

not
white

diversity in beginning design education



Shannon Chance, AIA, Editor

PROCEEDINGS of the
20th National Conference on
the Beginning Design Student
Hampton University Department of Architecture

Copyright 2006 Hampton University Urban Institute
/individual articles produced and edited by the authors

Printed proceedings produced by Shannon Chance, Assistant Professor of Architecture, Hampton University.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means without written permission of the publisher.

Published by:
Hampton University Urban Institute
Department of Architecture
Hampton University
Hampton, VA 23668
757-727-5440
fax 757-728-6680

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Chance, Shannon
Not White: Diversity in Beginning Design Education
(Proceedings of the 20th National Conference on the Beginning Design Student)
compiled by Shannon Chance
1. Architecture - Diversity 2. Teaching - Architecture 3. Teaching - Diversity 4. Teaching - Design
5. Diversity - Design

ISBN 0-9785172-0-2

Moments of Conviction: The Problems and Promises of Nurturing Students' Emergent Cultural and Personal Identities

This paper investigates how the set of assumptions about student knowledge and cultural identity shaped the beginning architecture design studio pedagogy of Katia Borges, a UC Berkeley adjunct professor (and practicing architect) that I observed and interviewed in the late 1990s.¹ Katia's own descriptions of the relationships that emerged between herself and three of her beginning design students (Ernesto, a Latino male, Julia, an Asian woman, and Catherine, a White woman) will be used to explore the complex interplay between her Brazilian identity, her professional identity, and her explicit attempt at encouraging her students to explore their own cultural identities and personal inner selves within their designs. Recorded descriptions of her own interactions with three students will depict Katia's approach to challenging her students to "let go of convention and invent original design metaphors based on personal and cultural identity."

Within the narrative of her experiences in the beginning design studio, Katia emphasized her interest in "nurturing" her students' capacities for "working independently" by validating and supporting their inventions of their own original vocabularies for talking about, and making, their designs. She told me that she looked for moments when her students would argue for their designs based on their own ideas. These "moments of conviction," as she called them, were indicators that a student's "designer's personality" was beginning to emerge. Katia told me that students undergoing their initial design studio experiences tended to have a "very hard time abandoning convention" because they were afraid of "taking the risk" of being different. Influenced by magazines, previous teachers, as well as their design studio peers, students tended to drop their own original ideas in favor of safer sets of architectural conventions and norms. She saw her role as a teacher in terms of the support she could give to her students as they learned to "let go" of the conventions of normal architectural language. By coming to what she called "an awareness" of their "personal or inner selves," students could step outside of the existing set of architectural norms and create vocabularies of building form that were as unique as they themselves were.

Katia validated Julia's attempt at developing an architectural vocabulary of form based on the "flickering candle" metaphor that had emerged from her personal interest in the spatial experiences of light and shadow. She affirmed Ernesto's Latino cultural background and pointed him toward an exploration of Mexican architect Luis Barragan's exterior façade color schemes. Because she believed that any form of vocabulary that was expressive of the self could lead to breaking away from the existing conventions of architectural form making, Katia validated and supported her students' design explorations in which they invented vocabularies based on their unique experiences, on their cultural identities, or on various other aspects of their personal selves.

A narrative analysis of Katia's descriptions of her interactions with students reveals that she structured her view of her students based on a traditional conception of knowledge: knowledge was discovered, it was preexisting, and it had locatable origins.² Problematic students, like Catherine (was problematic within Katia's point of view because she turned to external rather than internal sources of knowledge, which Katia took as a sign of Catherine's absence of "conviction to her work"; an absence of an "awareness of the self.") were those whose personal vocabularies for talking about their design works did not align with their own (teachers') conception of the

abstract

Dr. Elijah Mirochnik

Assistant Professor in Initiatives in Educational Transformations,
George Mason University
email: emirochn@gmu.edu

Dr. Elijah Mirochnik is Assistant Professor in Initiatives in Educational Transformations at George Mason University. He received a Ph.D. from UC Berkeley, Masters degrees from Harvard and Columbia (in education and urban design, respectively) and an undergraduate degree in architecture from the University of Maryland. For over twenty-five years he has used the architectural education studio model as the basis for engaging public school children and teachers in new educational practices. His work with children in Harlem (in New York City) led him to numerous collaborations with educators interested in testing out experimental and creative classroom practices that empower students and teachers to change their communities. He has authored and co-edited two books: *Teaching in the First Person: Understanding Voice and Vocabulary in Learning Relationships*. (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2000) and *Passion and Pedagogy: Relation, Creation, and Transformation in Teaching* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002).

best method for *discovering* knowledge.

Narrative analysis also revealed that the “awareness of inner self” metaphor that Katia used in narrating her students’ process of developing their personal sets of architectural vocabularies reflected her belief that the language her students used to describe their designs was *not separate* from the language they used to describe themselves: that their descriptions of their designs could derive from descriptions that reflected their awareness of their personal interests, their unique wants, and their cultural roots. Katia’s story, as told in her own words, complemented by narrative analyses that seeks to expose the theories that were embedded within her teaching strategies, reveal the set of challenges that beginning design studio professors face within their attempt at providing students with a pedagogical environments that nurtures the integration of personal identity, cultural history, ethnicity and design vocabulary.

paper

Letting Go of Conventional Language

Katia Borges, a Latina woman in her mid thirties, was born and grew up in San Paulo, Brazil.¹ She immigrated to the United States and entered Berkeley’s Department of Architecture as an undergraduate in 1981. She received her Masters Degree in Architecture from Yale University in 1990. After her east coast experience in graduate school she returned to the west coast, and built up a one-woman firm located in Richmond, California. By the mid 1990’s her firm had that gained her a reputation for sensitivity to the identities of ethnic-minority communities and their residents. In the late 1990’s I had the opportunity of observing Katia teach an undergraduate beginning design studio a UC Berkeley where she was employed as a part-time adjunct professor. After I observed her interacting with her students in the studio setting, I recorded a series of conversations about her approach to teaching beginning design. Her set of assumptions about student knowledge and cultural identity shaped her approach to teaching the beginning, and it this set of assumptions and their enactments in the form of pedagogy that I want to share with you.

In a small, quiet meeting room on the third floor of Wurster Hall, where we met for lunch and conversation about her approach to teaching, Katia often emphasized her interest in teaching her twelve students “how to be independent in their designs.” “I get very worried when I see sameness in the studio,” Katia told me as she described her students’ struggles with “letting go of conventions, of norms, and of what is expected.” She understood her students’ resistance to “letting go” as the roadblock that kept them from “incorporating” their “individual talents, differences, and strengths” into their work. For Katia, the process of “letting go of convention” was concurrent with her students’ processes of recognizing their own individuality and difference. One of the primary conventions that Katia believed that students could eventually “let go of” was the traditional language that architects spoke. But before “letting go of” conventional language, before, as she put it, “venturing into uncharted territory,” students had to “not only know themselves as individuals, but also become secure about their knowledge about the convention of architectural language.”

For Katia, the formative stages of developing an individual personality as a designer interlocked with a process in which students learned the conventions of architectural language so that they could “manipulate” that language in their own individual and different ways. Once they understood the normal and conventional ways that architects had adopted for talking about the design and construction of buildings, then students could “start inventing new ways of communicating” through a process of “manipulating” the existing conventional language *in their own terms*. She related her students’ processes of learning to recognize and make use of their own individuality and difference to her own experience of leaving her native Brazilian culture to come to the United States, or more specifically, to come to Berkeley for her undergraduate architectural studies. “I came from a place where everybody knew me, to this place where I was nobody,” she told me recalling the challenges of finding herself in a foreign culture. “I mean that could be incredibly intimidating because it’s in Berkeley, California, in the United States. Not only was I foreign to the culture, but I was also foreign to this place, to this school. So in order to kind of swim or sink, I really concentrated on fulfilling the requirements just like my students do. To be a really good student. That’s what I knew how to do no matter what the cultural milieu, so I did that because I didn’t know anything else. And I survived.”

Dropping Diego Rivera’s Murals

The “proof” that she “had what it took” to be an architect came through surviving the system and adopting the conventions of traditional architectural language rather than coming to “an awareness” of who she was as an architect; an awareness she believed enabled the confidence required to “let go” of existing architectural language conventions. Of the several design projects that her students completed during the summer session in which I observed Katia, the “room project” was the one that she felt best conveyed her pedagogical approach to challenging her students to “let go” of architectural language conventions by creating designs reflective of their inner selves. In the “room project” students had to choose three objects that would be the starting points for their investigations into the design of a room that was meant to function in much the same way that their existing bedrooms functioned: as spaces in which they kept their possessions, where they slept, and where they did their studying. The aim of having students choose three objects to be housed in the room was to have them recognize that objects evoked personal meanings and memories that could inform the direction of their designs and lead them in the direction of letting go of convention.

Katia described the struggles that Ernesto, a twenty-year-old Latino man in her design studio, was having with the “room project.” Katia reflected on her conversation with Ernesto, telling me, “He initially wanted to include reproductions of Diego Rivera murals in his room, and he decided against it, and I said, ‘Why?’ And he said, ‘because people wouldn’t understand.’ So I said, ‘Because it’s the work of Diego Rivera’s murals? Do you mean that you were thinking that an Anglo-Saxon person could not understand, could not get at the core of the work? There is an exhibit going on right now at the Museum of Modern Art on that very subject, Diego Rivera and Frida Kahlo, and maybe you should go. It is the height of high culture and there it is. And next door across the street there is a Center for the Arts that was created for the very purpose to showcase multicultural art in the city, in the Bay Area: to really look at some of our own artists and what they are talking about.’ So that was one glimpse that I got.”

Katia had gotten “a glimpse” of “the core” of Ernesto’s individual identity as a designer via his description of his personal interest in Diego Rivera’s artwork. She took Ernesto’s intimation about his hesitancy to make use of the Rivera poster as a cue that he needed validation of the anxiety he felt about being a Latino in an “Anglo-Saxon” culture. Her affirmation of Rivera as a Latino artist whose works had been culturally approved as being “the height of high culture,” and her subsequent affirmation of local “multicultural art” was her way of posing that she perceived Ernesto’s cultural difference as a strength to be pursued through expression, rather than diminished or discounted through *repression*.

While Ernesto eventually abandoned the use of the poster of the Diego Rivera mural as one of his “room project” objects, he began developing an architectural vocabulary in which he employed colored wall surfaces that Katia described as similar to those of Mexican architect Luis Barragan. Ernesto may have been implicitly revealing his Latino identity through the use of “Barragan” kinds of color schemes, but he was among the majority of students who, in Katia’s experience as an undergraduate design teacher, had not acquired the confidence to “go out on a limb” and explicitly explore the relationship between their cultural identities or their inner selves *and* their design vocabularies. She explained, “Only very rarely have I had undergraduate students that have done that. And I am very encouraging of that, always. If they want to bring cultural themes to their work, hey, as long as they work within the parameters of the studio that’s just the more richer. So I am often very encouraging of that but not everybody has that self-confidence to take that leap and do something different than the others.”

Katia’s “nurturance” of Ernesto’s difference, his uniqueness, was meant to point him in the direction of “doing something different than the others,” of defining his own set of architectural metaphors that reflected his inner self and his “awareness” of the architect that he was becoming. But despite Katia’s encouragement, Ernesto chose to abandon the use of the Rivera poster as the starting point in his design exploration; a use that would have explicitly revealed what she called the “cognizance of his identity.” Instead he opted to safely imitate a previously created architectural vocabulary of color and form. The possibility of explicitly expressing his cultural identity had been eclipsed by his lack of confidence and his fear of being misunderstood. Imitating the style of Barragan, an architect whose Latino cultural roots were aligned with Ernesto’s own, may have seemed to Ernesto to have been a step in the direction of expressing his unique identity, but in the end for Katia, he had created a replica rather than a set of architectural metaphors that were particularly his own. Katia described her encouragement and validation of Ernesto’s own expressions of cultural and personal self as her ways of helping him shore up the confidence that he would need if he was to eventually break from the conventional design language that he, instead, chose to replicate.

The Flickering Candle

Another student she spoke about within her narratives of her teaching experiences in her beginning design studio pointed to Katia’s pedagogical aim of encouraging her students to “go out on a limb” by making use of their own interests and their own metaphors within their individual design processes. Katia described Julia, an Asian American woman in her early twenties, as a student who “had an incredible ability to translate metaphor kinds of concepts into spaces.” Julia revealed her “incredible ability” by thinking of one of her “room project” objects as a metaphor for the kinds of experienced qualities she wanted her room to exhibit. Thinking and speaking metaphorically about the candle she had chosen as one of her “room project” objects helped guide Julia toward the development of her own architectural language of building forms and spaces.

Katia explained Julia’s process of using a candle to guide a metaphorical exploration of architectural space, recalling that “there was a moment early on when Julia was talking about the flicker of a candle and how that translated into space.” Julia had produced a sketch in which she attempted to render an interior quality reminiscent of the experience of candlelight. As she talked about her sketch of the room Julia described her interest in designing a room in which various intensities of light, from bright light to dark shadow, could be experienced as the inhabitants of the room moved from the room’s periphery to its interior.

As she spoke to Katia, Julia likened the architectural qualities of light intensity dissipating from bright to dim *and* the contrasting light and dark shadow play on wall surfaces *to* the experiential qualities of a flickering candle. At that point in her design process, Julia had stopped thinking and talking about the candle as an object and started thinking and talking about the candle as a metaphor. But two days later Julia had abandoned the flickering candle metaphor, much to Katia’s dismay. She recalled coming into the studio two days after she and Julia had explored ways in which Julia’s set of architectural forms could be informed by the “flickering candle” metaphor. But by that time Julia had abandoned the “flickering candle” as the metaphorical basis for her design and was exploring what Katia described as “trellis type things with the columns marking the rhythm” of the experienced progression from the exterior wall to the interior center of the room. Julia had opted for “something more conventional.” Julia had dropped her development of an original vocabulary of architectural ways to describe progression through *light*, and instead began employing a conventional way of marking progression through space by using the traditional architectural vocabulary of *columns*.

Katia told me that when she asked Julia why she had abandoned her original “flickering candle” metaphor and concurrent

exploration of architectural forms, Julia told her that “she didn’t think that it had a practical use. Having slipped from her poet’s body into her logician’s mind, Julia told Katia that she didn’t think that one could inhabit that kind of space. In our conversation Katia told me that she restrained her response to Julia’s move, but inside she felt like saying, ‘Who cares about the use? You know, it’s beautiful.’ When I asked Katia why she thought Julia had not “pushed it,” but rather, had abandoned her original “flickering candle” metaphor, she said, “Maybe it’s peer pressure. Other people who look at her desk and they are not understanding. Conventions, norms, what is expected. I don’t know who the kind of judging is for her. Is it what is published in the magazines? Her peers? Her past teachers?” Recalling the “moment early on” when Julia seemed to be on her way to making use of her “sensibility” for “translating metaphor kinds of concepts into spaces,” Katia framed Julia’s subsequent abandonment as “the syndrome of having a lucid moment and being able to create something wonderful and then abandoning it out because it’s not practical.”

Julia’s original defense of her design ideas in *her own* metaphoric terms, had sent Katia a clear signal that her (Julia’s) “designer personality” was being formed. Katia realized that Julia’s strength as a metaphor maker could be used to overcome what Harold Bloom recognized as the strong poet’s “anxiety of influence”: the poet’s fear of replicating other poets’ conventions, and thus never creating a work that was uniquely one’s own.³ Katia’s encouraging Julia to be “less concerned with the conventional,” and to “take risks even when not entirely sure where she was going,” was indicative of a teacher who believed that her students could overcome their tendency toward conventional ways of creating buildings and conventional ways of exhibiting designer personalities that were imitations of others rather than expressions of their own unique voices and vocabularies.

Reflections of Their Inner Selves

Within the narrative of her experiences in the beginning design studio Katia treated the language capabilities that her students brought with them to her studio as reflections of their inner selves. By framing the processes of manipulating ordinary spoken language as “simultaneous with” the processes of manipulating form and space, she conveyed to her students the possibility that creating architecture was coincident with the architect’s discovery of her self. Katia emphasized her interest in “nurturing” her students’ capacities for “working independently” by validating and supporting their inventions of their own original vocabularies for talking about, and making, their designs.

Katia believed that by “manipulating” the conventions of existing architectural language, students could eventually gain the confidence needed to develop their own original vocabularies. That confidence and commitment to their own ideas and architectural vocabularies would come at the same time that they gained insight into their own unique sets of inner qualities: qualities of the personal self that she defined as the core of the “designer’s personality.”

Because she believed that any form of vocabulary that was expressive of the self could lead to breaking away from the existing conventions of architectural form making, Katia validated and supported her students’ design explorations in which they invented vocabularies based on their unique experiences, on their cultural identities, or on various other aspects of their personal selves. The “awareness of inner self” metaphor that Katia used in narrating her students’ process of developing their personal sets of architectural vocabularies reflected her belief that the language her students used to describe their designs was *not separate* from the language they used to describe themselves: that their descriptions of their designs could derive from descriptions that reflected their awareness of their personal interests, their unique wants, and their cultural roots. Katia’s message to her students was that their metaphors could bridge their identities as persons with their identities as architects; their metaphors that emerged from the self and eventually resulted in architectural translations into building form were metaphors that pointed to the intimacy between the thing created and its creator; between designs created and the designer’s self.

Not A Moment of Conviction

Catherine, a white woman and a third generation Californian from a well-to-do professional upper-middle class family, was Katia’s most challenging student. Of all her students, Katia found Catherine the most frustrating because, as Katia described it, there was “not a moment of conviction in her work.” As opposed to the minimal “worry about sameness” that Katia felt about Ernesto’s and Julia’s immature fear of the unconventional, the “sameness” that frustrated Katia about Catherine manifested in the form of Catherine’s tendency to “regurgitate the same idea over and over.” Katia believed that Catherine’s tendency toward constant repetition of the same design idea was rooted in her “thinking that she was completely unable to come up with something new.” As a result of her perceived inability to have original design ideas, Katia told me that Catherine was “much more prone to say, ‘I saw that example in *Architectural Digest*. I think I’m going to employ it right here’ as opposed to saying ‘what is enclosure?’ or ‘How do we define passage?’”

Katia expanded on her frustration with Catherine. As she started with a deep sigh she explained, “The only one I’m really worried about is Catherine. She is very stubborn. She has these preconceived ideas. Somewhere along the line she has been used to, she has gotten used to praise. Somebody must have been doing a lot of patting on her back, and saying, ‘Oh it’s beautiful, oh wow, just go that way.’ There is no way I’m going to tell her that and since I’m not going to give her that, then she’s gone through twenty variations of her scheme. She is just waiting for this standing ovation and she cannot get that conviction from herself. She cannot work independently. It’s unbelievable. Not a moment of conviction in the work. It’s almost like,” Katia changed from her adult tone to imitate a child’s voice, and ended her characterization with, “did you like this, can I do this?”

Katia equated Catherine’s lack of independence to her absolute inability to generate her own design ideas. To compensate for her impotence in original design thinking Catherine reverted to cutting and pasting the works of others into her own work. The problem with Catherine’s mode of aping the ideas of other designers, as Katia described it, originated “somewhere along the line”

when she had been uncritically praised for her efforts. The result of Catherine having sought and apparently having received her previous teachers' approvals was that Catherine had developed the habit of believing that if she kept generating "variations on her scheme" she would eventually hit upon a design that would move her teachers to applaud her efforts with a "standing ovation." One of the objects that Catherine had chosen to house within her "room project" design was (as she explained to Katia) the diploma that she would eventually receive upon completion of her undergraduate studies. Through her desk crit conversations with Catherine, Katia began to "put her finger on" the personal meaning that the diploma had evoked for Catherine. Katia told me, "It's very interesting that one of her objects was the diploma. And it was such a big deal about the diploma. Catherine is highly conventional in the sense that she is doing it for the degree, not for the education. She is not in the thinking, in exploring, and spending sleepless nights thinking about exactly how do you feel when you walk through this building. She's interested in, 'By the time 2001 is over,' she says, 'I graduated Berkeley.' I think I'm finally starting to put my finger on it. I think it's about consum-ing. I think that is what I find so troubling: it's about acquiring.

"The degree is one more of her possessions in a certain sense. And I hate to, I know I'm standing on pretty shaky ground making a value judgment on her social status or her background, but I know enough about her as a person that I cannot help but make conclusions and put two and two together. I think the degree is just one more acquisition. That's what really irks me, because that's the particular kind of person that I am. Education, for me, is a sort of a whole category apart. And it has to do with a lot of my background. For me it's in a category all its own. In other words, it doesn't matter to me how much you make, if you are not well educated then it's not important... Education is a way to skip social classes. The fact that you were born into a certain social class shouldn't mark you for life. That if you have ambition, and you are tenacious enough that's a bridge. And it is perhaps the only kind of democratic space, the space of education. So for somebody to be treating the degree as a com-mmodity is very insulting."

Here the dynamic between teacher and student, in terms of Katia's commitment to an version of knowledge that was personal and inner, as opposed to objective and external *and* in terms of a dynamic between the privileges and power-positionalities that were part of Katia's and Catherine's identities, was informative. Katia's commitment to an internal source of student knowledge, and her commitment to her students cultural identities are two aspects of her own pedagogy that she placed into the foreground of her narrative of her relationship to her students. The background of power and privilege dynamics came into play in her description of Catherine's upper middle class social status, in contrast to her own roots in a working class Brazilian family. "Treating the degree as a com-mmodity," was insulting to Katia, but her strong commitment to equity and democratic space revealed the invisible lines of tension between her status as a Latina woman in a pedagogical relationship with her white student.

Invisible Visible

In our conversations Katia did not raise the issue of her Latina identity in relation to Catherine's white identity. She talked more about her attempt at drawing forth from Catherine "a moment of conviction." Just as she had portrayed her interactions with Ernesto and Julia, Katia focused more on the professional aim of pointing students in the direction of developing their designer's identities through their connection to their "inner selves" and their cultural roots. In those two cases Katia was explicit in letting her students know that she was seeing them in terms of their "inner" resources; encouraging and nurturing those resources. I read Katia descriptions of Catherine's dependency on external norms and conventions as examples of her teacher enactments of resistance toward the white privilege status that she perceived her student embodying. Katia's examples of Catherine's commodification of her educational experience, her dependency on architectural magazines for inspiration, and her assumptions that her previous teachers applauded her efforts with a "standing ovations," made visible, in our conversations, the invisible status of a particular white students' whiteness.

Making white invisibility visible is one step in redefining the emerging set of roles that whiteness studies theorists have recently started to construct.⁴ In my conversations with Katia, the focus she chose to place at the center of her narrations of herself as a teacher was one that pointed toward the validation of her students' personal voices. That validation was meant to point them toward limiting their dependencies on external architectural norms and conventions. She believed that as her students gradually shifted their search for design ideas away from magazines, or peer pressure, or other external sources, and toward their own backgrounds, idiosyncrasies, memories, even their phobias, they would gain confidence in their abilities to work independ-ently; they would drop their habit of depending on external factors as they gradually picked up on an awareness of their inner selves; they would make visible their invisible set of commitments.

One way to Katia's description of Catherine's lack of conviction, would be to place it in the context of Katia's implicating Catherine's white set of privileges that she brought into the beginning design studio. In the context of white privilege, what Katia presented as "lack of conviction" can be re-presented as a conviction to the white codes power⁵ that she seemed to have taken for granted. Seen in this light, Catherine's interest in referencing the Great White Architects that appear in glossy mainstream architectural press could be seen as behavior that fits well into a construction of objective knowledge, where reliance on their internal sets of motivating forces were seen as detriments to the learning process.

The issue of white privilege, and its invisibility in the studio education process, cannot be separated from the Western set of assumptions about what counts and doesn't count as knowledge. Within that ancient theory, learning was a process that required detachment from the self, in that learning was the acquisition of objective knowledge that existed outside of personal experience. Following the traditional objectivist knowledge theory, if students were to acquire knowledge of which of their ideas were objectively true and which were biased by their own subjectivity, then they would have to deploy a method by which they could be independent of their subjectivity.

The historical construction of a Cartesian version of disembodied knowledge has led to studio education in which objectifying method-ologies including analytical considerations of objective contextual determinants, studies of historic precedent, and exclusion of first person vocabularies from argumentation have become the norm. Within that construction of knowledge the mind is assumed to have privileged status over the body; logic over intuition; detachment over personal commitment. Katia's view of her students' learning processes was framed within the perspective that knowledge was something that already existed within her students' personal experiences. Her narrative descriptions of her interactions with students implicated her attempt at an *abandon-ment* of the idea that her students' knowledge existed outside of their inner selves. In thinking that knowledge already existed within her students' inner selves Katia thought about learning in terms of its internal origins. The success that Katia had with Ernesto and Julia, I read as coupled with her successful resistance to Catherine's enactments of white privilege. Studio instructors like Katia remind us that defining knowledge based on her students' personal experiences as making their bodies visible, against the grain of historically white-European set of assumptions about knowledge, can be a step in the direction of making visible what Elisabeth Lloyd calls "tyranny of objectivity."⁵ And in that way Katia worked toward making visible her students' bodies, encouraging them to explore their own cultural identities and personal inner selves within their designs set into motion the possibility that studio education can become a site for contesting traditionally marginalized identities.

NOTES

¹ The design studio professor and her students within this study have been given pseudonyms.

² I draw on numerous sources that inform my analysis of the theory of knowledge that was embedded within Katia's teaching strategies and interactions with her students. These include: Allison M. Jagger and Susan R. Bordo, eds., *Gender/Body/Knowledge* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1989), Hilary Putnam, *Realism with a Human Face* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), Elisabeth A. Lloyd, "Objectivity and the Double Standard for Feminist Epistemologies," *Synthese* 104 (1995):351–381; Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), pp. 1–25; Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, trans. by Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Press, 1978), Mark Edmundson, *Literature Against Philosophy: From Plato to Derrida, a Defense of Poetry* (Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1995), John Dewey, *Quest for Certainty, John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1958 Vol. 12: 1938*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), and Rorty, Richard. *Consequences of Pragmatism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

³ See Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

⁴ See for example, Audrey Thompson, "Entertaining Doubts: Enjoyment and Ambiguity in White, Antiracist Classrooms," in Elijah Mirochnik and Debora Sherman (eds.), *Passion and Pedagogy: Relation, Creation, and Transformation in Teaching* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002) 427–448, Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," in *Race: An Anthology in the First Person*, ed. Bart Schneider (New York: Crown, 1997) 120–26, Stephanie M. Wildman, "Reflections on Whiteness: The Case of Latinos(as)" in *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997) 323–26, Carol Schick, "Keeping the Ivory Tower White: Discourses of Racial Domination," in *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, ed. Sherene H. Razack (Toronto: Between the Lines Press, 2002) 99–119.

⁵ Lisa Delpit outlines the following "Aspects of Power Related To Schooling" which were meant to address public school education of children and adolescents, but can inform conversations about power and privilege in the beginning design studio: 1) Issues of power are enacted in the classroom each day – Teachers have power over students; Curriculum directors and publishers have the power to present a certain point of view; The state has power to enforce regulations regarding schooling; An individual or group can determine what constitutes intelligence or normalcy; Schooling impacts your economic future and job opportunities. 2) There are codes or rules for participating in power, that is, there is a culture of power – There are codes regulating speech, communication skills and modes of dressing, and ways of interacting. 3) The rules of the culture of power are a reflection of the rules of those who have power – The culture of power reflected in schools is that of the upper and middle classes; Children from these backgrounds are already ensconced in the dominant culture. 4) If you are not already a participant in the culture of power, being told explicitly the rules of the culture makes acquiring power easier – Culture of power transmitted implicitly to co-members; When implicit codes are attempted across boundaries, communication frequently breaks down. 5) Those with power are frequently least aware of or least willing to acknowledge its existence – Those with less power are often most aware of its existence; For many that consider themselves liberal, acknowledging and admitting participation is distinctly uncomfortable; When acknowledging or expressing power one tends to be explicit; When de-emphasizing power, communication is often indirect. See Lisa Delpit, *The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children* (New York, NY: The New Press, 1995) 24–26.

⁶ See Elisabeth A. Lloyd, "Objectivity and the Double Standard for Feminist Epistemologies," in *Synthese* 104, 1995, pp. 351–381.