

2021-09

The Elephant in the Room: How neoliberal architecture education undermines wellbeing

Troiani, I

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/17791>

Charrette -Association of Architectural Educators

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

The Elephant in the Room: How neoliberal architecture education undermines wellbeing

Igea Troiani

University of Plymouth

Abstract

This essay examines the performative space of neoliberal architectural education in the United Kingdom, its history, attributes and values, focusing on staff and student wellbeing in relation to work-time. In so doing, it addresses the vertical unit studio as the 'elephant in the room'. As a site in which unhealthy work practices are acculturated, and which, when learned at university, can be perpetuated throughout an architect's work life, the vertical unit system encourages a competitive ego culture at the expense of a balanced work life. In a neoliberal market economy, how might the architecture design studio education be reframed to enhance wellbeing?

Keywords

Neoliberalism, architecture, pedagogy, wellbeing, time

Acknowledgements

This research began in 2016 and is part of a forthcoming book by the author entitled *Playing the Game of Life: In Architecture* (Routledge: London).



Figure 1. Students, Ecole des Beaux Arts, Paris, ca 1871. Photograph by Gaudenzio Marconi/Archive Farms Inc / Alamy Stock Photo, E7T3R8. (Copyright secured online from May 21, 2021- May 21, 2026)

Architectural education in the neoliberal university

Architectural education at university can be, and is, nurturing and invigorating for many students and staff who work in it, meeting or exceeding expectations. But as universities orientate more towards neoliberal quantitative rather than qualitative modes of production, content and ethos, and further away from the liberal arts, the form of architectural education is changing markedly because of its focus on the economic. In neoliberal countries such as the United Kingdom – which this article focuses on – a vast majority of architecture schools have been forced to change because of the neoliberalisation of Higher Education (HE).¹

Neoliberalism is generally understood to be a *laissez-faire* economic market-oriented system in which business transactions are free from regulatory restriction. It is driven by the desire of a neoliberal government to make economically independent individuals and institutions from the state and is defined positively or negatively depending on what aspect of the neoliberal system is focused upon. Janet Newman writes that unlike scholars, such as Bob Jessop and Jamie Peck, who emphasise 'the role of the state in securing political and ideological reform' to maximise corporate capital, social geographer David Harvey contends that neoliberalism is a class-based political project which ultimately creates social and economic inequality.² According to Harvey, neoliberal entrepreneurial freedoms mainly advance free market trade and

Commented [SB1]: Can you please confirm what the image copyright owner anticipates with the expiration of this period?

Commented [IT2]: I'd be happy to pay to extend it again after this period. Sadly this was the maximum duration I could acquire copyright permission for at this time.

Commented [SB3]: A bit long and convoluted syntax. Please rephrase if possible/refer to the in-text suggestion

Commented [SB4]: It would be helpful to add here a brief sentence opening up the intention of the paper. You arrive at that at the very end of the section but it would be helpful to the reader to have a more explicit hint of your particular focus on work load culture/wellbeing tension in neoliberalist education before reading on the unpacking of neoliberalism, which is in itself quite rich and complex.

Commented [IT7]: These are my words. I've been writing about neoliberalism since 2015 and I think I've developed this definition of it.

Commented [SB8]: Can you please add a reference to support/illustrate this framing?

Commented [SB9]: This sentence is a bit long and dense – please consider breaking into two.

The neoliberalisation of the UK in the 1970s, under Baroness Margaret Thatcher's Conservative party, involved withdrawing state funding from many public sector services including HE. By withdrawing economic support for universities in order to make them economically self-sustainable, most institutions have been forced to employ new business strategies to survive and thrive in the global HE marketplace. This has ultimately led to a semi-privatisation of universities. Academic capitalism involves the increased mass production of graduates and has grown in its demands for efficient productivity in the university workplace.⁶ The university is no longer associated with a place for slow scholarly contemplation; it is driven by optimisation, economisation, rationalisation, flexibility and employability.

Commented [SB11]: '...', which are now focused on...'

Neoliberal universities now operate much like global corporations and are increasingly being run like entrepreneurial businesses working for industry. The entrepreneurial university aims to spread 'throughout the world (encouraging excellence and innovation in an environment of mutual competitive rivalry)' in order to 'enhance ...their own institution' in the 'global university space'.⁷ University workers, who are innovators, can become a conduit through which capital and labour in the university are commodified. And it is this neoliberal commodification of HE that is impacting dramatically on architectural education and the wellbeing of its workforce.

Commented [SB13]: Business repeating – please consider an alternative term – Perhaps the former could be 'establishments'?

Here, architecture education is discussed in relation to the proportion of work-time required for increased productivity demanded by the neoliberal university, and the politics of the body of the architecture educator and student, whose energy is consumed to deliver that work. The need to optimise the resources necessary to run the neoliberal university has come mostly from top-down management enacted through restructuring staff and administration for cost-cutting. In this context, as the primary site of architectural education, the design studio becomes instrumentalised to enforce neoliberal values and processes of optimal productivity. Architecture schools compete to create new revenue streams through initiating new courses, building new campuses and increasing HE market share while reducing their cost of labour and resources. The latter most commonly occurs through maximising the workload of permanent staff and growing its precariat class of architecture tutors and visiting lecturers. As the centre of any architectural curriculum, the architectural design studio emerges as a critical site of analysis because of the way it consumes and demands of its labour force, affecting wellbeing. But while widely recognised, and despite the abundance of everyday complaints, the overworking culture of the design studio is curiously unchallenged publicly; even docilely accepted as being a rite of passage. Here, it is argued that the unhealthy and imbalanced long work hours culture of the architectural design studio that has been exacerbated under neoliberalism and post-pandemic through online studio teaching needs to be acknowledged as 'the elephant in the room' of architectural education.⁸

Commented [IT14]: the 'vertical unit' as a design studio model within which originated a work-heavy and competitive culture, and the wider studio culture, in which some of these traits may have been inherited and consolidated by now.

The issue is that architectural education, and the design studio in particular, can acculturate work-life imbalance.

This article's

original contribution to knowledge is the alternative reading of the neoliberal design studio, not as a positive entrepreneurial space of productivity but, as a space of in which unhealthy work habits are learned

. Here, the subject is discussed openly, not only to acknowledge its presence and that it is a problem but to also recognise that the perpetuity of its logics undermines the wellbeing of students pre- and post-graduation because unhealthy patterns of work learned at university are normalised and, therefore, perpetuated in architecture

Commented [SB15]: You have already defined the overworking culture as 'the elephant in the room' immediately above – within and before neoliberalism, which makes this sentence sound a bit repetitive. Please consider rephrasing this opening sentence of the paragraph to acknowledge your previous statement and connect to it more directly. Is this about looking more closely at this condition in the context of neoliberalism? If yes, perhaps this sentence needs to explain how the issue of work-life balance/harmony differs from the 'overworking culture' previously mentioned.

labour in practice, on site or within architectural education – the latter continuing the cycle. This is no longer an issue that the profession or the bodies accrediting architecture programmes can avoid if the sustainability of architectural education is to be prioritised. Through a review first, of competitive spirit and the rise of the vertical unit in architectural design studio and, second, the work-time conundrum and neoliberal performance monitoring in architectural education, this essay asks: Can architecture education be reframed to enhance wellbeing rather than exploit and deplete the energy of those who work in a neoliberal HE market economy?

The architecture design studio, the vertical unit and (un)healthy competition

Architectural studio pedagogy has only recently emerged as a growing topic of research in the discipline. Since the early 1990s, there has been a steady growth in research examining the culture of the architectural design studio.⁹ Some authors, most of whom are women, recognise that the design studio has historically been a combative and defensive space that was often premised on negatively framed criticism.¹⁰ Studio criticism, arguably aimed at toughening up students to cope with any unpredictability in their architectural life after graduation, is not always constructive. Other researchers have focused on the architectural design studio as a discriminatory social space that acculturates through a process of institutional and natural selection and favours or disadvantages according to gender, class, ethnicity or race.¹¹ The latter literature asserts that the architecture studio can contribute to the making or breaking of a student's life and career post-university. But as architecture schools in neoliberal countries become more conditioned to operating and being 'designed as factories' for mass education "whose goal ...[is] to produce goods not subjects", to quote Pier Vittorio Aureli, there is an urgent need to examine the recent changes to architectural education.¹² [The 'vertical unit' as a design studio model has created a work-heavy and competitive culture, and wider studio culture, whose traits have since been inherited and consolidated. Here](#) the architectural design studio in [examined](#) its current heightened neoliberal vertical unit form, first, in regards to how it has acculturated a culture of overwork since its inception in the late 17th century and, second, in terms of how that long-standing work culture impacts on the wellbeing of those who work in it.

Alexander Griffin claims the first institution to be devoted exclusively to the study of architecture was the Académie d' Architecture (or the Académie Royale d' Architecture) founded by Louis XIV in 1671.¹³ It was set up to create graduates who would decorate his royal apartments at Versailles and was housed mostly in the Louvre in Paris. According to its director, the engineer Jacques-François Blondel, its members met weekly in the Louvre's ground floor lecture halls for public talks on mathematics and architecture. Another large room was devoted to the display of architectural models.¹⁴ While it was only short-lived, in 1863 it evolved into the École des Beaux-Arts which became the foundation of architectural education through its studio atelier model (Figure 1). While some attributes of the École des Beaux-Arts architecture education have changed, its sense of nurturing competitive spirit, tested through working day and night to complete a design competition for the *Grand Prix de Rome*, remains.

It was at the École des Beaux-Arts that the concept of working *en charrette* emerged. The title of this journal, *charrette* in French means 'chariot' or 'cart' and *en charrette* means to work 'in the cart'. This is because it was common at the end of the term, for architecture students at the École des Beaux-Arts, to work day [and night](#) right up until the deadline, when a cart would come to collect their models and drawings for review at the École. The term *charrette* in design studio remains in usage today and is tied to working intensely in short periods of time. The Beaux-Arts model of long work hour architectural studio has been heightened further through the vertical unit system.¹⁵

Commented [SB17]: Reference?

In the UK, the vertical unit system was first introduced at the Architectural Association School of Architecture or Architectural Association [AA] in London by the Canadian-born AA Director, then Chairman between 1971 and 1990, Alvin Boyarsky. It has since been implemented in design studio education in the vast majority of other architecture schools in the UK at one time or another. The AA is an independent architecture school that operates outside the UCAS (Universities and Colleges Admissions Service), which is the conventional system of university application. Instead, applicants are hand-picked through interview. The school typically cherry-picks a greater proportion of international students compared with other UK architecture schools; the majority of whom pay higher than normal tuition fees. It is one of only a few private architecture schools in the UK and as such has been founded on hefty tuition fees well before the neoliberalisation of all public universities in the UK. While it does not participate in university rankings, the AA has a reputation of having produced many of the most well-known architects in the world, including among many, Zaha Hadid who studied there as an international student. This is primarily because of the chains of elite establishment architects it attracts as atelier leaders, whose capital can transfer to make the next generation of elite architects.

The vertical unit studio stands in contrast to a more traditional, year-level segregated model of architectural education because of its mixing together in one studio group of students of different academic year levels. In architectural education, the vertical unit system is generally considered a favourable mode of architectural pedagogy, its benefits outweighing any drawbacks, although this depends on the tutor's tacit experience, whether positive or not, of studying under the system as a student. In 'A Case for the Vertical Studio', James Barnes argues from his personal experience at the also private Rhode Island School of Design (RISD) that 'the 'Vertical Studio' system challenges traditional, sequenced design studio organization by allowing students of various developmental and skill levels to interact and compete with one another in a topical, thesis-based studio'.¹⁶ Recent literature by Irene Sunwoo has recorded the history of the vertical unit system's application in UK architectural education and recognised how it aligns with neoliberal philosophy.

Commented [SB18]: This is a bit unclear – Is it the tutor's tacit experience or the student's?

In 'From the 'Well-Laid Table' to the 'Market Place: The Architectural Association Unit System', Sunwoo notes that Boyarsky launched 'a critical departure from the AA's postwar [sic] modernist professional training' through his development of the 'unit system' as the basis of the school's curriculum.¹⁷ The vertical unit system differs to earlier studio teaching in that rather than being taught architecture by one or two great masters in a studio year group, students are given a range of different studio tutors to choose from, somewhat like shopping for a design studio tutor. Typically, tutors present diverse modes of architectural thought and practice from which a student can choose. This model of teaching has transformed architecture education into a neoliberal mode of free-choice consumerism. Unlike the post war generation of AA teachers, who Peter Cook described as 'Old Etonian Marxists' working collaboratively with the government on welfare state projects, Boyarsky's new vertical unit system brought architectural education into the global HE marketplace by allowing students to take control of their individual projects, education and architectural genealogical pathway.¹⁸ Sunwoo sums up Boyarsky's vision as:

If a school of architecture was to function as a critical thermometer of contemporary architectural production, then it must be fueled [sic] by 'the energies and interests of a lot of people, so that the school community is bubbling with dozens of sometimes contradictory interests and activities' and in which the 'so-called curriculum', [...] must therefore be 'conditioned daily, weekly, and annually'.¹⁹

The freedom to choose one's studio was first suggested in an AA school meeting in January 1973 where 'Boyarsky proposed that the Diploma School student should be able to "weave" his or her way through a "rich supermarket" of offerings and self-generated programmes'.²⁰ The first generation of AA vertical unit tutors – or 'the thoroughbreds' to quote Boyarsky –

allowed the AA unit system of teaching to flourish because of their architectural pedigree and innovative teaching programmes.²¹ The subsequent generations of AA vertical unit tutors, 'many of whom had studied under the "first generation" did not carry the same diverse market selection, at times becoming more 'insular' and 'alike"', to quote Robin Evans.²² Sunwoo explains that; 'Although the volatility of the AA's postmodernist "marketplace" model had been designed to inhibit the hegemony of architectural certainties, its consumerist processes and pluralism were equally capable of producing a new institutional realm. The unit system had successfully become, as Evans implies, 'just that: a system [...] – both effective and thoroughly exportable, nonetheless'.²³

Commented [SB19]: Can you please check and clarify where this quote ends? Please also add a reference to Sunwoo at the end of the sentence.

As the lineages of unit tutors migrated to work in other architecture schools, the vertical unit system was disseminated within the UK and abroad. Graduate of the AA in 1960 and AA vertical unit tutor from 1964-1990, recognised for running one of its strongest units, Peter Cook notes that Boyarsky's remodelling of the AA design studio 'begat many aspects of [Bernard] Tschumi's Columbia, Leon Van Schaik's RMIT [Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology], [Nigel] Coates' RCA [Royal College of Art] and my own at the Bartlett [University College London]. We four were his students in the art of schoolmaking [sic].²⁴ The vertical unit system that was transported globally through the AA's staff and students has had consequences, which are similar to those of neoliberal capitalism: students become consumers in a 'free-enterprise system' of architecture education.

Commented [SB20]: Should [teaching] be added somewhere in this sentence?

Commented [IT21]: I don't think so.

In the same way that Thatcher saw only the positives in the free-enterprise system because 'in any marketplace anywhere, ... [there is] a lively, human, social and sociable reality: in fact, though serious it ...[is] fun', the AA's pedagogical model transformed design studio into a lively, sociable, model of competitive academic play.²⁵ But the vertical unit system also concomitantly requires that tutors pitch studio projects and ideologies in opposition to one another so that their design project product offering can be differentiated. While architectural studio has always been a competitive space – even since the times of the *Grand Prix de Rome* design competition at the École des Beaux-Arts – the vertical unit system of amplified marketplace selection and competition requires an abundant input of energy from its architectural community of staff and students, whose enmity and resistances to one another becomes an entrepreneurial driving force for innovation in architectural education and practice.

While neoliberalists contend that freedom of choice is liberating, some students can find it stressful. Having too many options to choose from can increase a student's anxiety. In the architectural studio, it can accentuate a highly competitive, rather than collaborative space. This is because in order to heighten the territory of each design studio's product offering, architectural pedagogical 'tribalism', to quote Reyner Banham, can emerge.²⁶ Criticism becomes a primary weapon to retain a market share in the vertical unit system and is used to undermine the design studio product offering of other tutors. Participating in a competitively driven vertical unit system requires physical stamina to keep things lively, buzzing and 'bubbling', in Boyarsky's terms, and to physically and mentally sustain the long hours work culture required for delivery. Teaching staff with the highest levels of energy and stamina and who are mostly younger or do not have external care commitments can input unlimited amounts of time and energy into studio teaching and therefore become a valuable commodity in this HE marketplace. Mostly at the lowest paid end of architectural tuition rates, these tutors suffer from the way in which the neoliberal university exploits a casual workforce.

Commented [SB22]: Just to differentiate from the shortly earlier use of 'to quote...' – feel free to rephrase

The deregulation of the labour market by Thatcher's Conservative government, which overlapped with the disempowering of student and staff unions, has had a great impact on the HE sector leading to increased casualisation of its labour market. In academia, the casualisation of the labour force has been rising in architecture schools. The increase in the number of casual design studio tutors entering the HE marketplace creates a highly

Commented [SB23]: It would be useful here to define the period in which this was initiated in order underline the timescale of this impact

competitive HE design studio staff environment.²⁷ It is not uncommon for a casual architecture studio employee to be leading or teaching in 2 to 3 or more design studios while undertaking (sometimes unpaid) research and, often, also working in practice or outside the university. The casualisation of the labour market in UK architecture schools is enabled by a flooded labour market of casual studio tutors, who have to compete with one another to gain employment. Their promotion pathways are arguably more arduous because they are competing in a larger HE marketplace of precariat workers. Premised often on a love of teaching design studio, a disillusionment of their day job, and the opportunity for professional prestige, architecture schools are enabled by neoliberalism to benefit from exploiting casual design tutor labour. Many younger tutors are also not openly critical of heavy workloads and have the stamina to sustain unreasonably demanding work lives inside the university and outside in practice. Studio educators who have the endurance to devote a large percentage of their waking hours to architectural labour, who do not have other commitments in their lives beyond architecture (because they chose that path or not) and who are not concerned about limiting their time to teach, consciously or unconsciously, advocate a culture of overwork. Casual teaching staff do not receive the benefits of permanent employment (part-time or full-time) such as paid leave or fixed contracts. By enacting unhealthy patterns of work, these workers become poor role models for students. In caring too much that their students do well (in order to also ensure the studio remains a popular choice and so their contract can be renewed next year), it is common for a casual vertical unit tutor to push themselves and their students to the limit.

While the vertical unit studio space is where the most competitive battles tend to take place, the wider play space of the architectural academy can be highly political and combative too, although arguably less so, in the horizontal design studio model or across other areas of the curriculum. Architecture educators can be and are notorious for being aggressively competitive within the academy, particularly insecure teaching staff who feel threatened. Many academics can be territorial of the subject of their research or teaching too. Beyond the factional divisions inside and between architectural design studios, ideological battles can be played out between architectural design, architectural history and theory, design science and technology, and management practice that can result in epistemological attacks and takeovers, that ostracise or marginalise less powerful staff. Additional anxiety and stress can also come from being unlike or personally incompatible with staff or students in the dominant power networks or 'master-pupil' chains.

In many western countries, the architectural academy consists of not one architectural tribe but many. Most architectural tribes were initiated by significant male architect-educators – Boyarsky's 'thoroughbreds' for example – who acculturate followers, in turn like and liked by them. Being able to be a copy or replica and obey a master (regardless of gender) or not is key to fitting into the social structure of any architecture school. Difference, lack of desire or inability to acculturate with the group can halter or prevent career progression and promotional pathways, diminish morale and can cause anxiety and depression.²⁸

Being able to be competitive or endurance the vertical unit system become key to success in architectural education. But working in a combative, 100% work manner is seen by some as problematic because it can build unhealthy workplace relations and discriminate against and exclude those students unable to display that work ethic. Roger K. Lewis explains that 'Many who start architectural school never finish. There are many reasons that people drop out, the work load and competition being among them'.²⁹ Others argue there are different consequences for different genders. According to Kathryn H. Anthony 'the competitive model of design education is very much a male model' because of its historical origins.³⁰ Before there was a concerted effort to

Commented [SB24]: Might be worth mentioning why they are most commonly uncritical – or not openly critical. Very often it is due to their need for work and the normalization of that necessary 'sacrifice'

Commented [SB25]: It is not clear at this point whether you are still referring to bought in casual staff alone (the previous sentence could well refer to permanent staff also). Please add a definition to clarify this.

balance gender in studio teaching staff, many male tutors and reviewers have used overt and covert strategies to assert their patriarchal knowledge dominance and power over students. And as Dörte Kuhlmann notes in *Gender Studies in Architecture*, architectural education can also create habits for women; she writes: '...It could be argued that while men think different than women, studying architecture necessarily leads women to masculine standards'.³¹ Some male and female students can naturally cope or be conditioned to cope with difficult, combative or confrontational discussions . Others, however, find the competitive vertical unit culture draining and become dissatisfied. Some students don't have the desire or energy to want to engage in sporting contest behaviour. As Anthony notes 'the athletic and military analogies that many design instructors routinely use in design studios can be a sore spot for women students [... as well as **men who are not naturally competitive**] and may offend some...' simply because they see that sporting activities help 'develop one's own ... abilities' and are not solely about bettering an opponent.³² The competitive nature of vertical unit design enacted most extremely in design juries or reviews, where students are made vulnerable through the need to defend their design position in public, can be disconcerting for shy or sensitive students who suffer from the 'emotional toll' which can in turn affect their confidence.³³ 'Competitive pressure is internal and external. Dedicated students push themselves, notwithstanding other influences, reacting to an internal need to achieve. With this comes pushing from external sources – faculty, fellow students, friends, and family – which can be relentless and unending. Some students thrive on such pressures; others feel substantial anxiety, which can affect their work'.³⁴ Managing emotional performance under stressful situations – for instance, whether a student cries or breaks down openly in front of their tutors or **peers** or not – involves negotiating traditional 'masculine standards' of behaviour directed towards rationality and objectivity.³⁵ According to Naomi Stead, design jury criticism that is flattering can be at odds with a historically embedded pedagogical practice of negative criticism in the studio because it can be seen to be less effective in producing robust architectural graduates ready to take on the most difficult challenges in the real world.³⁶

Many architectural design studios have operated or operate 'like [a] boot camp: twelve hours a day seven days a week in basic design ... [where students are] more or less being broken'.³⁷ Many design studio educators agree that the best students exhibit a singular focus on their individual production and are driven to do nothing but work; they meet deadlines and perform optimally under intense pressure; they are fully committed to a career in architecture and these attributes can make them highly employable. But the bodies of academic university workers have come under further time pressure due to the neoliberalisation of architectural education. Managing time in a long-work-hours culture requires the (re)conditioning of the academic body of architecture educators and students to manage 'the time squeeze'.³⁸

The work-time conundrum and neoliberal performance monitoring in architectural education

No matter where we are in real time the problem of 'the time squeeze' on the body of workers is increasing. In 'Labour, Work and the Time Squeeze', Guy Standing argues that our sense of time has dramatically changed because of the global market society in which we can work longer hours.³⁹ In an agrarian system of production, people worked according to seasonal rhythms and variable weather conditions. They would never have imagined working **an eight-hour day** because they needed to work around these natural times. But it was industrialisation that brought in 'time regimentation'.⁴⁰ In the late 1960's, E. P. Thompson eloquently chronicled in 'Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism' that 'the nascent proletariat was disciplined by the clock' and the calendar.⁴¹

Commented [SB27]: Please add your first reference to Standing here.

Commented [SB28]: Please check and clarify where the quotation ends/begins/is interrupted. According to the MHRA style we ask for single quotation marks and the use of double quotation marks for a quote-within-a-quote

Commented [SB29]: Can you please add a specific page number for this reference?

Two changes to time management occurred from the shift from an agrarian to an industrial life and a global free market system.

The first

was the abandoning of the demands of the 24-hour body clock after international time zones were created.⁴²

Standing astutely notes that the global economy 'has no respect for human physiology'.⁴³

This is because the global marketplace functions much like a machine that has no rest, running on a 24/7 clock, which when countries have daylight or night time.

Overall, neoliberal, free-market economies seek

to eliminate any distractions that create 'barriers to trading' and which are counter to 'the totem of the age, competitiveness, and contrary to the dictate of flexibility'.⁴⁴ For this reason, global capitalism (including academia) values the person that can sleep less and work more in continuum, ideally with greater productivity.

According to Standing, the second change emerged in industrial society and is how time became divided into blocks of work time for specific tasks.⁴⁵ Under industrial labour laws, workers rose in the morning, worked ten to twelve-hour days in factories, mines, shipyards etc. under no or very loose contractual arrangements, and then went home. They were given holidays (originally holy days to celebrate special religious days, later becoming special days to rest or relax from work), where rest was taken in blocks. As Standing remarks, 'work, labour and play were distinct activities, in terms of when they were undertaken and where the boundaries of each began and ended'.⁴⁶ In contrast, neoliberalism asks for increased flexibility and productivity, which demands that work be enacted 'in continuum everywhere'.⁴⁷ 'Hours at work' no longer align with 'hours of work'.⁴⁸

With the advent and rise of working online that has accentuated post-pandemic, universities are increasingly conditioning their students and staff to work in optimally fluid and flexible ways for greater output. No longer is the academic worker's home for domestic activities and rest away from work or the university or office only for academic work. Using digital machine technologies (mobile phones, computers etc.), academic labour under neoliberalism occurs over longer working hours, sometimes across international time zones, so that, as Arlie Russell Hochschild notes, 'work becomes home and home becomes work'.⁴⁹

A 24/7 globally oriented work culture in architectural education is enacted at home, work and everywhere in two ways. The first is by conditioning the body to an intensive work ethic, demanding more and more of the body and mind of the architectural student or educator, and the second, by employing digital machine technologies and auditing to enhance and facilitate more efficient productivity thereby conditioning the academic worker into compliance.

In *Discipline & Punish*, Foucault distinguishes between the docile body and the manipulated body.⁵⁰ Foucault argues that 'A body is docile that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved' and it is through the exertion of disciplinary power on the docile body (here reference is made to the body of the architecture worker at university) that it suffers through being disciplined and punished.⁵¹ In the architectural academia, the body of the student or staff worker is the vessel in which capital is contained. As such, it is disciplined, moulded and monitored to determine and improve its level of performance. As Foucault notes, under our current economic system 'the two processes – the accumulation of men and the accumulation of capital – cannot be separated'; they are co-existent.⁵² In this sense the body of the worker is the vessel in which capital accumulates. Carl Cederström and Peter Fleming go further arguing in *Dead Man Working* that:

The traditional line-in-the-sand between capital and labor [*sic*] no longer makes sense to anyone. Today, the real struggle is between capital and *life* (bios), although the struggle is not played out under especially unfair rules, given that we can hardly

tell what life is anymore. We should consider here what Foucault and his followers called bio-power. If work was once primarily regulated by bureaucracy through depersonalization then today we witness the emergence of a new regime of control which we call *biocracy*, in which life itself is an essential 'human resource' to be exploited.⁵³

Neoliberalism conditions and exploits the body of the architectural worker throughout their life and differently than when working under industrial capitalism. While Harvey argues that; 'Capital circulates ... through the body of the laborer [sic] as variable capital and thereby turns the laborer [sic] into a mere appendage of the circulation of capital itself', neoliberalism goes further than capitalism to lead the worker into thinking they are freely choosing, and are in control of, how their body is used for capital production.⁵⁴

The way in which the body of a worker has been conditioned to work under neoliberalism is deeply linked to global 24/7 production. In *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*, Jonathan Crary claims that in regards to work a 24/7 work life 'renders plausible, even normal, the idea of working without pause, without limits. It is aligned with what is inanimate, inert, or unaging'.⁵⁵ The machine-like academic worker whose body is economised, rationalised and flexible, is most valued. The situation is different for the worker who is compromised by commitments other than architectural work. It is more difficult to discipline them and for them to manage their own work life balance.

If the architectural student or educator has family or care responsibilities, their time can be hurried and their bodies are demanded more of, than the *architect homo oeconomicus* who is 'family-free.' Increasing demands on work time can create negative stresses and tension in home and family life. The architecture student and educator who has care commitments outside their work are hurried and stretched in their university or 'anywhere' workplace and can hurry those for whom they care. Time management is less compromised if the architect worker is conditioned to be a more flexible worker who is shaped around work-centred goals and priorities rather than non-work centred ones. What architectural education can do is create a space in which time is less valued and not always managed.

The **time devoted to** design in architectural education typically occupies **50%** of a student's **curriculum** work time

. In contrast, in professional practice, only a small fraction of time, sometimes only 5%, is spent on the design of a project, leading Reiner de Graaf to note that 'where other professions operate on a basis of maximising financial return while minimizing labor [sic], architecture is predicated on the reverse'.⁵⁶ The fact that architecture education **as a course also** takes so long, often compromising the time for other activities outside it, continues to perplex many non-architects who often ask 'isn't architecture just four walls and roof'?⁵⁷

Architecture degrees require the learning of a vast array of knowledge in construction, regulation and law, but also a mental and physical conditioning. Most architecture courses advocate the learning of a new way of life, which teaches the lesson, to quote Rochelle Martin, to 'give great importance to the satisfactions derived from professional life and [denigrate] those derived from personal life',⁵⁸ unless the two are intertwined. The creatively fulfilling, long work hours culture and building of a strong work ethic that prioritises architectural design studio labour above any other daily life activities has and remains the hallmark of academic excellence, with many famous architects pushing their bodies to the limit. The total commitment to architecture by some of the most famous architects in the world has meant they have suffered physically from short to prolonged work-related sickness as well as death.⁵⁹

It is problematic that over-working is deemed by select notable architects to be invigorating.

Commented [SB32]: This section needs some clarification. The emphasis on the reduction of actual time dedicated to design resolution does not clearly reflect the idea that the architectural profession maximises labour. Is the insinuation here that the 5% refers to the allocation of billed hours rather than real time required for the design work to be carried out, thus reflecting the mis-calculation of actual workloads in practice?

For instance, when discussing OMA's frenetic production of architectural proposals for China in the 1990s, Koolhaas delights in the excesses of work and argues that having the time pressure to produce vast projects like the design of a whole city in two weeks should be approached 'by architects 'with vigour'.⁶⁰ This culture of gaining pleasure from the pain of being pushed to the limits, is tied to the nurturing of what Stead describes as the 'curious masochism', founded in architectural criticism in education.⁶¹ An always at work culture, in which the academic body is subjected to intense work time pressure, is enculturated in architectural education in two steps. The first step occurs in the first year as a conditioning to the 'work load shock'. The second is losing perception of work hour boundaries that can continue throughout later life, with varying consequences.

In *Architect? A Candid Guide to the Profession*, Roger Lewis discusses the experience of an architecture education focusing in particular on the first year of study.⁶² Lewis analyses the effect of 'the work load shock' that typically occurs in this stage and notes the emergence of Stead's 'curious masochism' in architectural criticism in education.⁶³ Lewis explains: [t]he work load shock, like any assault on the mind and body, produces both positive and negative responses. Negatively, it is tiring, enervating, and numbing. Much of the studio work is labor [sic] intensive rather than intellect intensive. ... If you can tolerate it all, it will toughen you.⁶⁴ As a result, Lewis recommends that the best approach to the First Year workload in an architectural education is to adopt 'a positive, have fun, on-to-victory one'.⁶⁵

Commented [SB33]: Please add reference including page number

Essential to coping with the 'work load shock' is time management, although the time required to complete the blocks of work in and for architectural education can be difficult to manage when the work that needs to be done cannot be completed during a nine-to-five hour or 24-hour work day.⁶⁶ The vast amount of mostly manual work a First Year architecture student undertakes conditions them to a life without clear work-hour limits and can nurture the necessity to stay at work in the studio or on their computer to meet demanding deadlines. This nurturing of a never-leave-work mentality can lead to architecture students either living (literally including sleeping) in the (physical) studio or devoting all their waking hours to studio work wherever they are.

The all-nighter – a feature of most architectural education – is symbolic in that it shows a competitive spirit and a commitment to a life devoted fully to work.⁶⁷ The systemic long-work-hours architecture school culture that starts in First Year means a student has, in the past, found 'little sympathy' among staff to 'air complaints about the amount of work [... being asked to do], the overlapping deadlines and exams, the pressures, and the state of [a student's] mental and physical health'.⁶⁸ In some of the 'best or better' architecture schools, for staff who create over-work for themselves, their work-life patterns can also have a knock-on effect on their students.

The irony is that while neoliberal architecture schools focus on nurturing competitive spirit that is only ever considered 'healthy' because sustenance and endurance are regarded as essential for an optimal entrepreneurial life after university, by doing so they can also nurture an unhealthy work culture for educators and students. While staff workloads are managed through quantifiable Workload Allocation Models (WAM), student performance is measured through an audit culture that offers perpetual performance monitoring.

The bodies of students and academics in architectural education are controlled and monitored through tiers of management with differing levels of hierarchical power within a university. Running a university as a business led by levels of management is broadly structured around the premise of students being accountable to educators, educators to school managers, school managers to upper university management, upper university managers to their board of governors. According to Gina Anderson this approach relies on 'a focus on

efficiency and effectiveness (... of time and space), on quality assurance, accountability, and cost-savings', all of which are implemented by management through a heightening of a deeply embedded and dominating audit culture.⁶⁹

Commented [SB38]: Is this your addition or from the original text? If it is the former please use square brackets [...]

Beginning in the 1990s, the phrase 'audit culture' is defined by Peter M. Taubman as describing 'the increasing use of regulatory mechanisms, designed to monitor and measure performance, in fields other than accounting, insurance, and finance, where the mechanisms originated'.⁷⁰ Most university audit cultures rely heavily on the increasing administration of assessing performance criteria for all workers within a university. The audit culture in a university is accompanied by new values and language, such as *performance management, quality assurance, accountability, transparency, efficiency, best practices, stakeholders, benchmarking, research outputs* etc., and a long and growing list of acronyms. An audit culture employs new digital technologies and software to collect data, which is used to discipline, track and monitor productivity within the university at all levels.

The university's administration-heavy methods of audit assessment have followed neoliberal, qualitative, checking systems used in manufacturing, so much so that Mike Laurence argues that 'the university, like the hospital or the prison, can be understood as an apparatus of perpetual examination'.⁷¹ Audit culture in the university quantifies each and every aspect of university production on a performance-based system of delivery. All university staff are assessed through Performance Development Reviews (PDRs) while research, books and journal articles – inclusively termed 'research outputs' or 'deliverables' – are rigorously counted and ranked on their value to make economic return for the university. Every academic staff member and their outputs in the university is diligently counted and ranked using systems of assessment (including REF (Research Excellence Framework), TEF (Teaching Excellence Framework), and KEF (Knowledge Excellence Framework). UK programmes are further judged through the NSS (National Student Survey), which contributes to University League Table rankings. In architecture programmes, in particular, periodic reviews and regular monitoring and regulation by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and Architects Registration Board (ARB) ensure that architectural education meets the performance standards of external accreditation. Gender and equality standards are assessed through Athena Swan awards. All in all, the systems of monitoring, counting and controlling an architectural educator's outputs are vast in number. As a consequence, the academic's time becomes increasingly devoted to and consumed by 'administrivia' or the production of 'outline paperwork and other administrative tasks that are regarded as trivial, uninteresting, and time-consuming'.⁷² While not deemed necessary not so long ago, the university audit culture is now considered vital for quality assurance of architectural education.

Commented [SB39]: Does this refer to specific periodic reviews – in other words, does it need to be capitalized?

Commented [SB40]: Clarity – 'While, relatively, recently established, the... in by now...?'

For students, the audit culture of architectural education, pre-pandemic involved the completion and production of work assessed through assessment forms or pro-formas, with university attendance recorded through sign-up sheets or the scanning of student cards. Post-pandemic, the participatory engagement in online teaching platforms mostly happens through the data collection carried out on digital platforms such as S4, through which students are taught and submit work. Laurence contends that a process of standardisation or normalisation occurs in order to acculturate students into disciplinary norms:

The student is constantly evaluated, graded, measured, created. The abnormal is marginalized, rejected and excluded. The human sciences develop and the university introduces the student to a world where everything can be measured, including their imaginations.⁷³

The consequence of this growing culture of auditing is that it increases workloads and also conditions younger staff and students into becoming what Wendy Brown describes as a

'neoliberal subject'; unable to (have the time to) think or question because they are overwhelmed by work.⁷⁴ Architecture students, conditioned only to achieve the best grade results, can be negatively impacted in regards to their identity formation causing them to suffer stress from underachieving or not be able to cope. Ironically, audit cultures also exist within the university to assess how many students (less so staff) are suffering in terms of their wellbeing in architecture, from a system which itself can create the feelings of anxiety and unhappiness in the first place. Student wellbeing is managed through university student wellbeing services and for staff there is an audit culture that supports improving occupational health.

In a culture of neoliberalism, in which student consumer satisfaction is one of the key markers used to sell university programmes, the NSS relies on students recognising they are well supported in their academic and personal wellbeing. But NSS systems of assessment can potentially be shaped through staff in powerful positions inviting a selection of satisfied neoliberal subjects to engage in the survey, excluding those that might be seen to offer negative commentary. There are many rumours about how power is exerted by staff in the process of examining architecture programmes too. Timing NSS sessions to coincide with points of the teaching year when students are known to be more satisfied, may be seen to skew data.

Commented [SB42]: Unless there is some evidence to ground this claim more specifically

While the purpose of an audit culture in architecture schools is to ensure parity and fairness, assessment processes can still operate inside and outside set standards. There remain persistent examples in which a student's design studio performance – more so than other modules and generally carrying greater weighting – is impacted by conscious or unconscious bias. Covert techniques and political positioning, used by staff in higher positions of management or greater power, can influence and alter agreed student grades while still appearing to comply with assessment criteria. Particularly in design, module leaders and studio tutors can correctly administer the required marking procedures of using cross-studio moderation and external examiner moderation but can then add another additional tier of assessment that gives a higher-level manager unlimited decision-making power to change agreed marks. In this way, the assessment paperwork produced does not record the way in which marks were shaped outside agreed rules of studio peer-review. The situation can be stacked against architecture educators too.

Studio managers can conceal through an anonymised audit culture the poor performance of select staff and protect them from student assessment and criticism. For instance, reviews of studio teaching can be obscured so that the performance and delivery of select studio staff that is condemnatory can be camouflaged by bundling all online studio feedback together so that complaints and compliments cannot be attributed to any particular named studio staff member. Then, there is the fact that there is no audit culture to ensure that staff work fairly with one another, particularly if Human Resources within a university are not impartial and, instead, concede to the power exerted by higher levels of management. Copying studio ideas or practices, bullying by some staff against others can continue undetected by the university's audit radar. Deliberately blocking career progression to positions of greater power or prestige has been endemic in some architecture schools. Unless a teaching staff member or student is like (and liked) or acquiesces to the more dominant pedagogical power-network i.e. in an inner 'favoured circle',⁷⁵ they can suffer emotional, mental and sometimes physical decline leading to lost energy, exhaustion, burnout, ultimately quitting and leaving.

The elephant in the room: Neoliberal architectural education might not be such a nurturing place

In 1993, Jennifer Bloomer published a two-page article on how 'the spaces of institutions and the soft, chummy violence that circulates within them' operate to 'silence'.⁷⁶ Bloomer

argues that critics in architecture should make public 'the tiniest, nearly invisible, interstitial moments' where institutional violence is permitted to occur and is widely known to happen but never taken issue with.⁷⁷ This essay has sought to make explicit 'the elephant in the room' of neoliberal architectural education, namely that the vertical unit system that nurtures a culture of competition and overwork, exploits human resources and acculturates an unhealthy work life balance that is carried on from generation to generation.

Commented [SB43]: I think this should be expanded to refer to 'the culture of competition and overwork originated in the vertical unit system...' as you have clearly shown that these phenomena by expand way beyond it.

Architecture education has since the 17th century acculturated a long-hour *en charrette* work culture, which has been heightened in the neoliberal university. The university as 'a protected space for unhurried scholarly contemplation' is vanishing.⁷⁸ Neoliberal schools of architecture in the UK increasingly advocate a 24/7 culture of work, although some are beginning to challenge this. A problematic space of architectural pedagogy comes about because of 'the time squeeze'; a devaluing of time in relation to the working body of an architecture academic, which can be exploited and exhausted, but is conditioned and made compliant to not question. In their first year of architecture studies, students are conditioned to accept and adapt to the First Year 'work load shock'. The neoliberal vertical studio structure, introduced to the UK by the AA, which has since been adopted worldwide through lineages of educator proponents, can delude students into thinking that they are free to choose their own career path, instead, conditioning and nurturing a combative competitive work culture based on the survival of the fittest. While some might argue that architectural education is not the sole site whereby unhealthy work habits in the profession are developed, unhealthy attitudes towards the competitive architectural culture that can be acculturated at university means the sentiment can remain post-university.

The application of audit cultures into a university, only serves to increase the work loads of staff and students which create additional pressures that damage wellbeing. The onslaught of managerialism in neoliberal universities paradoxically asks for more and in so doing exploits its human resources more rapidly. As education factories for the mass production of architecture students and educators, architecture schools in the UK are suffering strain from operating in a neoliberal competitive space of liquidity, which can, arguably lead more easily to varying degrees of disillusionment, dissatisfaction, exhaustion, fatigue, stress and burnout. The rise of a burnout culture in physical and mental wellbeing, in the architectural academy pre-pandemic, is linked to the consumption and exhaustion of the labour workforce as a resource and so it is essential to rethink the hours of work in the future in order to allow academic bodies to rest.

The pandemic has forced us to change our work patterns in the university, for better or worse. It obliges architectural educators to rethink the model of architectural education that was already contributing to damaging the wellbeing of some university workers. By acknowledging issues that are creating unhealthy workplace imbalances in UK architecture schools that have arisen from the neoliberalisation of the HE sector, this essay provides the platform to address how design studio can create a nurturing culture.

If we are to reinvigorate architecture as a profession post-pandemic, we need to dramatically redesign architectural education to be less greedy and consumptive. Architectural education should not create unreasonable workloads and demands, or delude people into replicating unhealthy modes of work but, instead, teach students and staff how to manage their time, say no, and ask less of all academic workers. It needs dramatically reduce and diminish the culture of quantitative measuring and counting that ignores the need to nurture in architectural education. Revising the vertical unit system so that there are both student-choice and collaborative studio projects during any one design studio period challenges an individual ego culture for more balanced teamwork. Challenging the trend toward the casualisation of architectural design tutors to halt the steady rise of their exploitation as a precariat architectural working class is

Commented [SB44]: Please break into two sentences for more clarity and emphasis on your propositions

another recommended area of change. Lastly, revising the quantitatively biased performance review structure that audits educators and students is vital for the regeneration of mind and body to maintain a work-life balance.

The future health and wellbeing of architecture students and educators is paramount. Energy needs to go into creating balanced and healthy work patterns, rather than replicating old bad habits. The first step for doing that is to recognise the 'elephant in the room', that neoliberal architecture education is not a nurturing place. The second is to value the importance of time away from architectural education so as to create new patterns and expectations of labour in architectural education and greater equity for people of different gender, race, ethnicity and class.

Commented [SB45]: Unclear what the equal parts are – please clarify

¹ This article focuses on the examination of architectural education in countries that operate under neoliberalism. The inadequacies of neoliberal architectural education are beginning to be challenged and new models are being sought in countries beyond those listed. Leslie Lokko's initiative to start up the African Futures Institute (AFI), an architectural school she is founding in Accra, Ghana aims to challenge contemporary models of neoliberal architectural education that are exclusionary, discriminatory and racist. The opportunities for new models of architectural education are emerging outside a Euro-centric framework.

² Bob Jessop, Liberalism, 'Neoliberalism and Urban Governance: A State-Theoretical Perspective', in N. Brenner and N. Theodore (Eds), *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 105-125; Jamie Peck, Geography and Public Policy: Constructions of Neoliberalism, *Progress in Human Geography*, 28.3 (2004), 392–405; Janet Newman, *Working the Spaces of Power: Activism, Neoliberalism and Gendered Labour* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012), p. 157.

³ David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 2.

⁴ David Harvey, 'Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, NAFTA and Beyond: Alternative Perspectives in the Study of Global Trade and Development, 610, 22-44 (p. 23).

⁵ Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1997).

⁶ Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1997).

⁷ Ansgar Allen, (2011) 'The Idea of a World University: Can Foucauldian Research Offer a Vision of Educational Futures?' *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 19. 3 (2011) 367-383, (p. 390)

⁸ The phrase 'the elephant in the room' was arguably first used in Ivan Krylov's 1814 fable, 'The Inquisitive Man' in which a curious man visits a museum and while noticing a range of small exhibits fails to see a large elephant in it. Based on the idea that something large, conspicuous or obvious to everyone can be overlooked, 'the elephant in the room' has come to mean not being able to see or the repressing of codified social interactions. It was extended by scientists like George Berkeley and philosophers later in the 19th century and early 20th century into the question of the reality or not of the existence of the elephant; its visibility or invisibility depending on in-person experience. Refer to Ivan A. Krylov, *The Fables of Ivan Krylov* (Sawtry: Dedalus, 2017).

⁹ Donald A. Schön, *The Design Studio: an exploration of its traditions and potentials* (London: RIBA Publications, 1986).

¹⁰ Refer Kathryn H. Anthony, *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991); Helena Webster, 'The Architectural Review: A study of ritual, acculturation and reproduction in architectural education', *Arts and*

Humanities in Higher Education, 4.3 (October 2005), 265-282; Helena Webster, 'The Analytics of Power: Re-presenting the Design Jury', *Journal of Architectural Education*, 60.3 (1984), pp.21-27; Christine McCarthy, *Redesigning the Design Crit (Report)* (June 2011); Charles Doidge, Rachel Sara and Rosie Parnell, *The Crit: An Architecture Student's Handbook* (London: Routledge, 2006).

¹¹ Refer Garry Stevens, *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1998); Igea Troiani, 'Gender, Architectural Education, and the Accruing of Capital', in *A Gendered Profession: A Question of Representation in Space Making*, edited by James Benedict Brown, Harriet Harriss, Ruth Morrow and James Soane (London: RIBA Publishing, 2016), pp. 220-232.

¹² Refer to Igea Troiani, 'Academic Capitalism in Architecture Schools: A feminist critique of employability, 24/7 work and entrepreneurship', in *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, edited by Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, Helen Runting (London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 170-180. Pier-Vittorio Aureli's factory for mass education is referenced in note no. 9.

¹³ Alexander Griffin, *The Rise of Academic Architectural Education: The Origins and Enduring influence of the Académie d'Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2019).

¹⁴ [Alexander Griffin, *The Rise of Academic Architectural Education: The Origins and Enduring influence of the Académie d'Architecture* \(London: Routledge, 2019\).](#)

¹⁵ These changes, which removed government money for public universities at the time, were complimented by the introduction of full tuition fees for international students in 1981. This opened up the UK H.E. marketplace to foreign investment both financially and ideologically. Refer Jack Grove, Thatcher had 'immense impact' on higher education, *Times Higher Education* (April 8, 2013); <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/thatcher-had-immense-impact-on-higher-education/2003059.article> [Accessed May 31, 2021]

¹⁶ James Barnes M.S., 'A Case for the Vertical Studio', *Journal of Interior Design*, 19.1 (May 1993), 34-38. Quotation is from the abstract.

¹⁷ Irene Sunwoo, 'From the 'Well-Laid Table' to the 'Market Place': The Architectural Association Unit System', *Journal of Architectural Education*, 65.2 (2012), 24-41.

¹⁸ Peter Cook, *Alvin Boyarsky (1928-1990)*, *The Architectural Review* (September 28, 2012) <<https://www.architectural-review.com/essays/reputations/alvin-boyarsky-1928-1990>> [Accessed 31 May, 2021]

¹⁹ Sunwoo.

²⁰ Michael Walsche, 'Alvin's staff meeting', *AA Newsheet* 2, 10 (March 1973).

²¹ Boyarsky quoted in Sunwoo, p.49.

²² Robin Evans quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

²⁴ Cook.

²⁵ Thatcher, p. 566.

²⁶ Reyner Banham, 'A Black Box: The Secret Profession of Architecture', in *Reyner Banham, A Critic Writes: Essays by Reyner Banham*, edited by Reyner Banham (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1996), pp. 292-299.

²⁷ This precariat class of architectural educators have arguably emerged from the increase in PhD candidates being taken in and graduating from architecture schools who cannot find full-time teaching contracts after completing their PhD.

²⁸ Nedim Karakayali, 'The Uses of the Stranger: Circulation, Arbitration, Secrecy, and Dirt', *Sociological Theory*, 24.4 (2006), 312-330.

²⁹ Roger K. Lewis, *Architect? A Candid Guide to the Profession* (Revised Edition) (Cambridge, Mass.; London, England: The MIT Press, 1998), p. 73.

³⁰ Anthony, p. 165.

-
- ³¹ Dörte Kuhlmann, *Gender Studies in Architecture: Space, Power, Difference* (London: Routledge, 2013), 43-44.
- ³² Anthony, , p. 165.
- ³³ Ibid., p. 165.
- ³⁴ Lewis p. 74.
- ³⁵ Kuhlmann, pp. 43-44.
- ³⁶ Naomi Stead, 'Three Complaints about Architectural Criticism', *Architectural Australia* 92(6) (2003), 50-52.
- ³⁷ Steven Izenour quoted in Anthony, p. 15.
- ³⁸ [Guy Standing, *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class* \(London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016\), pp. 135-154.](#)
- ³⁹ Guy Standing, *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016), pp. 135-154.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 135.
- ⁴¹ E. P. Thompson, 'Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism', *Past & Present*, 38 (Dec. 1967), 56-97.
- ⁴² Standing, *The Precariat*, p. 135.
- ⁴³ Ibid, p. 136.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 136.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 136.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 136.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 138.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 152.
- ⁴⁹ Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997).
- ⁵⁰ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995), p. 136.
- ⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁵² Ibid., p. 221.
- ⁵³ Carl Cederström, and Peter Fleming, *Dead Man Working* (Alresford: John Hunt Publishing, 2012), p. 14.
- ⁵⁴ David Harvey, *The Limits to Capital* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), p. 157.
- ⁵⁵ Jonathan Crary, *24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep* (London and New York: Verso, 2014), p. 9-10.
- ⁵⁶ Reinier de Graaf, *Four Walls and a Roof: The Complex Nature of a Simple Profession* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press, 2017), p. 81.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 15.
- ⁵⁸ Rochelle Martin, 'Out of Marginality: Toward a New Kind of Professional', in *Architecture: A Place for Women*, edited by Ellen Perry Berkeley and assoc. editor, Matilda McQuaid (Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), pp. 229-236 (p. 232).
- ⁵⁹ Take for example, the cases of Rem Koolhaas and Zaha Hadid. Refer to Igea Troiani, 'Zaha Hadid's Penthouse: Gender, Creativity, and "Biopolitics" in the Neoliberal Workplace', in *The Routledge Companion to Modernity, Space and Gender*, ed. by Alexandra Staub (New York and London: Routledge, 2018), pp. 131-149 (pp. 142-143).
- ⁶⁰ Rem Koolhaas, quoted in Graham Owen ed. *Architecture, Ethics and Globalization* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 1: 'It seems clear that somehow [sic] we [architects] should be able, when given the impossibly difficult problem of designing in two weeks a city for three million people, to respond with vigor [sic] and skill.'
- ⁶¹ Stead, p. 50.
- ⁶² Lewis, p. 61.
- ⁶³ Stead, p. 50.
- ⁶⁴ [Stead, p. 50.](#)

⁶⁵ Lewis, p. 62.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 62.

⁶⁷ The 'all-nighter' is made possible and is normalised in architectural education because many neoliberal schools of architecture provide 24-hour access to studios and computer facilities.

⁶⁸ Lewis, p. 63.

⁶⁹ Gina Anderson, 'Carving Out Time and Space in the Managerial University', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19.5 (2006), 578-592 (579).

⁷⁰ Peter M. Taubman, 'Audit Culture', in *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*, edited by Craig Kridel (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2010), pp. 60-61.

⁷¹ Mike Laurence, 'Reconstituting the Political: Foucault and the Modern University'. Paper presented at eh annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Ontario, Canada (September, 2009).

⁷² Refer to <<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/administrivia>> [Accessed 31 May, 2021]

⁷³ Laurence.

⁷⁴ Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (New York: Zone Books, 2015), p. 29.

⁷⁵ [Garry Stevens, *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction* \(Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The MIT Press, 1998\).](#)

⁷⁶ Jennifer Bloomer, 'Not Now', *Assemblage*, 20 (Apr., 1993), 18-19.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

⁷⁸ Anderson, p. 578.