about what 'architectural input' means, if it is not only about developing an original 'look' and suggests that its definition as a design driven production is a particular view and definition not necessarily shared by all those active in the field. The challenge to the dominant narrative, in other words, has a material basis in the actual experiences and practices of architects. By implication, this primacy afforded to the aesthetic aspects of a building also defines the architect as someone who designs, but this image of *"creative genius"* also came in for criticism as participants refer to the full scope of architectural process, pointing out that design comprises only a small part of their role. We might then next ask what making architecture involves other than design, because participants suggest that experiences of practice vary not only by the kinds of buildings, sectors and clients and also by the role one plays in the architectural process.

8.2 Different kinds of architect: What do architects do?

In this section, I explore participants' critical reflections on the mismatch between their experiences of practice and the taken for granted view that architects are designers. As the following discussions will show, many were aware of this disjuncture and made pointed references to architectural education as the source of their now shattered beliefs about practice. There were references to the public and media images of architecture as a creative and artistic

endeavour and participants were at pains to contradict those perceptions. Julie (26) is a recently qualified architect, "still adjusting to reality" and spending a lot of time drawing and on project administration. She talked about how her first employment made her "see the mundane side of architecture":

> "Everyone has this idea of it being a quite romantic thing to do, creative and exciting and not really realising that it's just a boring job like every other job .... You know, in films, architects are always portrayed as the creative type, always doing lots of sketches, and working isn't anything like that!"

Others referred to information received from career advisers and the schools of architecture and the portrayal of architects as artists. As discussed in Chapter 6, participants described their education to be mainly about learning to design in the abstract and developing design skills and creative abilities. In retrospect, they were highly critical of the teaching of design without realistic limitations and lack of technical education and argued that they found themselves completely unprepared for the routine, technical and commercial nature of architecture; several referred to "not learning anything about construction", "designing without regard to structural requirements", "learning things in isolation which does not help with understanding how a building is actually put together". Dan (32) describes the "shock of reality" many referred to and points to the signals from schools of architecture as the source of this unrealistic 'image':

> "I think it's just the whole way it's set up. Because you have a careers adviser who is saying to you at 15, you need to be an artist and you need to be a scientist, you are not quite sure which one and then you come through the education process and it suddenly goes, 'well, can you draw all this?' and that's like 'Oh?!' There is a real failure in architectural education in that, it says that you are the star, you are the designer, when you are kind of not really."

In contrast to these images of architects as designers, participants, invariably, described design as a small part of their job and highlighted the other aspects of their work. The next extract makes these descriptions of "multi-able" practitioner come alive. Lochlan (64) is talking about a day in practice:

"The nice bit of it would be the concept, it's quite a small part of it. We'd all love it to be more, but it isn't. I mean 90 per cent of what we do is law, registration, legislation, policies, technical issues. It's endlessly tedious… And a lot of it is problem solving. Things come up on a regular basis and you have to respond to issues as they arise …. I mean, for example yesterday, [NAME] and I were talking about a valley gutter detail … and you are discussing the size of a screw nail and how it centres. I was on site yesterday morning discussing how we have got to put in a new beam and prop it up with steel work. And yet, we were talking about in the afternoon about an urban design issue that … you know where people live, where they go to school, how they shop, how they play. The skills of architects range from, it could be designing a town, all the way down to discussing the size of a nail and how many times you hit it with a hammer."

Some participants invoked the classical debates about the definition of architecture as between art and science and described it as a "combination of both". Mark (39) is a senior architect with lead design responsibilities and speaks for those who call for a re-definition of architecture as a more practical endeavour:

"I mean, yeah, a lot of design, I mean it's technical, it's practical... I suppose there is a degree of art, but you have to be really practical, really practical… For me, it's more of an applied art, designing you know, … you've got to take into account a lot more things than if you were painting!"

The overwhelming majority of participants, regardless of their current role and the type of practice they work in, wanted to counter the image of "artist architect" or the "creative type" by descriptions of a "multi-skilled practitioner able to wear a number of different hats".

172

Although not disputing the importance of the other aspects of the architectural process, only two participants, both young architects with design ambitions, were keen to emphasise design as the quality that makes architecture what it is and sought to separate 'real' architecture from buildings with no architectural input. They said that architects "sell visions" and "architecture is about capturing imaginations" and without that creative input, "buildings are just buildings". These participants were a minority in the sample, but their views give voice to the field's autonomous claim that architecture is about creativity and design in building construction. Similarly, senior architects in well known architectural firms, such as Mark quoted above, were more likely to stress the importance of design, but none of the participants described architecture as a purely creative activity. There was, at the same time, a desire among participants to make clear the place and value of design. There is a tension in several accounts between wanting to emphasise the significance of design and highlighting the other aspects of architectural process that are essential if a design is to be turned into an actual building. It was also suggested that most architects would prefer to spend their time on the more creative stages of work, but they have to accept that a large part of their time will be spent on its realisation. The next two extracts are from George and capture that mood very well. George (40) worked on large transport projects, in urban planning and spent the last ten years in the small residential sector and conservation. We heard his criticism of the primacy given to iconic and famous buildings, but as the next quote shows, this does not mean giving up on architectural ideals:

> "You know, you've got the specification, you've got the drawings, you've got the schedules. You've got all manner of things. It [design] is just one element of a big wheel. And you cannot not be involved. To understand architecture, you've got to be involved in every single spoke of that wheel and it is boring stuff as well as the contractual stuff as well as the nice design ..... Yes, there is an element of talent, but going back to the other elements, it's the talent of how you deal with a contract on site, how you detail up a building and make it stand up, how you make money for the office to be able to provide salaries for everybody. It's so many different aspects ... And I would say, sometimes it [design] is a big element, but I think it's exaggerated. ..... Architecture isn't about just doing funky design. It is about a lot of rubbish. It is about a lot of mundane stuff ... I think there is a lot of pre-conceptions in architecture that it's all about funky design and all that ..... I'm not downing the industry. I mean you've got to have imagination in this industry. But

you've also got to have the knowhow in how buildings are built, and also how to run lots of things…..."

And he implicates the profession and suggests that architects themselves are complicit in the creation of this 'idealist' picture:

> *"Well, I don't like the architectural profession actually... Because they do have this sort of attitude that we are better than everybody else. And, we do amazing designs and everything else. And it annoys me sometimes that attitude, but saying that, obviously, I'm proud to be an architect. And I'm proud to be a member of the profession. I just think the profession has the wrong attitude itself. But I don't know. I think they have to accept that what we do is not just about design. What we do is about lots of other aspects of buildings. And I just don't think that's championed as much. I think we would get a much better press if we didn't come across so pretentious. ..... But saying that, you've got to have good design. I think that's what makes life exciting."*

By describing the different aspects of their work, George and others also reveal architects' attitudes and preferences and the range of skills and abilities actually required in practice. One frequently raised point relates to management and the business side of architecture. Some talked about being "rubbish with money" or "not interested in how to pay corporation tax", others expressed a dislike of management, having to find new work or dealing with disputes, which resembles an image many referred to; that "architects are creative types and not managers", but this was also followed by "but they have to be". It seems that architects themselves have ambiguous views on the non-design aspects of their role, but not all fit in the stereotype of, as Dan put it, the "burdened artist" who cannot be bothered with administration, legal matters, staff management or contracts. Participants were aware of their own interests and abilities and referred to different types of architect, revealing perceptions of where they see themselves in this scheme. Terms such as "design architect", "delivery architect" and "business architect" were used to describe themselves or others, which indicate that these roles may be established positions in the field.

174

These accounts not only display a contrast with the ideals of becoming a 'star' architect and creativity, but also suggest that both the architectural process and the role of an architect are too diverse to fit into an 'ideal' model that depicts architects as artists leading building construction with an original vision. The differential degrees of design content is suggested to be defined by the types of building, sector and client type and budget, but implicit in this division also is the different roles that the architectural production calls for. This means that the doxic view does not only exclude certain kinds of architecture but also architect. In positioning themselves against the image of 'artist architect', participants were prompted by their experiences and argued that what they do in everyday practice does not resemble the narrative of design and creativity. This suggests that the roots of this differentiation into different kinds of architect also reside in the architectural process. In other words, the contestations of the artist-architect ideal are indicative of differentiations that both reflect and reproduce field divisions. If not all architects are able to be designers, by examining the different paths available, including those that are not celebrated, we can explore how and where the competition for architectural greatness takes place. The struggle for symbolic recognition also requires that one is in a position to be able to pursue their design vision and accounts suggest that this is not a possibility for everyone. The question is, therefore, how these different roles relate to the legitimate path of creativity and design originality. I now turn to outlining what the architectural process involves, consider the range of roles architects play and how and why involvement in design varies across the field.

8.3   The architectural process: How do you make architecture?

In describing their everyday work, participants often referred to tasks associated with different stages of the building process. Generally, new projects are progressed according to a framework recommended by The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), which divides

the building process into stages. The RIBA Plan of Work presented below provides an overview of the architectural process. The specific tasks column shows, in more detail, project administration and management tasks involved in co-ordinating the process from beginning to end. Broadly, the tasks associated with each stage can be summarised as follows:

- Preparation includes analysing the brief, carrying out feasibility studies, researching the proposed site or carrying out building surveys.
- The design stage involves developing an initial design concept, developing the design in detail and producing detailed technical/production drawings.
- Pre-construction is about the tendering process such as the preparation of documents, visuals/models and presentations.
- Construction is about co-ordination with other disciplines (e.g. Engineering) and construction companies and site management.
- Use is about post construction tasks including contract finalisation and evaluation of the building

It is worth considering what the process is likely to involve in small and large projects. In a small and mostly straightforward residential project each of these tasks could be carried out by one architect and the project could be completed in a matter of months or in a couple of years. Feasibility might mean a short visit to the house and discussions with the client, design may involve producing a few drawings for an extension and site management may require a few visits during and after construction. In large and long-term projects that took eight to ten years to complete, all stages are magnified to mammoth proportions. A feasibility study could take months to complete; planning application may take months or years to be granted as it may require public consultations; developing the design and producing technical drawings could take months or years and require the input of several architects; and the management aspect, including project, staff, site and finance, could turn into a major co-ordination operation.

Table 6: RIBA Plan of Work

Work stage		Specific tasks
Preparation	(A) Appraisal (B) Design Brief	Evaluate design brief Develop project programme and assemble team Consider procurement strategy Conduct site surveys/& feasibility studies Risk assessment
Design	(C) Concept Design (D) Developed Design	Prepare outline design concept Prepare developed design with detailed proposals for structural design, service systems, site landscape, specifications and cost plan Prepare and submit planning application Review and Update Design Brief Actions required by procurement strategy Prepare construction strategy Prepare project manual including software strategy agreement, performance specifications
	(E) Technical Design	Prepare technical design information including all architectural, structural, mechanical services specifications Performance Specified Work (specialist design) to be developed and agreed with subcontractors Actions determined by procurement strategy Submit Building Regulations submission Review construction strategy
Pre-Construction	(F) Production Information (G) Tender Documentation (H) Tender Action	Preparation of tender documents and actions required by the tendering process

Work stage		Specific tasks
Construction	(J) Mobilisation (K) Construction to Practical Completion	Offsite manufacturing and onsite construction Resolve design queries from site Review of progress and monitoring of quality objectives Administration of building contract
Use	(L) Post Practical Completion	Conclude contract Post occupancy evaluation of building Review project performance

Note: Adapted from the RIBA Plan of Work 2013 (www.architecture.com). The last column presents the detailed list of 'Specific Tasks' included in the original document in summary form. The timing of the planning application is suggested to vary in accordance with the type of contract.

Considering the division of labour within the architectural process, as a general guide, early stages such as planning applications and feasibility studies and detailed and technical drawings were more likely to be carried out by architects in the early stages of their career and responsibility for project management and delivery increased by experience and seniority. However, architects at similar grades have dramatically different experiences in different size practices and, as will be explored in the next chapter, the division of labour is not entirely tied to stage of career. The focus of this study is not architectural firms, but they need to be seen as part of the context of individuals' experiences and I will now summarise the pattern of differentiation by practice size and consider how this intersects with differences between the sub-sections of the field.

Generally, participants described working in a small practice as playing a more 'traditional role' whereby the architect would have responsibility for overseeing a project from start to finish, including design, management, construction and delivery. Participants working in small and also some medium practices seem to have the opportunity to get involved in all stages of work earlier in their career. For instance, Part II assistants or young architects in small firms

were more likely to have been involved in several or all stages of a project and talked about gaining a "more rounded experience" and getting the chance to "see a project through" and to understand "how a building comes together". A Project Architect could be responsible, practically, for all aspects of work including design development, drawings, and construction supervision. Senior Architects and Directors described being "in control" and "involved in all projects and stages". To a large extent, this is a function of the project size, as small projects allowed the close engagement of one or two architects who can lead it through the entire process and bring it to completion. This "old way of doing things" is still favoured by small practices (a third of participants - Table 2, Chapter 5) and particularly sole practitioners cited this as one of their main reasons for setting up their own practice and "keeping it small". This suggests that with about 50 per cent of all architects in England based in small practices (and 12 per cent Sole Practitioners, RIBA, 2010-11), half of the profession operate, most of the time[28], within the traditional framework.

As the practice and project size increases, so does the division of labour. In medium size firms, practice and project management begins to be separated and design development appears to need not just one person, but a team of architects. A Project Architect in a medium size firm for example described leading a team of architects working on different stages and parts of the building while her role was to "lead on design development, co-ordinate other disciplines and deal with client enquiries". The real contrast, however, is with large and very large practices where participants were much less likely to be involved in all stages of work. Young architects described working on a very small part of the building, for example producing technical drawings and even working on sub-sections of drawings such as those for doors, windows or bathrooms. There also exists a separate tier of Senior Architects who talked about being removed from design and the actual process of production and acting more like managers. Furthermore, specialist teams worked on different aspects of projects; for instance, design could be directed by a specialist team of lead designers and legal and financial management could be allocated to teams of lawyers and accountants. In projects based

---

[28] As discussed in Chapter 7, even in the small residential sector participants describe projects that end with obtaining planning permission which are then completed by builders.

overseas, a 'local' team of architects oversaw the construction stage and would also be involved in legal procedures. Some large commercial practices were described to have specialist teams of architects working in distinct sectors such as education, health or prisons. Architects of all grades in large and very large firms (17 participants, see Table 2, Chapter 5) have reported a more fragmented involvement in the process.

This division of labour, however, should not be taken as evidence of permanent specialisation. To the contrary, over the course of their career, participants accumulate knowledge and experience in all aspects of architecture and adopt strategies to maximise their exposure to different kinds of buildings and practices. It does mean, however, that, given the prevalence of large and very large firms, for young architects entering the field today, gaining an understanding and experience of the architectural process may take longer than it did. Indeed, participants often recommended starting in a small firm for it "provides a much better exposure to the whole process" and some young participants in large firms were looking to move to smaller practices for the same reasons. It also suggests that new architects might be faced with 'paths' that may be quite distinct from the 'traditional role' attributed to architects.

It could be suggested that the 'traditional role,' regardless of the degree of architects' involvement in its more routine aspects, describes the self-employed small practitioner. This model is also perceived as an ideal to aspire to; an own practice that is named after its founder provides the platform for pursuing one's design vision and for developing a distinctive style. It means that work produced by that practice will bear the name of its director. Part III of architectural education prepares new entrants for this option; it teaches how to run a practice and focuses on the legal and financial aspects of managing a private business. Not all

participants were interested in pursuing this option, but this is nevertheless seen as the 'path' to follow if one is to attain architectural ideals[29].

However, there seems to be a dilemma between the traditional path advised by the dominant narrative and the kinds of work and opportunities a sole practitioner or a small firm of architects can expect: a small practice does allow involvement and control over the entire process of a building's making including 'creative freedom', but participant accounts suggest that these are likely to be small residential projects, such as single houses, extensions, conversions and refurbishments or small scale commercial developments, such as restaurants and shops. A small practice therefore does not seem likely to provide the platform for experimenting with larger, more complex and potentially more interesting buildings and innovative design approaches. Commissioners of small residential projects who require and can afford an original design are likely to be wealthy clients and but they constitute only a small part of the architectural market. Thus, those wishing to pursue the ideal of designer architect would need to consider working for large firms which attract the kinds of clients and projects that provide the opportunity to work on grand, iconic buildings or large and complex projects. Participants positioned in small practices were aware of this but prioritised involvement in the entire architectural process over engagement with a wider range of architecture.

There is however, no guarantee that a large practice with the 'right' portfolio of projects will provide the opportunity to design such buildings. Here, the design orientation of the practice appears to be crucial. Differences in experiences by practice size is a major line of variation, but this sits on a more fundamental division between practices that are design oriented and operate in the restricted sector of the field, and those without a strong design direction. Here, I

---

[29] In 1970s there was a debate within the profession about whether salaried architects could be considered as architects and whether the Architects Registration Board should introduce a separate category for them (Saint, 1983).

refer to variation by type of practice. The main difference is the scope of design opportunities and particularly the management of the design process in different practices. Regardless of practice size, in all design oriented firms, the 'concept design' stage seems to be protected and fenced off for the director or the partners of the firm or the lead designers who work within the design ethos developed by its founders. Interestingly, practices that aim to find a place in the 'restricted field, but with a more varied portfolio of work also adopt a similar management strategy. By contrast, accounts suggest that in commercial practices, there aren't many restrictions on the design styles to be pursued and different kinds of designs are "allowed to come out of the office". The implication is that opportunities for design appear to be limited, but "design is what everybody wants to do", which presents a dilemma for individuals pursuing the ideal of 'designer architect' promoted by the dominant narrative of the field.

Implicit in these descriptions is the different kinds of expertise involved in the making of architecture, which can be seen as indicative of the kinds of capitals required and I now turn to examining their operation in the field.

8.4   Summary and conclusions

Participants suggest that the doxic view of the field defines legitimate architecture and architect with reference to 'aesthetic' qualities and creative abilities. What I show in this chapter is that practising as an architect involves working on different kinds of buildings, not just on grand and iconic works, acting in roles that diverge from the 'traditional' model and in positions that do not entail responsibility for design or the opportunity to develop one's own style. Thus, there seems to be different kinds of architecture and architect, but there is one ideal presented to all as the legitimate path of 'success'. This account, therefore, illustrates the complex and varied realities of architects as well as the differences in views.

The self-narrative of the field only acknowledges divisions in relation to autonomous production, that is, by styles, their representatives, or firms that symbolise a name or a particular design vision. Evidence presented here enables us to bring out the divisions by position in the field, which reflect the amount of resources and the opportunities one has at his/her disposal. There are divisions in the field between clients and buildings characterised by limited budgets and functional requirements, and those with more generous finances and aesthetic and symbolic requirements. This parallels the division Stevens makes between the restricted and the mass sections of the architectural field; it seems that certain kinds of architects, clients and buildings go together. Celebration of buildings that are distinguished by their design defines this as the criteria of legitimate architecture and sets becoming a 'design architect' as the ideal to aim for, but the structure of the field means that the opportunity to attain a position in the restricted field is limited. Furthermore, the nature of architectural production calls for different kinds of roles not just creative, but the primacy given to design means that these are excluded from the doxic definition of architecture. Critically, positions within the field and the role in the architectural process seem to be related to outcomes in the struggle to realise architectural ideals. In other words, we need to understand these different paths, their requirements and rewards also in relation to the overall structure and the dominant narrative of the field.

References to the "image" of architecture point to its public perceptions, media representations and the self-projections of the profession, which are indicative of the different mechanisms, platforms and institutions through which an image of architecture is created and continues to be reproduced. Participants believe that the self-narrative of the profession combines an overwhelming emphasis on the primacy of design and a disdain for its financial and managerial aspects. Despite a shift in emphasis that encourages architects to pay more attention to marketing and financial management these are all still, overwhelmingly, seen as 'instrumental' in the realisation of a design vision (Duffy, 1998; Symes et al, 1995). The

183

striking contrast between beliefs in the creative promise of architecture and the criticisms that denounce it for being unrealistic is suggestive of both the power of doxa and the degree of tension that arises out of its contestations.

The picture presented here could not be further from the classical descriptions of professions, which had little interest in their internal world. Chapter 6 illustrated the 'common ground' that unites architects, and here we note internal conflict, which is also part of the field's reality. Traditional view assumes an unproblematic internalization of the professional ideology, but these accounts paint a very different picture; architects seem to disagree with how architecture is defined and presented by the leaders of the profession. The mismatch between the image and the reality of practice reported here is similar to the one discussed in earlier studies (Cuff, 1991, Caven and Diop, 2012), but the field concept enables us both to explore this contrast and also to make sense of it; as Stevens suggests such a contrast exists, because the dominant 'image' gives us a partial picture and does not include the full reality of the field. The field concept enables us to solve the paradox of architecture theoretically, but it is the participant accounts that show the stresses it causes, both for individuals and in the field.

The final empirical chapter considers the differential distribution of the capitals required and utilised in practice and explores the links between the kinds of capital, positions in the field and the opportunities these present for gaining recognition as an architect.

Chapter 9

9 Creativity, technical and managerial expertise and recognition

Through an analysis of perceptions of the ideals and rules of architectural practice, the 'external' pressures that constrain their pursuit and the contestations of its dominant narrative, I have now built a picture of architecture as a field structured around a competition for achieving design originality, divided by the degree of access to design opportunities and yet, also as a field whose participants are united by their belief in architectural ideals and values.

The disjuncture between the 'image' and the 'reality' of architecture, I argued, is indicative of a mismatch between the vision of the dominant groups in the field and the experiences of everyday practitioners. Participant views that the field's dominant narrative does not recognise or celebrate the variety of architecture and architect that exist are also suggestive of a tension between the kinds of expertise utilised by those engaged in the making of different kinds of architecture or in different aspects of architectural production. My point is that these can be seen as indicative of the kinds of capitals that operate in the field, because 'access' to design opportunities is a function of the resources, that is the different kinds of capitals, one has at their disposal. The capitals at work in a specific field are the instruments of production that agents need to have to be able to take part in its game. These, therefore, constitute the basis of the competition in the field and lie at the heart of its struggles, which makes it a key part of understanding how the field is structured (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: p.98-99 and p.108). In other words, it is the possession of different kinds of expertise that puts individuals into different positions both within the architectural process and within the field.

I, therefore, end my empirical exploration of the field's tensions and processes in this chapter with an analysis of the different kinds of expertise - that is the knowledge, abilities and skills required and utilised by practitioners and continue to explore the disjuncture between the 'expectations and ideals' and the 'realities' of architecture. To this end, I try to unpick the position of different roles within the architectural process, the relations between them and their associated requirements and rewards. The analysis suggests a tension between 'creative' and 'technical-managerial' capital, particularly in relation to the ideals set by the dominant narrative. I argue that the doxa legitimates 'creativity' as the currency of the game, *the* capital required for acquiring recognition and does not value technical and managerial expertise. What this exploration also illuminates is the link between creativity and symbolic capital. I show that the path to recognition as an architect and the accumulation of symbolic capital are fiercely protected by an exclusionary and hierarchical management of the design process. Findings are based on analysis of both past and current job and project descriptions.

9.1   The design process: concept, technical 'details' and management

I begin my analysis by considering descriptions of the design process, which were prompted by the contrast participants found between the promises of creativity and the reality of more routine, technical and managerial work in architecture. The term 'design process' refers to the development of design from initial concept to the production of technical drawings, but the separation of design into 'concept, 'detailed' and 'technical' also raises questions about what designing something means. In response to the question of what designing a building means, several participants described it, in broad terms, as a "response to a set of constraints", and as something that "arises out of a given context". Externally, architectural design was described by its social and environmental impact, as a means of "introducing change" to a given setting; "how does the building respond to the city"; "is it responsible in terms of energy"; "how does it impact on the locality". Internally, it was defined as "a synthesis of function, structure and

aesthetics". Leonardo (40) explains the creative process in building design and talks about where the 'aesthetics' fit in:

> *"It's just an analysis of what's beside, how to make the overall context of that site look coherent, and quite consistent in a way. So, if there are abrupt ruptures in the scale, you might as well go ahead and keep that rupture of the scale…. I mean it's not about how it will look at the end of the day. Well, yeah, it is about how it is going to look, but it's not just about that. …. You start putting pieces together…. you start thinking, well, it has to be functional, it has to be contextual, it has to obey the brief and on top of that it needs to be beautiful. So, if it's not beautiful, you know something is wrong. So, you need to go back, but the beauty is a sort of accumulation of all these steps."*

The second point emphasised is that design emerges out of a lengthy and iterative process, rather than being the product of an inspirational moment. This description is from Conrad (42), a senior partner in a large design oriented practice:

> *"Some people try and think there is a Eureka moment and you can make a simple sketch, sketch an idea and that's it. It doesn't work like that. It really isn't, buildings are really really complicated [laughing] … It really is a team effort. Lots of things and ideas come together. "*

This is also reflected in the RIBA Plan of Work (Table 6, Chapter 8), which separates the design process into stages. Concept design refers to the initial design idea for a building, also called 'outline design'. The design concept is based on an assessment of client requirements, budget, evaluation of site conditions and restrictions and it specifies the overall characteristics of the building; its appearance, form and layout. At this stage, the design of the building is closer to being an abstract concept that can be presented through sketches, drawings and models. The concept guides the 'detailed design' phase, but at the same it continues to be

developed and refined through drawings. In 'detailed design' the requirements of structure and mechanical systems are incorporated and drawings are extended to describe the technical specifications of building structure and materials, internal layout, external look and include plans, elevations and sections. The detailed and technical specifications of the building are determined with the input of other specialists, such as engineers, health and safety experts and manufacturers, in a process coordinated by the architect. Thus, 'concept design' and 'detailed design' are intimately related as the actual workable plan of a building materialises through drawing and the initial concept is developed and takes its final shape in this process. The 'technical design' stage involves the production of exact drawings and detailed specifications or 'production drawings', which are used in construction and form the basis of contractual agreements.

The length and the complexity will depend on the project, but the key point to note here is that design is a process that involves the incorporation of a large amount of information and the input of many others with knowledge and understanding of technical and legal matters. Thus, producing drawings at the 'detailed design' stage is not simply about putting on paper a concise plan, but about testing and developing an abstract notion into a working idea. 'Creative' and 'technical' expertise is therefore not completely distinct; 'creative' abilities required in 'concept design' do not exclude knowledge and understanding of the technical or legal requirements of design and construction. This seems to be similar to Bourdieu's description of different capitals as "complimentary" in practice (Bourdieu, 1988). The drawing skill for example, hand or computerised, is *the* tool of the trade and a skill acquired and applied by all architects. And all architects aim to develop their design skills because to design a building means having the opportunity to develop one's own style. All architects, therefore, develop both creative and technical expertise, to differing degrees, which depends on personal abilities and interests as much as on the opportunities available. In addition, and also depending on the size of the project, the design process, from beginning to completion, is described as a "huge co-ordination effort", highlighting management as an essential part of the process and suggested by participants to take up a large part of their time.

Tensions arise because the roles of 'concept design', 'detailed/technical design' and management can be separated in practice and are performed in different combinations. The degree of differentiation is, unsurprisingly, greater in large firms, which reflects the increased division of labour that accompanies larger projects. But the critical issue here is that, according to participant descriptions, 'concept design' is fiercely protected and preserved for practice directors or senior partners in a hierarchically managed architectural process and particularly so in design oriented firms, that is in the restricted sector. This seems to act as a mechanism for further reinforcing the consecration of creativity as the hallmark of a 'real' architect. The reality of limited opportunities in the restricted field and for projects with a significant design interest only intensifies the competition and the conflict for architects chasing the dream of 'recognition' along a path set by the rules of the field. Turning to participant accounts of their experiences of this set up, I now analyse descriptions of the technical and managerial aspects of their work, the protection of concept design and the tension between creative and symbolic capital on one hand and technical and managerial capital on the other.

9.2   Technical knowledge, drawing and routine work in architecture

The technical expertise involved in the making of architecture range from scientific knowledge and understanding of general and specific construction related and building design issues to understanding of legislation and computer drawing and modelling skills. Some examples to the former, from participant accounts, include understanding structural engineering, flood defence structures, mechanical systems, urban planning, landscape design, knowledge of materials and techniques in historical buildings, health and safety requirements in transport projects, to list just a few. Examples of the tasks that require technical expertise include preliminary research (feasibility studies, site and building surveys); understanding and

responding to legal restrictions (e.g. planning legislation, building regulations); knowledge and understanding of the project specific technical and construction related issues and the development of the concept through drawings/models (detailed and technical design).

Participants described the technical aspects of their job as researching and collating a large amount of scientific, technical, legal and materials-production and construction related information and feeding these into design development. The nature of these tasks and the amount of technical input required from an architect vary considerably between different types of buildings and also by project size. In small residential projects, for instance, although every project is described to have "something different about it", feasibility, planning applications and construction related issues were described as "fairly routine". In large and complex projects the range and depth of expertise needed increased considerably, which also require the input of experts other than architects. My main focus here is on drawing and 3D modelling skills, which are part of the technical expertise, needed in design development in the detailed and technical design stages. Drawing is largely a computerised task today and it is undertaken with the aid of a computer assisted design package such as AutoCAD[30] or Microstation. These programmes are also used for producing 3D models of the proposed design, which have been increasingly used instead of hand-made models of the past. A small group of older participants working alone mentioned "still working on the drawing board" and a preference for hand drawings, but most participants under the age of 45 had "made the switch" to computer aided drawing. Several commented that architects need "massive computer literacy" or "advanced CAD skills" and some also mentioned being employed, at the early stages of their career or while Part II students, for their skills in producing 3D models, as 'Visual Technicians'.

Drawing is the means by which the initial design concept is developed into a working plan. Participants described their work on detailed design as "developing small design solutions",

---

[30] CAD stands for Computer Aided Design

"solving small space problems" or "solving technical problems". For instance, this could involve working out the internal layout of a floor in a large office building; planning the car park of a shopping complex or designing bathrooms in a hotel. In a small project, it may mean producing drawings for a newly designed house or an extension, including floor plans and elevations. There is a perception that 'detailed design' and 'technical design' are often undertaken by more junior architects such as Part II Assistants or newly qualified architects. Indeed, older and more experienced participants were more likely to operate in 'designer-manager' positions, but several experienced architects also described working on detailed design and taking on substantial drawing responsibilities. Here, differences by practice type were blurred as qualified architects could be involved in the more routine aspects of architecture in all kinds of firms, although as part of a different overall engagement with the whole process. Particularly in small and to some extent medium practices, there was generally more of a tendency to get involved in all stages of work, alongside drawing. A lone practitioner for instance could be personally responsible for all the work including drawings and this describes the experience of sole practitioners running very small practices with one or two students.

There are several examples of qualified and experienced architects with extensive detailed design responsibilities. For instance, John (34) has seven years of post-qualification experience and was employed in a small firm of four as a Project Architect. He described his role as "doing everything" including "spending a lot of time drawing". Previously, as an Architect in a medium size firm and on a larger project, his main responsibility was to produce large sections of technical drawings. Samira (33) has about eight years of experience and has been employed in a medium size firm first as an Architect, then as a Project Architect and her responsibilities included producing both detailed and technical drawings. The point to note about these participants is that they also had the opportunity to get involved in other stages of work on the same project or other projects in the practice, such as feasibility, planning application, input into design development and site management. Other participants working on larger projects described being responsible for "packages" which describe different parts of

a building. As with Leonardo below, this meant having the responsibility for detailing the design, producing drawings and supervising construction for that package, in effect, experiencing the architectural process from design to construction, but on a smaller scale. He is describing his work on some 'packages' in a large and award winning project involving a team of eight architects and a lead designer:

"So, for example, I had external insulator, render, I had glazing, I had secondary steel work. I had packages, but I had to detail. I had to do interviews for tender. I had to, kind of, do tests or supervise tests on, I had to do whole series of things on a number of packages that were assigned to me. ..... you know, that it complies with building regulations, which means that heat is not going to escape the building, you have it properly detailed ...... you need to insulate it, so there is no condensation. You need to make sure that the building is maintained properly. I was involved in that as well. Creating a report where it gave the client clear instructions on how to be safe and designed the safety systems to be latched to, even, when to clean gutters, the skylights. And talking to the providers that clean glass windows .... Others had responsibility for external doors, finishes, pavement, roofing, cladding, insulation, value calculations."

Qualified and experienced architects in large or very large practices also had substantial responsibility for detailed design and producing technical drawings, but not always alongside the opportunity to get involved in other stages of work. In some cases, work on 'packages' was also limited to producing drawings with no opportunity to follow through construction, but this was often due to the overseas location of the project. Participants working on large projects talked about working on "this tiny little part of a window for 15-20 weeks" or "working on production drawings for months and months." In large projects, the drawing task took epic proportions. One participant described how that meant dealing with more than 800 doors that had to be built to different sets of specifications; detailing every single one to exact measurement, investigating the materials to be used, ensuring compliance with building and health and safety regulations, overseeing the tendering and purchasing process and occasionally monitoring the fitting of the doors on site. Doors and windows were often cited

as the simplest of packages and described as one of the most routine jobs in architecture. John's (34) experience is typical of many:

> *"I was the last man in a team of five, I was at the bottom, doing door details, quite boring, incredibly boring. And on that job there must have been about 170 doors. A lot of them standard. Some of them have different conditions. Ehm, so, you have to go through each door and work out what is the wall, how big does it need to be, how wide, because it is an existing building, you might have an opening already in place."*

Drawing was repeatedly described as "repetitive", "tedious" and "boring". Participants also described using 'blocks', the 'ready-made' bits of drawings, and copy-pasting from previous projects on CAD and talked about leaving these tasks for late evenings because "you don't have to think and can do it when you are shattered". Julie (26), a qualified architect with a couple of years of experience, was prompted to give examples of the "boring" aspects of her work:

> *"Stuff like drawing up room elevations, or you know 25 bed nursing home, every room basically has the same level of detail, the same level of standard thing over and over again, but it's a slightly different shaped room, so you have to do a whole new set of drawing for it. You don't have to really engage your brain to do it. You just have to copy from one room to the next. …. It would be more interesting if I didn't always have to do the same thing every time. Whereas we generally use standard details that get copied, you know, from project to project. There are times when I just get so frustrated and I think I'd really like to have a job where I was more, you know, doing more different tasks from day to day, you know, being involved in different situations and not just doing the same job over and over again, day after day, for week after week."*

Participants described themselves or others in drawing roles, with sarcasm, as "CAD monkeys" a term widely known and used among architects. They talked about feeling like a

193

"drawing machine" or a "detailing machine" making repeated amendments and "spending too much time just clicking the mouse".

This examination suggests that despite being essential to the architectural process, the technical skills involved in developing a design concept through detailed drawings is perceived to be secondary to conceptual design and it is the one thing that participants were keen to leave behind as they gained more experience. However, evidence from interviews suggests that it is not only students and the newly qualified who work on detailed design and production drawings. Although participants highlighted the advanced computer skills needed, and talked about being involved in addressing "small design problems" or designing parts of the building in large complex projects by "developing options" to be considered by the lead designer, drawing was generally perceived as uncreative as it gets. It also seems that most object to the sheer amount of drawing and lack of involvement in other stages of work, rather than engaging in developing the design. Participants who had a more "rounded experience" of architecture in small and medium practices were less negative about detailing and those in very large practices with a more definitive division of labour were the most critical. The contrast highlighted here is also between the projections of architecture as a creative profession and the large amount of routine technical work from which design is inseparable.

Let me now consider management, the other aspect of architecture neglected by this narrative, but similarly inextricable from the architectural process, before I return to the other side of this equation, that is, the idealisation of 'concept design'.

9.3   Project administration and management

The co-ordination of the architectural process calls for management skills, highlighted by architects in charge of delivery as a large part of their responsibilities. The range of management-related tasks include all aspects of project administration such as preparing for tenders, organising meetings and briefings; relations with clients; design management; staff management; overseeing the budget, managing the communication with external consultants and contractors, contract management, legal aspects and also generating new work for the practice. More junior architects also referred to a "huge amount of paperwork" arising from administrative tasks related to general project management including responding to emails, preparations for meetings, writing letters, filing and project archiving, "which take up a lot of time". Here, I consider the tasks undertaken by architects in charge of projects, which begins with, generally, the 'Project Architect' grade. Just as the technical aspects are associated with being a junior architect, management is seen as the job of the most senior architects. This perception is borne by the evidence; it is true that management responsibilities and their complexity increase with seniority. However, participant accounts suggest that management is a part of the process of making architecture regardless of scale, as it is project based work that involves the co-ordination of input from several parties and often over a considerable length of time. Management abilities and skills are therefore required from all regardless of practice type, except for the most junior architects, such as Part II Assistants and those newly qualified.

As indicated before, in very small practices the director tends to be involved in all stages of work and that includes project and practice management, as well as design, drawings and technical aspects. Sole practitioners talked about how their job seems to be "all about finding new work", and referred to meetings with clients, legal correspondence, monitoring accounts, construction management, supervising junior staff and general office management. Participants suggested that trying to grow the firm as a business leaves little time for developing imaginative designs. In medium size firms, practice and project management begin to be separated, with directors taking care of the management of the firm, while senior architects deal with project delivery and lead the design process. A Project Architect in a small or medium firm is similar to an Associate Architect or a Senior Architect in a large firm, all of

whom have project delivery responsibility, except that the latter tends to look after more than one job. A Project Architect in a medium size practice described her role as "leading the design and being the main client contact, co-ordinating with all the other design disciplines, the quantity surveyor, the engineer and supervising the staff helping you with detailing." Overall, in small and medium firms management responsibilities could be combined with more hands on involvement in the process including design development.

In large and very large practices, management is more tiered and there were more specialist staff to monitor and support legal and financial aspects of the process and this reflects the sheer scale of the operation involved. There are some indications that the management role in the mass field and D&B contracts may exclude responsibility for delivery of the completed building, taken on by the construction company. In these cases, the role of the senior architect is geared more towards managing the design process internally with associated reductions in financial and construction co-ordination responsibilities. Participants in large and very large firms described their management duties as "co-ordinating the process", "administering the contract", "and making sure everything is going to plan" and also as "removed from detail". They referred to their job as "hand holding" the junior staff through the process, not doing the actual architectural work. Mansour (40) is a Senior Partner in a very large international practice.

> "There are two sides to it. There is a design side when you are sitting with the team working on the design, giving it direction. And then the management side in terms of resources, keeping on track with the budget of the project, with the expenses, how many people should be working on now, how we move from one stage to another, how we submit online, how we submit on time with no delays and how you make sure the client is happy, your planning authorities are happy …. You don't go into detail anymore. I don't draw anymore. I'm just managing the process."

Participants had differing degrees of interest in the management aspects of architecture; most architects described their position as having "arrived there by default" and several thought

196

management tasks as "unavoidable" or "just part of the job". They also described management skills and the ability to generate new work as a criterion for promotion. Some found managing the process "less boring" than having to do the routine tasks themselves. Perhaps not surprisingly, participants who saw themselves as more of a 'delivery architect' were more likely to express a like for management tasks, but those with generally 'positive' views about the management aspect of architecture are positioned in practices of different types and have both design and project management responsibilities, so there isn't a definitive pattern of differentiation. There is a perception that the management side of architecture is something architects endure but this does not reflect the preferences of all participants. There were a few participants who fitted this 'stereotype' and expressed a dislike of some aspects of management such as having to find work, dealing with contractual disputes or finance. Others, however, were more neutral about being in a coordinating role, accepted it as part of being an architect or expressed a stronger interest in management and this included participants with responsibility for concept design, such as directors of small firms or senior partners in very large ones. They talked about enjoying all stages of work and being interested in "bringing everything together" or "seeing the big picture".

As these descriptions indicate, management tends to include overseeing the design development process, but 'leading design' or 'managing the design process' does not equal having the ultimate responsibility for concept design and does not imply that the final product will bear the name of the architect in charge of running the project. Here, we need to consider the organisation of the design process and examine the separation of concept design as the most prized and sought after aspect of architecture and its preservation for practice owners or partners, because participants suggest that not only concept design is a small part of their job, but it may also be beyond the reach of even the most senior architects, unless it is their own practice.

9.4 Concept design, creativity and recognition

Accounts show that the 'concept design' stage tends to be fenced off for architects named as lead designers who are either the directors or partners of a practice or senior architects operating within the design approach established by them. Architectural firms, in this sense, represent the vision of their founder and serve as a platform for pursuing and establishing one's design ambitions and style. Indeed, firms tend to be named after their founder and all work issued by that firm bears their name. Famous works are also described as, for example, a 'Libeskind building' or a 'Stirling building'. The real measure of success is, then, becoming a 'name', that is accruing symbolic capital' and this is tied up with being celebrated as the creator of original design concepts that stand out and symbolise the achievement of the individual architect. What the hierarchical organisation of the design process does is to ensure the protection of the leading architect's style so that the firm continues to serve his/her ambitions. Put another way, it is a private business set up by individuals to develop and pursue dreams of establishing their name. Here is how Craig (50) described it:

> *"In design firms you've got a very strong lead. They want to do all the design stuff and ask people to draw up…. I think that ambitious designers will want to be the designer, so they want to be the name, so normally they name the practice after themselves. So they become the focus of the practice. That frustrates a lot of people in design firms. But that's the way things are. It's his practice."*

Although this quote refers to design oriented practices, similar approaches were reported from others in the mass field, but the design style appears to be more strictly controlled in the restricted field, particularly in well known 'brand practices'. Apart from participants in large commercial firms, all participants described a top-down approach to design development, but the process does not seem to be as strictly controlled in firms without a strong or clear design ethos or those specialising in public sector projects. Those based in commercial firms

described being "allowed to design freely" and not being restricted by an overarching style. In all other cases, accounts show that design is led by practice directors or partners, and employee architects, junior or senior, work within the design ethos developed at the top. Some reported a more loosely controlled process and others a tighter one where "all final design decisions are made by the director" and the job architect has to report back about any alteration, but ultimately, the directors are described to be in control of deciding the design vision for the practice. Those without project management responsibility, often Part II students and newly qualified architects talked about being completely excluded from design discussions and said they are "not allowed to design", but were expected to "prove themselves at the technical". Julie (26), who qualified two years ago, works in a conservation specialist and felt no involvement in design decisions:

> *"When you are recently qualified like me, there is no way I am going to be designing a building in my current job. .... The design comes from the very top and then at my level you are just detailing and doing the paper work. You have to basically have your own practice or be a director in a big practice, then you can do design."*

Architects leading jobs are trusted with developing the design concept and managing its detailing, but still they operate within the framework of the design vision established by the director. In large firms partners or senior architects were trusted with overseeing the development of the design concept, but the involvement of the director or the day to day involvement of the lead designer appears to be significantly reduced. Lochlan (64) described a practice where he spent over 15 years in a senior position, leading several large and award winning projects, including design and delivery responsibilities:

> *"Now, I'd argue that all the things I worked on, the Director [NAME] didn't actually design it, but there was a design ethos, so he was comfortable that what we were doing was within the spirit of his philosophy. That was absolutely important."*

In firms with a reputation and a 'signature style' that needs to be protected, the design process was described to be "very strictly controlled" and "authoritarian". In some "brand firms" even the most senior architects such as partners with responsibility for design and delivery described a process controlled by a designated group of architects in charge of monitoring design and described their role as an intermediary between this team of lead designers and the project team, ensuring that design is developed in the direction indicated from the top. Terry (40) is an experienced architect employed as an Associate in a very large practice and described the design process:

> *"You have to present to the lead designers and get their approval. We present the concept and if the client likes it, good for him. But if the lead designers don't like it, it's not happening. No one would say that out loud, but it's a fact. It's quality control. It's going out with the [practice] name, the brand now as it is. So, they just obviously are trying to control the quality of that."*

Participants described examples of firms kept "intentionally small" so that the director is able to remain in control of all projects. It was suggested that directors could be more interested in buildings with a significant design element and grant more freedom to staff in buildings with small budgets and less design interest. Participants talked about firms where criticising the director would be discouraged, staff with strong design skills could be kept on the margins and their ideas would not be considered because "they don't fit in with the main person's way of thinking". Archie (32) is an Associate Architect in another very large well-known firm and suggested that other styles will not be allowed to be developed:

> *"I mean one of the things in this office I am critical of is that, there is no up and coming designers. It's not allowed. Directors just stamp out anyone who is creative.*
> *... I mean, the problem is that we just do Person X buildings!"*

There were extensive accounts of the difficulties involved in this set up where the director expects you to be in "full accordance" with his vision and most talked about, "trying to guess what the director wants" and working against your own judgement and the frustration that comes with not being able to pursue your own ideas. The example is from Craig, who is describing his experience as a Senior Architect, in a medium size well-known practice:

> *"[Name of director] was pretty much the lead designer. Most of the ideas would come from him. He wasn't always around, so he would come up, he'd join the design reviews, come up with an idea, we'd take it away and try to work it up. He would only join in every two or three weeks and the design is going, heading in one direction, just by the nature of the thing, you've got to develop and take it away, so, trying to take on board some of that. But design also needs to comply with various standards, regulations, all that sort of thing, it's going to end up somewhere in between. After three weeks, he could come back and almost tear it up and say 'No, that's not what I was talking about, I want this to happen'. You've got to argue that it's not possible and this is the best you can do and things like that are very frustrating."*

Although very few, there were examples of different ways of managing design and often this decision was informed by a belief in the collaborative nature of architecture. These participants were also keen to emphasise their stance against individualistic notions of design. At the time of the interview, six participants were working in more 'democratically' organised firms (in two practices) and one participant described a previous experience of design management as "proactively inclusive". These participants described practices where all staff would be encouraged to contribute to design discussions and the building would bear the name of the practice, not a single person. Both are driven by design ambitions, but also rely on public sector projects. In both cases, the firms, deliberately, were not named after their founders and they expressed a commitment to establishing a different approach to design and a different culture of practice. Rafael (38) is the founding director of one of these firms and this is how he described his approach:

"Architecture is not about one guy saying 'lets do that'. It's teamwork. I mean I might come up with an idea, like in [NAME OF PROJECT] I said let's look at the whole town. That was an idea that I put on the table. But thousands of ideas are out there and decisions are not mine. It's teamwork. It's collaborative... Everybody puts something on the table. That's the only way to design a building. I don't believe in a star that comes with a concept."

While few had experience of working in more democratic firms, most participants were critical of the individualistic culture that names one architect, "often the one with the least involvement" as the creator of a building. Participants argued that making architecture is "team work" and a "synthesis", highlighting the complexity of building process. They emphasised both the input of the team within a practice and the contribution of 'external' agents such as engineers and builders, dismissing questions about competition between the experts involved. In large, long term projects the contrast between the scale of the operation and the crediting of one person with the end result is even more pronounced. For instance, one participant described, with notable sadness, a well known building on which he'd worked for nearly a decade as the leading architect, but which bears the name of the practice he works for, not his own. Terry (40) commented about his current set up in a very large 'brand firm' with international projects and this description of the scale of the operation does not include the 'local' team based in the country in which the project is situated:

"For people to claim that you are the sole designer of anything, at a certain scale, it's just a joke. It is impossible.... So, just within this office, there might be twenty people involved in everything we do, then you get on site, you deal with construction, there is obviously structure, services, so many people are involved in building a building, it is never one person's work. I know it is a [name of practice founder] building, but you know, so many people are involved."

Many also highlighted the limited opportunities for creativity and argued that the only way to develop as a designer is "to keep designing", but only "a small percentage get a chance to do that". Despite the description of architecture as a collaborative enterprise by the

202

overwhelming majority and critical reflections on the individualistic notions of design, there also appeared to be a belief that the only way to develop and achieve recognition as a designer is to follow the same path and set up one's own practice; "Ultimately, you set up your own practice and get on with it!". However, at the same time, this was coupled with an awareness that even that does not guarantee 'success' because small and newly established practices are associated with small scale and "uninteresting work" and are vulnerable to economic fluctuations. Furthermore, not all felt able to make the investment necessary to set up on their own or had "that sort of ambition". Both young and experienced senior architects contemplating setting up on their own referred to initial costs and the capital necessary to survive until they are established and have regular work, indicating that without economic capital, creativity may not be enough to reach the architectural heights. Consequently, participants are caught between believing in the ideals promoted by the dominant narrative and the realisation that the chances of achieving these 'dreams' may not be great or indeed that the expectations it creates are neither realistic nor representative of their realities.

Analysis of expectations at the point of entry to the field showed that the creative aspect of architecture was the main draw for all participants, although half also referred to its potential to combine art and science. In describing the non-creative aspects of architecture and the hierarchical management of design, references were made to the frustrations this creates because "design is what everybody wants to do". Consequently, there is a degree of disappointment, but also an adjustment of ambitions to opportunities. An examination of individuals' trajectories cannot be pursued here, but some tentative observations might be made about how design ambitions evolved over time and here, age appears to be an important factor. Older participants were clearer about their own abilities, preferences and also the chances of establishing their name. Nine participants expressed a clear preference for the design aspect of architecture and planned to pursue the opportunities that would allow the continuing development of their creative ambitions, but only four of them talked about establishing their name and practice. Five participants wanted to work only in conservation and some of them thought they did not have the vision needed to design a new building. A few

were strongly interested in construction and talked about how they enjoyed working with craftsmen on site and liked seeing things built. However, it is not easy to see a clear pattern of preferences for all participants and these are not always made in favour of a single aspect of architecture. Furthermore, these do not appear to be 'fixed' and it seems that for many the path followed is a matter of responding to opportunities, discovering one's strengths and finding a place in the field that meets expectations, abilities and preferences.

9.5   Summary and conclusions

Based on current and past job and project descriptions, I sought to establish the kinds of expertise required and demonstrated that making architecture involves the utilisation of creative, technical and managerial expertise. Participant accounts challenge representations of architecture as a creative line of work and show that it involves large amounts of technical and routine work as well as managerial tasks. There is a perception that architects are not interested in non-creative aspects of their work, but the preferences of participants contradict these beliefs; some profess to being more interested in technical aspects including construction, others prefer to get involved in all stages from beginning to end. However, these views exist alongside an awareness that the measure of success in architecture is the symbolic capital associated with recognition for one's unique style and many saw establishing their own practice as the only way to pursue this ideal. They also raise questions about the perceptions of design as the outcome of an inspirational moment by a creative individual. Repeatedly, design was described as a collaborative process of developing an idea through iterative steps. The majority were critical of the crediting of individuals for work produced by teams of architects and other experts.

Analysis shows that the doxic view of architecture equates the design process with 'concept design', and does not acknowledge the different kinds of expertise necessary for making architecture, and consequently, does not speak for the majority of architects whose experiences do not resemble that of an 'artist' engaged in creative work. The 'concept design' role is associated with 'creative/artistic' abilities, whilst the technical and managerial tasks are seen as instrumental in the realisation of the initial concept as a detailed plan and an actual building. The dominant narrative therefore defines creativity as the legitimate type of capital for success, whilst excluding technical and managerial expertise as merely instrumental in the achievement of creative ambitions. What we see here is a parallel between the dominant definitions of architect as a designer/creative type and the separation of design abilities as the most significant and valued input into the making of buildings. Just as architectural artefacts with distinctive design attributes are consecrated as 'real architecture', the rewarding of architects with responsibility for the conceptual design of a building indicates creative abilities as the criteria of 'making it' in architecture, and implies that 'design architects' are the 'true architects'.

Thus, we have a web of ideas and practices that promote a particular path for glory and consecration; an architect can only have his or her name on a building by developing the concept for it, and also if he/she is the owner of the practice, which means that creative, symbolic and economic capital are closely linked. The way in which the conceptual design stage is protected, further reinforces the elevation of creative abilities to a position of preeminence. The problem for individual architects is that, the great majority of them will not be able to emulate the success stories of 'star' architects, not for not wanting or trying, but because the opportunities and the constraints that structure the field make this a very small possibility.

Chapter 10

10 Discussion and Conclusions

I begin the final chapter of my thesis by reflecting on the evidence about the architectural field including its complex divisions, competing narratives and the connections with the social world. This is followed by a brief consideration of the tensions in the relationship between habitus and field and reflections on how the findings can inform a more systematic analysis of agents' strategies and trajectories. Next, I discuss the conceptual and methodological implications of the study for a Bourdieusian field analysis approach. I end by outlining the questions this study raises for the classical studies of architecture and the sociology of professions.

10.1 Architecture as a field: conflict and consensus

What do we learn from this study about the internal processes and dynamics of architecture? The evidence shows that the participants recognise and describe a set of ideas, beliefs and practices that could be defined as constituents of a specific field. The architectural practice is perceived to be driven by creative ideals, the pursuit of which involves developing an original design style, requires creative capital and access to a platform, often one's own practice, where this can be nurtured and promoted. The field is structured by this competition for recognition and the material and ideational struggles that it entails: architectural education gives primacy to design at the expense of technical training. The field is permeated by a competitive ethos that starts in schools, rewards originality and promotes the idea that architecture is an individual achievement. The dominant narrative of the field as expressed by

the schools of architecture, the media and the profession itself celebrates architecture distinguished by its aesthetic qualities and consecrates their designers as the 'true' architects. The conceptual design of a building is believed to be the most important part of architectural production and what architects entering the field expect to do. The preservation of concept design for the founders of a practice further reinforces the primacy of creative abilities and secures the path to recognition for 'design architects'. All these confirm creativity as the legitimate capital of the field and indicate the cultural and symbolic interests, in terms of which, the autonomous stakes of the architectural illusio are expressed.

For the architectural game to exist and continue to operate as described, there needs to be individuals who believe in its value and significance and of that, there is ample evidence. The expressions of dedication, the willing surrender to architecture's demands and the embodiment of the architectural game in one's persona and life-style exemplify, perfectly, Bourdieu's description of the relationship between agents and fields; they are "taken in by the game" and reproduce it simply by taking part in it and playing by its rules. Shared beliefs, ideals, values and practices bring architects together and appear to act as a counterforce to the conflicts that arise out of the competition for recognition as great architect. Architects are united by their belief in the autonomous stakes of the game and the process of enculturation into the architectural universe. This is reminiscent of Bourdieu's descriptions of the "solidarity" engendered by participation in a field and it suggests that the reproduction of the architectural universe through shared practices produces integration and contributes to the continuity of the field.

The evidence also illustrates architecture's inherently contested nature and is indicative of the field's main divisions. The competition for symbolic capital gives rise to struggles, conflict and ongoing tensions between architects, firms and buildings who seek a place in the restricted sector of the field, where design oriented production and the autonomous ideals of architecture are prioritised. The structural division between the restricted and the mass fields is overlain

and intersects with tensions between the autonomous and heteronomous pressures and between the kinds of capital operational in the field. In fighting for recognition, architects, firms and buildings also make claims on the very definition of architecture; how the architectural game should be played and what it should try to accomplish. The ideas and practices that constitute the architectural illusio weave a web around this competition to reach architectural greatness by facilitating its pursuit, reinforcing its significance and ensuring its continuity.

The evidence on the rules and requirements of the architectural illusio gives us an insight into the architectural universe. Analysis of the views and experiences of architects enables us to illustrate how the struggle over the field's specific capitals works itself out in and through the seemingly mundane and taken for granted everyday practices. What are the divisions and tensions that are indicated to arise out of these struggles?

10.1.1 A divided field: design oriented and mass production

For all the common ground that the shared practices of being an architect breeds, we find a heterogeneous field characterised by complex and varied differentiations. The division between clients, buildings and architects characterised by limited budgets and functional priorities on the one hand and those with more generous finances and aesthetic and symbolic interests on the other, confirms the distinction that Stevens (1998) makes between the mass and restricted production. Architecture situated in the sub-field of mass production, such as public sector works (e.g. housing, transport, schools, hospitals, urban design), commercial buildings and low budget private residential developments do not appear to be built with aesthetic priorities or provide the opportunity to develop original designs. This division between restricted and mass production is reproduced in divisions between architectural firms

that are positioned along a continuum of varying degrees of emphasis on design. Commercial practices, public sector specialists, design oriented firms, conservation or interior design experts do not produce the kinds of buildings that represent architecture. What is celebrated as works of architectural significance tend to be the award winning works with distinctive designs, built for wealthy clients and by famous architects positioned in the restricted sector.

The competition for a place in the restricted sector lies at the heart of the main division in the field. Disparities in relation to clients and budgets go hand in hand with disparities in priorities and can mean the difference between being able to create architecture or having to sacrifice it, alongside one's chances of gaining a desirable position. This sets architects, firms and buildings against each other and suggests that despite the rhetoric of design as its defining quality, not all architectural production can meet this criterion. Architects, therefore, operate in distinct sub-fields that offer very different opportunities for achieving architectural ideals. For all concerned, the meaning and the place of design-oriented practice in the grand scheme of the field's structure and the criteria of success is clear, but this united vision de-legitimates the other kinds of architecture produced in the field, and the contribution of their producers.

10.1.2 Tensions between creativity and technical-managerial expertise

The parallel between the descriptions of architecture as an artistic endeavour and the celebration of buildings with original design attributes extends to the valuing of creativity above the other kinds of expertise required in making architecture. Creative and technical-managerial capital are not completely distinct from each other as their collaboration ensures the functioning of the field, yet this relationship also carries the mark of the struggle to accumulate the symbolic capital that underpins positions of authority. The restricted sector calls for and enables more attention to the design of a building, but in all kinds of architecture,

209

turning a design concept into a building is what comprises most of the architectural process. As Stevens argues, being a 'delivery architect' or a 'business architect' confirms one's professional status, but analysis suggests that at the same time, it reflects and further entrenches their position as secondary to that enjoyed by 'design architects'. Tensions arise because although the technical and managerial capitals are essential to the realisation of a design concept as a building, their application can be separated in practice and the roles encompassing them do not provide the opportunity to establish one's name. The organisation of the architectural process along strictly hierarchical lines, in particular in design oriented practices, facilitates the preservation of the designer role for practice owners, which leaves no doubt that the 'designer route' is the path to follow for a place among the elite.

This exploration of the different roles in the architectural process enables us to identify the kinds of capitals required in architectural production and to examine their relations. The cultural capital contained in creativity appears to be a prerequisite for gaining symbolic capital, but technical and managerial expertise do not carry the same weight. What is at stake here is the authority to define architecture, but this is a structured competition and the limited opportunities among the elite means that for the great majority of architects operating in technical and managerial positions, practice may mean struggling over an ideal that is beyond their reach and no voice over the direction of their field. For 'business or delivery architects' the continuing promotion of the 'artist-architect' notion de-legitimates their reality and contributions, whilst, at the same time, being instilled in them as an ideal to emulate, which creates further tension. This conflict finds a voice in the contestations of the dominant symbolic representations of the field.

10.1.3 Tensions between architectural ideals and heteronomous forces

The conflict between the autonomous ideals of architecture and the heteronomous pressures that impact on their pursuit is another source of tension with differential effects across the sub-fields of mass and restricted production. Stevens, following Bourdieu's description of the fields of cultural production, describes architecture as a weakly autonomous field, but the idea of semi-autonomy or how this tension between autonomous and heteronomous forces are played out is not reflected upon any further. The examination of everyday practices in this study sheds light on the processes of their negotiation and illustrates architecture's inherent and multiple dependencies. The boundaries of architectural ambitions are drawn by clients and designs are realised in the context of economic trends and a political and legal framework. Every step of the architectural process takes place in this dynamic web of connections and design decisions reflect the balance of power between heteronomous forces and architectural priorities. The evidence also demonstrates the perpetual nature of the conflict between architectural ideals and economic imperatives and the direct effects of the political decision to liberalise architecture.

However, the effects of these 'external' processes vary sharply between the mass and the restricted fields of production. Generally, in the mass production sector, clients are found to be less able to invest in the aesthetic aspects of buildings and more in buying a product to meet functional requirements. The reduction in commissions in line with the downward shifts in the economy intensifies the competition for design opportunities. Accounts of practice in a liberalised market suggest that the opening of the field to agents not driven to uphold architectural priorities represents a historical reversal of architecture's autonomy. Challenges to architects' control of the building process appear to have increased and 'cost-cutting' mechanisms entrenched, particularly in public sector projects. The effects of the latest recession, the fragmentation that ensued the liberalisation of the field, the prioritisation of economic gain by the new players, the declining power of architects to assert their expertise, to lead on design decisions and the built environment are also trends that are more apparent in the mass sector.

All architecture is made within the context of these permanent dependencies, but the 'independence' to pursue design ideals seems to be a luxury only available to those operating in the restricted field where clients are more likely to be interested in bespoke designs by famous architects and can provide the funds necessary for their realisation. Here, an architect's name tips the balance of power in his/her favour, underwriting the authority over the entire architectural process. Thus, the economic power of the client and the symbolic power of the architect combine to afford the designer the 'liberty' to espouse and pursue architectural priorities. In other words, the client-architect relationship acts as a conduit for the reproduction of broader economic divisions within architecture.

10.1.4 A field in flux: complexities and contestations

The evidence also suggests that architecture is highly dynamic with further and complex differentiations and its seemingly taken for granted dominant vision is highly contested. The mass-restricted division indicated in this study dovetails the broad outline proposed by Stevens, but the evidence is also indicative of further complexities in the field's structure, for the actual positional map of the field is neither static nor is it polarised in absolute terms, a fluidity that is revealed in accounts of the lived experiences. The evidence is indicative of complex variations and movements *within and between* the mass and restricted sectors. In terms of positioning architectural firms within the structure of the field, there is a difficulty with identifying design oriented practices because not all are well-known or engaged exclusively in restricted production and this is a problem, in particular, with small firms. The self-presentation of a small or even a medium size practice as design oriented might express aspirations rather than the composition of its actual portfolio of work. Many architectural firms vie for work in both sectors and engage in a mixture of work, which suggests that these are spread along the axis between the two poles of the field. Architectural firms do cross this

division, just as architects and building types do, and positions are not fixed; for instance, buildings that are conventionally found in the mass sector can gain symbolic value if they are designed by a famed architect (e.g. Evelyn Grace Academy, a local school in Lambeth, designed by Zaha Hadid Architects).

Further considering the experiences of restricted production, there appear to be significant differences between practices of different size and specialisation. To revisit a few examples, both very large 'brand practices' that produce iconic buildings in international markets and small firms that build bespoke houses for private clients can be defined as design oriented, and therefore as engaged in restricted production, but the architectural process in each is shown to be very different. Furthermore, the recognition enjoyed by a sole practitioner and a 'star' architect is highly unlikely to be of the same scale or 'value' in terms of the power and the authority these generate. Other examples are conservation and interior design, both of which, judging by their clients and priorities, operate in the restricted sector, but these are unlikely to produce the buildings that represent architecture.

The combination in which creative and technical-managerial roles are played and the extent to which they are separated also vary by practice and project size and across the mass-restricted division. Smaller practices and projects are more likely to allow for all three to be combined in a single role held by one person, hence to play a more traditional role. By contrast, larger projects and practices provide a much more fragmented experience and give rise to roles that diverge from the traditional image of a visionary individual leading a unified building process. The role of a 'design architect' is also more prominently separated in the restricted field. Furthermore, individual architects operate across the restricted-mass boundary introducing ongoing movement to the field's structure. What the above suggests is that whilst Stevens' outline of the main division is confirmed, the actual positional map of the field is more complex, varied and fluid. Stevens' global outline provides a very useful conceptual hook for instigating field thinking on architecture, but a further and closer mapping of the structure of

213

the architectural field in Britain today is essential for corroborating the evidence and contextualising this picture.

This complexity in the structure of the field also seems to find a voice in its representations; despite the strength of feeling about the ideals of architecture, its doxic vision emerges to be highly contested. There is a great deal of critical reflexivity about the dominant symbolic representations of architecture, which is not evident in the more theoretical description Stevens develops. There is, for instance, a notable recognition of the practical side of architecture as participants emphasise that designs cannot be turned into buildings without technical input. The narrative of practicality is not positioned as an alternative to creativity, but the critique of the 'aestheticised' image is indicative of tensions between the artistic and the practical/technical interpretations of architecture. Accounts are indicative of deep running resentment among architects about the neglect of the majority of practitioners and the exclusion of their contribution from the corpus of architectural works, as they challenge its aestheticised and unrealistic image with reference to the nature of the architectural process. Architects are clear that the positions of 'business' or 'delivery' architects exclude the opportunity to reach the top, but are also critical of a narrative that delegitimizes their position and contribution. The 'art or science' debate is not new in architecture, but viewed alongside the tensions between the creative and technical-managerial capitals, the emphasis on the technical aspects of buildings might also be seen to represent the voices of those outside the circle of elite architects.

A more prominently expressed dissent is found in relation to the social role of architecture and its perceived abandonment by the leaders of the profession. And this also illustrates, perhaps better than the technical critique, the significance of locating the sources and the holders of power within the field, for what is at stake here is not only the internal functioning of the architectural universe but also its role in reproducing the divisions of the social world. The priorities and the direction advocated by the powerful elite influence the ways in which

architecture comes to be shaped by broader social, political and economic power divisions, and their practices influence the collective thinking on architecture; its representations, receptions by the public and the views on its role in shaping the built environment. The strength of feeling about architecture's social ideals seems to contradict Stevens' view that the idea of a 'social function' has no place in architects' beliefs. His interpretation is valid in the sense that not being a part of the aesthetic system of rules that govern the making and the evaluation of architectural products, social ideals are irrelevant to the architectural production process. At best, the social function of architecture can be seen as an outcome, a contribution an architect makes through his design. What comes out in participant accounts, and this we might see as an advantage of a qualitative approach, is that commitment to design and social ideals are co-present in narratives. Architects see the improvement 'good' design makes to people's lives as the 'service' they provide and the social critique expresses architects' continuing self-beliefs about the capacity of architecture to improve the world on a more grand scale, even if this ability cannot be exercised today. It might also be seen to represent an 'alternative' view that is positioned against a perceived 'overemphasis' on aesthetic qualities by the dominant views of architecture and a decline in its social ambitions. This interpretation is also supported by accounts that more directly criticise the leading architects and their perceived reluctance to champion architecture's social role.

It is also interesting to remember that these more strongly articulated calls for a social role came from participants who described their political views as on the 'left' of the political spectrum. Some of them had also taken active steps to establish more democratically organised firms. In other words, they had a frame of reference outside of architecture that prompted a more critical take on the ideology and the practices of their profession. This is a small and self-selecting sample and we might put this only as a tentative suggestion, but their case might be seen to exemplify two processes: the first is the relevance of individuals' position in other fields to their views and strategies and the second is the implication that the sources of change in architecture might also lie outside its autonomous processes. This, in other words, can be seen as yet another manifestation of the interrelatedness of architecture

and the social world, which is brought to light by the in-depth attention to the workings of the field. Architectural battles are fought in the symbolic realm, between styles, but the 'technical' and 'social' readings of architecture exemplify the battle for the soul of architecture; the contest over its direction and purpose, a struggle which seems to be open to influences by ideas and dynamics outside of the field.

It might be useful, at this point, to highlight the relevance of social class divisions. This could not be pursued here for reasons of space, but class connections might also be relevant for explaining the highly contested nature of the fields' dominant symbolic representation. The sample of this study does not include the elite of the field and this might be contributing to the prevalence of critical views. The evidence is not conclusive and indicates a complex picture in relation to the connections between class origins and positions achieved in the field, but as it was noted briefly in Chapter 6, early interests seem to vary by class background with working class participants more likely to refer to its technical aspects for choosing architecture. They also appear to be more critical of the elitist culture of the field and talk of a struggle to 'fit in'. Bourdieu's studies of the emergence of cultural fields were particularly attentive to the continuities between the dominant classes and the field processes, and examined the complex ways in which their priorities and values impress themselves on cultural production and products. The architectural literature is suggestive of the relevance of similar class connections for understanding the historical origins of contemporary ideas and practices. More historical accounts suggest that the 'artist architect' ideal is associated with the 'gentlemen' architect of the pre-professionalisation era who first used the title 'architect' and came to lead the professionalisation movement by positioning themselves against the craftsmen of working class origins. The structure and the content of architectural education is also suggested to reflect the theoretically leaning and the broad based liberal arts education favoured at the time, which was seen as superior to the more practical training of master craftsmen (Esher, 1981; Saint, 1983; Richards, 1974; Crinson and Lubbock, 1994). Stevens, similarly, notes the continuities between the 'gentlemanly' values of authority, disinterest in financial gain and the promotion of similar ideas today.

216

Considering the multiple connections and continuities between architecture and the social, political and economic dynamics, we are compelled to acknowledge that the semi-autonomous position of the field is a source of immense complexity, and to examine every aspect of the field's functioning in relation to its external determinations. This aspect of the research could be taken forward in an examination of the contemporary dynamics of architecture's relationship with the political field and the wealthy elites, which could begin by learning from the historical studies that document the impact of economic, political and technological developments on the evolution of architecture (Jenkins, 1961; Richards, 1974; Esher, 1981). The evidence also implies that whilst the consequences of political decisions and economic cycles are more readily observable, we also need to pay attention to the more subtle, indirect and entrenched mechanisms of influence such as those hidden in classed practices if we are to understand how the field's divisions are reproduced in an inextricable relationship with the divisions of the social world.

10.2 Understanding the habitus-field relationship

An account of architecture's dynamics and reproduction is also the story of the relationship between agents' habitus and the field's structure, but this could not be subjected to a systematic analysis in this study. To a large extent, this has been a logistical decision because a systematic analysis of the relationality between these two sides of the field could not be satisfactorily addressed within the scope of a single project. Although, theoretically, the 'objective' context of a field's structure and divisions is a product of agents' subjectively directed acts, in practice, there is a need to put these interrelated moments of analysis temporarily on hold (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1989a; 1992). Bourdieu suggested that the analysis could begin with any of these 'moments' of reality and in prioritising the exploration of the field's structural divisions and capitals, this study, it could be argued, begins with its 'objective' realities. Given that this is a first in holding a field lens onto architecture in Britain, this also reflects the need to grasp the functioning of the field, at least in outline, before agents

could be placed within it.

Nevertheless, the evidence is suggestive of the dynamics of this relationship and here I briefly consider the evidence and indicate some of the ways in which this aspect of the study might be taken forward. Without a systematic analysis, it is not possible to be conclusive about patterns, but individuals' cases reveal the factors that might influence their strategies and trajectories. As discussed above, this brief exploration suggests that access to both cultural capital (i.e. as nurtured creativity and embodied states of being and acting) and economic capital (e.g. for setting up one's own practice) are likely to be advantageous, and the cultural capital in particular might assume a certain class background. An analysis of how the views and experiences of education and practice vary by class origins would shed light on the continuities between social class and architectural divisions. An examination of the changes in the class composition of the field might also be relevant for understanding the intense feelings of conflict and the high degree of critical reflexivity among participants.

The relevance of gender is revealed in reflections on the difficulties of reconciling the requirements of practice and motherhood, and age is indicated by the shifts in priorities throughout the life-course. More generally, strategies seem to reflect an attempt to reconcile personal abilities, preferences and the opportunities perceived to be realistically available. Individuals seem to arrive at 'choices' through an understanding of own strengths and chances and often over time. Some prefer the 'complete' experience a small own practice offers and accept that they will work on more routine architecture. Others are attracted to the opportunity to work on complex and potentially iconic buildings and to have the name of a famous practice on their CV, but are resigned to remain 'anonymous' in their contribution. Yet for others, conservation architecture offers the less competitive setting they seek, particularly if they are not interested in new builds. Age is important as it seems that individuals develop, over time, an understanding of their own abilities, preferences and the opportunities available and seek to find a place by reconciling ambitions and possibilities. A systematic analysis of

218

individuals' case studies would reveal the patterns, if any, in how the constraints and the possibilities of the field are negotiated and the tensions resolved, allow us to explore the 'personal', class, gender and the temporal aspects of these experiences, and further deepen our understanding of the field's reproduction through agents' 'choices'.

The analysis is also revealing of the tensions involved in finding a place within the field. There is a constant tension apparent in accounts that waver between disillusionment and pride in being an architect. Participants seem to oscillate between a yearning for the idealist spirit of architecture and disappointment at its failure to deliver on its promises. On the one hand, accounts speak of the co-operation inspired by the game and the force the field exerts on agents. The expressions of belief in architectural ideals, the development of an architectural gaze and the embodiment of the requirements of the game in one's life-style and persona imply a transformation beyond the acquisition of qualifications and skills. Denouncements of any interest in economic gain, also manifest in the language of 'vocation' and 'practice' as opposed to 'job' or 'work', the deep attachment to the creative and the social ideals of architecture are indicative of the ways in which the field's own requirements come to frame architects' views and perceptions and shape their habitus. The perceived overlap between personal interests and architectural ideals suggests that practicing architecture acts as a conduit for individuals' self-realisation projects, which might underlie the deep interconnections between habitus and field.

On the other hand, the relentless competition, limited opportunities for design, having to battle unemployment, underemployment and to give up on expectations of creativity, do much to erode the power of professional ideology. The accounts are suggestive of the effort involved in maintaining a 'façade' in the face of relentless challenge from the everyday realities of practice. The contrast between the expressions of 'love' for architecture and the awareness that its ideals are not particularly realistic is suggestive of a clash between the consensual and the conflictual aspects of the making of architectural habitus and indicates that the field-

habitus relationship is a source of tremendous stress both for individuals and in the field. The 'unrealistic' doxic vision, the 'illusions' promoted by this ideal serve, at the same time, as a source of motivation and inspiration and these are mobilised to counter the challenges and disappointments of practice. The psychology of this conflict was also revealed in the overwhelming sense of disillusionment and the air of revelation that permeated the interviews. What intensifies this tension is that this is not a dilemma individuals can resolve. It comes with partaking in the field and lies at the heart of architecture. So architects live with this conflict and try to sustain the illusions of architecture, which becomes a "collective belief" (Bourdieu, 1972, p.43-52) that, in turn, sustains the field. Here, we might want to return to the descriptions of architecture, in almost every single interview, as "very hard", with participants often repeating it a few times to emphasise their point, as they struggled to find the words to explain what they meant and as if the word 'hard' was not enough to put across their meaning. We might now suggest that 'making yourself' an architect, finding a place in the field and surviving its tensions might be what is hard about architectural practice. The intangible but very real effort and investment involved in being an architect highlight the psychological cost of adjustment to the field's structures, and we might argue that this tension needs to be given a more prominent place in examinations of the habitus-field relationship.

10.3 Implications for Bourdieusian field analysis

What are the conceptual and methodological implications of this study for a Bourdieusian field analysis? As the above discussion illustrates, the concept of field has proved an extremely useful tool for making sense of the evidence on the internal world of architecture. The field lens directed our attention to its internal processes with the concepts of capital, illusio and doxa guiding detailed examination of its functioning. To recap briefly, the evidence on architecture supports Bourdieu's general description of fields as structurally divided spaces of relationships constructed around a competition over a specific stake and a game played by individuals who believe in its significance. The structure that emerges parallels Bourdieu's

general description of the cultural fields as segmented between production for producers (i.e. restricted production) and mass production. The degree of internal differentiation with regards to the kinds of architecture and architect that exist and the views on what architecture is and should be, is indicative of a divided and heterogeneous field. Accounts are also suggestive of deep interconnections between individuals' perceptions, beliefs and practices and the necessities of architecture, which exemplifies the relationality between habitus and field that Bourdieu emphasised.

The notion of a field specific capital has been used to frame the questions of what is at stake in the architectural game and what resources are required in architectural production. In its former sense, it has enabled us to identify the autonomous ideals of the field, the symbolic capital that underpins architectural authority. In its second sense, that is, as the skills and abilities required in architectural production, it has allowed us to identify the resources agents need to be able to take part in the field. Defined as such, we could conceive the different roles associated with these specific capitals also as positions within the field's structure. The recognition of symbolic capital as significant in its own right has been particularly useful for bringing into view the relationship between different kinds of interest, capital and power. Crucially, this also enables us to conceive individuals' experiences as framed by the possibilities and the constraints that issue from these structural dynamics.

In interpreting the evidence on the 'internal' world of architecture and architects, I worked with the concept of illusio. With this idea, I tried to see, in participants' views, beliefs and practices, the operation of the architectural game and the manifestations of its conflicts and struggles. The idea that practices in a field can be understood as mechanisms that legitimate the structural divisions and the power relations that are played out in and through them, has enabled us to hold a critical lens onto the everyday and allowed us to show the exercise of power and domination hidden in the small, routine and unquestioned actions and practices that make up life in the architectural universe. One advantage of this framing has been the breadth

it allows for making *connections* between various sites, mechanisms and practices that may appear as unrelated matters. For instance, the espousal of artistic aspirations by the schools of architecture and the preservation of concept development for designer architects can *both* be seen as processes that legitimate creativity, rather than separate questions of architectural education or the organisation of the architectural division of labour.

The idea of illusio also permits a powerful, dual interpretation of the architectural field; as practices with real power to generate co-operation and also as the mediated expressions of the underlying reality of division and conflict. The game as lived by architects, that is, the doxic practices and views, constitute the subjective reality of the field, but the doxa also acts as an *illusion* as it hides the 'objective' reality of domination. For instance, statements of belief in the value of architecture reveal the power of the doxa, but by setting it against the structural divisions and tensions, we are able to recognise the miscognition entailed in them. Thus, in field analysis, the notions of illusio and doxa work together with the ideas of struggle over capitals and domination and this study shows that by considering them in relation to each other, we can bring into view the processes by which the interests and the vision of the dominant come to be legitimated. This conception has proved particularly useful in making sense of the contrasts between the dominant symbolic representations of architecture that represent the ideals and the values of the elite, and the lived experiences of the majority of architects.

The study is also indicative of some of the ways in which the concept of field might be extended. In relation to the doxic experience of the game, the commonalities it creates between architects have emerged to be a powerful source of consent and consensus, potentially dissipating any dissent. Despite Bourdieu's extensive discussions of the immersive relationship between fields and agents, the assimilation of its necessities and the co-operation that is engendered by the structuration of the habitus, his field analysis has come to be associated with an emphasis on the competitive aspects of the relationships that structure a

field. The strength of feeling about architectural ideals and values, the intensity and emotion with which architecture is practiced, and the willing compliance with the all encompassing investment it calls for render aspects of life in architecture that do not seem to fit in with the conflict model of fields. The evidence presented here points to the co-presence of both consensus and conflict and suggests that the sites and the mechanisms of integration deserve more attention in our conception.

The notion of semi-autonomy has been utilised in capturing the permanent tension between the autonomous ideals and the heteronomous pressures. Bourdieu starts with the idea that fields are not separable from political and economic terrains and his studies of the fields of cultural production focused more on their relationship with the political field and the dominant social classes, both of which, as discussed above, also need to be examined in building on this explorative analysis of architecture's externalities. The relations with the economic field, however, remain understudied and to some extent, appear to be taken for granted. With the idea of semi-autonomy, we acknowledge their relatedness and we can 'bring in' the economy, but this does not enable us to address the economy of architecture. The evidence shows that the creative ideals of architecture can only be realised if there are clients willing to fund them, but their priorities and preferences also, in return, influence architectural decisions and design outcomes. In other words, economy is not just a field outside of architecture, instead, economic relations are embedded in architectural production. As suggested by the examples cited in this study, most of the leading practices in the field are also large firms with considerable economic power, which further underpins their command of the restricted market and its wealthy clients. The decision to set up one's own practice, suggested to be essential for developing own design ideas, is indicated to depend on whether one has the economic capital to survive until the practice is established. In other words, in spite of the projections of 'disinterestedness', economic and symbolic power are closely linked. Other evidence suggests that whilst large, multi-national companies make up a small part of architectural firms, they earn the greatest share of the fee income generated in the market (RIBA, 2010-11). There is, therefore, in addition to an artistic elite represented by design practices, a distinctive and

223

economically dominant group that includes agents such as construction companies that may not be driven by architectural ideals, and we need to examine their position and power in the field (Sklair, 2005). The concept of field, therefore, needs to be extended to incorporate into our understanding, more systematically, the economic divisions and relations that are hidden by the doxic vision that Bourdieu enables us to unmask.

The study also raises questions about the actual geographical boundaries of fields. The sample was based, largely, in London and the Southeast of England, the metropolitan hub of the country. It also included participants that hailed from other parts of the world and buildings positioned in other countries and there was a global tinge to experiences. The few participants with experience of working in other parts of Britain referred to some practices, such as the intensely competitive nature of the market, as 'London issues'. There is also a clearly articulated perception that to 'make it' in architecture, one has to be in London, perhaps not surprising given that several large and well-known practices led by famous architects are based in the capital. All these raise the question of whether a field has a geographical centre and whether the field's force is felt more strongly around that core. This could be probed in a further study by mapping the geographical distribution of restricted and mass production across the country and exploring experiences in different localities. The global dimension of architecture also emerges as a matter for further consideration. The large firms led by well-known architects operate in global markets, and their creations are funded by clients from across the world; some of the participants were involved in such projects and several had not worked on a UK project for years. The question is how do these increasingly global relations affect the shape and the dynamics of the field in Britain. Bourdieu's studies of the fields of cultural production have a clear national character, for instance the literary and the academic fields in France, or a European/Western orientation, as in the examinations of the scientific field or the juridicial field (Bourdieu, 1987a; 1987b; 1988; 1993; 1996). It may be that this reflects the reality of the relatively insular nature of these fields at the time, but the case of architecture suggests that previously nation-based fields may now be operating within global networks of relationships. Further investigations into the architectural field could seek to

explore these global connections and consider their implications for our conception of fields.

Turning to methodological questions, the study highlights the difficulties in operationalising the concept of field and the related notions such as 'semi-autonomy', 'illusio' and 'doxa'. As a first step in developing a field analysis framework for studying the architectural profession, this study does not and cannot claim to be a 'complete' analysis, but there is also a difficulty around establishing the boundaries of a 'complete' analysis of a field. It is difficult to state clearly where the analysis of a field ends and what it should and should not include, and this 'vagueness' is further reinforced by Bourdieu's call for an iterative and open-ended process of research (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1989a; 1992). One example we might consider is the exploration of the architectural illusio. What should an examination of the architectural game include? It is easy to establish the field's entry criteria, but the taken for granted, unwritten 'rules' and 'requirements' of participation and the mechanisms of 'investment' could take any number of forms and manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Given that this is equivalent to describing the mechanisms of the field's reproduction, could we possibly identify all of these practices that contribute to its continuity? Here I highlighted, and only broadly, the most prominent features of the game, as evidenced by participant accounts, but could we set out clearly what the analysis of the architectural illusio should include? This openness of the concept can be seen as an advantage, for it does not predefine the theoretical boundaries of the research in the way that, for instance, a study of the strategies of occupational closure might do. But this makes it difficult to clearly set out the *practical* boundaries of research, which raises further questions about how to evaluate the *quality* of field analysis as a methodological approach. Future applications of a field analysis approach to other professions would therefore benefit from a systematic review of its growing use (See Benson and Neveu, 2005; Grenfell, 1996; Grenfell (eds), 2008; Bottero and Crossley, 2011; Cultural Sociology Special Issue, June, 2013).

Not a question for Bourdieusian field analysis, strictly speaking, but a further point might be

made here about the 'qualitative' strategy adopted in this study. One advantage of field analysis is that it does not commit to a given set of methods or data (i.e. as in the quantitative-qualitative distinction) and this study has taken advantage of that liberty to explore field processes with interview data. I noted some advantages of an in-depth approach above; qualitative research has a capacity for allowing us to enter the life-world of agents. In this study it has been instrumental in facilitating an understanding of the doxic experience of the architectural illusio, in particular an appreciation of the emotion and tension it provokes in architects. Data from qualitative interviews also illustrate the processes of the field in the everyday and allow an in-depth understanding of the field's mechanisms of reproduction. This yields an insight into the making of the field as a fluid process of ongoing movement and tension, an appreciation a field map does not facilitate. But these findings are based on data gathered from an unrepresentative sample of architects and do not allow us to draw firm conclusions about the field's structure or the patterns observed in the data. Thus, triangulating the analysis of specific aspects of the field is necessary to increase confidence in the findings. For instance, an analysis of the publications by the professional association would enable us to explore the 'official' version of the dominant narrative of the field and also how it might have changed over time.

10.4 Implications for the sociology of professions

This study raises several questions for the sociology of architectural practice and the classical theories of professions. The assumptions of homogeneity, a common culture, drive to achieve and maintain occupational closure and autonomy are undermined with evidence that indicates heterogeneity in experience, views and interests and dependencies on many levels. This analysis of the complex world of architecture suggests that the definition and the boundaries of architecture are constructed in and through the internal struggles that drive the field, not found a priori, in the idea of profession.

Let me begin with the empirical challenge and highlight the evidence that contrasts with the classical assumptions of homogeneity and ideological unity, collective strategies of closure and autonomy. In contrast to the orthodox vision of a unified and homogenous group, the evidence indicates architecture to be highly differentiated; architects are divided by the different degrees of access to the field specific capitals and views on the definition of their profession. The pursuit of creative and symbolic capital contradicts the assumptions that they are driven by the objective of occupational closure and illustrates that interests other than economic rewards are at stake. There is near to no reference to inter-professional competition and architecture was described as a collaborative enterprise where increased specialisation renders futile the claims of authority over other experts. In the classical literature, internal conflict is viewed as a question of potential challenge to the control of a profession from 'lesser' occupations with their own ambitions of professionalisation, and it represents the changes in the division of labour. It is therefore seen as the process by which the domain and the boundaries of a profession come to be decided. This restricted view of internal conflict and the assumption of unity around the presumed objective of closure do not leave any space for the variety of interests and struggles that are indicated to generate conflict within architecture. The internal tensions highlighted in this study are shown to arise out of the struggle for the field's specific capitals and there is no indication that they represent prospective professionalisation movements.

The presumed common culture of architecture also emerges to be highly contested and architects are shown to be divided in their views of the definition and the direction of their profession. The classical idea of common culture is similar to the shared ideas, beliefs and practices that were found to generate consensus in the field, but it cannot account for its internal contestations or the relationship to the structural divisions of the field. The shared beliefs, ideals and practices *do* create a degree of consensus among architects and indicate that architects develop a common gaze by virtue of the education and the enculturation process, but the analysis has shown that these also ensure the reproduction of the field's divisions in favour of the agents who have the symbolic power to impose their own vision or the 'culture'.

Hence, the much discussed disconnect between the 'idealist' self-projections of architecture and its 'reality' is shown to be a contrast between the vision of the elite and the lived experiences of the majority whose contribution to architecture is not represented by it.

The demonstration of architecture's dependencies challenges both the projections of 'independent artist' and the assumptions of autonomy. Both the process of making buildings and the functioning of the architectural universe are inextricably linked to broader social processes. The classical literature tends to focus on external macro changes and how these affect architects' position in the division of labour and their control of the market. The analysis presented here confirms the trends of fragmentation, loss of control over designs and increased competition in the market, but it also illustrates the varied and inherent channels of influence on architects' ability to prioritise design, to apply their expertise and to pursue their ideals. Crucially, these influences vary between the restricted and mass sectors of the field, a distinction completely missed by the previous descriptions of the effects of political and economic shifts (Symes et al, 1995; Gutman, 1988). In the context of the evidence on the inherent and multiple dependencies of architecture, the argument that architects should try to maintain their independence in the face of increasing interference from third parties appears to be misplaced as these permanent pressures cannot be overcome by more aggressive strategies of market protection.

What are the theoretical implications of the evidence that contradicts the classical accounts of the architectural profession? The difficulties of the classical approaches are manifold, but four related conclusions with significant implications stand out, and these capture the essence of the critique posed here that a shift in *how* we frame the question of professions is what is needed. Firstly, in light of the evidence discussed above, it is now clear that attempts to understand professions with reference to the strategies of the professional association, shifts in the boundaries of professions or the construction of a professional ideology directed at inter-professional competition are likely to tell us very little about how a professional domain of

practice functions and moves forward. There is a difficulty with the assumption of a collective professionalisation drive, but also a more fundamental problem with confining the studies of professions to the occupational realm. This reflects a concern with the differences between occupations and indeed, much of the classical literature defined the issue as a question about the professional division of labour or, about the place of professional occupations in the capitalist system. The fundamental issue is that this framing excludes any questions about the internal dynamics of a profession and fosters a focus on their characteristics and strategies as a group. Abbott (1988), for example, argues that studies of professions should aim to define the nature and the boundaries of their work. Looking at architecture from his perspective, the architect's unique task would be defined as 'design', but the evidence shows that the definition of design is far from clear and its' dominant view would exclude a great proportion of architectural production and their producers. Furthermore, without an appreciation of the place and the meaning of occupational positions within the broader field, this abstract definition of an architect's job with reference to the nature of architectural labour seems rather limited. My point is that if the aim is to understand the field of architectural production, occupied by agents who call themselves 'professional architects', we need to look at more than the boundaries of their work and move away from concerns with the division of labour, both within the architectural process and with the other experts involved in the making of buildings.

Secondly, the externally directed understanding of professions fails to account for the mechanisms of their making. This study demonstrates that architecture is a distinctive world organised around very specific interests and one that generates its own rules, differentiations and systems of reproduction. A focus on the internal dynamics of architecture enables us to acknowledge and incorporate conflict, power relations and develop a grounded understanding of the structure and the culture that characterise it. This attention to internal processes is crucial if we are to be able to account for divisions and conflict without recourse to assumptions of inter or intra-occupational challenge. Bourdieu's conception does not exclude commonalities, but the case of architecture also highlights the relevance of appreciating the social foundations of ideas and values that are projected as a 'common' view or culture. It is

only by accounting for internal conflict that we can represent the reality of domination within the field.

Thirdly, our conception of professions needs to have a proper sense of agency. Without an understanding of the relations, struggles and possibilities within which individuals operate, it is not possible to develop a grounded understanding of their lived experiences and by a reverse logic, it is only with attention to agency that the construction of a professional domain can be understood as an outcome of their practices. Attributing the same collective professionalisation drives to individuals is not only a narrow understanding of the interests and motives at stake, but it also implies an abstract and one-dimensional notion of agency and of their relationship to the dynamics of their field. The classical theories ignore real agency, but then replace it with institutions or the occupational group, which are personalised and attributed objectives. There is no distinction between individuals and the group, which makes it impossible to ask questions about power and domination. It is only by analysing agents' practices that we can begin to understand how their milieu is reproduced and moves forward.

Fourth, the idea of an autonomous profession is inadequate for understanding the position of architecture vis-a-vis the social world. The evidence indicates that the idea of autonomy hides architecture's dependencies from its own practitioners, and the institutional right to self-regulate distracts from its position as a space that operates in relation to an existing framework of relationships and divisions. Both Larson's (1983) and Abbott's (1988) attempts to account for the externalities of professionals are hampered by their focus on their effects on the boundaries of architectural work. There is no question that the architect's job has changed over the last century and the increased division of labour led to the emergence of new professions such as surveyors and town planners. Such shifts do have implications for who is in or out of the field, but should this be the first and the last question we ask about architecture? The influences of external dynamics go beyond impact on boundaries of expertise. The evidence also challenges the assumptions that the 'esoteric' knowledge

contained in a profession underpins its autonomy from interference. To the contrary, architectural expertise does not appear to be a sufficient guarantee of power or authority unless supported by economic resources. Finally, the idea of autonomy completely obscures the continuities between broader social, economic and architectural divisions with the consequence that architecture's place within the social world is defined in terms of its self-projections as an elite group that stands above class divisions. The evidence suggests that architectural expertise is put to the services of the wealthy and that the majority of architects do not feel able to apply their knowledge and skills in the interests of the built environment.

But how do we bring these permanent, varied and multiple channels of influence to light? By paying attention to agency and the internal world of a profession; yet here, we start going around in circles, for the difficulties faced by classical approaches are all connected. What this study brings to the fore is the limit set to the sociological imagination by the assumptions that underlie the classical theories of professions. The complexity uncovered suggests that reductive investigations into the culture, strategies or the economic context of architecture are unable to account for the processes and practices that contradict those assumptions. The more fundamental problem, however, is that these assumptions, although undermined by the evidence, are built into the concept of profession, so that to be able to broaden the scope of our thinking, we need to re-define our problem and place professionals as actors within the wider world of their field. With this step, we break with professions' self-definitions and a priori theoretical assumptions about their objectives or strategies, and open the world of a 'professional' domain of practice to *empirical* investigation. This study has inevitably been limited in its scope, but the field approach has wide reaching implications for our conceptions of its history, construction, producers and products, and provides the tools to develop a more integrated and socially grounded understanding of the entire field of architecture without limiting our horizons to shifts in boundaries of expertise.

Whilst the concept of field implies a radical reformulation and might even be seen to negate

the sociology of professions as a study of occupations, it is open to the re-incorporation of the concerns that occupied the classical theorists. For instance, the ideology of professionalism, can be studied as an aspect of the doxic narrative of the field. Similarly, how the emergence and the growth of new specialisms within the field might impact on its structure and dynamics, and how the dominant groups react to these shifts could be examined as part of a field analysis of architecture. The possibilities that are opened up with a field analysis approach are exciting, but let us not get ahead of ourselves. This study does not intend to set out a blueprint for a field analysis of professions, but exemplifies the kinds of understanding enabled by the field lens. The potential promised by the field concept needs to be tested in further applications, and my thesis, on the basis of the evidence presented here, is that this would be a fruitful endeavor that would yield an understanding of their complexities not permitted by the notion of profession.

Appendix: Fieldwork Documentation

Included in this section are copies of the Research Information Sheet, Interview Schedule and the Consent Form

(B)   A1. The Research Information Sheet

Rewards and challenges of a career in Architecture

This document provides information about the aims of the research and describes what your participation in the project will involve.

This project is being carried out as part of a PhD, which is registered at the University of York. The lead researcher on the project is Mrs. Melahat Sahin-Dikmen. The study is supervised by Professor Mike Savage.

The aim of the project is to explore how individuals negotiate the opportunities and constraints that operate in the field of architectural practice. This will be investigated through in-depth interviews with architects from a range of practices and at different stages of their careers.

The interviews with architects will explore personal experiences of architectural education and professional practice. Interview questions will focus on motivations for pursuing a career in architecture; transitions from training to professional practice and individual career strategies and paths.

The interviews will be conducted at a time and place to suit you. It will be **i**nformal and will last about an hour. With your permission, the interview will be audio-recorded. Please note that you can refuse to answer any question or terminate the interview at any time.

In line with ethical research guidelines, all contributions will be treated as **confidential,** unless an interviewee prefers to be identified. Interview recordings and transcripts will be kept secure on pass-word protected computers at all times.

The findings will be reported in a PhD thesis, with the objective to **publish** in academic journals and the professional press.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this invitation.

If you would like more information or decide to take part in the study, please contact the researcher.

Researcher contact details

Mrs. Melahat Sahin-Dikmen
PhD Researcher, Sociology
University of York
Email: msd507@york.ac.uk

(C) **A2. The interview schedule**

Rewards and challenges of a career in Architecture

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this project.

Before we start the interview, I'd like to reiterate the aims of the project and tell you a bit more about what this interview will involve. The research is being carried out as part of a PhD project. The broader objective of the PhD is to understand what working as a professional involves and architecture has been chosen as the case study profession. The aim of these interviews is to explore architectural practice by asking architects themselves what it is like to be working as an architect. This interview will therefore be about your personal experiences of practising architecture. I am interested in finding out about your views and what matters to you, so there are no right or wrong answer. This is not intended to be a formal interview, so please feel free to say if any of the questions are not relevant to you, if you do not wish to answer a question, or if you would like to take a break.

The questions will be about your:

(I)   education
(J)   work history and current employment
(K)   views on the significance of your work in your life, its challenges and rewards and
   future plans
(L)   views on the profession more generally and how it has been changing

Remind the interviewee that their contributions will be anonymised and kept completely confidential.

Confirm that the interviewee agrees to the recording of the interview.

Ask if the interviewee has any questions.

Section 1: Architectural education

Could you please tell me about your Part I studies?
Probes:
Place, time, mode, length of study, place of study, reasons for choice of school

What would you say are the main things you got out of your Part I training?
Probes: knowledge (what kind?), skills, contacts, friendships.

What was your experience of Part II like?

Probes: type of practice and projects, where, how found, positives and negatives, post-qualification career opportunities?

What was your experience of Part III like?
Probes: Where, how found, reasons for 'choice', how long, types of practice and projects, positives and negatives, post-qualification career opportunities?

Do you mind telling me about your Professional Exam by the ARB?

Do you remember having any particular difficulties or any negative experiences during your training?
Probes: length of education, concerns about not completing, difficulties with an aspect of course requirements, hesitations about choice of career

Did you feel ready for practice when you finished your training? Why/why not?
Probes: skills and job readiness, concerns, does training continue in the first few years after graduation

Did you undertake any further training after your qualification? Where and what?

What does the annual CPD requirement involve? Do you feel able to complete this training?

Section 2 : Work history

Could you please talk me through your previous employment, starting with the first one after you registered as an architect? (Ask a copy of the CV available)

For each position ask:

Reasons for wanting that position & employer
How did you find the job?
Job title, responsibilities, types of projects, skills used and developed
Employer, type, size and location
Type of contract, working hours,
Length of employment
Types of projects worked on
Organisation of work
Positives and negatives (probe: expectations and reality, frustrations, rewards, achievements)
Working hours, stress
Reasons for leaving (probe for redundancies)

Section 3a: Current employment: IF employee

Could you please tell me about your current/most recent position?
Probes:
Job title, responsibilities

Length of employment
PT/FT
Permanent/contract based
Employer details (name, size of company, nature of business and services, why chose this employer)

Could you help me understand your work a bit better by perhaps describing your typical day/week or by describing your involvement in a project?

Could you tell me a bit more about your area of expertise (e.g. Conservation, housing, transport) and why you chose this specialisation and why this employer?)

Could you describe the kinds of skills and competencies needed in your current position?
Probe: design ability, technical skills, management, administrative, communication, marketing
Specialisation area

Could we now talk about the way work is organised and managed in your current/most recent workplace?
Probes:
Project based division or other?
Areas of specialisation
Management structure
Participation in decision making (organisational, project specific and artistic decisions)

What do you think about the organisation and management of work in this way? Do you see any advantages/disadvantages to it? Have you worked in places with a different kind of management/work organisation structure?

Do you feel that you have control over all aspects of your work? Does this matter? Why/why not?

It is often said that professionals are distinguished from other workers, because they have a lot of control over what they do and how do it. Does this describe your experience? What does being autonomous mean to you? Is this important for you? Why?
Probes: having a say on choice of projects, control over design aspect, participation in decision making, autonomy over day to day management of work and time

Could we now talk about the conditions of work and employment in your current work place?
Probes:
Working hours and work loads
Office conditions
Career opportunities
Job security
Pensions
Flexible working
Training - ARB annual CPD requirements
Healthcare

Maternity/paternity benefits
Family friendly policies
Equal opportunities

Are provisions and policies of this kind important for you? Would you take these into account in deciding to work for an employer?

Section 3b: Current employment: IF self-employed

Could you please tell me how you came to set up your own practice?
Probes:
length of time
Reasons
where
Partners
number of staff
any specialisation
examples to projects

Could you tell me a bit more about your own role?
Probes:
responsibilities
projects

Could you tell me about your typical day/week and about the projects you are currently working on?

Could you tell me a bit more about the way you organise and manage work? It might be helpful to talk through a specific project?

How do you feel about wearing two hats (if this is the case) - having to manage a practice and also to work as an architect on some projects?

Do you think that running your own practice calls for different kinds of skills that you might not need if you were an employee? What sorts of skills?
Probes:
Management
Administrative
Marketing
finance

Where does your work come from?

What have been the main challenges and rewards of setting up on your own?
(Probes: bringing in work, marketing)

What do you think are the advantages/disadvantages of running your own firm as opposed working as an employee-architect?

How do the ups and downs of the economy affect your business?

Would you recommend setting up on your own to an architect starting out now?

Evaluating current position

What do you think are the best things about your current set-up?

Is there anything you would want to change?

Do you feel that this position allows you to practice architecture in the way you would like to? Why/Why not?
Probes:
Utilisation and development of skills/underemployment
Choice over projects
Organisation of work
Work loads
Personal development plans

Perspectives on career

Were there times when finding work was an issue?

I am struck by the high/low job mobility suggested by your work history. Why do you think you have/have not changed employers very often?
(Probe: check whether related to long project lead in and completion times and whether this ties them to a particular employer? Can you get credit for work not completed?)

Why did you choose this area of specialisation (e.g. Conservation, residential, transport, interior design)? Did you consider moving into another area of specialisation? Why/why not? Would this be easy?

Throughout your career, did you ever have to work on projects that you didn't want to for professional or personal reasons?
Probe: example may be designing a site/building for an organisation with whose agenda you disagreed with. Say if you are against nuclear energy but had to work on a project for a nuclear energy plant)

What do you think are the main factors that enabled you to achieve your current position?

What would you say have been the challenges you've had to deal with in establishing your career?

What advice would you give to someone who has just qualified as an architect?

Section 4: Computers and architectural practice

In this section, I would like to ask about your use of computers in your work.

Do you use any of these technologies?
Probes:
CAD technology - computer aided drawing
3D modelling technology - computer aided design
BIM (Building information modelling)
Dynamic computing models - simulating a design

Do you think that your job involves different kinds of skills because of computers?
Probe: What kinds of skills?

How do these technologies affect the way you work? Can you please give examples?
Probes:
Simpler or more complex?
re-organisation of the work process (more fragmented or integrated?)
Standardisation of the process or some parts of it
creation of new roles (technicians as well as manages to oversee a may be more fragmented process?)
Involvement of other professionals
The design process: more individual/collective/transparent ?

It strikes me that in nearly all lines of work, people tend to talk about how computers speed up the work process? Is this the case in architecture? How does this affect you?

What do you think about the argument that computers first undermined the 'drawing' skills of architects and are now taking over the design task?

Section 5: Work and identity

Would you say that work is important for you? Why?
Probes:
Expression of personal ambitions and talents
Way to earn money

Why did you choose architecture? (IF NOT MENTIONED ALREADY)
Probes: influences, role of family contacts

If you had another chance now, would you choose architecture again? Why/why not?

Do you feel that the reality of architectural practice matched your expectations?

What would you say your main achievements have been in your career?

Do you have any disappointments in relation to your career?
Probes:
disappointments of the workplace - is this where you wanted to be

barriers to realising personal professional design ambitions
underemployment, control over type of work and role and how to deal with these
personal ideals and the reality - expectations and achievements
culture of star architecture and the reality

Is there a conflict between the individual nature of design (personal design ideals) and the collaborative nature of architectural production? Do you feel this to be a problem? If so, how do you resolve this conflict?

Do you think that the architectural profession has changed much since you've started practising? In what way?
Probes:
more like a business?
more govt regulation?
More competition in the job market
Skill requirements
More/less specialisation

What does it mean to be a 'professional' ?

Are you a member of RIBA? What is the significance of this membership for you?

Do you see yourself as part of the architectural profession or a member of a wider community of professionals?

Do you see yourself as belonging to a social or economic group or a social class?
Probes: Which class and why? What does this mean to you?

Section 6: Future plans

May I ask about your future plans?

Where do you see yourself, in terms of your career, in the next 5 -10 years?

Do you see any barriers to achieving those objectives?

Concluding the interview

Thank the interviewer and reassure regarding confidentiality.

Check if the interviewee would like to receive a copy of the research summary.

Ask the interviewee to sign the consent form

(D) A3. The Consent Form

Rewards and challenges of a career in Architecture

Consent Form

I can confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above project and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without detriment to myself.

I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded.

I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

I agree to the anonymised interview transcripts being archived for possible future use by the researcher.

I understand that the PhD supervisors may need to access the anonymised interview transcripts.

I agree to take part in the above project.

_____ _____ _____
Name of participant   Date   Signature

_____ _____ _____
Name of the researcher   Date   Signature

Bibliography

Abbott, A.D. (1988). *The system of professions: an essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Abbott, A.D. (1991). The Future of professions: occupation and expertise in the age of organisation, *Research in the Sociology of Organisations* (8), pp.17-42.

Abbott, A.D. (2005). Linked Ecologies: States and Universities as Environments for Professions, *Sociological Theory*, 23(3).pp.245-274.

Arber, S. (1993). The Research process. In Gilbert, N. (Ed.). *Researching social life*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 32-50.

Barnes, H. Parry, J. Sahin-Dikmen, M., Bonjour, D. (2004). *Minority ethnic students in architecture.* Report for Commission for the Built Environment

Blau, J. (1984). *Architects and firms: a sociological perspective on architectural practice.* Massachussetts : MIT Press

Becker, H. S. et al. (1961). *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Benson, R. & Neveu, E. (Eds.) (2005). *Bourdieu and the journalistic field.* Cambridge : Polity.

Bledstein, B.J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: the middle class and the development of higher education in America*. New York : Norton.

Bourdieu, P. (1972). *Outline of a theory of practice*. UK : Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1975). The Specifity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason, *Social Science Information*, 14 (9). 19-47.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). Social space and the genesis of groups, *Theory and Society*, 14(6). 723-744.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In Richardson, J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York : Greenwood, pp.241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (1987a). The Force of law: toward a sociology of the juridicial field, *Hastings Journal of Law,* July, 807-853.

Bourdieu, P and Koch, E.R. (1987b). The Invention of the artist's life, *Yale Studies*, 73, 75-103.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. UK : Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1989a), Towards a Reflexive Sociology: A Workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. Sociological Theory, 7(1), p.26-63

Bourdieu, P. (1989b). Social space and symbolic power, *Sociological Theory*, 7(1). 14-25.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words*. UK : Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. UK : Blackwell Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of cultural production*. New York : Columbia University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). *The Rules of art.* UK : Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). *The Logic of Practice*. UK : Blackwell Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. UK: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (2002). Social Space and Symbolic Space. In Calhoun, C.(2002). (Ed.), *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Brint, S. (2001). Professionals and the 'knowledge economy': rethinking the theory of Postindustrial society, *Current Sociology*, 49(4), 101-132.

Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: the changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Broadbent, J., Dietrich, M., Roberts, J. (1997). *The End of the professions? The restructuring of professional work.* London : Routledge.

Brubaker, R. (1985). Rethinking Classical Theory: The Sociological Vision of Pierre Bourdieu, *Theory and Society*, 14(6). 745-775.

Building Design (2013), 8 March.

Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (1990). *Professions in theory and history : rethinking the study of the professions.* London ; Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (1990). *The formation of professions : knowledge, state and strategy*. London: Sage.

Burrage, M., Jarausch, K. and Siegrist, H.(1990), An actor-based framework for the study of the professions. In Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (1990). *Professions in theory and*

history : rethinking the study of the professions. London ; Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Caven, V (2004) Constructing a career: women architects at work. *Career Development International*, 9(5), 518-31

Caven, V (2006a) Choice, diversity and false consciousness in women's careers, *International Journal of Training and Development*, 10(1), 41-54

Caven, V (2006b) Career building: women and non-standard employment in architecture. *Construction Management and Economics*, 24(5), 457-64

Calhoun, Craig J., Edward LiPuma, E. and Postone, M. (1993). *Bourdieu : critical perspectives.*Cambridge: Polity

Caplow, T. (1954). *Sociology of Work*, Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.

Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A. (1933). *The Professions*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press

Caven, V. & Diop, M. (2012). Architecture: a 'rewarding' career? An Anglo-French comparative study of intrinsic rewards in the architecture profession, *Construction Management and Economics,* 30(7). 513-523.

Cohen, L., Wilkinson, A. Arnold, J. And Finn, R. (2005) "Remember I'm the bloody Architect!", *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol.19(4): 775-96

Collins, R. (1990), Market Closure and the conflict theory of professions. In Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (1990). *Professions in theory and history : rethinking the study of the professions*. London ; Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Crompton, R. (1990). Professions in the Current Context, *Work, Employment and Society*, 4(5). 147-166.

Crinson, M. and Lubbock, J. (1994). *Architecture: art or profession? Three Hundred Years of Architectural Education in Britain*. Manchester : Manchester University Press.

Cuff, D.(1991). *Architecture: the story of practice.* Massachusetts : MIT Press.

Cultural Sociology, Special Issue on Field Analysis, June, 2013.

Current Sociology Special Monograph (2011). Reconnecting professional occupations and professional organisations, 59(4).

Daniel Muzio, D. and Ian Kirkpatrick, I.(Eds.) (2011) Special issue: reconnecting Professional occupations and professional organizations, *Current Sociology*, (59/4).

Davies, C. (1983). Professionals in bureaucracies: the conflict thesis revisited. In Dingwall, R. and Lewis, P., S., C. (Eds.). *The Sociology of the professions: lawyers, doctors and others.* London:Macmillan.

Drain, D. (1991). Practical knowledge and occupational control: the professionalization of architecture in the United States, *Sociological Forum*, 6(2). 239-268.

Dent, M and Whitehead, S. (Eds.) (2002). *Managing professional identities - knowledge, performaties and the 'new' professional.* Routledge: London.

Derber, C. (Ed.). (1982). *Professionals as workers : mental labor in advanced capitalism.* Boston:G K Hall.

Dingwall, R. and Lewis, P., S., C. (Eds.). (1983). *The Sociology of the professions: lawyers, doctors, and others.* London: Macmillan.

Dingwall, R. (2008). *Essays on professions*, Aldershot: Ashgate Classics in Sociology.

Duffy, F. (1998). *Architectural knowledge: The Idea of a Profession*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Esher, L. (1981). *A Broken wave: the rebuilding of England, 1940-1980.* London: Penguin Books.

Elliott, P. (1972). *The sociology of the professions*. London: Macmillan.

Etzioni, A. (1969). *The Semi-Professions and their organisation: teachers, nurses and social workers*. New York : Free Press.

Exworthy, M and Halford, S (Eds.) (1999). *Professionals and the new managerialism in the public sector*. Buckingham : Open University Press.

Fielding, N. (1993). Qualitative interviewing. In Gilbert, N. (Ed.) *Researching social life.* London : Sage Publications.

Filson, R. (1985). Architectural education: can schools span the gap to practice? *Architectural Record.* November 1985, 59-63.

Flick, U. (1998), *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications.Fowler, B. and Wilson, F. (2004). Women architects and their discontents, *Sociology*, 38(1). 101-119.

Freidson, E. (1986). *Professional power: a study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge.* University of Chicago Press : Chicago.

Freidson, E. (1975). *Doctoring together: a study of professional social control.* New York: Elsevier.

Freidson, E. (1984). The Changing nature of professional control, *Annual Review of Sociology,* 10, 1-20.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: the third logic*, Cambridge : Polity.

Freidson, E. (1970). *Professional dominance: the structure of medical care*. New York: Atherton Press

Fowler, B. And Wilson, F. (2004), Women Architects and Their Discontents, in *Sociology*, Vol. 38(1): 101-119

Gaskell, G. (2000). "Individual and group interviewing". In Bauer, M.W. & Gaskell, G.(2000). *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound: a practical handbook*. Sage Publications : London.

Glaser, B.G. And Strauss, A.L. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, New York: Aldine.

Grenfell, M.(1996), Bourdieu and Initial Teacher Education: A Post-Structuralist Approach, *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(3).

Grenfell, M. (eds) (2008). *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, UK:Acumen Publishing.

Gilbert, N. (1993), "Research, Theory and Method" in Gilbert (ed), *Researching Social Life*, London: Sage Publications.

Goldthorpe, J.H. (1982). On the service class, its formation and future. In Giddens, A. andMackenzie, G. (eds). *Social Class and the division of labour: essays in honour of Ilya Neustadt,*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.pp.162-85

Graft-Johnson, A., Manley, S. and Greed, C.(2003), *Why do women leave architecture*, University of the West England, Bristol.

Gutman, R. (1988). *Architectural practice: a critical view*. New York:Princeton Architectural Press.

Gutman, R. (1992). Architects and power: the natural market for architecture. *Progressive Architecture,* 73(12). 39-41.

Halliday, T.C. (1985). Knowledge mandates: collective influence by scientific, normative and syncretic professions. *British Journal of Sociology*, 36(3). 421-447.

Holdaway, S. (2000). Theory and method in qualitative research. In Burton, D.(Ed.). *Research training for social scientists*. Sage Publications : London.

Hughes, E.C. (1958). *Men and their work*. The Free Press : Illinois.

Jenkins, F. (1961). *Architecture and patron: a survey of professional relations and practice in England from the sixteenth century to the present day*. London : Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, R. (1992). *Pierre Bourdieu*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, T. (1982). The state and the professions: peculiarities of the British. In Giddens, A. and Mackenzie, G. (eds). *Social Class and the division of labour: essays in honour of Ilya Neustadt*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, T.J. (1972). *Professions and power*. London : Macmillan.

Jones, P.(2009). Putting Architecture in its Social Place: A Cultural Political Economy of Architecture, *Urban Studies,* 46, p.2519.

Jones, P.(2011). *The Sociology of Architecture*, UK: Liverpool University Press.

Kaye, B. (1960). *The Development of the architectural profession in Britain*. London : Allen and Unwin.

Kocka,J.(1990). 'Burgertum' and professions in the nineteenth century: two alternative approaches. in. Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (eds). *Professions in theory and history: rethinking the study of the professions. London* ; Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

 Kostof, S.(1977). *The Architect: chapters in the history of the profession*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Krause, E. A. (1996). *Death of the guilds: professions, states and the advance of capitalism*. New Haven : Yale University Press.

Larkin, G. (1983). *Occupational monopoly and modern medicine*. London : Tavistock Publications.

Larson, M., S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: a sociological analysis*. Berkeley : University of California Press.

Larson, Magali, Sarfatti, (1990). In the Matter of Experts, how it is not possible to leave anything unsaid. In Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (eds). *The formation of professions: knowledge, state and strategy.* London: Sage.

Larson, M.S. (1983). Emblem and exception: the historical definition of the architect's professional role. In (Eds.) Blau, J., La Gory, M.and Pipkin, J. *Professionals and Urban Form*. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 49-85.

Larson, M.S. (1993). *Behind the postmodern facade: architectural change in late twentieth century America.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Larson, M.S. (1994). Architectural competitions as discursive events, *Theory and Society*, 23(4), 469-504.

Leicht, K. T. and Fennell, M.L. (2001). *Professional work: a sociological approach.* Massachusetts : Blackwell.

MacDonald, K. M. (1995). The sociology of the professions. London: Sage Publications.

Maton, K. (2008). Habitus. In Grenfell, M. (ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts.* UK : Acumen.

Malatesta, M.(2005). Comments on Sciulli. *Current Sociology*, 53(6), 943-946.

Melia, K.M. (1997). Producing 'plausible stories': interviewing student nurses. In Miller, G. & Dingwall, R. (Eds.). *Context and method in qualitative research.* Sage Publications : London.

Mouzelis, N. (1991). *Back to Sociological Theory: the construction of social orders*, London: Macmillan.

Mouzelis, N.(1995). *Sociological Theory: what went wrong: diagnosis and remedies,* London: Routledge.

Murphy, R. (1988). *Social closure : the theory of monopolization and exclusion.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murphy, R.(1990). Proleterinisation or Bureuacratisation: the fall of the professional? In Burrage, M. and Torstendahl, R. (1990*). The formation of professions: knowledge, state and strategy.* London: Sage.

Muzio D and Kirkpatrick (2011) Introduction: Professions and Organisations - a conceptual framework, *Current Sociology*, Vol.59:389

Parsons, T. (1954). *Essays in sociological theory.* Glencoe, III: Free Press.

Pavalko, R.M. (1971), *Sociology of Occupations and Professions*, F.E. Illinois: Peacock Publishers, INC.

Perkin, H. J. (2002). *The rise of professional society: England since 1880.* London : Routledge.

Perkin, H.J. (1996). *The Third revolution: professional elites in the modern world.* Routledge: London.

Pickard, S. (2009). The Professionalization of general practitioners with a special interest: rationalization, restratification and governmentality, *Sociology,* 43(2), 250-267.

Pepper, S.(2009). Rise and Fall: a long century of changing public sector practice. Paper presented at the Changing Practices Symposium, London, RIBA.

Prest, W. (1984). Why the history of professions is not written. In Rubin, G. R. and Sugarman, D. Law, economy and society 1750-1914. Abingdon, Oxon: Professional Books.

Punch, K.F (1998), Introduction to Social Research, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, London: Sage Publications.

Reader, W. J. (1966). *Professional men: the rise of the professional classes in nineteenth century England.* London : Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Reed, M (2007) 'Engineers of human souls, faceless technocrats or merchants of morality? Changing professional forms and identities in the face of the neo-liberal challenge' in Pinnington A, Macklin R and Campbell T (eds) *Human Resource Management: Ethics and Employment,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Richards, J.M. (1974). *Architecture*. UK : David and Charles Publishing.

RIBA (2010-11), *Architects' Earnings and Benefits Survey, Architects' Performance, Architects' Markets,* by the Fees Bureau.

Saint, A. (1983). *The Image of architect.* New Haven : Yale University Press.

Savage et al. (1992), *Property, Bureaucracy and Culture*, Routledge, Great Britain.

Sciulli, D. (2005). Continental sociology of professions today: conceptual contributions, *Current Sociology*, 53(6) 915-942.

Sciulli, D. (2005). Escaping without Eliding an Atlantic Divide, Etymological and Conceptual, *Current Sociology*, 53(6), 952-958.

Shaw, N. and Jackson, T.G. (Eds.) (1892). *Architecture: a profession or an art?* Oxford : Printed for the Oxford University.

Silverman, D. (1997). The Logics of Qualitative Research. In Miller, G. & Dingwall, R. (Eds.). *Context and method in qualitative research.* Sage Publications : London.

Sklair, L.(2005), The Transnational Capitalist Class and Contemporary Architecture in Globalising Cities, in International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29(3), pp.485-500.

Smith, Chris, David Knights, and Hugh Willmott. 1991. *White-collar work : the non-manual labour process*. London: Macmillan.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990), Basics of Qualitative Research, Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques, London: Sage Publications.

Symes, M., Eley, J. & Seidel, A.D. (1995). *Architects and Their Practices - A Changing Profession*. UK: Butterworth Architecture.

Stevens, G. (1998). *The Favoured Circle: the social foundations of architectural distinction*. USA: MIT.

Saunders, W.S. (Ed.) (1996). *Reflections on architectural practices in the nineties*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

Thomson, P. (2008). Field. In Grenfell, M. (Ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts*. UK : Acumen.

Torstendahl, R. (2005). The Need for a definition of 'profession', *Current Sociology,* 53(6), pp.947-951.

Wilensky, H.L. (1964). *The professionalization of everyone?* Berkeley: University of California.

Witz, A. (1991). Professions and patriarchy. London: Routledge.