

Re-voicing the classroom: a critical psychosocial spatiality of learning

Abstract

Why is the physical environment largely ignored by teachers as a key influence on learning? The individual classroom has seemingly remained unchanged since the Industrial Revolution, with spatiality playing an almost sinister, silent and subconscious role in schooling. Yet school buildings do reflect power relations as is evident in the stark contrast between elite private schools set in leafy grounds within wealthy suburbs compared with the instantly recognisable, institutional, and prison-like public schools in less well-off areas.

This research project recognises that school spaces and places are neither innocent nor neutral and that they are an instrument of the political and social. Space has an impact on the performance of students and teachers and it both prohibits and establishes order. It commands and locates student bodies within society and determines what is acceptable. As social action, space is a fundamental and all-pervasive source of power. School buildings can formalise relationships and shape the performance desired by authority. Societal and institutional power is structured by architecture and architecture itself celebrates and monumentalises the structural networks of power. Furthermore, the design of schools emphasises the status of students and teachers in society.

In responding to these ideas, this dissertation examines how active engagement with space and place within schools can demonstrate resistant and emancipatory

possibilities for those who are disadvantaged through gender, race or socio-economic position in society. Through an ethnographic and collaborative 'courtyard project' at the ABC (asphalt, brick and concrete) High School the study shows how students and teachers can demonstrate spatially liberative concepts in the classroom. This interactive phase of the project followed a deep theoretical analysis of pedagogy, sociology, identity formation and the subconscious and how these factors interrelate with a spatiality of learning.

The project exposes the hegemony of the design professions who, by controlling the design process by excluding user input and participation, remove spatiality from the domain of teachers and students thereby increasing their sense of spatial helplessness, vulnerability and disengagement. A deep spatial silence within students was encountered in this study demonstrated by their inability to relate to or describe the spaces in which they spend much of their time and where significant aspects of their identity are formed. Students seem disconnected from the experience of school and particularly the school as a space and place. They appear to accept the societal belief that schools should be 'prison-like', alien and unrelated to their real selves or their lives outside of the school environment. This project has shown that students and teachers can articulate a spatial theory and practice which relates to their everyday lives and identities and that this is possible within the school. Such a cooperative spatial approach which introduces a measure of control over their learning environment provides a powerful and alternative message and a means of creating an experience that is more relevant to their own lived worlds within the school.

School spaces and places should become a fundamental part of the curriculum and teacher's work. The student as a 'body-in-space-and-in-society' might be a way of re-engaging them with learning and could provide a model for an 'architecture of resistance' in schools. Such an approach could liberate teachers' practice in assisting them to engage with students in ways that will be both transformative and sustainable. This dissertation outlines a manifesto for a critical psycho-social spatiality of learning which can practically demonstrate the aspirations of social justice in schooling by re-engaging students and teachers with their lived, day-to-day realities in

Peering into the fishbowl of the 'stuck' classroom

This critical spatial–pedagogical project is grounded in some key ideas and categories. Before launching into these categories I must emphasise that in no way does this project attempt to set out a case which argues that the physical environment has an overarching influence on student behaviours and their critical thinking. There is a myriad of forces acting on schools and schooling, and space and place constitute only a small part of this array of forces. My concern is that, despite the breadth and depth of spatial research in schooling, particularly in non-critical traditions, its role remains under-theorised.

Further, spatiality is still not legitimised in pedagogical discourses: it is predominantly dealt with through the unconscious and is accompanied by deep silences. Yet we experience space and place constantly throughout our lives and my instincts tell me that our school and home-based spatial memories go on to shape our spatial understandings in our adult civic lives (Chramosta, 1996). The production of public spaces and the associated lack of critical civic engagement is, in my view, a direct

result of our limited level of spatial literacy and vocabulary, as well as a severely lacking focus on critical visual literacy in pedagogy.

This, in turn, is due to a disturbing lack of spatial awareness resulting from its relative absence from the school curriculum and/or a critical form of spatial pedagogy. It is this unconscious spatial awareness that I am tackling in the hope that I can find ways of critically and consciously engaging students in placemaking and meaning-making. I hope that this spatial project can demonstrate how it is possible for students to become critical citizens through the application of a critical spatial pedagogy.

Schools are effectively a microcosm of society and making livable schools should be as critical as making livable cities. It could also be argued that if we can't make schools livable how could we ever make our cities livable? Such a position is reflected, for example, in health, with the 'healthy schools movement' which strives to ensure 'healthy cities' (WHO, 1995). It is through critical ethnographic discovery and dialectical theory building that spatial knowledge can be developed in the classroom and which might show how this could lead towards a more socially just spatial world.

The design of schools has been the focus of considerable research the world over since the advent of the Lancastrian School in the mid-nineteenth century. These schools emerged as a response to the Industrial Revolution and the increased urbanisation of the time, together with a range of societal needs for educated labour such urban intensification implied. A significant proportion of the wealth of school design research, however, has been steeped in a positivist paradigm (Lackney,

1994). Notable exceptions to this have been Dutton (1991), Dutton & Hurst-Mann (1996), Derouet-Besson (1996), Sultana (1995), and Ward (1996).

With such a dominating and externally driven positivist focus on school planning and design it is therefore not surprising that little appears to have changed in the spatial, organisational and pedagogical concept of a classroom over those intervening 150 years. Formal classroom environments have been imposed on the occupants with little opportunity for their active, voiced and constructive inclusion in the shaping of the spaces, spaces in which they learn for at least twelve of their formative years and in which teachers spend most of their working lives.

Some of this positivist research has been predicated on the detached 'gaze' (Lacan, 1977; Benjamin, 1978) of the professional designer and educational facility manager. They observe the classroom fundamentally as an 'object' in which occupant behaviour can be seen and 'analysed'. These researchers attempt to prescribe ways to impose change on those behavioural patterns through various spatial practices (Lefebvre, 1991). This is not unlike peering into a fishbowl and observing occupants as 'objects' from a distance, an approach favoured in environment-behaviour studies in the 1970s and 1980s. The hegemonic spatial paradigm holds that schools are created by design professionals working as 'servants' of financial capital, on behalf of the occupants. The occupants are given little say in the shaping of their own learning environments as the 'experts' seem to conclude that 'amateurs' are unable to explain what is needed spatially. Indeed, many occupants say that they cannot design and need design professionals to do this for them.

This elitist and hegemonic spatial attitude runs throughout most, if not all, architectural practice – from the design of classrooms to major projects in the public realm and most spaces in between, with the exception perhaps of the domestic house (Bachelard, 1969; Habraken, 1998). There are many contested factors lying behind this flawed model and this ‘critical pedagogy of space’ research project has attempted to analyse or deconstruct these myths. Such myths have been constructed by those having the power of class, gender, race, wealth and position, who have a hegemonic control of spatial production of schools and other publicly funded buildings. Their practices have ensured that little has changed in classroom design since the 1850s, with the reified design professions continuing to maintain their dominating and powerful role (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996).

Because of the lack of what I call a ‘critical spatial and visual literacy’ (New London Group, 1996; Burgin, 1996) of the occupants within learning environments, and in the community at large (Thorn, 1999), there has been little possibility for any real challenge to this hegemonic spatial practice. The majority of school design research has occurred within positivist-oriented design academies and not within critical pedagogical academies, and so it is the design and related discourses which have dictated an analysis of a largely uncritical form (Ellin, 1996; Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996). What is needed is a balanced viewpoint driven and informed from critical sociological, pedagogical, human geography arguments and related discourses, as a counterpoint to the largely and currently apolitical architectural critique (Peters, 1997; Peters et al., 2001; Giddens, 1997; Harvey, 1989; Habermas, 1989; Adorno & Horkheimer, 1947; Foucault, 1972; Jameson, 1991).

With the exception of critical human geography, few of these discourses have been 'deconstructed' within a spatial framework (McLaren, 1998; Shor, 1996; Peters, 1997; Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996; Sultana, 1995). Critical pedagogy needs to include a spatial component through the aegis of critical human geography (Soja, 1996; Pile, 1996; Gregory, 1989; Benko & Strohmeyer, 1997; Cosgrove, 1989) to contest the perceived immutability of spatiality and its relations with the social. Critical pedagogy also needs to rub 'against the grain' of theories of identity formation and the development of the individual self within society through an examination of critical psychoanalytic theory (Marcuse, 1956; Adorno, 1978; Benjamin, 1973; Butler, 1997; Irigaray, 1993; Pile, 1996; Rose, 1995; Ingleby, 1987).

It is also clear that the largely positivist and phenomenological arguments postulated by many of the design-oriented researchers of the 1980s and early 1990s (Moore & Lackney, 1993; Lackney, 1994; Seamon, 1987, Rapoport, 1982), supplemented by later postmodern reinterpretations (Jencks, 1996; Wigley, 1996), have, in terms of understanding these spatial, social and individual power relations, been lacking in rigour, depth and theoretical foundations. These impoverished and façade-like architectural dialogues have been framed, for example, on outcomes-based concepts characteristic of positivist and quantitative paradigms.

This historicist position is now vigorously contested by critical human geographers who argue for a spatial re-evaluation of history rather than for one underpinned by the traditionally hegemonic time-based accounts (Harvey, 1989; Soja, 1996). That such a positivist gaze is seen as the only legitimate form of research might explain why there has been little change in school design over such a long period of school

building development. The adoption of a qualitative or critically social perspective, however, can offer a vast array of alternative views or points of difference (Lefebvre, 1991; Derrida, 1976). Importantly, these qualitative approaches take much greater account of the views of the occupants of schools as silent spatial sites. The voices of teachers and students, although still concerned citizens, are predominantly marginalised and precluded by their very incarceration and bounded-ness within the social construct of a school campus and its classrooms.

There are some who argue that the school campus has reached its culmination and that home-based learning, community-based learning, industry-based learning, distance learning, flexible delivery and so on will all make the traditional organisational and physical construct of school redundant (Jilk, 1997). To the contrary I argue that, since social interaction is fundamental to the human species, such a dispersal of collegiate and collaborative learning, which constitutes the very core of much of our society's cultural underpinning, will be resisted (Foucault, 1996; Jameson, 1992; Harvey, 1993). As a counterpoint to the virtuality of the Internet and the 'flexible accumulation of capital' (Harvey, 1989), there will be a return to rediscovering place as a critical factor in creating cultural meaning in society. The school campus as a space and place of collaborative and collegiate learning, and as a place of critical enculturation, will be vigorously renewed through a renewed 'cultural pedagogy' (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996).

Over the past few years this trend has already emerged, notwithstanding the parallel rapid growth of the Internet, with large capital sums being spent on educational buildings in the school, vocational and university sectors. The use of new technology

and arts facilities to entice private school students into the flourishing privatised schooling system in Australia is further evidence of this resurgence in spatial interest in an increasingly marketised education system. This still leaves, however, a gaping hole in the dismal funding for the rapidly decaying existing, and yet-to-be-built, new public school buildings. This public 'stock' consists of the classrooms in which students 'live' for twelve years and teachers for much longer in a system which is being confronted with relentless commercialisation. Further, there is little opportunity for school communities to have a voice in the development of urgently needed school building renewal programs. Their participation would, however, both enrich and inform the rehabilitation planning processes – provided that students and teachers are given training to enable them to participate fully and effectively in this important process.

Still, this explanation of why classrooms are 'stuck' and viewed as fishbowls is still all too simplistic since there are many other factors which bear on the production of school space. As I note above, my spatial and pedagogical concern stems from a belief that our worldviews of space and place are very much shaped by our school experiences which later inform our urban and environmental worldviews in adult life as citizens in the community. Yet in school we are not exposed to the sort of spatial and environmental arguments which are now becoming strident in critical human geography, critical urban design and critical placemaking. 'Spatial literacy' (The New London Group, 1996), especially of the non-critical variety, is seen as very much the domain of the professional designers.

These designers, despite being the 'experts', 'dress themselves in black so that they cannot be seen' (Sartor, 2001). A good example is a recent issue of *Architecture Australia* which features thirty or so university buildings (Architecture Australia, 2001). Reviews of these buildings offer no pedagogical comment other than from a couple of architectural academics. In most cases architects avidly avoid engaging in critical spatial debate in the public domain for fear of alienating their clients and sponsors (Soltan, 1996). They are captives of the capitalist system in the same way that their clients are constrained by the material world of corporate or government finance. Furthermore, both architects and sponsors seem unable to engage with the social world. It is only planners, urban designers and geographers, supported by a handful of increasingly intimidated academic, ethnographic and sole-practice architects, who are in a position to take a socio-political view of the spatial realm. These minority critics are also vilified as not being part of the accepted design academy and are thus not accepted as legitimised members of the approved hegemonic discourse.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I framed my original research questions at the start of this study. What I had set out to do was to develop an analytical framework which demonstrated a greater understanding of the relationship between learning environments and meaningful learning, with a specific focus on young adults. These research questions, while still relevant, I have replaced with a new set described below.

In this final Chapter I tease out a number of the factors which have remained hidden, either intentionally by the designers and bureaucrats (to ensure the preservation of their hegemonic dominance), or unintentionally by the occupants due to what I call a

'spatial unconsciousness'. Dominating my psycho–socio–spatial critical pedagogical thesis is the notion of cognitive mapping which continues to subversively infiltrate this spatial, social and identity-making struggle (Jameson, 1991). Cognitive mapping implies a tension which involves an interdisciplinary discourse between the spatial, the social and the psychological. Cognitive mapping is an integrated approach that practitioners of each have been tentative to enter and one that involves a trajectory which incorporates the spatial imagination of the individual with the political place-making realities of the social. It involves broaching an overlapping inner- and outer-space and unpicking a physical, social and personal spatial dialectic – unfamiliar territory to architects, planners and geographers. It is also a space which critical social theorists have only recently begun to explore.

We need to stake out this 'third-space' of 'otherness', particularly as it relates to classroom practice within a critical pedagogical paradigm, by first exploring the self, the social, the spatial and their interaction (Soja, 1996; Benhabib, 1996).

Mapping the social

Accepting, even embracing difference and otherness is at the core of critical pedagogy and critical social theory. Critical pedagogy in turn strives for a democratic and emancipatory form of schooling which is free of gender bias, racial hatred and class privilege (Shor, 1996; Apple, 1996; Giroux, 1999). It aspires to social justice in a pedagogical practice that is attuned and relevant to the lifeworld of the student (McInerney, 2001) and seeks a resistant form of schooling which works 'against the grain' of normalising forces to shape a curriculum and school experience which is both enabling and empowering (McLaren, 1998). Also at the heart of critical pedagogy is the idea of schooling for social capital (Smyth, 2000) in which 'social

psychoanalysis and the significance of place' (Kincheloe & Pinar, 1991) play a critical part. Put more simply, critical pedagogy calls for a democratic form of school reform so that student and teachers' voices are heard and acted upon rather than the 'system' imposing and regulating all matters in the school, towards social justice in schooling (Giroux, 1997; Peters, 1997; Shor, 1996; McLaren, 1998).

A critical 'cultural pedagogy' (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996) has to be shaped, one that ensures the school lifeworld of the student is relevant to the social lifeworld they experience outside the school (Shor, 1996). It is through a classroom-based 'critical literacy' (Friere, 1972) that the external, social and political forces, which mould the student within the school, can be understood at a deeper level by both teachers and students. Such a critical literacy searches behind the façade of the accepted 'norms' of not only text-books but also of print and electronic media, film, the Internet, and advertising (New London Group, 1996; Burgin, 1996; Kellner, 1998; Denzin, 1995). Critical literacy calls for a deeper understanding of the environment, of globalisation, of fashion and of brands. Further, of fundamental relevance to my spatial project, it calls for a critical visual literacy as these 'objects' are not what they might seem to the observer as surrealists such as Magritte have struggled to point out (Burgin, 1996).

Yet it is within the context of these 'critical multiple literacies' that the continued silence surrounding space, place and architecture in schools is of most concern to me. Despite the apparent uncritical discourse in architecture, some efforts, such as the commentary relating to critical regionalism (Frampton, 1985; Tsonis & Lefaivre, 1996; Mumford, 1961), have been made in an attempt to tease out the homogenising and hegemonic influence of the modernist and internationalist movement. Critical

regionalism, drawing on Benjamin (Buck-Morss, 1989) argues that traces of local or regional resistance can be expressed in architectural form. While postmodernism also attempted a resistant deconstructed project to question the role of space in society (Jencks, 1996; Wigley, 1996; Jameson, 1991; Derrida, 1986; Habermas, 1988), it has been the lack of a critical spatial literacy in the pedagogical academies that has allowed this hegemony to reign supreme (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996; Giroux, 1991; Soltan, 1996; Ellin, 1996; Ward, 1996).

It is through the refocussed lens of critical spatial literacy that the space, place and architecture of the school and its classrooms needs to be re-read and deconstructed. This has to be achieved in such a way that power relations are understood and socio-spatial practices, such as critical placemaking, are rediscovered to resist the dominating spatial practices of the design professionals (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995; Ellin, 1996; Sandercock, 1998). This will require a rethinking of how spatial practices are inter-related, co-constructed and mapped with the social.

Mapping the spatial

As public citizens we experience spatiality in a variety of ways. Many of these ways are still unsupported by a curriculum or a pedagogical practice which might have provided us with a critical spatial vocabulary to enable us to articulate what we see and feel about space and place. Any spatial tools that do exist stem primarily from studies in spatial meaning grounded in the concept of phenomenology (Heidegger, 1971; de Certeau, 1984; Seamon, 1994, Tuan, 1974). It is generally accepted that our normatively formed uncritical spatial literacy originated from our experiences as young children in the home which principally involved an exposure to a multiplicity of intimate domestic spaces (Bachelard, 1969). These absorbed and largely uncritical

experiences are not sufficient to prepare us for the larger-scale built world encountered outside the home as we later emerged from that secure introverted environment, to 'live' in the school and subsequently the community or wider public domain. Following our experiences in the home and during our years at school we were not introduced to adequate spatial tools to enable us to engage with this vast other world.

While design professionals generally hold that untrained laypersons are not qualified to explain spatial perception, Bachelard has postulated that space can only be experienced in a way which parallels the way we experience poetry. As mental images are constructed from the words of poetry, similarly our mental maps of spatiality are constructed and this is the way space is experienced – in the imagination. The problem that still remains in this idea is the lack of any critical social perspective. It assumes that space and place are immutable and we are left powerless to act to change our spatial circumstances even if we wanted to.

Other approaches which have attempted to provide a deeper insight use, as a primary vehicle, the idea of semiology which was first articulated by Saussure (Gordon, 1996). The signifier (the representative image) is purely symbolic of the signified (the original object) and bears no causal relation to it other than through a linguistic and structural link imposed by the rules of language (Eco, 1976). Critical regionalism attempts to separate signifieds from signifiers by seeking out the coded traces of topographical, social, cultural and physical human experiences existing within the surrounding region in order to provide a contrast to the externally imposed

homogenised and internationalised modernist movement (Frampton, 1985; Tsonis, 1996).

The identity-free international modernist style was, and still is, clearly evident in the post-war boom of school architecture of the 1960s (Vergriete, 1997). The emancipatory intentions of the modernist movement rejected 'difference' in favour of 'equality', an equality which forestalled any sense of belonging to unique communities or identities of the self. Postmodernist, poststructuralist and deconstructionist discourses all sought to resist this homogeneity which is largely associated with 'meta-narratives' stemming from the Enlightenment. They argue for a resistant form of architecture represented by a fragmentation and penetration of the façade through a deconstructive re-reading of these unifying social theories (Derrida, 1973; Jencks, 1996; Wigley, 1996). All three approaches sought to refute any form of understanding through a global meta-narrative, rejecting Enlightenment worldviews and replacing them with a localised sense of meaning. This trend can be observed and categorised in the so-called nationalist 'balkanisation' movements evident in Europe and Asia (Peters, 1997; Jameson, 1991).

Counter-arguments assert that there has been no fracturing of the sociological evolution of humanity and that the present contemporary architectural movement is a progression of the modern. It is 'late-modern' rather than a new form of expression as embodied in the so-called postmodern movement (Habermas, 1988; Giroux et al., 1995; Jameson, 1991). This progression was most pronounced and could be readily observed in architecture where the modern, up to the 1960s, subsequently evolved into the postmodern pastiche of the late 1970s and 1980s. This trend then faded

only to return to the bland late-modernist architecture of today (Jencks, 1996). This progression also illustrates the impoverished nature of spatial discourse in the architectural academies.

We have to turn to critical human geography (Gregory, 1989; Soja, 1996; Harvey, 1989) to gain any real insights into critical thinking on space and place to evolve any rudimentary arguments which have been developed within architectural discourses. While critical urban design (Ellin, 1996; Schneecloth & Shibley, 1995) and critical urban planning (Forester, 1988; Sandercock, 1998) have explored the political shaping of space and place, these discourses are still limited – although they are still far more penetrating than that of architecture. My socio-pedagogical spatial study, by focussing on a critical spatiality of learning, examines a trajectory from the local place level, represented by architecture, through to the spatiality of geography. While there is minimal critical thinking at the architectural end, the level of criticality increases through the related disciplines of landscape architecture, urban design and urban planning to critical human geography. This trajectory reveals increasing levels of critical thinking, writing and discourse, where space and place are hotly contested as agents in the shaping of the individual, the social and the cultural.

While attempts at a form of social collaborative architecture were made in the 1970s, they were discredited by the New Right as being related to the resistance movements of the time and they largely lapsed during the economic rationalist reigns of Thatcher and Reagan in the 1980s and 1990s (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996; Hatch, 1986; Hale, 2000). In a similar vein, design academies pursued a collaborative approach to teaching design in the studio but these efforts were not sustained. This

is evidenced in the way contemporary public architecture is dominated by autocratic design professionals (Schon, 1983, 1985; Dutton, 1991; Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996; Hatch, 1986).

Spatial language has been pivotal in this struggle since concepts such as 'grounded', 'structure', 'bounded', 'carceral', 'shaped', 'framed' and so on have been appropriated within the literature of critical social theory to enrich the language of arguments within disciplines and epistemologies other than architecture (Wigley, 1996; Derrida, 1976). Yet this colonisation has had a reverse effect on spatial discourses. Architecture and urban design have suffered a dilution of meaning as the lexicon of those disciplines has been weakened by the use of key spatial terms within other discourses. While the discourses of non-architectural disciplines have been enriched through the appropriation of architectural language, architecture and urban design have not been so fortunate.

Critical human geography, in its struggle to shake off the hegemonic dominance of the notion of history as shaping the world, has confronted this language dilemma (Peters, 1997; Benko & Strohmayer, 1997; Soja, 1996, Harvey; 1989). While human geography disputes some of Lefebvre's (1991) seemingly fragmented ideas of spatial production and consumption (Soja, 1996; Urry, 1995), the ideas enunciated in his seminal work, *The Production of Space*, have spawned a vast array of critical spatial thinking and writing within human geography. Lefebvre developed a triadic link between spatial practice, the representation of space (the signifier or symbolic) and representational space (the signified or that which is real).

Lefebvre, and subsequently critical human geographers, drew heavily on Marxist analytical frameworks and were concerned mainly with the social, and how this related to the material (Harvey, 1989, 2001; Jameson, 1991). Put another way, this struggle with the dialectics of materialism was seen as a kind of dialogic 'third-space' which examined and interrogated the tensions between materialist capitalism and the structure of the social. Subsequently Lefebvre's idea of a third-space was adopted by Soja (1996), McLaren (1998) and others. Yet Lefebvre did not concern himself to any significant degree with the role of the individual, the formation of an identity of the self, and how this related to the identity of the group or the social whole. Currently the analysis of identity formation of the individual self is becoming increasingly the focus of social theorists, with critical pedagogical theorists beginning to focus attention on this issue (Wexler, 1987; Keith & Pile, 1993; Blum & Nast, 1996; Harvey, 1998; Massey, 1998; McWilliam, 1997, 2000). The construction of spatial meaning and identity through the self, and our apparent unconscious perception of spatiality, is now also being examined through a critical pedagogical lens.

Mapping the self

To date, issues relating to the self and concepts of spatial meaning have been addressed primarily through the uncritical focus of phenomenology. To take theorising in this area further requires a cross-disciplinary psycho-social spatial study. However, since each of the relevant individual disciplines have been seen as either too uncritical or not concerned with the formation of identity, barriers to a deeper understanding still exist. Psychoanalysis, for example, has not had a sufficiently legitimate status in critical social theory, although the Frankfurt School has a tradition of grappling with psychoanalytic theories (Adorno, 1978; Marcuse, 1956; Ingleby, 1987; Whitebrook, 1996). It is necessary to understand, in a critically

social way, the interplay of the inner-space of the individual with the outer-space of society (Pile, 1996). It should be noted that many radical feminists have quite rightly contested the patriarchal foundations of psychoanalytic theory and the implications of this for a gendered spatiality (Irigary, 1993; Rose, 1995; Klein, 1988; Butler, 1997; Blum & Nast, 1996). Yet others believe that 'psychoanalysis and feminist and postmodernist theories have much to teach us about the character and importance of their particular objects of inquiry: gender, knowledge, self, power and justice' (Flax, 1990).

If psychoanalysis is ignored as a means of tapping into the spatial unconscious, what other avenues are there to peel back the protective layers surrounding the apparent immutability of spatial practice be peeled back? What other more effective analytical tools are available to understand the individual's perception of spatiality if we are not to re-tread the paths of the hegemony of the positivist environment-behavioural psychologists? Given few, if any, other alternatives, the spatial tropes of Freud (1930) and Lacan (1977) and their psychoanalytic theorising can be re-read and related to Lefebvre's (1991) own spatial concepts to establish a case for using psychoanalysis as a legitimate tool for spatial analysis (Pile, 1996).

It is critical to note that Freud's and Lacan's patriarchal theories do not have to be accepted in their entirety. As Marx has been adapted by the Frankfurt School so, too, can use be made of the conceptual methods of psychoanalysis to map a theory of spatial consciousness and sub-consciousness. In this way new spatial ground can be staked out and contested, rather than continue to be ignored. Some critical pedagogists have recently explored this possibility. Kincheloe et al (1999) write,

'[W]hen psychoanalysis takes into account the Deweyan, the Vygotskian, and more recently the postmodern rejection of Freud's separation of the psychic from the social realm, it becomes a powerful tool in cognitive and educational psychology' (p19).

Much of Lacan's work was framed in a structuralist era drawing from phenomenologist colleagues (Levi-Strauss, 1949; Merleau-Ponty, 1945). Yet despite the contested nature of these structuralist ideas within post-structuralist theories, no other more effective socially critical visually oriented analysis of the individual body-in-space has been possible. Critical social theory itself has been described as the psychoanalysis of society as it strives to uncover the apparent unconscious acceptance of hegemonic practices (Habermas, 1968; Gramsci, 1973; Giroux, 1999). In a similar way, psychoanalysis can also be explored as a means of uncovering the unconscious self and our perceptions of space and place.

Such a spatial unconsciousness was immediately evident in my initial interviews with students at the Asphalt, Brick and Concrete High School (ABCCHS). The students seemed to be suffering some sort of spatial torpor or malaise. Yet it clearly encompassed more than this: in many instances they seemed almost robot-like as they went about their various classroom activities during the day. My initial 'interviews' with students resulted in unsolicited comments, such as 'we have to come to school; it sucks, but you have to do it so you just get up and go' (Chris). Students seem unable to identify their feelings in relation to inanimate, seemingly immutable, objects nor write about their feelings about them (Bigelow, 1998).

I could see students constantly struggling with the 'desensitising' effect of the bland classroom environments and dull courtyard views outside, both of which stifled any sense of 'being in the world' (Heidegger, 1971) or experiencing the lived world (Shor, 1987). It was not surprising to me that students were disconnected from their feelings: this was what the school architecture was symbolically and semiotically urging them to do (Baldry, 1999). It was unconsciously compelling them to close down their emotions and feelings, denying them any sense of self or identity formation and implying that they should conform with the normalising forces of society.

These lifeworld school experiences have been theorised as a trialectic, integrating the 'real', the 'imaginary' and the 'symbolic' as I noted in Chapter 5 earlier (Pile, 1996; Lefebvre, 1991; Lacan, 1977; Freud, 1930). Pile (1996, pp.156–7) has neatly merged these three categories by arguing firstly that *real spatial practice* is a tension between contradiction and cohesion, fragmentation and disintegration. The *imaginary representation* of space is spatial practice through the use of images either consciously or unconsciously perceived through signs and coding. Finally, *symbolic representational* space embodies complex symbolisms which have conscious and unconscious resonances. These are associated with an 'underground' social life', and they take on meaning specifically in the process of exchange within a system of differences. As meaning is associated with value, then it is through the symbolic that power relations become the most visible.

This is a strong argument that the power of school architecture is shaping the behaviour of its occupants, if unconsciously. If the psychosocio-spatial concepts of

Freud, Lacan and Lefebvre are intertwined, it is possible to construct a credible framework for a psychosocio-spatial analysis of the inner- and outer- spatial perception of the individual 'being' in the lived world which is society.

The creation of symbolic spaces is not given in the stars but painstakingly nurtured and fought over, precisely because of the hold that place can have over the imagination ... The strength of the Lefebvrian construction, however, is precisely that it refuses to see materiality, representation and imagination as separate worlds and that it denies the particular privileging of any one realm over the other, while simultaneously insisting that it is only in the social practices of daily life that the ultimate significance of all forms of activity is registered. (Harvey, 1993, p.23)

Thus space, place and built structures have a functional and symbolic relationship to social organisation. To take an example outside of education, '[t]he signs and functions of office buildings can undermine as well as reinforce each other so that an image of corporate prestige conveyed by the external façade of the building may be cancelled out by a feeling of individual worthlessness by the employee in the open-plan office' (Baldry, 1997, pp.365–7). Although such an argument is yet to be made in regard to school architecture, the unconscious is nevertheless addressed by some critical pedagogists, critical human geographers and radical feminists. They have suggested that, as teachers, we need to re-engage with our 'corporeality' and that we need to 're-flesh', 're-eroticise' and 're-self' (Wexler, 1992; McLaren, 1989; McWilliam, 2000; Harvey, 1998).

Identity formation is a process of responding to traces of the past and how we see these spatially embedded traces is culturally dependent (Benjamin, 1978; Buck-Morss, 1989; Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996). '[O]ur identities [are] always contingent and incomplete processes rather than determined outcomes. [They exist within] epistemologies as situated and ambivalent rather than abstract and universal' (Keith & Pile, 1993, p.34). The concept of cognitive mapping supports this trialectic or third-space idea. Sociological mapping can be viewed as analogous to urban or spatial mapping, and the inability to map one can be equally as crippling as the inability to map the other (Jameson, 1991; Lynch, 1976). A third, internal, dimension additional to the social and spatial offers another layer of complexity, with all three interacting in the formation of our identities, either consciously or unconsciously. We are in a constant struggle to map the three – the personal, the social and the spatial – (over each other) to make sense of our lived worlds.

In the traditional lands of Australian Indigenous people this eternal struggle is expressed through the use of song, and dot painting, and is the means of cognitive mapping. These song and dot paintings thus constitute an Indigenous 'third-space'. The songs and paintings, or dreamings, describe the cultural myths, and the fantasy beings residing within these myths describe and become features in the landscape. In turn, the landscape describes the culture, with the complete socio-cultural spatial map being embodied in what are called Songlines (Chatwin, 1987). Notwithstanding the critical re-readings of Chatwin's plagiarisation of Aboriginal 'secret men's business', it is the constant singing of these Songlines over time, and the constant re-rendering of dot paintings, which provides meaning and identity to that socio-cultural group.

This cycle breaks down for the Indigenous community when their connections with land is lost, and when their physical landscape becomes the urban or city environment. The landmarks within their adopted, no longer nomadic, urban Western cultural landscape remains unconnected with their now urbanised and fragmenting culture. Essentially my project is attempting to develop an equivalent Western non-nomadic songline or cognitive map for our (non-Indigenous!) urban existence so that the spatial references and traces of memory reflect our cultural, political and social landscapes (Harris, 1990).

Postmodernists and poststructuralists argue that our contemporary societal dysfunction is evidenced by the fragmentation of any concept of a socially coherent global meta-narrative (Derrida, 1986; Wigley, 1996; Venturi et al., 1997). In their apparently meaningless architectural forms, the work of deconstructive architects clearly reflects this shattering of social structure (Wigley, 1996; Jencks, 2001). Yet their attempts at deconstructing society, and then reconstructing its remnants in an alternative form, are undertaken in an autocratic way rather than one which is dialogic. The spatial and the social are still played out in separate disciplinary discourses, with the protagonists of each discipline arguing the truth of their position. All too few architectural designers collaborate with their constituent communities on these deconstructed spatial projects in any critically, spatially literate way.

It is this complex web of realities, unconsciously played out in the classroom and in the grounds of schools, that we need to unpack and understand at a deeper level before any sense of empowerment will be possible. We need to develop our own

collaborative cognitive maps to enable us to make sense of our contingent life-worlds.

Deconstructing multiple identities through dialectical theory-building

I was totally unprepared for the pervasive sense of 'spatial disembodiment' I found in first entering the ABCHS. Thus I felt that it was critical that I understood the origins of the state of mind of students, and the resultant frustrations of teachers in the classroom, to make sense of my project. I explored a range of ways to tap into student notions of spatial perception, finding that the bedroom and the beach were the closest to their 'hearts and minds' (Haagstrom, 2000; Smyth, 2001). As noted earlier, I provided cameras for students to photograph examples of local architecture and landscape in their neighbourhood that I believed would appeal to them (Walker, 1993; Schratz & Steiner-Loffler, 1998). This exercise largely resulted in shots of the school and of unbuilt, natural environments. The students were clearly telling me that they had a distaste for the built form, either in or out of school, and preferred natural spaces and places. Unconsciously it might have meant that buildings represented incarceration and that the outdoors offered a form of freedom.

I soon realised that such a personal and direct probing into understanding how spatial psychoanalysis might be embodied in students' minds was limited. It might tease out evidence of these emotive blockages but it could not do much to change them. What was needed was a way to 're-flesh' students in their classroom and schoolyard worlds. Further, the cultural separation of classroom from external lived worlds, expressed through their multiple identities, had to be challenged. The image of school as a 'place you had to go to' needed to be changed to 'a place you wanted to go to and be in'. Perhaps the Indigenous idea that 'we belong to the land, not the

land belongs to us', might be going a bit too far, but it was nevertheless necessary to move towards that ideal.

Notions of critical ethnography (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Anderson, 1994; Marcus, 1998), 'dialectical theory building' (Lather, 1986), 'critical practice in the design studio' (Schon, 1985) and creating 'enunciative spaces' (Smyth, 1998) seemed to be ideal vehicles for a significantly more interactive and indirect approach. Yet there exists some doubt as to the validity of critical ethnography as a legitimate form of research, although other voices validate it as a form of social research practice which can stand alongside, or contest, positivist paradigms. I nevertheless hoped that a reflexive, dialectical theory-building process could involve student collaborators in the construction and validation of meaning (Lather, 1986). I believed that it could be possible to create a reciprocal relationship of cultural transformation where any contradictions could be enunciated through participant narratives (Marcus, 1998).

This process, as I discovered at ABCHS, could really only happen over an extended period of time (Lather, 1986). While some synergies with the practice of urban design as a form of cooperative spatial praxis already existed, which offered some hope of a deeper form of collaborative placemaking (Ellin, 1996; Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995; Sandercock, 1998), this still-emerging discipline constantly struggled in contentious circumstances, with perennial sniping by architects and planners in an ongoing battle for legitimacy in conservative, not critical, design academies and professional organisations. It struggled to be 'critical', in the Frankfurt School sense, in part because it is seen by some as being dominated by 'lapsed' architects possibly

seeking a social architecture redolent of the 1970s. It was therefore not legitimised by the traditional non-critical architectural hegemonic discourse (Hurst, 2000).

At the ABCHS I wanted to tackle the 'spatial un-conscious', to see if it was really a 'spatial sub-conscious' able to be re-activated to consciously engage in the spatial realities enclosing students in the classroom. If space and place subconsciously played a part in inscribing the school sociology into their identities (and vice –versa?), could spatiality be brought to the conscious minds of students? In progressing from my direct one-on-one psychoanalytic approach with individual students, I determined that a hybrid approach combining a more abstract dialectical theory-building process within a practical placemaking project framework could offer me an indirect and informal access to student feelings and perceptions. This approach presented ample time–space opportunities, within an informal–formal, and spontaneously–planned framework, all circumscribing the project, with possibilities for continued and repeated engagement over the long-term. By collaborating in what was to become known as the 'courtyard project', students, teacher and me, the researcher, were all united in a task which was multi-dimensional and which could also take a number of years to complete. In fact it might never be finished but could continue to evolve as incoming students re-evaluated the project as a place which they could explore to shape their own meaning and perhaps leave some spatial traces of their own (Blyfield, 2001).

The project provided a non-threatening environment for the practice of 'purposeful conversations' (Burgess, 1988). I also hoped that the project would subversively insinuate itself (Sandercock, 1998) throughout the school, since it was the student–teacher relations in the classrooms themselves that I truly wanted to tackle, not only

the 'outdoor rooms' or school grounds. I also wanted a cross-curriculum strategy which would see all teachers asking themselves 'how can I teach this topic using the classroom, the school buildings or the school grounds as a teaching and learning tool?' Teachers and other education professionals constantly question information technology usage in the curriculum, so why not spatiality? The project was to be a tool to demonstrate 'grassroots school reform'; it also had to resist the hegemony of the professional external designers of the school itself; and it had to demonstrate a spatial form of social justice in schooling.

The courtyard project was to become a form of 'agora' for the practice of school democracy. It started out as a collaborative effort between a solitary art teacher, together with students from Years 8 through to 12, and included a number of non-government authorities and an artist-in-residence, and an artisan or landscape gardening contractor. Subsequently, parents and other teachers collaborated on the project through the school forum and the school board. The expressive arts were initially used as the entre to a spatial literacy and vocabulary, directed towards a critical spatial-social understanding of the public sphere (Habermas, 1989). I hoped that the project would subsequently gradually penetrate other areas of the curriculum, first to English, then technology studies and so on throughout all of the eight learning areas of the SACSA curriculum (DETE, 2001). Eventually, I also hoped, it would be horizontally and vertically integrated in the school in a truly insurgent and subversive manner as a cross-curriculum, spatial thematic project for a period of five weeks. It became obvious that the success of the project would be highly dependent on the pedagogical practices of the teachers and that, for the

process to be sustainable, the notion of integrating space into the curriculum, as innovative as it was, had to be 'taught' to other teachers.

It needed to become part of a 'teachers' learning project' within the school (Smyth, 1998a). Sustainability through teacher professional development was, at the time of writing, being negotiated through the Community Arts Network (Williams, 1995). This non-government agency agreed to collaborate in the development of a two-day teachers' professional development training package on 'place, space and identity in the curriculum'. It is planned that the program will be supported by the collation of dozens of examples of arts-and-architecture-in-schools-and-grounds projects, all of which have combined a number of elements of this integrated, embodied, social capital, spatial approach to critical pedagogy (Wirth et al., 1994; Latrielle, 1986; Williams, 1995).

Ultimately my critical ethnographic encounter in the ABCHS resulted in the exploration of seven generative themes. The first, *the spatially 'stuck' classroom*, explored the reality of the almost numb acceptance of the classroom as an immutably bounded space. It is widely accepted that public schools are badly underfunded, but the limited attempts at any form of adaptation of the 'really boring' classrooms was quite distressing. Clearly, teachers and students had given up all hope of any means of altering their learning environment. I then struggled with *spatial silences: the construction of school spatial knowledge*. As noted, initial interviews had uncovered a spatial ennui. This led me to *the spatially unconscious: the role of the expressive arts* and, subsequently, to *the [spatial] curriculum as*

agency. With the benefit of hindsight it was obvious that the practice of community art embodied much of what I was seeking to achieve.

This was the genesis of the courtyard project whereby students redesigned their bleak art courtyard. The project involved extensive evaluation of the existing school, consultation with a range of students from all years, various planning strategies and the design of landscaping and furniture and, finally, the construction of a series of models. Ultimately, the construction of the courtyard itself was funded by a grant which became available for community-oriented collaborative projects. The courtyard project uncovered the complex area of *multiple identities: the role of art in identity formation*. Here the idea of youth spaces and the role of the school and the impact of art in identity formation were tackled. It was through the process of *dialectical theory building: the courtyard project* that we were able to use school design to integrate all the categories I had encountered in my research into a collaborative and dialogic courtyard project.

This work eventually framed what I have called *sustaining teacher's (insurgent, subversive and spatial) work*. The themes were used to weave spatial theorising into a spatial praxis to lead to a set of spatially democratic and socially just pedagogical goals, the desired outcomes of the study. This 'learning teachers' spatial work' project will continue to explore ways of using space and place in a thematic way as a means of integrating the curriculum across the eight learning areas. The project has already been adopted by another school which approached me for further information after hearing about it.

The discussion between the teachers was animated and excited. As a staff we have been exploring the area of sacred space both within and without. I think that it may have some links with your ideas on third space. That transcendent place that is within us all that links our inner hopes and ideas with the outer world. The point of appropriation and creativity. My own study is about the children's constructions of 'hope'. We have decided to keep asking ourselves the question 'how can we empower the children through the expressive arts and how can we enable the children to use their environment?'(Feehan, 2001)

A manifesto for a 'critical psychosocial spatiality of learning'

The central theme of this study has been to respond to the 'increasingly urgent' calls for the exploration of a 'third-space', through a 'spatial trialectics', to develop a deeper understanding of space and its conscious and unconscious role in society (Peters, 1997; Soja, 1996; Benhabib, 1996; Lefebvre, 1991; Pile, 1996). I have shown that cognitive mapping (Pile, 1996; Jameson, 1991; Lynch, 1976) can offer a useful cross-border (Giroux, 1991) and cross-disciplinary (McLaren, 1998) methodology which links the discourses of space, society and the unconscious, or the imaginary. However, this approach is still lacking in that it overlooks the 'body in space'; that is, the relationship between inner- and outer- space experienced by the individual and the self. The inclusion of the body through spatial psychoanalysis (Pile, 1996) implies that a fourth dimension must be attached to the previous three.

This might result in a four-way process whereby cognitive mapping could be used to track the relations between the body and its unconscious to society and spatiality. It is an idea which is evocative of Bourdieu's (1990) four notions of capital – social, economic, cultural and symbolic – which are all grounded in the *habitus* of the

individual. The art-in-architecture projects in schools described above have demonstrated how this approach can be activated to be an agent of resistance by integrating these ideas to a refreshed and corporeal spatiality.

This four-way notion, in order to explicate a complete theoretical framework, must also incorporate a critical 'cultural–pedagogical' approach to spatiality (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996). Such an attempt to include all of these elements demonstrates that, to understand spatiality and its role in shaping the body–society–culture–pedagogy, a cross-disciplinary approach is required. Yet, architecture, psychoanalysis, geography and, to a lesser degree, sociology and pedagogy, are all treated as discrete circumscribed epistemologies within specific bounded discourses. What is needed is a transgression of these boundaries to construct an ontology which is grounded within a 'critical psychosocial pedagogy of space'. This dissertation has attempted to cross these boundaries in order to identify how linkages might offer a clearer picture on the relationships between such interdisciplinary categories.

Such a deconstructive spatial analysis can only be achieved by re-reading 'against the grain' within and across these boundaries (McLaren, 1998). This form of critical approach could ultimately offer an 'architecture of resistance' (Dutton & Hurst-Mann, 1996), developed through a collaborative practice of 'dialogical theory building' (Lather, 1986) in the classroom, and it would attempt to truly provide an 'architecture of pedagogical encounters' (Sultana, 1995). Even more profound might be a classroom practice which, through the entwining of spatiality, critical pedagogy, the body and society, turns this paradigm around and explores instead a 'pedagogy of

architectural encounters'. Such a reversal would challenge traditional subject-based hegemonies in secondary schools to take a critical cross-curriculum approach to students 'being in the classroom'.

If the spatial Zeitgeist of school buildings, as they exist in their many private and public forms today, are truly representative of our contemporary culture, it is clear that there remain extraordinary social inequities in our society. The questions I set at the start of my project attempted to understand this malaise. Looking back at them through a critical psycho–socio–spatial and pedagogical–cultural lens, I can now see an unconscious sub-text underlying my frustration. The original questions sought to relate the social to the spatial, and to distil a pedagogical praxis which might enlighten this relationship through what I now understand as 'critical cognitive mapping'. In the closing stages of this particular project I can now see a new set of questions which need to be framed.

If schools were to be designed as spaces for youth culture, how could youth space be described (Crane, 2001)? What would be the relationship between formal and informal space, or public and private space (Habermas, 1989)? What would youth culture's concept of virtual space be and how would this be expressed in the physicality of space? How would such an approach affect traditionally accepted spatial practices and spatial production in schools, notions such as 'out of bounds', corridor duty, yard duty, yard cleaning, vandalism, outdoor shade and shelter, leisure time, cars and transport, hours of use and separated faculty 'empires'? What would this all mean for 'grassroots school reform' in late-modernist times? And to what extent do existing school shapes, forms and spatial functions inhibit grassroots

school reform through the agency of a consciously imposed, yet unconsciously experienced, panoptic designs? (Foucault, 1984).

An active collaborative engagement with identity formation through a 're-corporealisation' (McLaren, 1989) or 're-selfing' (Wexler, 1992) of the body in the classroom, within a resistant re-reading of the externally constructed spatial boundaries imposed on students, is one way that an emancipatory, democratic and relevant student lifeworld and spatial experience might become possible. Such a 'school as place' might indeed still provide a 'container', but it might also become one where a socially just pedagogy is practised and nurtured. School 'graduates' will enter the adult world as critical, spatially aware and literate citizens, keen to ensure that a just and liveable world can be achieved.

Is this fantasy or reality? In the context of school design it has taken 150 years to move a very small distance. However, and most importantly, in pedagogical circles over the past five years there has been some genuine interest shown in public school spatiality, matching what has been known for centuries in private schooling. I believe the growing tensions between the globalised capitalist world and the localised lived world will see a vigorous and critical psycho-social return to the spatial.

It is through a socially just form of critical spatial pedagogy in schools that this struggle can be brought to the attention of our conscious lifeworlds.

References

- Adorno, T. and M. Horkheimer (1947). Dialectic of Enlightenment. New York, Herder and Herder.
- Adorno, T. (1978). Freudian theory and the pattern fascist propaganda. The Culture Industry, Selected Essays on Mass Culture. T. Adorno. London, Routledge: 114-135.
- Anderson, G. (1994). "The cultural politics of qualitative research in education: confirming and contesting the canon." Educational Theory 44(2): 225-237.
- Apple, M. (1996). Cultural Politics and Education. New York, Teachers College Press.
- Architecture Australia (2001). "Educational Architecture Feature Articles." Architecture Australia July/August.
- Bachelard, G. (1969). The Poetics of Space. Boston, Beacon Press.
- Baldry, C. (1997). "The social construction of office space." International Labour Review 136(3): 365-378.
- Benhabib, S. (1996). Critical theory and postmodernism: on the interplay of ethics, aesthetics and utopia in critical theory. The handbook of critical theory. D. Rasmussen. Cambridge, Blackwell Publishers.
- Benjamin, W. (1973). Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism. London, Verso.
- Benjamin, W. (1978). Briefe. Briefe. T. Adorno and G. Scholem. Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Benko, G. and U. Strohmayer, Eds. (1997). Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Post Modernity. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Bigelow, W. (1998). The human lives behind the labels: The global sweatshop, Nike, and the race to the bottom. Teaching for Social Justice: a Democracy and Education Reader. W. Ayers, J. Hunt and T. Quinn. New York, Teachers College Press: 21-38.
- Blum, V. and H. Nast (1996). "Where's the difference? The heterosexualisation of alterity in Henri Lefebvre and Jacques Lacan." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 14: 559-580.
- Blyfield, J. (2001). Kangaroo Island Area School: Artist in Residence Report. Adelaide, Gray Street Art Workshop.

- Bourdieu, P. (1990). The Logic of Practice. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Buck-Morss, S. (1989). The Dialectics of Seeing: Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Burgess, R. (1988). Conversations with a purpose: the ethnographic interview in educational research. Studies in Qualitative Methodology: A Research Annual. R. Burgess. London, JAI Press.
- Burgin, V. (1996). In/Different Spaces: Place and Memory in Visual Culture. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection. Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Chatwin, B. (1987). The Songlines. London, Picador.
- Chramosta, W. (1996). The New Schoolhouse: Schoolchild's Universe and Urban Particle: The School Building Programme of the City of Vienna. Wien, Stadplanung Wien and Magistrat der Stadt Wien.
- Cosgrove, D. (1989). Geography is everywhere: culture and the symbolism of landscapes. Horizons in Human Geography. D. Gregory and R. Walford. London, MacMillan Education Ltd: 118-135.
- Crane, P. and M. Dee (2001). "Young people, public space and new urbanism." Youth Studies Australia 20(1): 11-18.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). The Practice of Everyday Life. London, University of California Press.
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln (1994). Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. (1995). "The experiential text and the limits of visual understanding." Educational Theory 45(1): 7-18.
- Derouet-Besson, M.-C. (1996). Architecture and Education: Convergent and Divergent Approaches in Evolving Political and Scientific Circumstances. Paris, INRP (National Institute for Research into Pedagogy).
- Derrida, J. (1976). Of Grammatology. Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1986). "Point de Folie - maintenant l'architecture." AA Files 12(Summer): 65-75.
- DETE (2001). South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework (SACSA). Adelaide, Department of Education, Training and Employment.

- Dutton, T. (1991). Voices in Architectural Education. New York & London, Bergin & Garvey.
- Dutton, T. and L. Hurst-Mann, Eds. (1996). Reconstructing architecture: critical discourses and social practices. Pedagogy and Cultural Practice. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Eco, U. (1976). A Theory of Semiotics. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Ellin, N. (1996). Postmodern Urbanism. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.
- Feehan, P. (2001). Personal Communication by Email.
- Flax, J. (1990). Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Forester, J. (1988). Critical Theory and Planning Practice. Critical Theory and Public Life. J. Forester. Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). The Archaeology of Knowledge. London, Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Space, Knowledge and Power. The Foucault Reader. P. Rabinow. London, Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1996). The Order of Things. London, Routledge.
- Frampton, K. (1985). Towards a critical regionalism: six points for an architecture of resistance. The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture. H. Foster. London, Bay Press: 16-30.
- Freire, P. (1972). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Freud, S. (1930). Civilisation and its discontents. Civilisation, Society and Religion: Group Psychology, Civilisation and its Discontents and Other Works. Harmondsworth, Penguin Freud Library. 12: 251-340.
- Giroux, H., C. Lankshear, et al., Eds. (1995). Counternarratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces. New York, Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1997). Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope : Theory, Culture, and Schooling : A Critical Reader. Boulder, CA, Westview Press.
- Giroux, H. (1999). "Rethinking cultural politics and radical pedagogy in the work of Antonio Gramsci." Educational Theory 49(1): 1-19.
- Gordon, T. (1996). Saussure. London & New York, Writers and Readers

Publishing Ltd.

Gramsci, A. (1973). Letters From Prison. New York, Harper and Row.

Gregory, D. (1989). Areal differences and post-modern human geography. Horizons in Human Geography. D. Gregory and R. Walford. London, MacMillan Education: 67-96.

Habermas, J. (1988). "Modern and postmodern architecture." 9H 4.

Habermas, J. (1989). The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1990). The philosophical discourse of modernity. Cambridge, Polity.

Habraken, J. (1998). The Structure of the Ordinary. London, MIT Press.

Haggstrom (2000). The Teenage Room as Practise in Modern Living, Gavle, Sweden.

Hale, J. (2000). Building Ideas: An Introduction to Architectural Theory. New York, John Wiley and Sons LTD.

Harris, S. (1990). Two-Way Aboriginal Schooling: Education and Cultural Survival. Canberra, Aboriginal Studies press.

Harvey, D. (1989). The Condition of Postmodernity. Oxford, Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1993). From space to place and back again. Mapping the Futures. J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Tickner. London & New York, Routledge.

Harvey, D. (1998). "The body as an accumulation strategy." Environment and Planning D 16: 401-421.

Hatch, C. (1986). The Scope of Social Architecture. New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Heidegger, M. (1971). Building, Dwelling, Thinking. New York, Harper & Rowe.

Hurst, R. (2000). The urban design practitioner: why they do it, University of South Australia, Faculty of Art, Architecture and Design.

Ingleby, D. (1987). Psychoanalysis and ideology. Critical Theories of Psychological Development. J. Broughton. New York & London, Plenum Press: 177-210.

Irigary, L. (1993). An Ethics of Sexual Difference. London, Athlone Press.

Jameson (1991). Post Modernism or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. London, Verso.

Jameson, F. (1992). Signatures of the Visible. New York and London, Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc.

Jencks, C. (1996). What is Postmodernism? London, Academy Editions.

Jencks, C. (2001). Radio Interview with Charles Jencks about 'Fractal Architecture'. Arts Today (14th April, 2001), Radio National (Australian Broadcasting Commission). Melbourne.

Jilk, B. (1997). The Learning Village School. Minnesota, Cumberland Architects.

Keith, M. and S. Pile, Eds. (1993). Place and the Politics of Identity. London, Routledge.

Kellner, D. (1998). "Multiple literacies and critical pedagogy in a multicultural society." Educational Theory 48(1): 103-122.

Kincheloe, J. and W. Pinar, Eds. (1991). The Curriculum as Social Psychoanalysis: the Significance of Place. Albany, State University of New York Press.

Klein, M. (1988). Envy and Gratitude, and Other Works: 1946-1963. London, Virago.

Lacan, J. (1977). The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis. London, Hogarth Press.

Lackney, J. (1994). Educational Facilities: The Impact and Role of the Physical Environment of the School on Teaching, Learning and Educational Outcomes. Milwaukee, Johnson Controls Institute for Environmental Quality in Architecture Working Paper Series (Centre for Architecture and Urban Planning Research, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee).

Lather, P. (1986). "Research as praxis." Harvard Educational Review 56(3): 257-277.

Latrielle, W. (1986). Places for People: Urban Spaces in Victoria. Melbourne, Victorian State Urban Arts Unit.

Lefebvre (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1949). The Elementary Structures of Kinship. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Lynch, K. (1976). The Image of the City. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

- Marcus, G. (1998). Ethnography Through Thick and Thin. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1956). Eros and Civilisation: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud. London, Arc.
- Massey, D. (1998). The spatial construction of youth cultures. Cool Places: Geographies of Youth Cultures. T. Skelton and G. Valentine. London & New York, Routledge: 21-129.
- McInerney, P. (2001). Schooling for Social Justice. Education. Adelaide, Flinders University of South Australia: 400.
- McLaren, P. (1988). "Schooling the postmodern body: critical pedagogy and the politics of enfleshment." Journal of Education 170(3): 53-83.
- McLaren, P. (1998). "Revolutionary pedagogy in post revolutionary times: rethinking the political economy of critical education." Educational Theory 48(No. 4): 431-462.
- McLaren, P. and R. Faramandpur (1999). "Critical pedagogy, postmodernism and the retreat from class." Theoria June: 83-115.
- McWilliam, E. (1997). Beyond the missionary position: teacher desire and radical pedagogy. Learning Desire: Perspectives on Pedagogy, Culture and the Unsaid. S. Todd. New York, Routledge.
- McWilliam, E. (2000). Taught Bodies. New York, Peter Lang.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). Phenomenology of Perception. London, Routledge.
- Moore, G. and G. Lackney (1993). "School design: crisis, educational performance and design applications." Children's Environments 10(2): 99-112.
- Mumford, L. (1961). The City in History. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- New London Group (1996). "A pedagogy of multiliteracies: designing social futures." Harvard Educational Review 66(No 1): 60-92.
- Peters, M. (1997). Poststructuralism, Politics and Education. London, Bergin and Harvey.
- Peters, M., C. Lankshear, et al. (2001). Critical Theory and the Human Condition: Past, Present, and Future (Counterpoints (New York, N.Y.) Vol. 168). New York, Peter Lang Publishing.
- Pile, S. (1996). The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Subjectivity and Space. London, Routledge.

- Rapoport, A. (1982). The Meaning of the Built Environment. Tucson, University of Arizona Press.
- Rose, G. (1995). "Distance, surface, elsewhere: a feminist critique of the space of phallogocentric self knowledge." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 13: 761-781.
- Sandercock, L. (1998). Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities. Chichester, John Wiley.
- Sartor, F. (2001). Museum of Contemporary Art Competition Exhibition, Sydney.
- Schneekloth, L. and R. Shibley (1995). Placemaking - The Art and Practice of Building Communities. New York, John Wiley.
- Schon, D. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. London, Temple Smith.
- Schon, D. (1985). The Design Studio: an Exploration of its Traditions and Potential. London, RIBA Publications.
- Schatz, M. and U. Steiner-Loffler (1998). Pupils using photographs in school self-evaluation. Image-Based Research: A Sourcebook for Qualitative Researchers. London, Falmer Press: 235-251.
- Seamon, D. (1987). Phenomenology and environment-behaviour research. Advances in Environment, Behaviour, and Design. G. Moore and E. Zupe. New York, Plenum. 1: 3-27.
- Seamon, D. (1994). "The life of the place." Nordic Journal of Architectural Research 7(1): 35-48.
- Shor, I. (1987). Critical Teaching and Everyday Life. Chicago & London, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shor, I. (1996). When Students Have Power: Negotiating Authority in a Critical Pedagogy, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Smyth, J. (1998). "Finding the enunciative space for teacher leadership and teacher learning in schools." Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education 26(3): 191-202.
- Smyth, J., R. Hattam, et al. (1998a). Teacher's Learning Project. Adelaide, Flinders Institute for the Study of Teaching.
- Smyth, J. (2000). "Reclaiming social capital through critical teaching." The Elementary School Journal 100(5): 491-511.
- Smyth, J. (2001). Managing the myth of the self-managing school as an

international educational reform. Taking Education Really Seriously: Three Years of Hard Labour. M. Fielding. London & New York, Falmer Press.

Soja, E. (1996). Thirdspace: Journey to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Soltan (1996). Deconstruction and architecture. Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices. T. Dutton and L. Hurst-Mann. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Sultana, R. (1995). "The Architecture of Pedagogical Encounters." Education (Malta) 5(3): 2-6.

Tanner, K. and E. Jago (1999). The Influence of School Facilities on Student Achievement. Washington DC, University of Georgia.

Thorne, R. (1999). Community Opinion of City Architecture: a Qualitative Study. Sydney, University of Sydney.

Tsonis, A. and L. Lefavre (1996). Critical regionalism. The Critical Landscape. M. Speaks. Rotterdam, 010 Publishers.

Tuan, Y. (1974). Topophilia: a Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

Urry, J. (1995). Consuming Places. London and New York, Routledge.

Venturi, R., D. Scott-Brown, et al. (1997). Learning from Los Vegas: The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Vergriete, P. (1997). Final Report of the Project Group on Distressed Urban Areas. Paris, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Territorial Development Division.

Walker, R. (1993). Finding a silent voice for a researcher: using photographs in evaluation and research. Qualitative Voices in Educational Research. M. Schratz. London, Falmer Press: 72-92.

Ward, A. (1996). The suppression of the social in design: architecture as war. Reconstructing Architecture: Critical Discourses and Social Practices. T. Dutton and L. Hurst-Mann. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Wexler, P. (1987). Social Analysis of Education: After the New Sociology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Whitebrook, J. (1996). Pragmatics, psychoanalysis, and aesthetics. Handbook of Critical Theory. D. Rasmussen. Massachusetts, Blackwell: 287-305.

WHO (1995). Building a Healthy City: a Practitioners' Guide. Geneva, World Health Organisation.

Wigley, M. (1996). The Architecture of Deconstruction - Derrida's Haunt. Massachusetts, MIT Press.

Williams, D. (1995). Creating Social Capital: Evaluative Research on Community-Based Arts Projects. Adelaide, Community Arts Network of South Australia.

Wirth, M., N. Highes, et al. (1994). Swallowcliffe Schools Redevelopment Project. Adelaide, SACON.