websites displaying their vision and work as well as animated presentations for their clients. Students with knowledge and skills in these areas are sought after and highly valuable.

Among others, the course addresses two primary criteria set by the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB). These are crucial in the development of well-rounded and professional capabilities of the students.

Verbal and Writing Skills
Ability to speak and write effectively on subject matter contained in the professional curriculum

Graphic Skills
Ability to employ appropriate representational media, including computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process
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Rethinking the Design Studio: Art + Architecture – a Case Study of Collaboration in an interdisciplinary Context
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Abstract
This paper relates directly to the Conference’s theme of Building Partnerships and the need to Rethink the Design Studio. It contributes to the ongoing debate about public art in the urban realm, and the potential that new collaborative experiences and interdisciplinary studio models present in an educational context. It discusses the potential that partnering and collaboration between architects and artists has for creative interaction with a city’s cultural fabric. It introduces and examines a selection of site-specific installation works in Brisbane and Berlin, which were the results of collaborative practices initiated by the author. These temporary works provoke our comfortable notions of life in cities as well as challenge our understanding of the roles of architecture and art, and their modus operandi.

The first part of the paper explores the method of ‘drawing together’ different disciplines, and explains the differences between three collaborative design studio models, which the author coordinated. Each model represents a unique way of drawing different disciplines together, and of opening conversations between and beyond compartmentalized traditions of disciplines.

The second part of the paper introduces a case study of two projects, both of which are collaborative exhibition projects: Art+Arch infinite, 2004, in Brisbane, and Rethinking: Space, Time, Architecture, 2002, in Berlin. Both exhibition projects were based on one of the studio models, and each installation involved the collaboration of at least one artist and one architect. This part of the paper provides insight concerning the organisational process and the interaction of the organisations involved and the behind the scenes activity as to how the curator
was able to get the different groups involved, to work together and focus on the project. While working together with a common goal opens up new arenas for artistic exploration, where do the boundaries between art and architecture begin and end? Addressing this question of discipline boundary is an essential element in an educational context of interdisciplinary pedagogy, a context in which both projects were set.

The exhibitions involved teams of established and emerging artists, and students of architecture, visual arts, landscape architecture and urban design. The resulting dialogues and contemporary crossovers between the disciplines have led to new forms of collaborations and ways to understand the urban context. It has also promoted a fresh perspective on the design process, demonstrating the potential of such reciprocal relationships. Of course there have been many other examples of collaborative work and a large extent of literature is available. Based on common terrain from both projects, the author presents the research findings and addresses such questions as: How do visual art students draw inspiration from architecture students and vice-versa (eg. intuition vs. analytical approach)? How can disciplinary boundaries best be challenged and transgressed in order to critically reassess them? How might architecture and art students work together in Design-Build Studios on urban interventions in public space, in an interdisciplinary future?

**Keywords:** Collaborative design-build Studio, site-specific installations, interdisciplinary crossovers, reciprocal relationship, public space, intuition vs. analytical approach

1 Testing three Different Studio Models of Collaboration

Our cultural world is continually looking elsewhere — outside itself — for reference points in order to define itself. This paper contributes to the ongoing debate about public art and interdisciplinarity, and discusses the potential for collaboration between architects and artists in interacting with the cultural fabric of the city. (Lehmann, 2005) The temporary works presented here ‘provoke our comfortable notions of life in cities as well as challenge our understanding of the roles of architecture and art, and their modus operandi’. (Hocking, 2005) We need to be able to operate in several domains at the same time, or as Wouter Davids has put it: ‘Disciplinary borders should be challenged and transgressed in order to critically reassess them.’ (Davids, 2005) To explore the idea of drawing together different disciplines, three studio models, which the author coordinated in the previous academic year, (Lehmann, 2004) are presented as a means of furthering an understanding of collaborative environments. Each pedagogical model represents a way of drawing disciplines together and creating specific learning situations in design education.

In response to our current times of rapid change, we become increasingly aware of the need to look beyond conventional models of organisation and to develop more appropriate cross-disciplinary studio models for architecture students. (Lehmann, and Franz, 2004) Such collaborative studios differ from the traditional studies in that they are cross-disciplined and, at the same time, embed a leadership role for architecture. Of course, there are many precedents for such an interdisciplinary approach. The advantage of collaborative studios is that they produce students who are highly motivated, who are rigorous in their thinking and who offer greater depth and breadth of knowledge than in previous years. The three developed models with varying levels of cross-collaboration consisted of:

**Studio model 1**: Students working side-by-side on the same project, each producing their own proposal (‘transdisciplinary encounter model’, Fig. 01).

**Studio model 2**: Students working in multidisciplinary teams, each encompassing architecture and visual arts students, to collaborate on joint individual projects (‘real team collaboration model’, Fig. 02). This model was used for the two presented case studies, and will be further explained in the paper.

**Studio model 3**: Architecture students invite students from other disciplines to come to the studio, from time to time, as external consulting experts (‘interdisciplinary consultation model’, Fig. 03). This model is probably closest to the standards of ‘real’ architectural practice.

**Collaborative Studios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Within FBE</th>
<th>working side by side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-disciplinary elective where the faculty</td>
<td>The inside of Desert</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - student class</td>
<td>5 - student class</td>
<td>5 - student class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 + 5 + 5 + 5</td>
<td>5 + 5 + 5 + 5</td>
<td>5 - student class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 01. Diagram of studio model 1: ‘Transdisciplinary encounter model’. Diagram by the author.
Collaborative Studios

Example 2:

| Cross (Lehmann) Public Space: Art + Architectural |
| Architecture College of Visual Art |
| 28 19 |
| 28 Rooms 11 Arts & 15 students |

Fig. 02. Diagram of studio model 2: ‘Real team collaboration model’. Diagram by the author.

Collaborative Studios

Example 3:

| Cross-Paradigm Infrastructure + Architectural Bridge |
| Architecture Civil Engineering |
| 30 artists 18 Civil Eng. (Structures and Foundations) 6 Group (91 Arch. + 7 C.E. students in each) |

Fig. 03. Diagram of studio model 3: ‘Interdisciplinary consultation model’. Diagram by the author.

2. Ways of Sharing Criteria

As the next step, the author will introduce and compare the two case studies, which were based on the previously mentioned model diagram shown in Figure 02. Here, the starting question to the students was: where does the discipline of art begin and that of architecture end? Our aim was to uncover methodological differences, if any, through the act of making. Our investigations revealed interesting crossover practices, where contemporary artists produced architectural objects and space-engaging installations, while artistic tendencies such as Pop Art or Minimalism were quickly adopted by architects. The reciprocal relationship between architecture and sculpture has been an intriguing artistic phenomenon for a long time. Addressing such questions of ‘disciplinary homeland’ is essential in an educational context.

The idea behind the exhibitions Rethinking: Space, Time, Architecture in July 2002 in the centre of Berlin, and Art + Architect in September 2004 in downtown Brisbane, was to bring together the disciplines by engaging artists and architects / landscape architects in a collaborative and exploratory discourse with each other. Therefore, the exhibition projects involved teams of both established and emerging artists, and students of architecture. The author believes that collaboration thrives on difference as much as similarities, and that the resulting dialogues between the disciplines leads to new forms of collaborations and innovative ways to understand urban context, and it demonstrates the potential of such reciprocal relationships. Working together, with a common goal, has opened up new arenas of artistic exploration. Today, more than ever, making architecture is an interdisciplinary adventure without clear boundaries. Space, proportion, material, colour, surface: architects share with artists a whole range of criteria in their work, as well as some central elements of theory, planning and delivery. Both disciplines are concerned with the construction of space. Consequently, the influence of works by artists such as Richard Serra, Donald Judd or Gordon Matta-Clark on architects and urban designers (e.g. Le Corbusier, Arata Isozaki, or Herzog De Meuron) is often evident, despite the radical alienation from architecture by these artists. (Hesel, 2005) Crossing the boundaries into each discipline’s métier is nothing new, however. The area between the two poles is charged with a tension that can release artistic energies, witness the case of Matta-Clark, who introduced radically new ideas into the artist-architect relationship, and who is known for his dissections of buildings. ‘Why hang things on a wall,’ he asked, ‘when the wall itself is so much more a challenging medium?’ (Matta-Clark, 1975) His installations transformed the notion of sculpture into bisected pieces of walk-in architecture. Thus, art and architecture can meet and define each other’s respective domains on many levels, in a healthy cross-fertilisation.

3. Site-Specific Installations in Public Space: How ‘Context became the Content’

The three prerequisites for the exhibition projects were: collaborative, outdoor, temporary. At this point it is helpful to briefly recall the transformation process in the long historical partnership between artists and architects, and how interdisciplinary work was paramount in the Arts and Crafts movement at the beginning of the 20th century. However, architecture absorbed art and
marginalised the artist in the 1920s, when architects like Theo van Doesburg or Le Corbusier understood themselves as artists. The differentiation made by Kant between ‘art as a pure art (ornamentation)’ and ‘architecture as an applied art’ became widely adopted by the arts community itself and was further formalised by the Bauhaus group. (Kunt, 1790)

The process of industrialisation of the building process finally removed art from architecture and, in the 1950s, gradually reduced art to decoration (as frequently seen in shallow murals and mosaic works of this period), where the artist has been viewed by the architect as a decorator. A turning point came only a decade later when, around 1967, artists started to increasingly engage the public in site-specific installation works and generating interesting ideas and receiving new ‘content’ in return. Miwon Kwon recognised that ‘along with the spatial expansion of art – out of the gallery – there has been a parallel expansion of sites of knowledge on which art might draw to emphasize the site specificity of a work’ (Kwon, 2002). Understandably, several avant-garde group formations of the 1960s and 70s consisted of a combination of artists and architects, for example the Situationists, Archigram, Cobra and Archizoom groups. (Observation discussed at conferences in Helsinki and Hobart, 2005). In 1975, urban theorist Bernard Tschumi demanded: ‘We need to reintroduce art into architecture’. (Tschumi, 1975)

The term ‘spatialisation of art’ was probably first coined by Rosalind E. Krauss in 1983, however, around the same time, several theorists were pointing to shifting philosophies. Installations by artists Dan Flavin, Walter de Maria and Daniel Buren, which produced an ‘institutional critique’ of the gallery, marked a significant departure from the standard treatment of exhibition and gallery spaces. ‘A working process with reference to a particular location or situation can be called in situ. It means borrowing from architecture’, as previously described by art historians Krauss and Rorimer. (Krauss, 1983; Rorimer, 2001)

4. Documenting the Temporary Works

For too long, artists and architects have performed in their separate communities. Prior to the exhibitions in Berlin and Brisbane, the interaction between practising artists and architects was limited or, rather, accidental, in Berlin it was limited to a small group.

In order to improve this situation, the projects were conceived to realise site-specific installations at different locations in the city — outside, not inside a museum or gallery — because, as Malcolm Miles had previously pointed out, ‘such temporary character generally allows one to take greater risks, since the installations are not meant to last for a long time in the public space’. (Miles, 1997) The resulting installations were exhibited for a period of one month. The areas of intervention were focused: in Berlin to the district ‘Mitte’ and, in Brisbane, to the ‘Central Business District’.

Due to the overwhelming interest and the great commitment of the participants, a book for each of the exhibitions was produced. Both publications featured a collection of critical texts, and presented the works of students right next to the works of established participants — an intentional decision so as not to delineate between roles or skills. The publication of the books coincided with the exhibitions themselves, thus visitors were able to use the publication to compare the actual effect of the installations with their conceptual idea.

Fig. 04. Book edited by the author: *Absolutely Public. Crossover: Art and Architecture* (2005, Images Publishing Group, Melbourne); the catalogue of the exhibition project in Brisbane.

Fig. 05. Book edited by the author: *Rethinking Space. Time. Architecture* (2002, Jovis Publisher, Berlin); the catalogue of the exhibition project in Berlin.
5. The Potential of Interdisciplinary Crossovers and New Forms of Partnering

The notion of "working conceptually" is crucial here, since this method relates directly to working methods in architecture as well as in visual arts. Through the collaborative process, architecture and the arts willingly or unwillingly became "accomplices" in working together in the construction of space. Why is it that the conventional 'Art built-in' process rarely produces really interesting outcomes? Perhaps the answer is that the art work is only successful if it is conceptually and physically integrated with the architectural approach. 'Art built-in' or 'art as a reflection of architecture', however, was not the focus of these projects; the real focus, instead, was on installations that strongly depended on their public location, their temporary intervention, and which reflected subjects relating to public space.

The organisers soon realised that the culture of temporary use and temporary installations can be an important urban resource, generating and encouraging new activities, even making significant contributions to city life. Most importantly, the temporary exhibitions resulting from these projects demonstrated the potential of interdisciplinary crossovers in urban spaces, while the installations themselves managed to create a new awareness by mirroring, revealing or complimenting the unique characteristics of the chosen sites. From the beginning, the aim of the project was to investigate contemporary and relevant crossovers between disciplines, as well as testing and experimenting with new forms of collaboration. It turned out that the existing rigid boundaries between disciplines are both artificial and counterproductive, and that the borders between the various disciplines are quite arbitrary. Today we have recognised the need for working beyond our conventional boundaries to enable new forms of communication, and to initiate public debate about it.

Other obvious benefits of such interdisciplinary collaborations are the creation of diversity of outcomes and the personal growth of the individuals involved by being exposed to new knowledge and insights from another discipline. Thus, the collaborations produced interfaces between the disciplines that were both innovative and mutually reflexive. However, it is important to mention that such collaborations cannot be forced to happen; they must find their own cause naturally and out of a desire on the part of the participants.

6. Agreements, Disagreements, and Resolutions: The Interaction behind the Scenes

Both exhibition projects involved the collaboration of teams of at least one artist and one architect. Of particular interest is the organisational process and interaction behind the case studies: how the curator was able to get the different groups to be involved and to work together on the installation projects.

There were a large number of stakeholders involved, and they all had their own motivations: Two universities, the Institute of Architects, a local developer, the local gallery scene, the various architects' practices and individual artists, City Council, the 'Art-built-in' Public Art agency of State Government, the Brisbane Festival (with which the project became associated with), the Year-of-the-Built-Environment Committee, and Artists Alliance. Intensive regular meetings ensured a coordinated interaction between these organisations involved, and that these organisations worked together with a clear focus on the project. It also meant a fortnightly encounter between artist/designer/curator with those institutions and bodies that seek to control activity in our cities.

It seems that collaboration frequently means different things to architects and artists. While the roles played by architects and artists certainly vary from project to project, and while it is impossible to generalise about their relationship, old stereotypes need to be challenged and new forms of partnering explored. Firstly, the author looked to gain the City Council and a local developer as main sponsors of the exhibition works. A call for participation was published in several newspapers, and submissions from interdisciplinary teams were received.

Secondly, the involvement and support of the local gallery scene was sought and their input on suggestions for suitable artists for installations in public space was incorporated into the method. From time to time, the curator had to intervene in order to identify compatible partnerships and facilitate team communication, but several architects had already approached the concept with their preferred artists. The area of intervention was limited to the inner-city centre. Most of the teams were quick in selecting their sites. The curator established creative discussion within the teams, acting as facilitator and mediator between artists and architects when required. The preparation period was hampered by the difficulties of liaising between overpowered architects and egocentric artists, where observations and concepts where at constant risk of being compromised. Soon it became clear that there is no "ideal" way artists or architects should perform, and there were some expectable differences between what was supposed to happen, and what really did happen. Surprisingly, most of the artists acted more like architects, whereas the architects started to approach the design task suddenly in the way as expected by the artists. (Baron, 2000) There were endless discussions about 'placement' and the precise siting of the works. Usually crucial discussions were made at unrecorded sessions at on-site meetings, where tense negotiations about the most appropriate location of the artwork were at the top of the agenda.

During this critical phase, it was important not to water-down the ideas through long procedures, but to give full reign to risk-taking ideas. This phase revealed the varying levels to which individuals were able to work across discourses and accommodate different perspectives. As noted by Niculescu, 'interdisciplinarity concerns the transfer of methods from one discipline to another', similar to the borrowing of techniques or values. (Niculescu, 1997) Such teaming-up, of course, is generally not so new for the architectural disciplines which have, for a long time, recognised and responded to situations in
practice where collaborations with consultants from various disciplines have become a common standard. Unfortunately, in the past, this has too often been piecemeal and not explicitly informed by theory, substance or method. The author realised that discussions between architects and artists involved in innovative collaborations required changing roles in terms of agreements, disagreements and resolutions. Furthermore, it seems that the architect is frequently unable to experiment, with the same degree of freedom as the artist. It often seems that 'the question of assumed disciplinarian rights, namely that of form-giver and space-maker, bothers architects more than it bothers artists.' (Drew, 1986) As Philip Drew rightly remarks, 'the artist frequently appears to be at liberty to develop a new means quickly and inexpensively with an ease that the architect can only envy'. (the Holocaust Memorial by Eisenman and Serra is an interesting case in this regard) Some lessons could be learnt from such projects.

7. Strategies for Art in Public Spaces: Transferring Techniques

How have the teams of visual artists and architects dealt with the complexity and diversity of their urban surroundings? (Florida, 2002) How have they transformed their various environments? And, in turn, do these installations alter our perception of the city?

The earlier exhibition in Berlin led to a wider understanding of contemporary art and its appropriate venues, and even to an advancement of architectural knowledge. In some way, the Brisbane project developed from the experience with the Berlin exhibition, and the Brisbane exhibition was a continuation of these aspects. Importantly, the method of working ensured that art was always a part of the whole, not simply a later application. Thus these types of projects have the potential to open up a much broader discourse about public space. However, it seems that art in public spaces - with a focus on situation and spatially related strategies - has always endured a harder time than art, which is installed inside buildings, protected in museum rooms, galleries and entrance lobbies, where the artwork is directly linked with the building itself. Today, the task of art and architecture, with regard to public space, cannot be reduced to decoration without content, critical thinking and spatial engagement within the cityscape. The author believes that the work of the following young, contemporary artists - working at the intersection with architecture - is likely to be a significant contributor to the development of public art: Liam Gillick, Rachel Whiteread, Ernesto Neto, Olafur Eliasson, Jorge Pardo, Andrea Zittel.

In both cities, the selected participating teams used prominent places and locations for their interventions, such as city gardens, city squares, inner city parks, busy thoroughfares, as well as little known spaces such as laneaways and alleyways off the central business district, under-croft spaces along the river, and less-known corners of the city precinct. Typically, such often-overlooked spaces evade description or have outlived their former usefulness.

8. The Case-Study: Some Works from Berlin and Brisbane

Frequently, the installations were driven by the varied histories of the sites and the private speculations of the teams. The following presentation shows a selection of six works. However, it is very difficult to capture the true essence of such installations from viewing a slide; the installations worked with their surroundings, and several of the installations used sound as part of the concept.

Fig. 06. 'Where is Boll?', Berlin 2002. Art: Florian Bolk. Arch: Philip Wchage. The installation comprised of turning panels with photos of macro and micro views. (Photo: Florian Bolk)

Fig. 07. 'Making Time and Territory', Berlin 2002. Art: Colin Ardley. Arch: Hermann Scheidle. A large, object-like ramp was inserted into a ruin of a church by Schinkel. (Photo: Florian Bolk)
Fig. 08. ‘MegaCity: Sao Paulo City Surface’, Berlin 2002. Art: Cida de Aragon. Arch: Steffen Lehmann. Video projections simulated the act of entering the urban space by penetrating the screen. Installation with sound. (Photo: Florian Bolk)

Fig. 09. ‘Surveillance’, Brisbane 2004. Art: Cida de Aragon. Arch: Phil Heywood. Large eyes and whispering voices indicate a climate of fear: post 9/11 paranoia, security systems and control of space. The danger is that too much control diminishes the public realm. (Photo: Cida de Aragon)

Fig. 10. ‘Dining Room’, Brisbane 2004. Art: Simone Eisler. Arch: Andrew Steen. A large chandelier is suspended from underneath a bridge, playing with the irony of opulence, and offering a dining room to the homeless. It offers a delicate image of the city as a place which could be furnished and decorated as you would a domestic interior. (Photo: Megan Cullen)

Fig. 11. ‘Picture Perfect’, Brisbane 2004. Art: Sarah Nesbit, Amie Batalibasi. Arch: Emma Ternmont-Schenk. Manipulated, constructed images reveal the site’s non-perfect symmetry, and re-create a ‘picture perfect’. The presented faked-up view of the city is perfectly symmetrical down to the movement of its inhabitants. (Photo: Richard Stringer)

9. Some Concluding Remarks

The involvement of students from different disciplines in the presented exhibition projects created a pedagogical model that resulted in a particular type of learning situation. This paper suggests that the applied collaborative model was successful in engendering an interdisciplinary attitude, as well as achieving creative energy and new awareness of public space. From the students’ feedback, it can be noted that for an educational purpose the projects were highly successful. In this respect, the collaborative exhibition projects were used as the theoretical basis for the further development of the author’s interest in cross-discipline studios for architecture students.

To understand the real benefits of such ‘partnering’, we explored the way in which the different disciplines were teamed-up. Both disciplines are concerned with the construction of space. However, collaboration thrives on difference as much as similarities. At a time when the definition of contemporary architecture and the notion of disciplinary rights are being redefined, it is to be hoped that the success of these exhibitions will serve as a stimulus. Architecture is constantly used as a vehicle to fundamentally rethink the way artworks are displayed on both the micro and the macro level. Today, the museum of contemporary art would like to transform itself from a static repository and institutional space into a dynamic workshop engaged directly with the city and the artist’s ever changing
strategies of production and presentation. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that the public, outdoor and temporal nature of both presented projects has allowed for works unlikely to conceive of in the 'white cube' of an art gallery. Here, contemporary art indulges in the truly public domain by being, literally, in public space. Most of the time, convincing art is temporary, not permanent. Therefore, all art in public space can be called Public Art. We discovered that the culture of temporary use and temporary installation is an important urban resource that can generate and encourage new activities and make a significant contribution to city life. Interestingly, such interventions can be small scale; they do not need to be permanent or of large scale.

Despite earlier suggestions that art and architecture are closely related, they constitute two distinctly different cultures, where artists and architects are expected to design in different ways: artists make decisions more intuitive, and architects in a more analytical way. Presumably, then, architects are better able to take a reasonable and systematic position and defend it. However, neither side can expect that their approach will simply be accepted by those within another profession. We conclude that, despite this difference, forms of behaviour and decision-making within art and architecture are most of the time based on sound reasoning. The exhibition project Art+Arch infinite has already improved and triggered more collaboration between artists and architects in Brisbane. The architecture students involved in the project were highly motivated to test this new ground, and most of them confirmed afterwards that they wanted to do more work with artists in the future. A vibrant and active network is evolving out of the project. These collaborative programs offer a useful model for other architecture/art programs to adapt. All the works explored the uniqueness and the scope of topics that are brought together within the fields of art and architecture, and the contradictions inherent in the relationship of architecture, as an art form in itself, to the forms of life that it serves.
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Abstract

This paper introduces a new view on architectural education based on successful models and theories in pedagogy and education. Expanding on this point of view, the characteristic of traditional architectural design education is turned into a holistic studio program into which all the auxiliary/complementary courses are incorporated. The goal of this program/studio is to reveal the potential talents and expertise of the learners, as opposed to teaching certain things to them; helping them to explore their potential and therefore find their own individual direction and unique way of seeing the world of Architecture.

In such a system of teaching/learning architecture, pedagogy does not necessarily mean training architects as the final product of education, rather, to open a number of doors to different aspects of architecture such as structure, climatic and environmental concerns, research, history, theory, conservation and rehabilitation, for the purpose of inspiring the students’ aptitudes and helping them to explore their own field(s) of interest. In this system of education, there would be no specific program solely for all of the students; rather, each student’s program is individualized and defined based on his/her competencies and latent potentials.

This paper introduces a holistic and flexible educational system to architecture that varies according to the individual talents, involving them in as many pertinent fields as possible by means of a comprehensive studio embracing a full spectrum of all possible and relevant courses.

Keywords: Studio-oriented, architectural pedagogy, holistic-studio, design-studio pedagogy, flexible educational system, comprehensive-studio.