

Graphic layout issues

Examiner One

“My only criticism is that the red arrows ... it would have been better if these could have been drawn using software such as illustrator”

Examiner Two

“.. the problem is sometimes the arrows. Given the low resolution of the images there are not enough pixels for the arrows to stand out clearly”

Response:

Frame grabs will be redone in the manner suggested.

Spelling

The consisted misspelling of a name “Streeck” as “Streek” in the text (but not the references) will be corrected

Additional References

1) Examiner two suggested (Murphy 2004) and (Murphy 2005) were missing. These were sought out and, while interesting and on topic, were actually about architects in professional offices, As such they did not render my statement to the effect that (LeBaron and Streeck 2000) is the only study published on gesturing in design studios at the time of writing. However I have amended the passage on page 106 from:

“The only previous research into architectural ways of gesturing appears in a paper by Streeck and LeBaron”

To:

“The only previous research into architectural ways of gesturing in design studios, as opposed to studies in professional offices²⁸², appears in a paper by Streeck and LeBaron”

Murphy’s work is then footnoted as follows:

“A similar study by Keith Murphy was carried out 2003. This was a 6 month ethnographic study of work in an architect’s office and documented in (Murphy 2004). Murphy’s findings are not dealt with here as they do not concern didactic instruction, but portray three professional architects talking about design in the context of an ongoing, built project

I have not added the reference Lymer, G because, although it is relevant, it is still not available on the University of Melbourne databases.

2) Examiner one clarified that the work in (LeBaron and Streeck 2000) formed part of the PhD dissertation by Lebaron, not by Streeck as originally suggested in text:

“Streeck has carried out fieldwork in architecture firms and architecture classrooms.”

Which has been amended to:

“The ethnographic work portrayed in this paper was carried out by LeBaron as part of his PhD Dissertation”²⁸²

And footnoted as follows:

“(LeBaron 1998) A copy of this previous thesis was unfortunately not able to be discovered during the writing of this thesis.”

3) The reference by Lorenza Mondada suggested by examiner two was not able to be discovered in English

Finding not developed in conclusion

Examiner pointed out that the summary remark on page 183 about “the way that gesture can operate on, but doesn’t change, the representational ground” is a key finding that is not elaborated on in the conclusion. An additional paragraph was added on page 239 as follows:

“Significantly the fact that gesture can operate on, but not change the representational ground and ‘do violence’ to a student’s drawings, means that gesture is an important part of a teacher’s repertoire.”

Comments on Actor Network theory

Examiner two wrote a page on his difficulty with actor network theory in the context of this study. I don’t believe that any major changes are required as a result as his comments, as they represent more of what he admits is a difference in theoretical taste, which was not shared by examiner one who commented that “the way the author sets up her analytic framework so that bodies and gestures are given their proper places in the analysis of this profession’s work and reproduction appears entirely convincing to me”.

However some points raised by examiner two about the way the theory is employed in text do need to be addressed and clarified, which I have outlined below.

The examiner raises a common critique that ANT endows objects with agency that is different in kind but not necessarily in effect to human agency; a claim, which some scholars find uncomfortable. Although he acknowledges that I have clarified that objects have a different kind of agency, he highlights that I do not qualify my comments in some parts. One instance occurs in page 216 where I assert that:

“In fact the projection screen is so important to how this class operates, so *present*, that it acts like another member of the class. So when Pia holds up her right hand she is orienting it at another ‘member’ of the class, not waving it randomly in space.”

I have amended this text to read:

“In fact the projection screen is so important to how this class operates, so *present*, that it could be argued to act almost like another member of the class sitting at the table; it has agency that is different in kind, but not necessarily in *effect*, to the other human members of the class. This agency is constituted in time and space; at this moment, when Pia holds up her right hand, she is orienting it at another ‘member’ of the class who should be treated as part of the conversation, not waving it randomly in space.”

On Page 233 examiner two takes exception to my description of a representation as “good” pointing out correctly that the idea of good has a host of analytical problems: “when is something better or worse? For whom? And from what perspective?”. The original text is perhaps slightly misleading. I stated that

“Good representations, at least ones that are good enough for the purposes of the design studio, collude with designers helping in the process of design improvisation by being open to the possibility of ‘becoming other’.”

Which over generalizes the case by use of the phrase “for the purposes of the design studio. I have amended the text to read:

“The design studio requires students to produce representations that can collude with designers, helping in the process of design improvisation by being open to the possibility of ‘becoming other’. What is or isn’t a ‘good enough’ representation is a network effect; its agency will be contingent on the network in which it is placed. Not unlike Scott’s competence as a student, what might be a good representation in one place will not be in another. From this analysis we can see that the representation which Scott has made is certainly

‘good enough’ to work effectively in the joint imagining which is going on here with his teacher, which in turn helps to constitute Scott himself as a ‘good student’ in this studio.”

The last criticism the second examiner makes on this score is that “I think this way of talking about nodes in an actor network sometimes conflates different units of analysis”. This is a common mis-interpretation of actor network theory which specifically works against the common idea of networks having nodes (which was clearly stated in the methodology chapter of the thesis). The examiner points out that I talk simultaneously as gesture being a skillful action possessed by a member of a community and gesture as an actor with agency. However the thesis clearly puts forward that both ways of regarding gesture are true: the two modes of analysis (grounded theory and ANT) *produce* two different ‘realities’ of gesture. This is a post modern move which is grounded in the ontological position that multiple realities are made; therefore realities can co-exist and be treated as equally valid. The examiner seems to be working from the assumption that there is one reality which can be viewed from different perspectives. The thesis seeks always to present both accounts of gesture and does not attempt to collapse one into the other – which does produce tension, but this is the whole point. Whether gesture is one or the other *is* not settled.

The examiner suggests that this tension could have been discussed more, but I believe this ontological move is argued thoroughly in the methods section, at the end of chapter five and again at the start of chapter six. However further text has been inserted at the end of chapter six to push the point again on page 238 which reads:

“The reader might wish to recall to mind at this point that in the methods section of this thesis it was argued that the mode of analysis employed in the previous chapter and in this one (grounded theory and ANT) were employed in such a way that two different ‘realities’ of gesture are produced. This is a post-modern move which is grounded in the ontological position that multiple realities can co-exist and be considered as equally valid. Grounded theory produces categories, where gesture stands out clearly from the background activity, ANT blurs this clear cut account of gesture by bringing what is usually considered ‘background’ (in this case the model) into the foreground.”

- LeBaron, C. (1998). Building Communication: Architectural gestures and the embodiment of new ideas. Department of Communications Studies. Austin, Texas, University of Austin Texas. **PhD**.
- LeBaron, C. and J. Streeck (2000). Gestures, knowledge and the world. Language and Gesture. D. McNeill. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, K. (2004). "Imagination as joint activity: the case of architectural interaction." Mind, Culture and Activity **11**(4): pp. 267 - 278.
- Murphy, K. (2005). "Collaborative imagining: the interactive use of gestures, talk and representation." Semiotica **156**(11): pp. 113 - 145.