

## Women and Leadership in the Australian Architecture Profession: Prelude to a Research Project

Gill Matthewson,<sup>1</sup> Naomi Stead<sup>2</sup> and Karen Burns<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Architecture  
University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, 4072  
g.matthewson@uq.edu.au

<sup>2</sup>School of Architecture  
University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD, 4072  
n.stead@uq.edu.au

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning  
University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC. 3010  
karen.burns@unimelb.edu.au

**Abstract:** This chapter discusses the preliminary stages of a research project investigating implicit and explicit barriers leading to women's underrepresentation in the architecture profession in Australia, especially in leadership roles. When gender balance in the student population in architecture has been near parity for more than three decades, why do such a small proportion of trained women formally register as architects, or join the peak representative body? More importantly for this chapter, and despite demonstrated skill, talent and competence, why do so few women proceed to the highest and most influential roles in the profession, and hence to lead the creation of the built environment that the rest of the population uses every day? Using ethnographic research methods to make a close examination of three case study workplaces, the project will attempt a clearer picture of how women fare in the architecture profession, why they leave, and what the implications in one profession might mean for women and leadership more broadly.

**Keywords:** architectural practice, gender and architecture, workplace, ethnographic research, gender and organisations, professions

Women have been active participants in architectural practice in Australia for more than a hundred years. Those practicing in the early twentieth century include the Brisbane-based Lily Addison, daughter of well-known architect G.H.M. Addison, and Sydney-based Florence Taylor, who completed her training in 1904.<sup>1</sup> From these small beginnings, in 1950 women made up 2.7 per cent of registered architects in Australia, while by 1970 this had climbed slowly to 3.3 per cent.<sup>2</sup> By the late 1990s, the rate of women entering the profession had reached an all-time high, leading to predictions by Julie Willis that they would form 40 per cent of the profession by 2018.<sup>3</sup> However, a landmark nationwide survey of women architects by Paula Whitman in 2005 found that progress had been much slower than anticipated.<sup>4</sup> Women were just

14.2 per cent of the profession (as measured by registration) but more critically the study found that women were only one per cent of architectural company directors in Queensland, the only state for which a figure could be calculated.<sup>5</sup>

Such dramatic stratification and underrepresentation of women in professional leadership roles in architecture is not restricted to Australia. Canada, the United States, New Zealand and the United Kingdom all report similar patterns. The results of a 2003 UK study from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) were published under the blunt title *Why Do Women Leave Architecture?* while in the same year the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada sponsored a major report based on extensive consultations with women in architecture throughout the country, which identified very similar issues.<sup>6</sup> The situation led the American Institute of Architects to a number of affirmative action initiatives in the early twenty-first century – to increase gender equity and diversity more broadly, and to increase the number and proportion of women in leadership roles.<sup>7</sup>

Back in Australia, one of the surprising findings of Whitman's survey had been that some women architects explicitly chose not to pursue high levels of seniority, and that a significant proportion of survey respondents – 26 per cent – had declined a promotion at some time in their career.<sup>8</sup> The leading reason given for this was that 'I had different career aspirations', followed by 'I felt that I would not gain any increase in satisfaction in my work', followed again by 'I did not see the more senior role as offering a viable career path into the future'. But in the context of this chapter, it is important to note the fourth and fifth most-cited reasons for turning down a promotion: 'I felt that it would take me away from the sort of work that I enjoyed' and then, as only the fifth most-cited reason: 'I felt it would interfere with my family commitments'. Clearly the assumption is wrong, that women do not seek advancement to leadership positions simply because they are inhibited by caring duties.

Whitman's report acknowledges that data was gathered from a limited group and therefore the survey could not be considered representative, but nevertheless the finding on women's refusal of promotions was widely reported and discussed.<sup>9</sup> What continues to be missing from research in the field is a study of the kind of conditions that inform the 'choices' women architects make in Australia, and indeed an analysis of whether these are genuine choices at all. It appears that present conditions produce constraints and impediments that slow women's progression to the highest and most influential levels of the architecture profession. These impediments are still poorly understood both by the profession and its representative bodies. As Francesca Hughes has noted, 'absence of women from the profession of

architecture remains, despite the various theories, very difficult to explain and very slow to change'.<sup>10</sup>

In response to this ongoing issue, in 2010 a collaborative group of scholars from five universities across three states were successful in applying for an Australian Research Council Linkage grant for the project 'Equity and Diversity in the Australian Architecture Profession: Women, Work, and Leadership'.<sup>11</sup> The project seeks to understand factors that might aid or prevent women's entry into senior and leadership positions in architecture today, as well as engaging directly with industry and membership bodies to encourage a more equitable profession.<sup>12</sup>

### **The situation**

There are four important sites of architectural production. The first is the architecture schools where the process of becoming an architect begins. Second is the building site where the production of architecture is most clearly seen. Third, the architectural media in all its diverse forms is where representation and discussion of architects and buildings set the terms of definition, judgment and circulation of buildings and profile. The fourth and final site of architectural production is the architectural office or workplace. Of all the four, the workplace is by far the least visible, and it has not been well studied. But since it houses, structures and organises architectural labour and processes of decision making, communication and negotiation, the architectural workplace is a crucial site of production and representation. And so the research project will work with three large architectural practices, which are both partners and case studies for the investigation. Using the culture of these offices as a study, we seek to understand how gender and workplace intersect both in positive ways and in ways that may slow women's career progression. We aim to gain a sharper picture of women's participation in the profession and to understand why women are underrepresented in senior management. We will look at both barriers and good employment practice, and we aim to argue the case for the social, economic and architectural benefits of a gender-diverse workforce.

The statistics from the architecture profession confirm a clear trend within business and the professions more broadly. A gap is frequently reported between women's access to education, and subsequent professional achievement and levels of seniority. For instance, the Victorian Women Lawyers Association reports that across 2008 and 2009, almost 50 per cent of barristers signing the law rolls are women. However, women form only 22 per cent of lawyers at the bar. As widely reported in 2011, in Australia in 2010 women represent 9.8 per cent of directors in the top two hundred company boards.<sup>13</sup>

Some have argued that such figures represent a 'pipeline' issue, where insufficient women have been coming through the pipeline to reach senior positions. One of the striking things about the architecture profession, however, is that it comprehensively disproves the pipeline thesis. Whitman's *Going Places* report notes that in 2002 women were 43 per cent of architecture students in Australia but only 14.2 per cent of the profession.<sup>14</sup> In 2010 those numbers are 44 per cent of students, and 20.4 per cent of registered architects.<sup>15</sup> This marked disparity between education and the profession is noted in other countries (2010 figures for New Zealand are 48 per cent of students and 17.3 per cent of registered architects). While the proportion of women in the profession is indeed increasing, it is a very slow increment. The foreword to a 1996 North American anthology of architectural history and theory titled *The Sex of Architecture* observed:

For the last two decades, [women] have constituted nearly half the enrolment in this country's most prestigious architecture programs – programs from which they consistently graduated at the tops of their classes. Yet in 1995, only 8.9 per cent of registered architects and 8.7 per cent of tenured faculty in the United States were women.<sup>16</sup>

Fifteen years later, in 2010, women comprised 17 per cent of registered architects in the United States. This was a significant increase, yet still very low considering thirty-five years of near equal numbers of male and female architecture students. It is, however, true that registration is a flawed means of measuring who works in architecture and how. Robert Gutman calculated in 1988 that just over 75 per cent of the 90,000 architectural practitioners in the United States of America were registered.<sup>17</sup> Canadian research in 2000 likewise discovered that registration and membership of institutes of architecture were poor measures.<sup>18</sup> They concluded that the 'exclusion of the unregistered professional from any discussion of architectural practice neglects a wide range of women's contributions, while misrepresenting, to a lesser extent, the presence of men'.<sup>19</sup> The 2006 Australian census gives a higher figure of 23.3 per cent for women who coded their occupation 'architect' than the registered count in 2004 of 14.2 per cent.<sup>20</sup> But the fact remains that a much smaller proportion of women than men complete formal registration, and since registration is a key measure of perceived 'seriousness' and seniority in the profession, this in itself is a barrier to women architects taking on other senior roles.

Another discovery from the statistical data is that women earn less. The Royal Architectural Institute of Canada 2003 report records that full-time women architectural workers earn 82 per cent of the salary of full-time male workers in architecture, and part-time women architectural workers earn 62 per cent of the salary of part-time male workers in architecture. Comparative professions also report the earning equality gap. Full-time women civil

engineers earn 80 per cent of male salaries, general practitioners earn 70 per cent, dentists earn 66 per cent and lawyers/notaries earn 68 per cent. The reasons for the gap are complex but surely involve the over-representation of women at more junior levels of professions and management, which means lesser earnings. There is also a gendered difference in the extent of labour market participation. Women are over-represented in the part-time workforce and this limits earnings and career opportunities. A 2004 UK architectural survey reported that two-thirds of women in architecture had worked part-time at some stage.<sup>21</sup>

Once again, labour patterns in architecture can be contextualised within broader social trends. In 2010, a Melbourne University longitudinal study of graduates now aged in their mid-thirties was reported to have found ‘only 38.4 per cent of women with university degrees worked full-time, compared to 90 per cent of university educated Gen X men’.<sup>22</sup> Again the reasons for women’s over-representation in part-time work are complex.<sup>23</sup> It’s been argued that women move between full-time and part-time work over the course of their lives ‘according to their work histories and positions in the family life cycle’.<sup>24</sup> From the statistical data alone we can note women’s greater representation in different work experiences: across retention rates, lesser earnings, more junior positions and the part-time work force.

### **No job, occupation or profession is gender-neutral**

The slow progress and stratification of women seen in the architectural profession is shared with other occupations and professions. Extensive social science research has revealed how concepts of gender are implicated in structuring society, especially work culture. The 2010 Monash University *Social Inclusion at Monash: Gender Equity Strategy 2010–2015* report notes three things as gendered norms: linear employment, long hours and the absolute prioritising of work.<sup>25</sup> These form the ‘ideal worker’; someone who is available ‘anytime, anywhere’.<sup>26</sup> Such availability implies a worker with no commitments or obligations outside their job; traditionally, this is the ‘man the breadwinner’ with a wife at home. Despite more ‘wives’ in the workforce this model of the ideal worker still persists. And because, even in the twenty-first century, women still take on more of the responsibilities of the domestic world than men, this ideal worker model constitutes a structural disadvantage for women.<sup>27</sup> American professor of law, Joan Williams, notes that when both parents are in occupations requiring ‘ideal workers’, family care comes under huge pressure and is severely devalued.<sup>28</sup> She argues for concepts of work – both market and family – to be completely recalibrated because as currently structured and conceived they constitute discrimination against women.

Stereotypes based on gender can act prescriptively (an assumption that women or men *should* conform to a gender stereotype) or descriptively (a presumption that women or men *will* conform to a gender stereotype).<sup>29</sup> Stereotypes are not so much what individual women and men *are* like, but what they are *allowed* to be like and *perceived* to be like. But it is not just traditional ideas of family structure and women's role operating here. Virginia Valian has developed a concept of gender schemas and consequent accumulation of advantage to explain other ways in which gender impacts in the workplace. Gender (along with race, age, clothing and so on) is a way of shortcutting our assessment of people; it makes social life more manageable.<sup>30</sup> Gender schemas are approximations and are not necessarily sexist, but 'sexism steps in when values are attached or prescriptions imposed'.<sup>31</sup> Valian cites numerous studies that show that despite stated beliefs in 'equality', in general, people underestimate women and overestimate men.<sup>32</sup> Although such estimates may be quite small and certainly often unconscious, they add up over time such that men's accumulated advantages ease their careers.

### **Leadership and the professions**

Gender frames the image of what makes a leader. The ideal qualities of a leader are often perceived to align with masculinity (strong, authoritative, ambitious and so on). Although more recent conceptions of a good leader have shifted to include descriptions such as people-oriented, intuitive, and empathetic, qualities that have been traditionally aligned with femininity, the ideal leader has command of the full range and so still favours men. Women leaders become caught in a perception bind: 'Women are permitted to exercise leadership only in styles that are considered "appropriate" to their gender.'<sup>33</sup> Thus although barriers to women's advancement are often termed 'the glass ceiling', social psychologists Alice Eagly and Linda Carli argue that a labyrinth is a more apt metaphor, as there is not one but multiple barriers.<sup>34</sup>

These issues become compounded in the professions. There were multiple barriers to women's participation in all professions until shifts in education and opportunity throughout the twentieth century enabled freer entry. Professions are a particular kind of occupation involving a specialised knowledge base gained through a relatively lengthy period of tertiary education followed by vocational training and experience.<sup>35</sup> Achievement of this knowledge base is formally tested. In English-speaking countries such as Australia, membership of a profession is strictly controlled by the rules of the education system, legal licensing and a professional body, and 'these rules work to protect the incomes and social status of professionals through the exclusion of lay persons'.<sup>36</sup> Thus, a profession sets the boundaries of a market for services. Along with economic benefit there is also a class dimension, with

an occupation lifted from lower-class manual work into a higher, middle-class status. The implications of this for leadership are complex, in terms of status, class and authority as well as gender. Architects are, for instance, necessarily ‘leaders’ on the building site, where the nature of their work requires them to instruct and direct construction. But a role that requires leadership and implies status does not automatically confer authority, and many architects (both female and male) report having to ‘earn’ respect and status from their builders and subcontractors. This is crossed again by architects’ interactions with other highly gendered professionals such as engineers (strongly male dominated), and interior designers (strongly female dominated and often seen as subordinate to architecture).

Underlying the ideology of the professions is the idea that the work is of high value to society. Because of the long period of training involved, an intensive commitment is required and there is an expectation (even a vocation or ‘need’) to live and breathe the profession.<sup>37</sup> In this conception a professional works less for the money than within an ethical framework that prizes altruism, integrity and sacrifice. Sociologist Julia Evetts argues that once defined as a ‘professional’ there are no acceptable limits, the needs of others become paramount.<sup>38</sup> As such, arguing for better working conditions or considerations within a profession is seen as ‘unprofessional’. A professional person thus represents an even more intense version of the ideal worker. Debra Coleman notes that many women have thought this ideal of integrity in the professions would prevent gender-based inequity, and indeed there is a very strong self-perception within the architecture profession that it is progressive, liberal and equitable, a belief which may indeed be a significant barrier to equity initiatives. Coleman argues that in a gendered world, professionalism itself is still no guarantee of equity.<sup>39</sup>

### **The architectural profession**

We hypothesise that the unique nature of the architectural profession compounds all these issues further. Bridget Fowler and Fiona Wilson report that young women leave the architectural profession due to lengthy hours, slow career progression and low pay. The 2000 Canadian study mentioned earlier produced one of the few comparative accounts of male and female exits from architecture and discovered that men departed for the same reasons, including low salaries and economic downturn.<sup>40</sup> However, this information acquires more complex detail when we examine the list of fifteen reasons given by the RIBA 2003 report *Why Do Women Leave Architecture?*:

- low pay
- unequal pay
- long working hours

- inflexible/un-family-friendly work hours
- sidelining
- stressful working conditions
- protective paternalism preventing development of experience
- limited area of work
- glass ceiling
- macho culture
- sexism
- redundancy and/or dismissal
- high litigation risk and high insurance costs
- lack of returnee training
- more job satisfaction elsewhere.<sup>41</sup>

Of these fifteen reasons, seven can be seen to deal with forms of gender discrimination that limit work experience and advancement opportunities. A further three deal with the family–work balance, which includes the issues of long hours and lack of returnee training. Thus two-thirds of the reasons collated by the report given for women’s exit from the profession could be seen as gender based. Separately, one-third could be considered particular to architecture: paternalism, macho culture (usually because of the highly masculinised nature of the building industry overall), litigation issues, with stressful working conditions and redundancy indicative of the volatile nature of the building industry which is subject to extreme booms and busts.

Architecture has sometimes been called an ‘idiosyncratic’ profession that combines (or attempts to combine) the creative and building industries, art and business, creativity and technology. As such, it does not conform to the template of the ‘classic’ professions of law and medicine, and indeed Judith Blau argues that it differs from these professions in a number of aspects.<sup>42</sup> Firstly, architecture’s importance to the public is much less than medicine and law, both of which claim to protect the individual in direct ways.<sup>43</sup> Architecture is also more deeply aligned with corporate elites, providing services to the rich and powerful (who can afford to build) and so its claim to altruism is more suspect.<sup>44</sup> While the knowledge bases of medicine and law are added to more or less incrementally, architecture is subject to radical changes as ideas about design, function, technology and other factors are re-evaluated on a regular basis; therefore its education is much less uniform.<sup>45</sup> Finally, Blau notes that architecture has resisted specialisation whereas for the other professions specialisation is seen as an assurance of their complex knowledge base.<sup>46</sup>

Consequently, the architecture profession has been described as being in crisis by commentators for at least the last fifty years, if not longer.<sup>47</sup> The roots of the crisis are usually described as a series of almost irreconcilable tensions within architecture. Dana Cuff describes a series of dialectic dualities structuring practice: the individual against the collective; art versus business; design as decision-making versus design as making sense of a situation; and



architect as specialist or qualified generalist.<sup>48</sup> Andrew Saint considers the most significant of these tensions as that between architecture as an art, and architecture as a business.<sup>49</sup> Blau agrees that in architectural practice where creativity or art is ranged against a complex socioeconomic environment, inconsistencies and inescapable dilemmas are generated.<sup>50</sup>

In either formulation, architecture holds particular difficulties for women. As a business, architecture manifests the same difficulties for women becoming leaders as all other businesses. As an art, architecture triggers a whole other series of problems for women's place and advancement, particularly around concepts of authorship and genius.

### **Architecture as an art**

The conception of architecture as an art constitutes part of the body of knowledge that architects are trained in. Architecture's connection to art dates from at least the Renaissance.<sup>51</sup> In the first part of the nineteenth century, art became the main point of difference for the emerging profession – it was arguably the only element of the built environment to which another professional group could not claim and thus became very important.<sup>52</sup> But this is a conception that has some marked distorting effects. First, as an art, the history of architecture is portrayed and taught in the art history mode. This emphasises a succession of great buildings and the singular creative genius who designed them, for mastery in art is equated with the solo hero genius. Christine Battersby argues that the very notion of genius is gendered male; only men have the capacity to be geniuses.<sup>53</sup> This conceptualisation constitutes a barrier to women even being considered architects, let alone 'star' architects. At the time of writing, the most highly regarded international award in architecture, the Pritzker Prize, has in its thirty-three year history been awarded to only two women (one in collaboration with a male partner) alongside thirty-five men.<sup>54</sup> Likewise the 'starchitect' phenomenon, where a small global elite of architects are sought for their design 'genius' as much as the brand value of their names, is overwhelmingly male.

Of course, describing architecture as a form of artistic evolution grossly over-simplifies the act of designing and building.<sup>55</sup> It ignores the reality that the production of architecture is highly complicated; the result of a series of complex relationships between the architectural practice, clients, societal expectations, trends, materials and technology, and the economy.<sup>56</sup> Negotiating this complexity is achieved by the collaboration of all parties, including teams of architects. To lay a work of architecture at the feet of one male genius is to render the work of all collaborators, including large numbers of women architects, invisible.<sup>57</sup>

For those sociologists who draw upon Pierre Bourdieu for their analysis of the architecture profession, possibly the strongest distortion resultant on considering architecture as an individual artistic pursuit is the separation of architects and architecture from their cultural and social contexts.<sup>58</sup> In Bourdieu's terms, architecture is deeply embedded in society and can be considered a 'field' that structures a complex social universe. An architect is but one player within this larger field, and because it is a social field 'who you are' as a social being makes a significant difference.

The possession of privilege or cultural capital – charm, cultivation and good taste – is obtained via education and/or family background. It is equally, and sometimes much more, important than the knowledge base of the profession. Class position is of great importance not just because it strongly affects the ability to attract clients.<sup>59</sup> Importantly for this study, Bourdieu argues that women have been consistently denied access to those areas where the most valuable cultural capital can be obtained.

### **The project**

There are, then, multiple factors that might have an impact on the longevity of women's participation in the architectural profession, their relative invisibility despite significant and historical contributions, and their underrepresentation at senior levels. Testing how these factors operate will be the task of three case studies investigating workplace culture.

A number of the recent studies (including those of Whitman and De Graft) have used surveys as the basis of their analysis, providing primarily quantitative information, which is naturally limited by both the questions asked and who elects to answer them. This project's research methodology moves away from surveys to build an array of mixed methodologies. First, a quantitative 'snapshot' of the practices will be collated. This will be followed by in-depth interviews, participant observation in the work environment, and visual documentation of the practice. In addition, the laborious task of collecting accurate national statistical data on the number, location and practice of women architects will be undertaken, and a series of online surveys used to gather a snapshot of particular aspects of women architects' career progression and satisfaction.<sup>60</sup>

There are a number of reasons for choosing large practices to study. First, large offices are sizeable enough to study women's ascent (or stagnation) on the career ladder. Second, they have not been well surveyed or examined in the past. For the Whitman survey, information was gathered from a self-selected group accessed through membership of the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA). Employed architects in large practices are much less likely to be members of the AIA, to the extent that in December 2009 the

institute brought in a new category of membership to accommodate such people more easily.<sup>61</sup>

Women's involvement in the architecture environment is not easily accessible by standard quantitative means. A straight count of registered architects and members of the AIA gives numbers and percentages that are low and therefore concerning. There is, however, strong evidence that such counts do not properly measure or reflect women's participation in the profession, as one can be working as an architect (particularly in a large practice) and be neither registered nor a member of the institute. In this respect, architecture as a profession differs markedly from medicine and law where one *must* be registered to practice – in architecture the legal restriction lies in the use of the title of architect, rather than the ability to work in an architectural office. The irony is that many women who have trained as architects, and who spend their whole careers working in architecture offices, are forbidden to describe themselves as architects because they have never registered.

One of the key outcomes of this research project will be a draft national policy on equity and diversity in the architecture profession, prepared for the Australian Institute of Architects. Australia's lack of an overarching institute policy on equity and diversity is surprising, and redressing this is regarded by the research team as one important means towards change in the profession as a whole. The policy will include tools and methods to improve women's workforce participation, and to determine best practice models to foster greater opportunity for the advancement of women architects into senior management positions. It will be informed by other countries' institutional practices and policies, as well as the information and analysis gleaned from the case studies. Developing a best-practice model from the research results offers a blueprint for Australian architectural business seeking to be in step with corporate and government clients on issues of social inclusion and well-rounded employees.

## Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, there are many similarities between the architecture profession and other kinds of occupation, in terms of barriers to women's advancement and participation. It seems highly likely that issues of pay equity, unconscious bias, linear career pattern, the ideal worker and a lack of flexible work policies and family-friendly measures are problems for women in architecture just as much as they are in many industries. However, there are also particularities and peculiarities in architecture, which are unusual or even unique among the professions, and which make it a difficult object of study. Low rates of formal registration may be partly because trained

women leave the profession, and partly because many encounter barriers in the long, difficult and expensive registration process, but it is also partly because many women choose never to register yet continue to work in the industry in a way that is unrecognised by formal means. The professional identity of architects – as enlightened, liberal, creative, inclusive, altruistic and idealistic – might itself make an examination of gender difference, and gender-based discrimination, very difficult for the profession to accept. Likewise the idea of genius, and of the architect as artist, presents unique questions to women architects and those who study them.

In setting out the terms and objectives of this new research project, we have attempted to describe some of the complexities and even contradictions in trying to get to the bottom of women's underrepresentation at senior levels of the architecture profession. The research is still in its early stages – fieldwork has only recently begun with analysis not yet undertaken, hence it is too soon to report on findings from the three case studies. But through careful, nuanced investigation and analysis, the project hopes not only to increase knowledge on the work life of Australian women architects, but to enact meaningful and effective measures leading to a more equitable architecture profession, and to more women leaders in architecture.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Julie Willis and Bronwyn Hanna, *Women Architects in Australia 1900–1950* (Canberra: Royal Australian Institute of Architects, 2001). See also Robert Freestone and Bronwyn Hanna, *Florence Taylor's Hats: Designing, Building and Editing Sydney* (Sydney: Halstead Press, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> Bronwyn Hanna, 'Australia's Early Women Architects: Milestones and Achievements', *Fabrications* 12, no. 1 (June 2002): 27. Hanna cites Julie Willis, *A Statistical Survey of Registered Women Architects in Australia* (Adelaide: Faculty of Art, Architecture and Design, University of South Australia, 1997); Willis, *A Statistical Survey of Registered Women Architects*, 31.

<sup>3</sup> Willis, *A Statistical Survey of Registered Women Architects*, 31.

<sup>4</sup> Paula Whitman, *Going Places: The Career Progression of Women in the Architectural Profession* (Brisbane: The Royal Australian Institute of Architects and Queensland University of Technology, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 31. Whitman comments in her report that Queensland was the only state where data could be calculated on the proportion of women in senior roles. This reflects an ongoing challenge for research in this area – there is a marked lack of reliable statistical data, including reporting by architectural offices themselves, the architecture schools, and the representative and legislative bodies.

<sup>6</sup> Ann de Graft Johnson, Sandra Manley and Clara Greed, *Why Do Women Leave Architecture?* (London: Royal Institute of British Architects, University of West England, 2003); Eva Matsuzaki, Patricia Gibb and Imbi Harding, *Consultations &*

*Roundtables on Women in Architecture in Canada* (Vancouver: Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, 2003).

<sup>7</sup> See for example the AIA Diversity Action Plan 2009–2013, at <http://www.aia.org/about/initiatives/AIAS076701>.

<sup>8</sup> Whitman, 10.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>10</sup> Francesca Hughes, *The Architect: Reconstructing Her Practice* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996), x.

<sup>11</sup> The research is funded by an ARC Linkage grant (2011–2014), and has five industry partners: the Australian Institute of Architects (National); Architecture Media; BVN Architecture; Bates Smart; and PTW Architects. The research team is led by Dr Naomi Stead (University of Queensland); with chief investigators Professor Julie Willis (University of Melbourne), Professor Sandra Kaji-O’Grady (University of Sydney); Professor Gillian Whitehouse (University of Queensland), Dr Karen Burns (Monash University), Dr Amanda Roan (University of Queensland) and Ms Justine Clark. Ms Gill Matthewson is an APAI on the project, undertaking doctoral studies at the University of Queensland 2011–2014.

<sup>12</sup> The engagement between the research project and the profession occurs primarily through a web interface, *Parlour: Women, Equity, Architecture*, <http://www.archiparlour.org>. The site was launched on 11 May 2012 and during its first month was visited by more than eleven thousand unique visitors. By six weeks of operation 746 individuals had signed up to the site.

<sup>13</sup> *Age*, 19 September 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Whitman, 7.

<sup>15</sup> *Architecture Schools of Australasia 2011* (Canberra: Australian Institute of Architects, National Office, 2011).

<sup>16</sup> Noted in the foreword by Patricia Conway in Diana I. Agrest, Leslie Kanes Weisman and Patricia Conway, *The Sex of Architecture* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1996), 10.

<sup>17</sup> Cited in Dana Cuff, *Architecture: The Story of Practice* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1991), 44.

<sup>18</sup> Annmarie Adams and Peta Tancred, *Designing Women: Gender and the Architectural Profession* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000). The Canadian study used census figures and found a nearly two-fold discrepancy: registered architects 10.1 per cent women but in the census 19.6 per cent.

<sup>19</sup> Adams and Tancred, 35.

<sup>20</sup> Australian Institute of Architects, *Architects in Australia: A Snapshot from the 2006 Census* (2007), 4, available at [www.architecture.com.au/i-cms\\_file?page=11447/SnapshotCensus06](http://www.architecture.com.au/i-cms_file?page=11447/SnapshotCensus06).

<sup>21</sup> Bridget Fowler and Fiona Wilson, ‘Women Architects and Their Discontents’, *Sociology* 38, no. 1 (2004).

<sup>22</sup> Natalie Craig, ‘Successful Women are a Study in Flexibility,’ *Age*, 11 July 2011. The article reported on a recently released study by the Graduate School of Education, Melbourne University.

<sup>23</sup> See Janet Walsh, 'Myths and Counter-Myths: An Analysis of Part-Time Female Employees and Their Orientations to Work and Working Hours', *Work, Employment and Society* 13, no. 2 (1999).

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 199.

<sup>25</sup> *Social Inclusion at Monash: Gender Equity Strategy 2010–2015* (Melbourne: Monash University, 2010), white paper available at [www.buseco.monash.edu.au/social-inclusion/si-strategy2010.pdf](http://www.buseco.monash.edu.au/social-inclusion/si-strategy2010.pdf)

<sup>26</sup> Georges Desvaux, Sandrine Devillard and Sandra Sancier-Sultan, *Women Matter: Women at the Top of Corporations: Making It Happen*, McKinsey & Company, (2010), 6, available at [www.mckinsey.com/locations/swiss/.../women\\_matter\\_2010\\_4.pdf](http://www.mckinsey.com/locations/swiss/.../women_matter_2010_4.pdf).

<sup>27</sup> See Arlie Russell Hochschild and Anne Machung, *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home* (New York: Viking, 1989); Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997).

<sup>28</sup> Joan Williams, *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); also recorded in Hochschild and Machung.

<sup>29</sup> Joan C. Williams, 'The Glass Ceiling and the Maternal Wall in Academia', *New Directions for Higher Education* no. 130 (2005): 92.

<sup>30</sup> Barbara Risman cited in Amy S. Wharton, *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 68.

<sup>31</sup> Virginia Valian, 'Beyond Gender Schemas: Improving the Advancement of Women in Academia', *Hypatia* 20, no. 3 (2005): 199.

<sup>32</sup> Virginia Valian, 'Sex, Schemas, and Success: What's Keeping Women Back?', *Academe* 84, no. 5 (1998): 53.

<sup>33</sup> Yvonne Billing and Mats Alvesson cited in Barbara Bagilhole, *Women in Non-Traditional Occupations: Challenging Men* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 49.

<sup>34</sup> Alice Hendrickson Eagly and Linda Lorene Carli, *Through the Labyrinth: The Truth About How Women Become Leaders* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2007).

<sup>35</sup> Julia Evetts, 'Sociological Analysis of Professionalism: Past, Present and Future', *Comparative Sociology* 10, no. 1 (2011): 5.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas B. Lawrence, 'Rituals and Resistance: Membership Dynamics in Professional Fields', *Human Relations* 57, no. 2 (2004): 116.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>38</sup> Evetts, 13.

<sup>39</sup> Debra Coleman, 'Introduction', in *Architecture and Feminism: Yale Publications on Architecture*, ed. Debra Coleman, Elizabeth Danze and Carol Henderson, (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996).

<sup>40</sup> Adams and Tancred.

<sup>41</sup> Johnson, Manley and Greed.

<sup>42</sup> Judith R. Blau, *Architects and Firms: A Sociological Perspective on Architectural Practice* (Cambridge, Mass and London: MIT Press, 1984).

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 134.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 134.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 141.

<sup>47</sup> See Malcolm MacEwen, *Crisis in Architecture* (London: RIBA Publications, 1974); Andrew Saint, *The Image of the Architect* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

<sup>48</sup> Cuff, 11.

<sup>49</sup> Saint, 6.

<sup>50</sup> Blau, *Architects and Firms*, ix.

<sup>51</sup> Catherine Wilkinson, 'The New Professionalism in the Renaissance' in *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*, ed. Spiro Kostof (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 134

<sup>52</sup> Saint, 61.

<sup>53</sup> See Christine Battersby, *Gender and Genius: Towards a Feminist Aesthetics* (London: The Women's Press, 1989).

<sup>54</sup> The two women architect laureates thus far are Zaha Hadid in 2004, and Kazuyo Sejima in association with Ryue Nishizawa in 2010. See <http://www.pritzkerprize.com/laureates/year>.

<sup>55</sup> Julie Willis, 'Invisible Contributions: The Problem of History and Women Architects', *Architectural Theory Review* 3, no. 2 (1998): 61.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> See Tim Anstey, Katja Grillner and Rolf Hughes (eds), *Architecture and Authorship* (London: Black Dog Press, 2007).

<sup>58</sup> See for example Fowler and Wilson; Garry Stevens, *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1998); Paul Jones, *The Sociology of Architecture: Constructing Identities*, first edn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011).

<sup>59</sup> Fowler and Wilson, 112.

<sup>60</sup> The surveys will be undertaken through the research project's own website *Parlour: Women, Equity, Architecture*. By 6 July 2012 the first online survey had been live for five days, and gathered 786 responses. The research team is aware of the many methodological pitfalls of online surveys; however, this instrument is regarded as one of the few means to access women who have either 'left' architecture altogether, or who are otherwise disengaged from professional bodies – being neither formally registered nor members of the Institute of Architects, for example.

<sup>61</sup> A+ membership is for all members of a practice and is cheaper than individual membership fees.