University Library

A gateway to Melbourne's research publications

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:
Thompson, J

Title:
Promoting Occupational Engagement in Design Education: Accounting for doing, being, becoming, and belonging

Date:
2017

Citation:
Thompson, J. (2017). Promoting Occupational Engagement in Design Education: Accounting for doing, being, becoming, and belonging. Begin W/ Why: Ethics and Values in Beginning Design, pp.435-442. University of Utah College of Architecture and Planning.

Persistent Link:
https://hdl.handle.net/11343/281061

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE BEGINNING DESIGN STUDENT

33

BEGIN W/ WHY:
ETHICS AND VALUES IN BEGINNING DESIGN

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH | COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE + PLANNING
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 10-11, 2017

Promoting Occupational Engagement in Design Education: Accounting for Doing, Being, Becoming, and Belonging

James Thompson, University of Washington

Introduction

Conceptualizing education as a meaning-making process serves to reorient teaching, learning, and research activities around notions of personal and professional development in more holistic and humanistic ways than conventional approaches. Instead of "receiving an education," students get recognized as enacting a form of agency by engaging in self-growth while they weave educational experiences into broader personal narratives. Such a perspective is genuinely student-centered in that it more accurately captures the ways that education gets experienced as a progression of embodied, social, and psychological encounters. By considering how learners experience education as a process of ontological change over time, these significant dimensions—often neglected or considered secondary by conventional pedagogical practices—become foregrounded. Only when, as educators and researchers, we elicit and attend to such narratives, do learners become true protagonists of education. Whereas this understanding of education is supported by decades of research across disciplines and learning contexts, it has so far not been operationalized widely in applied research on design education.

The project reviewed in this paper, a recently completed case study of a graduate architecture program, imported and adapted the notion of "occupational engagement" from the field of occupational therapy as a way to capture the multidimensional nature of education as a holistic meaning-making process. Occupational engagement has been recognized as the interplay of *doing, being, becoming*, and *belonging*. Analysis of narrative content from in-depth interviews suggested that meaning-making occurred when all four dimensions of occupational engagement were expressed as an interrelated whole. Additionally, agency, autonomy, and psychological resilience were identified as themes centrally tied to narrative strategies these aspiring architects used to align their personal and occupational identities. Ultimately, reframing design education as falling within each participant's broader life history elicited a considerably holistic perspective of becoming-an-architect by including human facets rarely considered in scholarship on design education. The expectation is that these insights can begin to inform educators and researchers seeking to reframe and improve delivery modes and outcomes of design education starting at the beginning of the curriculum.

Literature Review

Past studies on architectural education exposed certain integral characteristics that often go unnoticed but are perpetuated nonetheless through its particular cultural and pedagogical practices. Dutton described how architecture's "hidden curriculum" tacitly plays out through the power-laden social dynamics of the studio, revealing the inescapably political nature of curricular and pedagogical practices.[1] Willenbrock's autoethnographic account of being an architecture student conveyed how student agency is a central aspect of design education despite being overlooked in most scholarship.[2] Surveys with architecture students over the years have illuminated the pernicious myths that continue to frame expectations and the experience of studio culture.[3] And Bachman and Bachman theorized how architecture students psychologically justify their efforts and unhealthy lifestyles.[4] Finally, in her seminal text on architectural practice outlining the "metamorphic transformation of layperson into architect," Cuff presented the field as a set of dualisms that get manifested by its members who, in their daily performance as practitioners, "tacitly cope" with the "fundamental discrepancy between the stated beliefs of the profession and the everyday work world of architectural practice."[5] This body of literature remains central to our theoretical understanding of architectural education as a complex social process of cultural reproduction. However, very

few empirical studies have examined this theme from the perspective of aspiring architects themselves—and fewer still have done so across the school-to-workplace divide as the study reviewed here did.

In addition to past research on design education, the theoretical basis for this study was drawn from three primary strains of scholarship: the ontological turn, the narrative turn, and an occupational perspective on health. The two "turns" served as theoretical frameworks, whereas the latter strain of scholarship was employed as an analytical lens for interpreting the study's narrative results.Together, these offered a set of complementary concepts that supported a holistic orientation toward education and suggested particular methodological approaches to the study.

The recent ontological turn proposes that higher education ought to be positioned in such a way as to promote human character development, as opposed to focusing so heavily on cognitive or skill development.[6] The central claim is that focusing on teaching and learning alone or in a limited way blinds educators to the more holistic dimensions and objectives of education that reflect the kind of ontological growth necessary for thriving in the contemporary context. Thus, the ultimate recommendation is to reframe teaching and learning practices in ways that cultivate graduates with the kinds of attributes that prepare them for a world where one's character is more predictive of success than the acquisition of particular skills or knowledge.

Traditionally, design education has been scaffolded primarily around a certain base of knowledge and skills as foundational learning outcomes. To incorporate an ontological perspective, the task would be to structure formative learning experiences in ways that cultivate dispositions in graduates identified as central to contemporary practice: to become professionals who can sustain their empathy, curiosity, humility, and passion amidst an environment of radical complexity and uncertainty. The fact that such a perspective has yet to gain wide acceptance in design circles is arguably not because of any cultural incompatibility. However, identifying and encouraging meaning-making requires a broader and more holistic scope than typically employed in research in design education. Thus, new methodological and analytical approaches are necessary to apply such an understanding.

This study also borrows from scholarship on narrative that considers the telling of life histories as an identity performance and meaning-making strategy.[7] Narrative is understood as a way that individuals make sense of themselves—as both relatively fixed and relatively mutable—in relation to their day-to-day life and social context by assembling into a coherent whole reflections on themselves, their experiences, their and visions of the future. This performative and sense-making notion of storytelling has a longstanding tradition within the field of architecture, with some scholars even arguing that architecture and narrative are analogous modes.[8] Drawing upon certain perspectives and concepts from the narrative turn became a way to operationalize this disciplinary tradition for the particular aims of this empirical study.

From the field of occupational therapy (OT), the "occupational perspective on health" offered an additional, adaptable framework for conceptualizing architectural education in more holistic terms than conventional approaches.[9] For occupational therapists, the term "occupation" does not refer merely to one's job title or career path. Rather, it implies how one's everyday activities and commitments inform one's holistic sense of self, and vice versa. In the ways that it encapsulates daily educational activity (doing), personal identity (being), a sense of belonging to the design community (belonging), and the perceived potential for personal and professional growth (becoming), professional design education can be understood as functioning as an occupation in this sense. When OT scholars use the term "occupational engagement," they are referring to the interrelated nature of all four of these dimensions: "Engaging in occupation requires that we perform activities and occupations (*doing*) that meet the needs of both ourselves (*being*) and others (*belonging*), that we can learn from and build upon through time (*becoming*)."[10] Considering the interdependent dimensions of *doing, being, becoming*, and *belonging* therefore becomes a way to structure design education as a holistic pursuit with ontological implications. Likewise, narrative offers a way of foregrounding the ways that individual learners make sense of this process by relating the four dimensions of occupation into their personal life histories. In this study, the following definitions were developed from interview content to suit architecture's disciplinary and pedagogical context.

> ***Doing*** included active engagement in meaningful educational activities, from the singular to the recurring. In this study, *doing* most commonly referred to the broad set of mental, social, and physical activities related to design, whether in an academic studio or a professional office environment. It also covered activities associated with the rest of the curriculum—such as researching a topic for a paper—as well as extracurricular or quotidian activities—

such as going to happy hour or commuting to campus. In an office context, *doing* also included tasks not directly contributing to design projects.

Being referred to notions of social and occupational identity, or who someone "is" under various roles like student, intern, or licensed architect. It also covered identity traits associated with factors like gender, race, and sexual orientation, as well as casual references made like "I'm someone who likes to draw." Personal interests, insofar as they form part of one's identity, therefore link *being* and *doing.* And just as *doing* includes "what architects do," *being* also includes general statements about "what it means to *be* an architect" or the predominant personality traits, interests, and backgrounds that participants felt were embodied by the architectural community writ large.

The dimension ***becoming*** denoted aspects of human growth and development, or the more mutable nature of identity. It included reflections on the past ("I became a different person") as well as aspirational futures ("I want to become self-sufficient"). In either case, *becoming* related at least two points in time and expressed a shift from one state of being to another. *Becoming* was also evoked in provisional, conditional, and unknowable aspects of the future, in statements like "Someday, I think I'll want to…" or "I can't predict the next few years…." In such statements, participants expressed a certain orientation toward the future and their place in it (i.e., as optimistic, skeptical, or apathetic). In this sense, the notion of *becoming* was very much tied to agency, as it evoked how individuals felt more or less able to author their growth and determine their future selves.

Belonging referred to the relative sense of connectedness one felt at various scales of community. Intimately tied to one's social and environmental context, *belonging* was not simply a description of that context. Rather, one's social context was evoked through reference to sensations and relationships that marked entrance into communities (acknowledged or otherwise) and passing from one community to another. Statements of *belonging* frequently evoked feelings of relative acceptance or ostracization. It also took on a more active dimension, when participants described forming sub-communities. In this way, *belonging* can illuminate thresholds, access, and barriers to membership in the communities encountered throughout an individual's life history.

Methods

Adopting transdisciplinary concepts and approaches, the study was designed as an exploration into ways of eliciting, representing, and examining narratives that might evoke the broad range of experiences that constitute an architectural education today.[11] In this case, a single academic program provided a shared context for the twelve participants, who were selected to fall within three cross-sectional cohorts to represent several points along the timeline of professional development—current students, recent graduates, and emerging practitioners.[12] As a site of inquiry, the University of Washington's Masters of Architecture (M.Arch) program was considered representative of the "integrated" model of professional education. Quickly becoming the standard in the Anglophone world, in this model, students complete professional programs having opportunities to develop and experiment with their professional identity, whether through internships or other formalized opportunities. In the case of this program in particular, most students expect to, and ultimately do, gain employment in local design firms soon after graduation, and most eventually obtain professional licensure. In this sense, then, the program is also representative of an educational model wherein academia and the local professional community operate in a cooperative arrangement: the school provides the profession with graduates able to immediately contribute to design production, and the profession supplies the program with a sense of purpose of cultural legitimacy.

Participants were selected using convenient sampling with an effort to achieve a certain level of diversity.[13] Participants in the two alumni cohorts were interviewed using an in-depth, one-on-one format over three sessions, whereas the cohort of current students participated in two focus group sessions. Interview protocols explored the decision to pursue architecture, as well as formative episodes that shaped the experience of architecture school and entry into professional practice. Finally, participants were asked to describe whatever issues they believed to be most pressing currently facing the profession. The underlying objective of these topics was to be able to examine the content of ensuing narratives to elicit how aspiring architects glean personal meaning—and ultimately a sense of occupational identity—from their experience of education.

Following transcription, ensuing analytical steps involved assembling and reducing each participant's responses into a coherent narrative and then identifying and interpreting evocative passages deemed relevant to themes of meaning-

making.[14] With interview protocols providing a structural point of departure, narratives tended to be organized around the following themes: entry into architecture; formative experiences; identity transformation; struggles, transitions, and turning points; and investment and membership the professional architecture community. The framework of occupational engagement then provided an additional lens to interpret narrative content by considering how participants evoked an interrelated conception of what they do, who they are, who they are becoming, and their sense of existing within the community. Passages with content expressing three or four of these dimensions corresponded with those previously marked as "content rich," substantiating this label. Below is one such passage of dialogue from an interview with Monica, a member of the emerging practitioners cohort, with phrases marked as expressing one or more dimensions of occupational engagement. When Monica entered architecture school, she doubted she would ever become an architect, as she immediately identified with the marginal and tangential vectors of the discipline. In this passage, she reflects on her place in the architectural community now that she finds herself becoming one. In terms of themes related to meaning-making and occupational identity, this passage is particularly rich in content.

You mentioned [in a previous interview] feeling between communities. What did you mean by that?

I sort of meant that…even once I get my license, I'm not sure I'm gonna feel like "an architect." — Becoming + Being

In school here, I felt like I was part of the broader university community *and* at times felt like I was well-entrenched in the departmental community. — Belonging
But also just felt like I wasn't quite *as* there as other people. That I either wanted or was looking for ties to other things that weren't just *this*, in the professional creative sense. — Doing

I *could* just be a hundred percent "Yay, architecture! Yay, architects! I am one!" — Being
But it doesn't feel like a natural fit to say that or buy into it to that degree, I guess…I feel like I hit a wall with architecture at a certain point. — Belonging
And I get to that place, and then I need to go elsewhere for creative inspiration or whatever. — Doing

But do you tend to view it more in that sense that there's this thing and you're around the edge of it? As opposed to you [saying], "I'm redefining what it means to be an architect!"

Well, I hope it's that! That would be great!…. [But] it feels really inflated to say that I'm doing that…I definitely don't think that on a regular basis. I feel like I approach the discipline and the profession in a way that makes sense for *me*, — Doing + Being
and I hope that I encounter people that feel similarly or similarly different about it. It's not that we even have to have the same approach, — Belonging
but just finding people out there who are doing something different than the party-line of how you do architecture. — Doing
And I did find people like that here! Other students or faculty members who had a vein of dissonance in whatever they were doing. — Belonging + Doing
So I don't feel like I'm the only one or like a 'trailblazer' or anything like that. — Being
But it's something that you're doing, and you don't really know what you're doing, and you're just kind of trying to do it to do what feels right for *you*, and you hope it gets you somewhere productive and interesting. — Doing
And if it's productive and interesting for other people then that's even better! — Belonging
But I don't know. Maybe I should have a more conscious understanding of what I'm doing, but I feel like I don't, really… — Becoming

I keep wondering if I'm gonna have an epiphany moment where I'm like, "I know exactly what I want to do, and how I want to do it!" — Becoming
And sometimes I think that would be really nice, but I don't know if it's gonna get to that point. I mean, even when I took this job, I had applied to *so* many places. I sent out like thirty applications before I sent this one out. And none of them I was really excited about. I mean, they were all places that would be "good" to work, y'know?…. But this was the first one that felt like any sort of match, — Belonging
that felt like something where I knew I could contribute something that wasn't being contributed. — Doing
And I think I'll stay here as long as I feel that way. But if it stops feeling that way, then it'll be time to do something else. But I have no idea what that would be! And I really wish I did! 'Cause I have no five year plan! — Becoming
Y'know, 'Where do you see yourself in five years?' I'm like, 'I don't know. Employed hopefully. Hopefully.'

But you still mentioned that if and when you get licensed…you wouldn't really feel like you're an architect, in some sense.

Yea! I don't know. 'Cause there are things about it that I probably still won't like, y'know? There are things about the job that I think kinda suck! And I know a *lot* of talented people that have a lot of great ideas that started off in architecture and have gone completely different directions. And part of me wonders like, 'Did they have the right idea? Why am I force-fitting myself into something that isn't a perfect fit?' But maybe they wouldn't have left if somebody that shared their perspective had stayed. So yea, I guess I do have this broad, vague, somewhere-in-the-future desire to expand what it means to practice in some way. In some very-small-corner-of-the-world way.	Being + Belonging Becoming + Doing
But you don't want to fit into what you think a typical architect is, so that's perhaps why you'd feel uncomfortable about being titled?	
I don't wanna drink the Kool-Aid, y'know? I don't wanna wake up one day and be the entity that I was criticizing ten years ago. I do want a paycheck! I do wanna continue to be employed. But yea, I don't know. I think it's just gonna be largely about finding avenues on which I can actively *be* that and challenge it at the same time.	Being + Becoming Being + Doing
And I feel like I'm working for someone now that is doing that, in some ways. And I feel like there's something to learn from that, and that I can sort of take what she has done and learn from that and figure out what that might mean for how I could do something similar.	Belonging Doing + Becoming

Discussion

The passage illustrates the kind of meaning-making that study participants evoked in their narratives. As participants navigated the different social and pedagogical contexts of their education, they encountered architecture in its various forms—as the physical built environment (prior to becoming an architecture student), as a mode of doing/making/learning and as a social/disciplinary community (as architecture students), and then as a professional field (as practitioners). As these various forms get encountered in progression, they accumulate into a sense of architecture as a multivalent occupation, necessitating meaning-making strategies in order to calibrate one's sense of self against disciplinary norms and expectations. This means revising one's personal narrative to justify a sustained passion for professional design practice that can overcome the inevitable periods of cynicism, apathy, and malaise.

Reasons for pursuing architecture largely centered on wanting to contribute to the creation of meaningful places. The noble quality of the architect as a social figure remained a powerful motif, though the professional title itself was not necessarily a significant draw. Like so many aspiring architects of this and past generations, participants referenced the desire to "make a difference" in terms of contributing to projects of social and environmental justice. Indeed, recruitment strategies for architecture programs have elevated "making an impact" to one of the chief selling points of an architectural education regardless of whether or not graduates choose to become licensed design professionals.[15] The foregrounding of "why questions" as a motivator for entering the discipline, which run parallel to discourse marketed by architectural education, raised certain points of tension throughout participant narratives. As students, participants faced instructors who they felt hampered their ability to explore such questions, typically by restricting design projects to primarily formal or technical considerations. Participants generally believed that school was an opportunity for aspiring architects to orient their internal compass and find their "voice" as a designer, by exploring how their personal interests might inform an approach to the design process. Once in professional contexts, they found themselves looking for opportunities and outlets to enact their agency as a designer. Oftentimes, this meant shifting their perspective towards design to identify meaning in quotidian tasks or engaging in projects beyond the realm of design familiar to them a students. A central thread running through participant narratives, therefore, was grappling with how the desire to "make an impact" plays out in the various pedagogical and social contexts of architectural education.

Generally, the experience of architecture school was expressed as an ebb and flow of self-doubt and empowerment. Participants would periodically question their commitment to architecture only to find themselves regaining a sense of occupational purpose. Unsurprisingly, the emotional attachment developed in relation to studio projects lay at the forefront of this oscilating rhythm. Navigating such a rollercoaster-like experience required a certain level of psychological resilience, social support from peers and mentors, and/or inspiration from role models. Alternative pedagogies like collaborative design projects, research and thesis studios, and studying abroad were identified as the most formative in terms of finding one's "voice" or orienting oneself in relation to professional norms and values. When participants recalled questioning the investment they had made in their career path, these were oftentimes periods when school activities felt disconnected from ethical concerns and their personal values.

Consistently, participants attributed opportunities to grapple with "why questions" through studio and research projects as critical to sustaining their sense of architecture as consequential and personal fulfillment. In these moments, they were not simply making sense of their education by acknowledging the merit of its content or methods; rather, they were relating their activities (doing) to their sense of themselves (being) and an imagined future role (becoming) within the professional community (belonging).

The dualistic and oscillating challenges of architecture school also came in more conventional forms, such as: the demand that aspiring architects disconnect from the outside world and public life even as they design for it; that they develop time management skills even as projects demand their complete, round-the-clock immersion; and that they dedicate themselves to fostering the social community of studio even though sustained productivity often entailed finding working environments outside the physical confines of the studio. In each of these cases, participants recalled that their reaction made them feel either more or less like a stereotypical architecture student—or more less a part of the dominant architectural community. What was somewhat surprising, though, was that participants acknowledged rarely discussing these sentiments with their peers. The psychological challenges of becoming a professional designer—which indeed may be the greatest challenges of design education—went largely unspoken, as inner reflective monologue.

The transition into professional practice spurred additional moments of self-reflection. Interns and graduates sought to get the lay of the land in terms of how particular professional contexts and modes of practice may or may not align with their architectural values and burgeoning design sensibility. Internship opportunities during school generally served to demystify aspects of professional life in the minds of participants. Having spent time working in local firms, they ostensibly would enter the profession after graduation with a narrower gap between their perceptions/ideals and the realities of practice. As students, participants already considered the kind of projects, firms, and professional roles that might best suit their interests and personal values. Some had placed certain limits on their future positions, like a firm's size, predominant project type, or philosophy. But others seemed to prefer letting their futures unfold more organically. What was consistently expressed was a "fear of specialization" and the complementary desire to engage in all aspects of the design process.[16] When describing entry into the professional workforce, narratives evoked a sense of humility—that an aspiring architect must "put in their dues" and learn certain skills unattainable in academic contexts before they can enact any genuine agency as a practitioner. Still, as students, participants had become so attuned to receiving positive reinforcement (from themselves, mainly whenever they were able to glean a sense of fulfillment and hold back latent feelings of anxiety and self-doubt) that they began their positions as emerging practitioners searching for opportunities to continue doing so. This often meant daydreaming of alternative futures or shifting one's perspective towards their day-to-day work in order to justify it as meaningful—either for them personally or for future users of the designed environment.

Conclusion

The study outlined in this paper broadens our notions of design education by illustrating the ways that it can be considered an ongoing process of meaning-making that individuals engage in over the course of their lives to construct and maintain their occupational identities. The content of participant narratives from this study suggests that navigating becoming-an-architect requires meaning-making that incorporates all four dimensions of doing, being, becoming, and belonging in ways that form a holistic framework of occupational engagement.

No one enters a career path with a complete or accurate understanding of what it means to *be* the kind of practitioner they are seeking to *become*. Navigating a pathway of professional education, and ultimately investing in that career, means grasping the problematic nature of this transformative process and recognizing one's agency in it. This includes acknowledging that one's identity is shaped by *doing* certain discipline-related activities, adopting and/or challenging certain discipline-related ideologies, and *belonging* to various scales of the disciplinary community. Reflecting on one's architectural education becomes a way of writing a personal narrative that can incorporate significant learning experiences, thereby gleaning meaning in ways that can help construct an occupational identity. Ultimately, laypeople do not become architects by simply graduating from architecture school, logging hours of work at a firm, and passing an exam that tests their competencies in disciplinary skills and knowledge. Rather, they join the architectural community by engaging with architecture across temporal scales and social/pedagogical contexts, encountering it as an "occupation" through various modes of engagement until they are able to construct an occupational identity coherent to themselves and others. Even once they have achieved this much, they must continue developing strategies to maintain their identity by revising their

narrative and continually recalibrating their identities in relation to their social context and developmental trajectory.

How might this holistic understanding of education help structure curricula and student support initiatives? If the goal is for students to develop a sense of occupational engagement that supports positive growth and is personally meaningful, as it should be, learning objectives must be structured to not only include the four dimensions of *doing, being, becoming,* and *belonging*—but to do so in ways that suggest the interdependent nature of all four dimensions. For instance, aspiring architects might be tasked with considering the following: *How do the activities in which I am involved inform who I am and what I want to become in relation to the architectural community in which I find myself?* Assuming that *doing* design activities alongside experts and peers will result in *becoming* a "good" designer or lead to a sense of *belonging* to a supportive or empowering design community is not necessarily a fallacy—but it overlooks the substantial psychological effort involved in the meaning-making process. Any understanding of student agency must account for the broad set of factors that constitute education, as they are central to how meaning and occupational identity get constructed and sustained.

One of the difficulties of addressing such a holistic framework of education, of course, is that no single educator can be reasonably held responsible for supporting students across all these dimensions over long stretches of time. Practically speaking, this returns us to notions of autonomy and agency, to ways of supporting aspiring designers in their meaning-making and the writing of personal narratives. Design portfolios, as a reflection of one's occupational identity, offer an existing point of departure. The conventional application of a portfolio could be expanded to include more reflective/narrative opportunities beyond design projects themselves in ways that can express the holistic nature of occupational identity and growth over time. Extracurricular opportunities like mentorship programs and student advising could also be better integrated with one another so that aspiring designers are supported throughout and beyond professional curricula.

The dearth of research in this area—or studies that take into account the authentic and holistic experience of students as agents in disciplinary reproduction—calls for further exploration, both to increase our understanding and to continue exploring methods appropriate for doing so. Because most studies on design education tend to focus on specific courses or pedagogical formats, we continue to lack a more comprehensive model from which to base teaching practice that can integrate extracurricular and psychosocial experience. Yet the desire to become more student-centered remains limited until educators form a more complete picture of design education and consider the perspectives of those presumably at its center.

Notes

[1] Thomas A. Dutton, "Design and Studio Pedagogy," *Journal of Architectural Education* 53(1) (1989): 16-25. For the problematic qualities of design juries, a mainstay of architecture pedagogy, see also Kathryn H. Anthony, *Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991) and Helena Webster, "Power, Freedom and Resistance: Excavating the Design Jury," *International Journal of Art & Design Education* 25(3) (2006), 286-96.
[2] Laura L. Willenbrock, "An Undergraduate Voice in Architectural Education," in T.A. Dutton (Ed.), *Voices in Architectural Education: Cultural Politics and Pedagogy* (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1991), 97-120.
[3] Aaron Koch, Katherine Shwennsen, Thomas A. Dutton, & Deanna Smith, *The Redesign of Studio Culture: A Report of the AIAS Studio Culture Task Force* (New York: American Institute of Architecture Students, 2002).
[4] Christine Bachman & Leonard Bachman, "Self-identity, rationalization and cognitive dissonance in undergraduate architectural design learning," *Architectural Research Quarterly* 13(3-4) (2009), 315-21.
[5] Dana Cuff, *Architecture: The story of practice* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), p. 116 and p. 262.
[6] See Ronald Barnett, "Learning for an Unknown Future," *Higher Education Research & Development* 31(1) (2012), 65-77; Gloria Dall'Alba & Robyn Barnacle, "An Ontological Turn for Higher Education," *Studies in Higher Education* 32(6) (2007), 679-91; Chad Hanson, "Changing How We Think About the Goals of Higher Education," *New Directions for Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, 2014).
[7] See Paul J. Eakin, *Living Autobiographically: How we create identity in narrative* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008); Dan P. McAdams, "Identity and the life story," in R. Fivush and C. A. Haden (Eds.) *Autobiographical Memory and the Construction of a Narrative Self: Developmental and Cultural Perspectives* (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2003), 187-207; Elliot G. Mishler, *Storylines: Craftartists' Narratives of Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Catherine K. Riessman, *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2008); Margaret R. Somers, "The Narrative Construction of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach," *Theory and Society* 23 (1994), 605-49.
[8] See Marco Frascari, "An Architectural Good-life Can be Built, Explained and Taught Only Through Storytelling," in Adam Sharr (Ed.) *Reading Architecture and Culture: Researching Buildings, Spaces, and Documents* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 224-34.
[9] See Danielle Hitch, Geneviève Pépin, & Karen Stagnitti, "In the Footsteps of Wilcock, Part One: The Evolution of Doing, Being, Becoming, and Belonging," *Occupational Therapy in Health Care* 28(3) (2014), 231-46; Daneille Hitch, Geneviève Pépin, & Karen Stagnitti, "In the Footsteps of Wilcock, Part Two: The Interdependent Nature of Doing, Being, Becoming, and Belonging," *Occupational Therapy in Health Care* 28(3) (2014), 247-63; Ann A. Wilcock, "Reflections on doing, being and becoming," *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 46(1)

(1999), 1-11; Ann A. Wilcock, *An Occupational Perspective of Health* (2nd Ed.) (Thorofare, NJ: SLACK Inc., 2006).
[10] Hitch, Pépin, & Stagnitti, “In the Footsteps of Wilcock Part Two,” 258.
[11] For a detailed description of this study’s methods, please refer to the complete dissertation: James Thompson, “Becoming an Architect: Narratives of Architectural Education” (PhD diss., University of Washington, 2016).
[12] The cohort of current students, all in the three-year track of the program, were interviewed twice in a focus group format between their first and second year—before and after their summer internship. The recent graduates had completed their degree requirements within two months of their participation in the study. The emerging professionals graduated six to eighteen months prior to participating in the study, and each was employed in a local design firm at the time of being interviewed. Interviews with four full-time faculty members provided additional perspectives on the program’s features and cultural character.
[13] Each participant cohort consisted of two males and two females. Other identifying factors that seemed to contribute to narrative content included: age, ethnicity, cultural background, and living situation. But, rather than foregrounding these factors myself, I was determined to allow each participant to define the contours of their story.
[14] Participant profiles were shared with respective participants for feedback.
[15] This phrasing can be found at www.studyarchitecture.com, a website run by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, which goes on to state: “Regardless of how you choose to study architecture, your path will certainly lead you toward a fulfilling place. You’ll make an impact. Whether you’re designing greener urban center, building smarter classrooms, helping to solve environmental challenges, creating art in three dimensions, or helping the next generation explore the wonder of the built environment, you’ll make a difference in the world around you.”
[16] This could be attributed to the fact that, traditionally, architecture programs do not promote specialization.