**ARC 6242 Research Methods Spring 2020**

Professor Charlie Hailey [clhailey@ufl.edu](mailto:clhailey@ufl.edu)

GNV: ARC 423, Thursday, periods 4-6 (352) 392-0205 x229

MCO: CityLab, Tuesday, 9:30am – 12:30am

**Introduction and Objectives**

ARC 6242 is a formal introduction to methods of research at the graduate level. The course is designed to prepare students to undertake the sustained research project required for their Masters of Architecture degree at the University of Florida. Because each student’s goals are unique and thus every project is distinct, students must individualize participation and production according to specific research interests. To serve the diversity of the student interests and the inclusive nature of the architectural discipline, a wide range of research techniques will be introduced. Students are asked to review critically these frameworks and to propose appropriate methodological structures for their work over the next year.

At different times and in different places, architecture has been understood as a mechanical art, as a liberal art, as a cultural production, even as a social art. Architecture has been closely associated with engineering, urban design, interior and landscape architecture. Our discipline also connects with fine arts, literature, philosophy, and other humanities. As a result, readings will cover a range of disciplines and will be edited for brevity to serve as an introduction to topics—a beginning of research rather than the end of an inquiry. Weekly reading assignments will average about twenty pages.

This course seeks to provide the following: (1) resources for MRP research (working sources); (2) tactics and strategies (working methods); and (3) proposal development (as a working document). To ensure that every student is prepared to undertake the Masters Research Project (MRP), this course includes assignments and exercises related to reading, writing, analyzing, constructing, and presenting. Weekly work includes the submission of writing fragments, reading analysis, continuing projects, and proposal components under development (see below for additional information). At the end of the semester, students put together a full proposal as a working document to continue their MRP over the summer, into the following fall, and toward the final spring semester.

A note about working groups: Early in the process, the instructor will work with students to form working groups based on their particular topical and methodological interests. These working groups are emergent; and, in that sense, they are not meant to lock a student into a particular topic of project. Instead, they provide a forum for students to explore their interests, to consider what kind of research they will carry out, and to make connections with faculty who share their interests. For the latter, at two points in the semester, we will invite faculty to join the course discussion.

**Synopsis of course modes**

This course includes weekly presentations by the instructor, complemented by group discussions and student presentations.

**Typical class**

* lecture presentation by instructor that looks prospectively to next week’s topic and speculatively at this week’s topic
* discussions within student working groups (includes writing critique, discussion of reading analysis, and case presentations)
* overall class discussion and presentation of working group ‘findings’ within their discussions

**Working documents**

This course includes three sets of working documents: Weekly Work, Projects, and Proposal Components. Typical format is 11x17 landscape-orientation sheets. This table outlines the timing of documents (note: Weekly Work ‘working groups’ is in-class)--

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Weekly Work** | | **Projects** | | **Proposal Components** | |
| Writing fragment | weeks 2-13 | Repetition | weeks 2-6 | Question and Thesis | Weeks 3, 4 |
| Reading analysis | weeks 2-13 | Collection | weeks 7-8 | Bibliography | week 8 |
| Case | weeks 2-13 | Construction | weeks 10-11 | Abstract | weeks 11, 12 |
| (working groups) | weeks 2-13 | Case study | weeks 13-15 | Full proposal | weeks 14, 16 |

**Weekly Work**

Format: 11x17 sheet(s), landscape orientation

Writing fragment: weekly writing for group discussion and critique. In some cases, these writing fragments serve as drafts for the Proposal Components (see below). Also, see course outline for specific dates; writing includes:

* Description of G1 project (100 words)
* Three questions
* Thesis statement (one sentence)
* Additional writing fragments throughout semester

Reading analysis: annotated critique and response of one page from assigned reading. This analysis should also make connections with other readings from the current week as well as previous weeks.

Case: one project, object, concept, or idea (from any source) deemed relevant to week’s discussion

**Projects** (longer-term assignments)

Repetition (ritual): define an activity carried out each day for 5 minutes (maximum 15 minutes). The activity should have some documentable outcome. Impose constraints as necessary in terms of format, media, place, and other limits. In each class, seven (7) repetitions will be due (in hard copy format). If necessary, you can ‘re-set’ your repeated activity after the first seven days. This exercise is as much about the process as the outcome. [relevant readings include Twyla Tharp’s *Creative Habit* and Robert Morris’ *Continuous Project Altered Daily*]

Collection (field): build a collection. Gather, then sort, then name what you have collected. You can also begin with a particular category or place in mind. Unlike the previous exercise, which has a temporal pattern, this project works by association, correspondence, and proximity. [relevant readings include the Parti-Pris series from the Louvre Museum and University of Chicago Press; and Joseph Mitchell, *Granta 88*]

Construction (collage): create a map of an emergent project. This project entails editing as well as relating ideas. Use word and text. Consider juxtapositions. Document the process of constructing the collage as it takes shape. [relevant readings include Peter Greenaway’s *Papers* (Paris: Dis Voir, 1990).]

Case (study): analyze one case, in the context of the other cases that you chose throughout the semester and in relation to your emergent proposal. This is as much a ‘study of cases’ as it is a singular case study. [relevant readings include Cecil Balmond’s *Informal*]

**Proposal and proposal components**

Question and Thesis: Thesis statement and question (two sentences in total)

Bibliography: Annotated list of texts, projects, and things (it will continue to build over throughout the semester). Initial submission includes a minimum of ten (10) books and articles.

Abstract: proposal summary (300 words)

Full Proposal: format discussed as semester moves along. This document includes Question, Abstract, Bibliography (final version with minimum of 20 books and articles), and all Projects from course.

**Working Groups**

Working groups begin forming in Week 2

Faculty discusses research with students and meets with Working Groups in Weeks 6 and 11

Students determine Committee Chairs in Week 13

**Schedule and Course Outline**

**1: January 9**

Introduction and initial topical/methodological discussion; list of Graduate Research Faculty

*Readings for next week*

Defining “thesis”

Selections from Frank Hekel and Robert Clocker, *Thesis*, *Thresholds* 12, Spring 1996.

Designing

Lily Chi, “Design as Research,” *JAE* 54/4 (May 2001): 250.

Lily Chi, “Translations,” JAE (2007): 61/1 (September 2007): 7-10.

Habit

Twyla Tharp, *The Creative Habit* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2009).

**2: January 16**

Writing: Description of previous studio project (100 words), presented on 11x17 landscape-format sheet (typical)

Reading analysis: One selection from readings assigned in previous week, with annotations laid out on 11x17 landscape-format sheet (typical)

Case: One project, object, concept, or idea (from any source) deemed relevant to week’s discussion, laid out on 11x17 sheet (typical)

Project: Repetition: activity defined (presented on 11x17 sheet)

*Readings for next week*

Procedure

Vittorio Gregotti, *Inside Architecture* (MIT, 1996)

Process

Robert Morris, *Continuous Project Altered Daily* (Cambridge: MIT, 1995)

Richard Serra, *Interviews*

Goldsworthy (as example)

Writing

William Zinsser, *On Writing Well* (New York: Harper, 1994).

Hannah Sullivan, *The Work of Revision* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014).

**3: January 23**

Writing: Three questions

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Repetition: presentation of 7 documents

*Readings for next week*

Making

Guiseppe Zambonini, “Notes for a Theory of Making,” *Perspecta* 24 (1988): 3-23.

Coleman Coker, “An Intent of Constructing,” *Mockbee Coker: Thought and Process* (Princeton Architectural Press, 1995), 56-73.

Digital/Analog/Craft

Selection from Antoine Picon, *Digital Culture in Architecture*

Selection from Malcolm McCullough, *Abstracting Craft: The Practiced Digital Hand* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998).

Tool

Selection from Raoul Bunschoten

Selection from Walter Pichler

**4: January 30**

Writing: Thesis statement (one sentence)

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Repetition: presentation of 7 documents

Proposal: Questions (revised from previous Writing)

*Readings for next week*

Art as Method

Josef Albers, *Search versus Re-Search* (Hartford, CT: Trinity College Press, 1969) (particularly lecture 01, complemented by illustrations throughout)

Drawing and sketching

Louis Kahn, on Sketching

Kimon Nicolaides, *The Natural Way to Draw*

Point, Line, Plane

Wassily Kandinsky, *Point and Line to Plane* (New York: Dover, 1979)

Paul Klee, *Notebooks*

**5: February 6**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Repetition: presentation of 7 documents

Proposal: Thesis statement (one sentence, revised from Writing)

Working groups: Faculty presents/discusses research with students

*Readings for next week*

Patterns and elements

Rem Koolhaas, *Elements*

Data

Edward Tufte, *Envisioning Information*

Diagramming

Mark Garcia, *The Diagrams of Architecture* (reference)

Bernard Tschumi, *Notations: Diagrams and Sequences*

Peter Eisenman, *Diagram Diaries*

Mapping: Landscape

James Corner, *Taking Measures across the Landscape*

**6: February 13**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Collection: presentation of first collection

*Readings for next week*

Sensing

Juhani Pallasmaa, *The Eyes of the Skin* (Chicester: Wiley-Academic, 2005), 41-46.

Phenomena

Gaston Bachelard, *Poetics of Space* (in relation to his complete work on fire, earth, water, and air)

**7: February 20**

Writing: fragment with footnote

Project: Collection: presentation of continued collection

Proposal: Bibliography

*Readings*

Narrative

John Hejduk, “A Matter of Fact,” *Vladivostok* (New York: Rizzoli, 1989), 15.

Le Corbusier, *Creation is a Patient Search* (New York: 1960), excerpted in Ivan Zaknic’s “Preface” to Le Corbusier, *Journey to the East* (Cambridge: MIT, 1987), xii-xiv.

Film

Andrei Tarkovsky, *Sculpting in Time*

Peter Greenaway, *Prospero’s Books*

Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form*

Music (composition)

Igor Stravinsky, third chapter (inspiration/composition), *Poetics of Music: In the Form of Six Lessons* (New York: Vintage, 1953).

**8: February 27**

Faculty presentations from School of Architecture professors

**9: March 5**

No class (Spring Break)

**10: March 12**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Proposal: Abstract (draft)

Project: Construction: draft of collage (with iterations)

*Readings for next week*

Travel as method

reading (tba)

Place

Edward Casey, *The Fate of Place* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

Place, permanence, production

Sola Morales essay

**11: March 19**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Construction: collage (with iterations)

*Readings*

Planning

Lebbeus Woods, *GR(O)UND* (Bern: RIEA, 2003), 4-9.

Socializing

Bruce Mau, *Selections from Massive Change* (New York: Phaidon, 2000)

Lars Lerup, *Building the Unfinished* (London: Sage, 1977), 17-32.

**12: March 26**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Project: Case (study): analysis

Proposal: Abstract

*Readings for next week*

Project: Designing/deliberating/engineering

Cecil Balmond, *informal* (Munich: Prestel, 2000) pp.17-55, 109-123. (see also pp.394-397: project names/hypotheses)

Knowledge

Jacob Bronowski, *The Origins of Knowledge and Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918)

Curiosity

Marco Frascari and William W. Braham, “The Curious Architect or the Curiosity of Critical Practice,” *Proceedings of 83rd ACSA Annual Meeting: “Practice”*, 1995, pp.307-310.

Practice

Donald Schon, reflective practitioner and problem-setting

**13: April 2**

Writing: fragment

Reading Analysis and Case: Note: For Weeks 3 - 13, the weekly assignments for Reading Analysis and Case are the same as described in Week 2.

Proposal: Full proposal (draft)

Working groups: 400-second presentation and discussion about selecting chair and co-chair of committee

**14: April 9**

Working groups: 400-second presentation and discussion about selecting chair and co-chair of committee (continued)

**15: April 16 (class meeting if necessary)**

Chair and Co-chair for MRP Committee finalized

**16: April 23 (no class)**

Proposal: Full proposal, packaged with all previous assignments, submitted to Canvas.

**Proposal Documents** (additional information and critical dates)

**Questions**

Due: Week 4: Final

Format: 11x17 sheet

Contents: Three questions

**Thesis statement**

Due: Week 6: Final

Format: 11x17 sheet

Contents: Thesis statement presenting an argument or critical position

**Bibliography**

Due: Week 8: Final

Format: 11x17 sheet

Contents: Text sources in Chicago Style (minimum book/article sources: 10 for this submission, 20 for final submission)

Additional sources (projects, images, related media)

Annotations: approximately 100 words (annotations should summarize argument and relation to proposal)

**Abstract**

Due: Week 11: Draft

Week 12: Final

Format: 11x17 sheet

Contents: Title: sub-title

Text (300 words) includes problem-setting, main question, and argument (thesis).

**Proposal**

Due: Week 14: Draft

Week 17: Final

Format: 11x17 sheets

Contents: Title

Abstract

Synthesis of reading analysis

Discussion of main ideas

Bibliography

Appendix: all projects throughout course (Repetition, Collection, Construction, Cases, and final Case)

General note: It is assumed that your topic will evolve, but write what you know now. Please do not describe how you are going to work (that should be a footnote or a separate information sheet). Instead work from a thesis telling us about the problems, concepts and objectives of the inquiry

**Textbooks**

There are no required textbooks for this course. The instructor will provide selected references and resources (see Schedule and Course Outline).

**References and Resources**

The professor will provide a collection of fundamental articles for the topics of the course.

*Chicago Manual of Style* <http://www.chicagemanualofstyle.org/tools.html>

Graham Foundation Abstracts <http://www.grahamfoundation.org/abstract/index.asp>

Frank Hekel and Robert Clocker, *Thesis*, special issue of *Thresholds* (Spring 1996).

Lily Chi, “Design as Research,” *JAE* 54/4 (May 2001): 250.

Linda Groat and David Wang, *Architectural Research Methods* (Wiley 2001).

**Evaluation**

Class participation 10%

Weekly work (writing, reading analysis, cases) 15%

Projects (repetition, collection, construction, case) 20%

Proposal (questions, thesis, bibliography, abstract) 20%

Presentation (400-second presentation) 10%

Final Proposal 25%

**Class attendance**

Attendance is mandatory and will be recorded for each class. After three absences, each subsequent absence will reduce your final grade by one letter. Requirements for class attendance and make-up exams, assignments, and other work in this course are consistent with university policies that can be found in the online catalog at: [https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx.](https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/attendance.aspx)

**Grading Scale**

The grade scale ranges from A to E, with + and – assigned as necessary:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Letter Grade | A | A- | B+ | B | B- | C+ | C | C- | D+ | D | D- | E |
| Numeric  Grade | 93-  100 | 90-  92 | 87-  89 | 83-  86 | 80-  82 | 77-  79 | 73-  76 | 70-  72 | 67-  69 | 63-  66 | 60-  62 | 0-  59 |
| Quality Points | 4.0 | 3.67 | 3.33 | 3.0 | 2.67 | 2.33 | 2.0 | 1.67 | 1.33 | 1.0 | 0.67 | 0.0 |

For more information on UF’s current grading policies, please refer to the following website:

<https://catalog.ufl.edu/ugrad/current/regulations/info/grades.aspx>

**Make-up exams**

Make-up examinations will be scheduled only in cases of documented emergencies or at the instructor’s discretion.

**Students with Disabilities**

Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation.

**Academic Honesty**

Students in the School of Architecture are expected to adhere to all University of Florida academic honesty policies. Failure to do so will result in lowered grades and/or referral to the University Honor Court. Since the University’s policies are necessarily generalized, the School of Architecture further clarifies academic honesty within the specific setting of design education. The following acts are considered to be academic dishonesty:

1. Plagiarism/misrepresentation: There shall be no question of what your work is and what someone

else’s is. This applies to all aspects of student performance, including but not limited to

* design guidelines (written and graphic)
* design, planning, and management projects or portions of projects
* class reports and papers (again, both written and graphic information)
* any assignment where sole authorship is indicated, such as take-home tests, individual projects, etc.
* CAD drawings and construction details

Examples of inappropriate activities include:

* copying graphics for a report without crediting the original source
* representing someone else’s work as your own (using existing CAD construction details, tracing drawings, etc.)
* allowing someone else to represent your work as his own

1. Multiple submissions of the same or similar work without prior approval. If the instructors understand that you are doing a paper associated with your thesis or senior project topic, then doing similar work for two different classes is acceptable—if the instructors agree to it. If a single paper is submitted for one class, then later is submitted for another, and the instructors expect original work, then the multiple submission is inappropriate.
2. Falsifying information

Examples include:

* misrepresenting reasons why work cannot be done as requested
* changing or leaving out data, such as manipulating statistics for a research project, or ignoring/hiding inconvenient but vital site information. (However, for educational purposes only, certain aspects of the “real world” may be jointly agreed upon as not being pertinent to the academic goals of the course, such as not dealing with specific project parameters or budget, changing the program, etc.)
* altering work after it has been submitted
* hiding, destroying, or otherwise making materials unavailable (hiding reference materials, not sharing materials with other students, etc.)

**UF Grading Policy**

Information on UF’s grading policy can be found at the following location:

<http://www.registrar.ufl.edu/catalog/policies/regulationgrades.html>

**Students with Special Needs**

Students with special physical needs and requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the Instructor when requesting accommodation. All attempts to provide an equal learning environment for all will be made.

**Online Course Evaluation**

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course based on 10 criteria. These evaluations are conducted online at [https://evaluations.ufl.edu.](https://evaluations.ufl.edu/) Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester, but students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at [https://evaulations.ufl.edu.](https://evaulations.ufl.edu/)