WOMEN

IN

THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

A REPORT BY THE ROYAL AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS TO

THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

NOVEMBER 1986

The research reported herein was supported jointly by the Human Rights Commission under a Research Consultancy Grant and the Royal Australian Institute of Architects (Education Division) which provided the balance of the funds. The research was designed and conducted by John Dean of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects and Dr Russell K. Darroch of the Department of Psychology, Australian National University.

A steering Committee consisting of Ms Anne Cunningham of Anne Cunningham & Ann Keddie Pty. Ltd., Ms Penny Rosier of Penny Rosier and Associates, and Ms Colleen Waide of the Human Rights Commission assisted in the initial design of the survey of women architects. Additional comments on early drafts were also received from many other women and provided a further check on the comprehensiveness of the survey items.

Other individuals who provided valuable suggestions on the student survey included Peter Bailey, Joan Jardine, and other members of the Human Rights Commission. Carolyn Wigg also made numerous helpful comments.

We wish to express our special thanks to Ms Karen Harbus who did the majority of the coding for both the students' and women's surveys as well as extensive library research in tracking down obscure references to women in various professions. Thanks are also due to Ms Penny Wood who assisted in coding and editing of data for the student survey.

We view it as unfortunate and very ironic that this report is one of the last to be produced under the aegis of the Human Rights Commission. Implementation of many of the suggestions made in this report will need to be acted upon by others who carry forward the spirit of the Commission in pursuing a more egalitarian society for Australia and all Australians.

Further information on the surveys reported here and copies of the survey questionnaires may be obtained by contacting:

Russell Darroch
John Dean

Education Division
Royal Australian Institute of Architects
2A Mugga Way
Red Hill, A.C.T. 2603.
Canberra, A.C.T. 1986

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND LITERATURE

1.1 During the 1970s, with rising awareness of issues concerning the various roles of men and women in Western societies and with increased attention to discrimination in its various guises, one area which received particular attention was the extent to which women in various professional groups were systematically disadvantaged at various stages of their careers.

1.2 Journalistic accounts and anecdotal reports indicated that women from many different backgrounds had experienced a range of discriminatory practices. From conference venues to formal research journals accounts emerged which indicated a level of concern and interest in increased equity and social change. Professions and professional women were particularly visible in such forums as there was growing awareness of the degree to which systematic disadvantages permeated the social system. In addition to various types of government, professional association, and other enquiries into such issues International Women's Year highlighted for many the actuality of the patterns of disadvantage.

1.3 Patterns of overt and covert discrimination were identified by researchers across the full range of educational and professional activities. This research made it apparent that from early schooling and subject selection through high school and careers guidance counseling to university course entry and on into professional socialization, job selection, and advancement there were a variety of mechanisms in place which systematically discriminated against girls and women in their pursuit of professional careers.

1.4 Women's place in the architectural profession was no exception to this pattern of intense scrutiny and a variety of conference papers, feminist architecture articles and formal research work appeared, with a particularly high level of such activity occurring between 1974 and 1978. Examples of such literature include, for example: O'Dean (1975), Pettingill (1975), and White (1975). (N.B. This is not a complete list; the Reference list included with this report provides a solid introduction to this literature. Unfortunately time and funding constraints on the study did not permit the development of a formal literature review chapter.)

CHAPTER 2 - WOMEN IN ARCHITECTURE IN AUSTRALIA - EXISTING INFORMATION

2.1 In Australia where women have always been a small proportion of architects there was no less interest in issues of the type outlined above. Various notable women architects spoke out in person and in print and drew attention to their sense of frustration and experiences of discrimination during schooling, university and professional work. Examples of such comment and research include: Cunningham (1982), White (n.d.), and White (1975).

2.2 In 1984 the RAIA undertook a national survey of all its members to ascertain patterns of professional involvement and knowledge on a variety of issues. This National Survey included a number of key issues which could be considered on the basis of the gender of the respondents. Results for several of these key issues, such as levels of income, types of employment, and status in the profession suggested to the RAIA that women architects were still, in 1984, a distinctly different group than their male counterparts.

2.3 The RAIA Education Division and its Consultant discussed the possibility, depending on the availability of research funds, of further investigating the status of women in the architectural profession and as a component of it to undertake a study of students to achieve a reasonable cross-sectional picture of the profession in 1985/86. The surveys were, broadly speaking, intended to provide a basis for comparing male and female students against the male and female respondents in the 1984 National Survey and to provide a basis for comparing female students with women architects currently in the workforce.

2.4 Fortuitously, in mid-1985 the Human Rights Commission advertised for small research grant applications in 1985 and the RAIA applied for support under this grant scheme to carry out the student survey and a national sample survey of women architects.

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

NATIONAL SURVEY

3.1 In order to serve its members to the fullest possible extent, the RAIA undertook a full scale national survey in 1984/85 in order to gauge the attitude and background of architects with regard to a wide range of professional and related issues. This survey was designed, among other things, to provide comparative information on male and female architects on key topics. At the time the survey was conceived it was not done with specific reference to issues of discrimination, but rather to collect descriptive data on the status of people working in architecture in Australia. A number of these issues related to the subsequent students and women architects surveys and the study reported here did additional analyses on the national survey data set.

SURVEY DESIGN

3.2 Though the procedure is somewhat unusual the National Survey was designed as a 100% sample on the grounds that (a) the population of architects in Australia was small enough to make this a feasible proposition and (b) because it was felt that a truly descriptive data collection would best serve the needs of the Institute. Consequently the survey questionnaire was extensively pretested, sent out for comment to key architects, and rechecked. The 97 item questionnaire was posted to all architects in Australia and to all RAIA members in October/November of 1984. The forms were returned to the Institute's national office for coding, analysis, and preparation of the report during 1985.

3.3 The survey itself consisted of questions on demographic characteristics, income and employment, education, registration, new technologies, the RAIA, continuing education, and other professional concerns.
Survey Administration

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

3.4 The 6 page survey document was an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire which was sent to the home address of the respondents with a covering letter from the President of the RAIA explaining the reasons for the survey and requesting cooperation.

3.5 A total of 7402 questionnaires were mailed out and of these, 43% (N=3229) were returned in a form suitable for analysis.

SURVEY OF STUDENTS

3.6 The aim of the survey of students was to cover a range of topics of interest to the educational aims of the RAIA and to ascertain the extent to which male and female students reported discrimination of various kinds in the pursuit of their studies.

SURVEY DESIGN

3.7 Survey design commenced in mid-1985 and a pre-test was carried out in early August. All schools of architecture were invited to participate in the study. Included with the letter was a draft questionnaire and a request for comments and suggestions on its final form. A copy of the final survey is attached at Appendix A.

3.8 Following revision of the survey questionnaire based on the pretest results and the feedback from the schools the final version was printed and sent to the schools in late September 1985. Some delays in actual funding added to the time pressure for the mail-out of this survey as survey questionnaires had to be distributed before the end of classes in October.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

3.9 Based on responses from the schools it was decided to ask lecturers of first and final year students to distribute the surveys in class and collect them. The importance of this was stressed in both written instructions and through telephone discussions.

3.10 Virtually all of the schools handled the questionnaires as requested and managed to fit the distribution in before the end of classes. (Unfortunately in one exceptional case such cooperation was not forthcoming and surveys were distributed in a less satisfactory manner and data from this school are consequently less reliable.) However, the majority of schools obtained comprehensive samples of between 70 and 90 percent of their first and final year students.

3.11 Surveys were collected by the schools and returned to the RAIA headquarters in Canberra for coding and analysis. This work was carried out during early 1986.

SURVEY OF FEMALE ARCHITECTS

3.12 The survey of women architects was originally conceived as an opportunity to determine the current status of women in the architectural profession in Australia. While initially designed as a general survey of issues of special interest to women architects. The survey emphasis was subsequently shifted to accommodate the interests of the Human Rights Commission. In order to cover the issues thoroughly a steering committee was established consisting of the principle investigators, 2 prominent female architects, and members of the Human Rights Commission.

SURVEY DESIGN

3.13 Initial survey design work was carried out during the period June 1985 to February 1986 with the final version of the questionnaire being completed in March. The aim of the survey was to provide a comprehensive set of information on the experience of women architects on a range of issues which the steering committee expected were of significance in the education of women architects, their career advancement, and their experience, or lack thereof, of discrimination in their professional education and the workforce.

3.14 Preliminary drafts of the survey were circulated for comment to a variety of people as well as the members of the committee. Further meetings were held in Melbourne and Sydney to review the draft document in detail and to seek additional inputs. Pretesting of the questionnaire was carried out with a small Survey Administration

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

3.15 Unfortunately cumulative delays in 1985 meant that the survey could not be done before the summer and Christmas vacation period and a further delay was necessary so that the survey would not follow too closely on the heels of another Royal Australian Institute of Architects survey to its members which was carried out in early 1986. Consequently the survey was finally distributed in March 1986 and the majority of returns were available by the end of May for coding and editing.

3.16 The survey was designed as a self-administered questionnaire with a combination of structured and open-ended questions. Respondents were provided with a covering letter, instructions, and a return envelope. All surveys were handled in such a manner as to guarantee the anonymity of respondents.

3.17 The sample for the mailout of the survey was derived from the complete Royal Australian Institute of Architects membership listing and from lists of professional women in architecture and related fields which were provided by other organisations with similar interests. The group Constructive Women was particularly helpful in providing access to a mailing list.

3.18 The comprehensive national sample which was available for the mailout included 543 names of women in architecture and related professions throughout Australia as well as some who were overseas. While this would not represent the total population of such women, it is a very substantial proportion of that population.

3.19 Of the 543 questionnaires mailed out a total of 151 usable questionnaires were returned. This gave an overall response rate of 27 percent.

CHAPTER 4 - ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

NATIONAL SURVEY

4.1 (N.B. As the data reported here were collected prior to the Student Survey and Survey of Women Architects the structure of some of the items differs from the later surveys.)

4.2 This section is based on material gathered by the RAIA in research for the publication Profile of the Profession, 1984/85. This material has been re-analyses to enable a comparison between the female and male respondents to that survey. This study analyses responses from 3231 architects, 188 of whom were female.

4.3 In reading the material in this section, it is important to recognise that the pattern of entry of females into the architectural profession has, historically, been rather low. In the 1984 survey, 5.8% of respondents were female, which is consistent with the then current estimates of female participation rates of 6.3%.

4.4 However, material from the University of Sydney indicates that the proportion of females enrolling in and graduating from architecture courses is increasing. In 1984, 18.3% of all architecture graduates in Australia were female, compared to 9.3% 10 years previously. Enrollments of females as a proportion of new enrollments continues to increase, and it is now estimated that around 40% of those enrolled are female. Even in light of the evidence (see 4.16 below) that females are more likely to withdraw from architecture courses than males, as these new entrants work their way through architecture courses the proportion of female graduates can still be expected to increase as final year enrollments of women now range up to 50%.

4.5 In the 1984 survey, females represented 15.0% of respondents in the 24-30 age group, 5.6% of those between 31 and 40, 3.9% of those between 41 and 50, 2.7% of those between 51 and 60, and 3.8% of those over 60. 50% of the females in this study were under 35 years of age, compared to only 23% of males. The consequence of this skewedness is that several average measures, for example with respect to income and registration status, show that females are less well-off in comparison to their male colleagues. Given the difference in the age profile of females, it is to be expected that there will be some differences between males and females, reflecting the different stages in their career paths.

4.6 Data from the 1986 survey of RAIA members (with a total of 1588 respondents) is, as this goes to press, under analysis. Results for the analysis of incomes shows clearly that when controlled for age or income the picture becomes clearer, and far less favourable for women. Controlling for age shows that for the age group "25 & under" 20.5% of the men (N=88) have incomes above $30,000 while none of the women (N=19) have incomes above this level. Similarly, none of the women (N=26) in the 26-30 age group have incomes above $30,000 but 14% of the men (N=179) do. In the 31-35 age range women fare slightly better, with 36% earning more than $30,000 compared to 40% of the men. However the absolute numbers are perhaps more informative as this translates into a total of 6 women (N=17) and 96 men (N=225)! In the higher age brackets the patterns echo this dramatic difference. The results are partially accounted for by the employment categories of the women - proportionally far more of them are in salaried positions in either the public or private sector, with sole practitioners being the next most common group. Thus controlling for employment category only serves to accentuate the pattern of differences - even in the sole practitioner group only a single woman (representing 6.3% of her group) earns more than $30,000 compared to 101 men (over 33% of the male sole practitioners). Regardless of how the issue is examined women stand little chance of entering the higher income levels.

Qualifications

4.7 There are differences in the female and male participation rates in the fifteen architecture courses. There tends to be a lower participation rate for females in the courses offered by the CAE/Institute of Technology sector, in comparison with the university sector.

4.8 Architects are eligible to register after satisfying the requirements of an approved academic qualification, and a minimum of two years practical experience. The practical experience is examined in an Architectural Practice Examination. The practice of architecture, which is a State responsibility, is not restricted by legislation. However the use of the word 'architect' is restricted, with only those listed on the roll of the Architect's Registration Board being entitled to its use. Registration is therefore the primary mark of entry into the profession. It can be seen from Table 4.1 that females in this study were somewhat less likely than their male colleagues to be registered, although the lower average age may explain this.

4.9 The data in Table 4.2 tabulates involvement in trade and industry. This indicates that females in this study were less likely to belong to trade and professional associations than their male colleagues - the exception being the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects. Here females were more likely to be members than their male colleagues. This is consistent with the work descriptions contained in Table 4.5. In this table it is indicated that landscape architecture and interior design are the two specialist fields in which females report similar patterns to males.

TABLE 4.1 - REGISTRATION STATUS (%) FOR FEMALES AND ALL IN STUDY

Females	81.3%
All in Study	93.0%

TABLE 4.2 MEMBERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL AND TRADE ASSOCIATIONS : FEMALES AND ALL IN STUDY

institution	*females*	*all*
Royal Institute of British Architects	4.2%	9.8%
Royal Australian Planning Institute	3.1%	4.7%
BOMA	1.0%	3.8%
Master Builders Association	2.1%	3.0%
Australian Institute of Landscape Architects	2.1%	1.5%

Employment Paths

4.10 If there is a conventional career path in the architectural profession, it is that graduates will be employed in the private sector until their late 20s or early thirties. At this time some enter the public sector, but most look to setting up their own practices either in partnership with others, or as sole practitioners. By the time architects reach their early 40s, relatively few remain in salaried positions in the private sector. Table 4.3 below indicates the employment categories for female respondents together with those for all respondents.

TABLE 4.3 EMPLOYMENT CATEGORIES (%) FOR FEMALES AND ALL IN STUDY

employment category	*emales*	*all*
Sole Practitioners	18.9%	20.2%
Partner/Director	16.8%	26.0%
Partner/Director of More than one Firm	0.5%	12.7%
Partner/Director of Multidisciplinary Firm	1.0%	2.9%
Freelance/Contract	10.3%	4.6%
Other self-employed	1.1%	0.7%
Salaried - private	20.5%	16.8%
Salaried - public	14.1%	18.2%
Academic	4.3%	3.3%
Salaried (not architect)	3.8%	1.9%

4.11 The major differences between the employment categories for females and those overall, is the substantially fewer females who reported their status as being a partner or director. There was some indication that females were more likely to be employed as salaried architects in the private sector or as contract architects, and somewhat less likely to be employed in the public sector.

Incomes

4.12 Table 4.4 below outlines incomes for females and all respondents. This data points to an average taxable income for all architects in the vicinity of $27,500, in comparison to $20,000 for females. What is more interesting is the clear pattern of women being in the lower income categories compared to their male counterparts.

TABLE 4.4: INCOMES, FEMALES AND ALL IN STUDY, 1984

	females %	*males* %	*all in study* %
under $5,000	13.8%	1.9%	2.7%
$5,000 - 9,999	8.5%	3.0%	3.3%
$10,000 - 14,999	11.7%	5.6%	6.0%
$15,000 - 19,999	19.7%	11.5%	12.0%
$20,000 - 24,999	15.4%	17.4%	17.3%
$25,000 - 29,999	10.6%	17.8%	17.3%
$30,000 - 34,999	7.4%	14.9%	14.5%
$35,000 - 39,999	5.3%	10.2%	9.9%
40,000 - 44,999	1.1%	5.4%	5.2%
$45,000 - 49,999	1.1%	3.2%	3.0%
$50,000 - 54,999	0.0%	2.6%	2.4%
$55,000 - 59,999	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%
$60,000 - 64,999	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%
$65,000 - 69,999	1.1%	0.2%	0.2%
$70,000- 75,000	0.0%	1.8%	2.4%
not stated	4.2%	1.8%	1.9%

Task & Work Activities

4.13 More women reported that they were not involved at all in documentation, contract administration, marketing and to some extent design, than their male colleagues. Women were more likely to report that they specialized in landscape design or in interior design than respondents overall.

TABLE 4.5 TASK AND WORK ACTIVITIES, FEMALES AND ALL IN STUDY

	major		*minor*		*not applicable*	
	all	*female*	*all*	*female*	*all*	*female*
Documentation	57.4%	54.7%	15.4%	26.9%	26.4%	18.4%
Design	48.4%	55.4%	29.2%	30.3%	21.2%	14.4%
Contract admin.	36.1%	48.6%	23.4%	30.0%	39.3%	21.4%
Job getting/marketing	12.7%	27.9%	22.8%	25.7%	63.2%	46.4%
Office admin.	17.4%	34.6%	24.0%	36.7%	47.3%	41.5%
Surveys/investigations	9.0%	14.3%	30.8%	43.6%	59.0%	41.5%
Planning	1.5%	3.2%	6.9%	9.4%	90.9%	87.4%
Urban Design	1.5%	3.5%	5.3%	8.2%	92.5%	88.4%
Engineering	1.0%	0.3%	2.6%	4.9%	95.7%	94.7%
Landscape arch.	3.7%	2.7%	20.7%	22.6%	75.0%	74.6%
Interior design	9.0%	6.3%	25.5%	30.0%	64.8%	63.7%
Arbitration	0.5%	0.8%	2.6%	5.4%	96.8%	93.1%

Conclusion

4.14 The results of the 1984/85 study indicate that there are differences between female and male architects in important areas such as in the types of work they undertake, in incomes, in employment categories, and in indicators of professional status such as registration or membership of professional and trade associations. A further indication of difference is that 26.4% of female respondents reported that at least half of their work was on projects with a value of $100,000 or less. While there is no data on which to make a comparison with male architects, this would seem to indicate that a relatively large number of women, on average, work on smaller, domestic projects, and it would be surprising if this pattern was similar for males.

4.15 The question to be answered is whether these differences arise because of socialization, discrimination, or for other reasons. If males and females pursue similar career paths, we should expect that, on average, women will earn less, and be less advanced in their careers because as we have noted earlier, their average age is considerably less. However, it does not appear that women pursue similar career paths, as women appear to work on smaller domestic, landscape, or interior design projects, which are likely to be less lucrative and offer fewer career advancement opportunities than major public and private works projects.

SURVEY OF STUDENTS

Basic Demographic Characteristics

4.16 Data reported here are only for students who do not hold student visas even though data were collected for all students, including those from overseas. The overseas students were found, in preliminary analysis, to contribute to seriously skewed distributions on a number of issues. In order to achieve consistency with the National Survey and the Survey of Women it was decided to remove such students from the present analyses.

4.17 The ages of the students is shown in Table 4.6. The first year women tend to be heavily concentrated in the 19 year old category and show much less variation in ages than their male counterparts. In the final year students the picture is somewhat different with women showing a more even distribution over the 21 to 25 year ages. The change in patterns suggests that a substantial proportion of women enrol in architecture courses but drop out before their final year. If, a different set of data from the schools themselves were accessible to test this hypothesis properly, and if it were proved accurate, then further research would be indicated into factors militating against women's participation in architecture at the higher education level, that is, after the choice of a profession has already been made.

TABLE 4.6 AGE OF STUDENTS BY YEAR BY GENDER AS A % OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE

	first year		*final year*	
age category	*females*	*males*	*females*	*males*
18 & <	2.7%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
19	15.6%	28.4%	0.0%	0.0%
20	2.8%	10.5%	0.0%	1.5%
21	1.4%	6.9%	1.5%	16.2%
22	0.9%	7.3%	4.4%	22.1%
23	0.5%	2.3%	3.7%	12.5%
24	0.5%	2.3%	3.7%	5.9%
25	0.9%	1.8%	3.7%	7.3%
26	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	3.7%
27	0.0%	0.5%	1.5%	2.2%
28	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.5%
29	0.5%	1.4%	0.1%	2.2%
30 & >	1.4%	3.2%	2.2%	9.6%

4.18 Of the first year women while only 6.4% are married or living in de facto relationships males show a substantially lower rate of 2.9%. For final year students the percentages have increased to 30% and 22.8% respectively. These patterns suggest males are both less "at risk" of having their academic careers affected by marriage or having their studies affected by parenthood. The differences may also suggest a greater need (as self-perceived bread-winners)for males to be sure to complete their course without the complexities of marriage. Unfortunately the present data set does not permit us to use this topic but it deserves further research.;the differential patterns provide a basis for speculating that a number of significant flow-on effects are likely and women with their higher rates and lower ages of marital involvement at each level are probably in greater danger of having their educational careers disrupted by marital demand, be they social or biological.

TABLE 4.7 DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY GENDER, SCHOOL, AND YEAR SHOWING % OF RESPONDENTS BY YEAR OF COURSE

school	*first year females*	*males*	*final year females*	*males*
Sydney Uni.	35.3%	64.7%	50.0%	50.0%
Uni. of NSW	37.9%	62.1%	0.0%	0.0%
NSWIT	19.2%	80.8%	8.3%	91.7%
Uni. of Newcastle	32.0%	68.0%	40.0%	60.0%
Melbourne	20.0%	80.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Deakin	12.0%	88.0%	5.0%	95.0%
Uni. of Queensland	38.7%	61.3%	41.7%	58.3%
QIT	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Uni. of Adelaide	35.7%	64.3%	22.7%	77.3%
SAIT	33.3%	66.7%	9.1%	90.9%
Uni. of W.A.	25.0%	75.0%	18.2%	81.8%
WAIT	34.2%	65.8%	25.0%	75.0%
TSIT	28.6%	71.4%	27.3%	72.7%
CCAE	38.9%	61.1%	0.0%	100.0%

TABLE 4.8 TYPE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED

type of school	*first year females*	*males*	*final year females*	*females*
govt, public	50.0%	50.0%	58.6%	59.6%
private, non-Catholic	26.9%	25.0%	24.1%	14.9%
private, Catholic	23.1%	23.8%	17.2%	24.6%
other	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.9%

4.19 The male students were more likely to have attended coeducational schools even though they were equally as likely to have attended a private school in comparison with female students ass shown in Table 4.8. For the males 40.5% of the first year male students attended non-coeducational schools while for females the figure was 47.7%. Of those in final years 32.1% of the women and 28.8% of the men reported attending non-coeducational schools.

Career Counseling

4.20 The majority of students had received some form of career counseling but no systematic patterns were apparent in the data with regard to architecture in particular. The most influential sources of encouragement to pursue an architectural course were parents and immediate family while the most influential sources of discouragement were fathers (more so for females - 25.8% versus 15% of males discouraged by their fathers) architects and teachers, with males much more likely to report being discouraged by teachers (20% versus 6.5% for first year students).

Course Patterns

4.21 In the first year sample there was no strong difference related to gender with regard to architecture being a first course preference but in the final year sample the women were much more likely (26.7% versus 14.3%) to say that architecture had not been their first course preference. Several of these women said Law had been their first choice whereas the men had had first choices predominantly in the engineering area.

Discrimination Issues

4.22 The student survey canvassed a number of issues directly and indirectly related to discrimination, both with respect to their immediate courses and in terms of their expectations.

4.23 Perceptions of differential aid to students are often mentioned in discussions of discrimination in education. One of the survey items asked students "Generally speaking, who do lecturers give more assistance to?" Table 4.9 shows these results. Final year students were far more likely than first years to say that there was differential treatment and interestingly final year males were almost as likely as final year females to say that their opposite sex classmates received extra assistance from lecturers. In the case of first year students the males were more likely to perceive the female students as receiving preferential assistance.

TABLE 4.9 PERCEIVED ASSISTANCE GIVEN TO MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS AS SEEN BY FIRST AND FINAL YEAR STUDENTS

assistance given	*first year females*	*males*	*final year females*	*males*
males given more	7.6%	3.4%	23.3%	6.5%
females given more	1.9%	14.4%	6.7%	19.6%
given the same help	90.5%	81.8%	70.0%	72.9%

4.24 The reasons for differential assistance given by those who thought there was differential treatment fell into two main groups and a third miscellaneous category. Women tended to perceive males as receiving extra assistance for mateship reasons while men tended to attribute the differential treatment to sexual preference and interests reasons. (No questions were asked to pursue either of these matters in any further depth but such additional questioning would be best suited to interview or case study methods). The miscellaneous reasons accounted for roughly half of the reasons given and ranged widely across the spectrum form beliefs about which gender was more suitable to architecture to the occasional attribution of personal involvement of lecturers with students.

TABLE 4.10 FOR STUDENTS ATTRIBUTING DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT TO MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS, PERCEPTIONS OF THE REASONS WHY SUCH TREATMENT OCCURRED.

reason for assistance given	*first year females*	*males*	*fourth year females*	*males*
mateship reasons	20.0%	11.4%	42.9%	7.4%
sexual preferences	0.0%	48.7%	14.3%	40.7%
other	80.0%	40.0%	42.9%	51.8%

4.25 Clearly almost half the students believe that to some degree or another they receive inequitable treatment from lecturers. While it is HIGHLY possible that these perceptions are based on observations and experiences this study was not designed to verify such perceptions or to attempt to determine the actual incidence of differential treatment.

4.26 Other perceptions related to course subjects also prove interesting as the women students tend, as shown in Table 4.11, to rate their performance in "traditionally male" topics such as construction and computing below that of their male counterparts. The only areas in which women's self-reports are on a par, or higher, than the men's is on "soft" options of design and man/environment studies. Insofar as such perceptions serve to reinforce one's sense of professional competence and self-confidence it is likely that, in general, the men are developing self-images of their performance which are stronger than the women's self-images. Verification of

these self-reports against grades would make this issue more interesting but was not possible as schools are (properly) reluctant to provide researchers access to such information. Ideally, a study run within the schools, by the schools, should look at such information to determine if there is systematic evidence of issues involving professional socialization and confidence in regard to these topics, as the data here suggest the possibility that the women students, both at the outset of their training, and at the end are either performing less well or are more self-effacing than their male counterparts. In either instance the implications for confident, professional success and performance are somewhat different.

TABLE 4.11 SELF REPORTS OF STUDENTS FOR ACADEMIC STRENGTH IN VARIOUS ARCHITECTURAL COURSE SUBJECTS

subject		*very weak*	*weak*	*average*	*strong*	*very strong*
First Year						
Structures						
	F	14.9%	14.9%	41.4%	25.3%	3.4%
	M	4.9%	8.9%	34.0%	35.5%	16.7%
Construction						
	F	44.9%	12.2%	59.8%	19.5%	3.7%
	M	0.0%	4.6%	37.8%	45.9%	11.7%
Professional Practice						
	F	3.1%	15.6%	46.9%	18.8%	15.6%
	M	2.6%	9.1%	49.4%	32.5%	6.5%
Architectural Science						
	F	8.6%	6.9%	43.1%	34.5%	6.9%
	M	0.7%	11.3%	44.4%	37.7%	6.0%
Computing						
	F	19.2%	23.1%	26.9%	19.2%	11.5%
	M	5.7%	14.8%	36.9%	27.0%	15.6%
Man/Environment						
	F	1.78%	12.1%	32.8%	34.5%	19.0%
	M	1.4%	8.0%	34.1%	48.6%	8.05
Design						
	F	1.0%	7.7%	40.4%	33.7%	17.3%
	M	1.7%	4.8%	42.4%	36.8%	14.3%
Fourth Year						
Structures						
	F	3.6%	21.4%	28.6%	46.4%	0.0%
	M	6.2%	15.95	31.0%	37.2%	9.7%
Construction						
	F	3.4%	17.2%	41.4%	27.6%	10.3%
	M	0.9%	6.3%	36.6%	42.0%	13.4%
Professional Practice						
	F	0.0%	10.5%	42.1%	36.8%	10.5%
	M	0.0%	13.6%	38.3%	37.0%	11.1%
Architectural Science						
	F	3.6%	7.1%	35.7%	42.9%	10.7%
	M	0.9%	5.7%	42.5%	39.6%	11.3%
Computing						
	F	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%	29.2%	12.5%
	M	14.9%	20.2%	33.0%	21.3%	10.6%
Man/Environment						
	F	0.0%	25.0%	60.0%	15.0%	0.0%
	M	0.0%	9.0%	38.5%	41.0%	11.5%
Design						
	F	0.0%	6.9%	41.4%	31.0%	20.75
	M	1.8%	5.4%	33.9%	43.8%	14.3%

4.27 Another possible indicator of professional expectations and socialization is represented in Table 4.12 in which perceived (expected) incomes are summarised. Male students generally expect to be earning higher incomes than their female colleagues both at graduation and after 5 years. The women's estimates, for both first and final year students, are more heavily clustered in the middle income range and the majority of estimates are less than those given by the males. While this (compare with the National Survey results) may also reflect current reality it is again interesting that the perceptions of the men and women differ substantially, and in the traditionally expected directions.

TABLE 4.12 STUDENTS EXPECTED INCOMES UPON GRADUATION (table entries in %) AND AFTER FIVE YEARS

at graduation	*first year females*	*males*	*fourth year females*	*males*
< $5000	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%
$5000 - $9999	5.1%	1.7%	3.8%	2.2%
$10000 - $14999	10.2%	15.7%	11.5%	25.6%
$15000 - $19999	44.1%	40.1%	69.2%	41.1%
$20000 - $24999	22.0%	33.7%	11.5%	16.7%
$25000 - $29999	10.2%	4.7%	0.0%	6.7%
$3000 - 34999	1.7%	1.2%	0.0%	2.2%
> $35000	6.8%	2.3%	3.8%	1.1%

after 5 years	*first year females*	*males*	*fourth year females*	*males*
< $5000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
$5000 - $9999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
$10000 - $14999	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	1.2%
$15000 - $19999	7.4%	6.0%	4.3%	7.0%
$20000 - $24999	31.5%	19.2%	30.4%	37.2%
$25000 - $299999	37.0%	30.5%	56.5%	18.6%
$30000 - $34999	7.4%	21.6%	8.7%	22.1%
> $35000	16.9%	19.0%	0.0%	12.9%

4.28 In other questions there were interesting patterns of differences on other issues. Students were asked if they had worked on building sites or had any special building skills. Not surprisingly 38% of the first year males had building site experience; in contrast , the figures for women were 12.3% and 20.0% respectively. The figures for women are perhaps higher than would be expected, but the differential remains of interest as part of the generally held perception in the architectural profession that practical experience on a building site is helpful. In response to the question as to whether they had particular building trade skills the males reported 15.2% and 28.8% for first and final year respectively while the comparable figures were 7.5 % and 10.0% for the women. Though these differences presumably reflect different summer jobs and other experiences and are not necessarily important to the practice of architecture per se, they again reflect different patterns of experience and exposure to at least some key aspects of the building and architectural fields. It is also possible that such differences in experience contribute to the different rates of dropping out of the courses though this cannot be ascertained in this study.

4.29 Another possible indicator of professional socialization and experience is the membership of professional groups. While students are less likely to be involved in such groups than practicing professionals, a percentage are involved as student members. Of particular interest in this survey were the percentage belonging to the RAIA. For first year students the women show a 18.1% rate of belonging and the men show a 24.9% while for final year students the respective figures are 53.3% and 58.6% - a much smaller difference. In both instances the students belong primarily to the RAIA (as student members) and to student architectural groups at their school.

4.30 As can be seen more clearly in the survey of women (below) childcare and working parent issues are concerns for most working, married female architects. While virtually none of the students are married with children, there were interesting differences in the male and female responses about the expected impact of children on architectural careers. A substantial 45% of the first and 31.8% of the final year male students said that "child-care commitments" would not affect their career at all and only 14.5% and 28.8% respectively said there would be "a great deal" of impact. The respective figures are quite different for the women, with 25% of first years and 11.5% of final years saying there would be no impact while 36.8% and 53.8% say "a great deal" of impact. Again the differences are in expected directions if one assumes traditional role behaviors. In the event that such expectations serve a self-fulfilling prophecy function as the men and women marry and have families, then it is likely that the traditional differences in responsibilities and obligations will persist for the majority of these respondents. This seems even more likely given the patterns evident in Table 4.13 where women and men show a divergence when evaluating the advantages of working from home - clearly for women the fact that architecture as a profession may reasonably be undertaken from home as a sole practitioner is seen as an asset. In both cases (i.e., first and final year groups) the differences are marginally ($p<.10$) significant but probably the more important difference is between the first and final year sample with the final year women and men being much more discrepant on this topic, (and being closer to (potentially) putting it into practice).

4.31 While these analyses do not exhaust the data set on the student survey they cover the issues which directly bear on matters related to discrimination and professional socialization patterns which might reasonably be expected to affect subsequent behavior. While strong patterns of discrimination are not apparent, and there were virtually no additional comments along lines appended to questionnaires it is nonetheless clear that more subtle patterns of difference exist. In the long run, the expectations held by the men and women themselves are likely to preserve the less visible (and more insidious) systemic socialization too which the data point.

4.32 A more in-depth study by the schools themselves might reveal more sharply defined issues and patterns that would further elucidate the evidence from this survey. Such studies need not of course be the responsibility of the schools but could in fact be done by the student architectural groups providing they were properly handled in terms of methodology and sampling (often major weaknesses in student run surveys).

4.33 [N.B. Unless otherwise indicated the tables in this section are based on a sample of 151 completed questionnaires (representing a usable return rate of 27% of the questionnaires out of the 170 (31%) returned).

4.34 (Also, while terminology is always a problem in contemporary social research, we have adopted the convention of using the word spouse to stand for spouse/de facto spouse/partner for expository ease.)

Basic Demographic Characteristics

4.35 The majority of respondents were in their late twenties and early thirties and the remainder of those responding were primarily in their forties. These patterns are generally consistent with the national survey findings. While the majority of the women are currently married 27% were, at the time of the survey, single.

4.36 The sample is biased in favour of the larger states in that while proportionally NSW and Victoria have more women in architecture and related fields, the numbers responding over-represent these states. On the basis of other information available to the RAIA this survey underrepresents women from Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia. It cannot be determined to what extent this sampling bias distorts other information from the survey although it seems unlikely that the general patterns would be strongly affected by State of residence. The patterns most likely to be affected concern the degree of representativeness of answers to State- specific questions such as experiences at schools of architecture.

TABLE 4. 14 AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

age group	*% of respondents*
24 & <	4.6%
25 - 29	25.8%
30 - 34	25.2%
35 - 39	15.2%
40 - 44	14.6%
45 - 49	9.3%
50 - 54	2.6%
55 - 59	1.3%
60 & >	0.0%

TABLE 4.15 MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

status	*% of respondents*
single	27.2%
married	55.6%
married & living apart	1.3%
de facto relationship	7.9%
divorced & now single	5.3%
divorced & remarried	2.0%
other	0.7%

TABLE 4. 17 GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

state/territory	*% of respondents*
NSW	53.2%
VIC.	24.8%
QNSLND.	2.1%
A.C.T.	5.7%
S.A.	6.4%
W.A.	5.7%
N.T.	1.4%
TAS.	0.7%

4.37 The majority of respondents are Australian born but a significant percentage were born overseas, with 7.2% from Asian origins and the majority of the remainder coming from the U.K. and Europe, as indicated in Table 4.18. As seen in Table 4.19, two thirds of the parents are Australian born.

TABLE 4.19 PLACE OF BIRTH

country of birth	*% of respondents*
Australia	74.2%
Malaysia	1.3%
Singapore	1.3%
China	2.0%
Indonesia	1.3%
Asia, other	1.3%
United Kingdom	6.0%
West Europe	4.0%
East Europe	7.3%
New Zealand	0.7%
South America	0.7%

TABLE 4.20 OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF PARENTS OF RESPONDENTS

occupation	*mother*	*father*
administration	7.2%	10.8%
architect	1.0%	5.8%
artist	1.0%	0.7%
business	0.0%	2.9%
clergy	n/a	0.0%
clerical	27.8%	7.9%
cmcl. art/interior design	3.1%	0.0%
engineers	0.0%	15.1%
farmers	0.0%	1.4%
health workers	2.1%	0.0%
housewife	3.1%	0.0%
journalism/ media	0.0%	1.4%
lecturers	2.1%	0.0%
nursing	8.2%	0.0%
professional	11.3%	19.4%
sales work	4.1%	9.4%
service	7.2%	5.0%
teaching	17.5%	3. 6%
trades (other)	4.1%	6.5%
trades (building)	0.0%	6.5%

TABLE 4.21 PARENTS HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCTION

level	*mother*	*father*
Primary	6.7%	6.6%
Secondary	34.0%	19.9%
Technical	28.0%	17.2%
Some tertiary	6.0%	7.9%
Completed tertiary	25.3%	48.3%

4.38 The majority of parents of respondents had completed at least some tertiary education although as anticipated there were far more mothers than fathers who had only completed secondary level schooling. As indicated in Table 4.21 over 30% of mothers and over 55% of fathers had some university education, thus making them a highly educated subset of the community which while no doubt typical for professionally oriented families is quite unusual compared to the average Australian family.

4.39 These exceptional patterns are also apparent when considering the patterns of secondary schooling reported by the women. As seen in Table 4.22 the majority (58.9%) had attended private schools and for the most part, as shown in the second half of the Table, these were not coeducational schools.

TABLE 4.22 SECONDARY EDUCATION PATTERNS OF RESPONDENTS

type of school	*% of respondents*
public govt.	40.4%
private, non-Catholic	45.7%
private, Catholic	13.2%
other	0.7%

TABLE 4.23 WHICH SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE DID YOU ATTEND?

school	*% of all respondents*
Melbourne Uni.	19.9%
Sydney Uni.	25.2%
NSW Uni.	17.9%
WAIT	2.0%
Uni of Adelaide	8.6%
U.W.A.	2.6%
S.A.I.T.	0.0%
Canberra CAE	4.0%
RMIT	3.3%
NSWIT	2.6%
Tasmania CAE	0.7%
Uni of Queensland	1.3%
QIT	2.0%
other	9.9%

4.40 Of those who started their course only seven failed to complete it and there was no systematic pattern to the reasons for not completing it but this is not suprising given the sampling frame. The population which needs to be studied in this regard is, of course, the group of women who dropped out of their courses and who would not turn up on lists such as were used as the basis for this study (although efforts were made in the questionnaire and otherwise to find such women). Follow up of students who drop out of courses would be best accomplished by the schools themselves as they (the schools) are properly reluctant to provide access to such confidential lists. Over half of the respondents attended schools in NSW and Victoria and this, as previously indicated, effectively over-represents both these states and these schools, as can be seen when comparing enrollments at the various schools currently as outlined in the previous section on the Student Survey.

TABLE 4.24 WAS ARCHITECTURE YOUR FIRST CHOICE OF COURSE?

response	*% of respondents*
yes	80.5%
no	19. 5%
	Of those who said no, first choices were :
art	15.4%
engineering	19.2%
interior design	11.5%
Indscpe. architecture	11.5%
other	42.4%

4.41 Over 80% of the women had done architecture as their first course preference. Those who had started their tertiary education in other fields were distributed primarily as summarised in Table 4.24, with the primary subjects being other design related fields and engineering.

Employment and Income Patterns

4.42 The majority of respondents were in fact already members of the RAIA and most of those who were not members indicated that they had not joined because they could see no benefit to belonging and/or it cost too much to join.

TABLE 4.25 MEMBERSHIP OF THE RAIA

response	*% of respondents*
yes	74.8%
no	25.2%

4.43 Most respondents reported that they were currently working as architects. Of those who said they were not currently working as architects the reported activities are summarised in Table 4.26. The largest category, Miscellaneous/other, included women working in many related fields, including interior design, building, assessing, landscape design, etc.

TABLE 4.26 TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OR ACTIVITY BY SPECIALITY AREA

area	*of respondents*
architect	80.0%
academic/ teaching	3.3%
parenting	4.6%
drafting	0.7%
studying	2.0%
planning	1.3%
planning	1.3%
miscellaneous/other	7.9%

4.44 Of those who are practising as sole practitioners or principals over half (54.4%) work exclusively from home. Furthermore, of these the majority (90%) were likely to contact them "any time of the day" because they were not working in a clearly defined separate office environment. This was seen as a liability of working at home since it proved more disruptive to family activities and reduced the separation between "home" and "work".

TABLE 4.27 TYPE OF PRACTICE

type of practice	*% of respondents*
sole practitioner	26.8%
prtnr/drctr. of firm	20.1%
salaried private	24.2%
salaried public	15.4%
academic	4.7%
other	8.7%

TABLE 4. 28 REPORTED ANNUAL TAXABLE INCOME

income level	*% of respondents*
< $5000	0.0%
$5000 - $9999	9.2%
$10000 - $14999	6.1%
$15000 - $19999	15.3%
$20000 - $24999	23.7%
$25000 - $29999	12.2%
$30000 - $34999	16.0%
$35000 - $39999	5.3%
$40000 - $44999	3.8%
$45999 - $45999	0.8%
$50000 - $54999	1.5%
$55000 - $59999	1.5%
$60000 - $64999	0.0%
$65000 - $69999	0.0%
$70000 - $75000	0.0%
$75000 & >	0.8%

4.45 The sample of women for this survey represent a somewhat higher income distribution (Table 4.28) than those in the National survey, with higher percentages reporting incomes in the $20000-40000 ranges.

4.46 For those where the question applied, as a percent of total household income the respondents' in come represents, for most (i.e. 61.9%), 50% or less of the total household income. Approximately 15% report earning more than 50% of the income but less than 100% of it and 24% indicate that they earn 100% of the household income. In answer to a question concerning the need to earn more if the respondents were the sole earner, half the sample said they would need to earn more if they were solely responsible for the household income.

4.47 In virtually all cases the women who are married are earning less than their spouses but 13% of the married women earn more than their spouses, and in a few cases substantially more.)

4.48 As can be seen in Table 4.29 a substantial percentage of the women are doing extra work beyond their "regular job" but most also indicate that this is not in order to earn extra money. Just under 40% of the women felt women architects were more likely to do unpaid work than male architects - this finding is contrary to the impressions and assertions made in the course of the development of this survey by some women architects that women are more likely than men to do "free" work, although the issue could be studied in more depth.

TABLE 4.29 ISSUES RELATED TO INCOME AND WORK PATTERNS

issue	*% saying yes*
do you do extra work beyond regular job?	45.4%
if extra work, is it mainly fro extra income ?	37.5%
are women more likely than men to do unpaid work?	39.4%

Childcare & Household Issues

4.49 Two issues which are usually considered to be particularly critical to the career progress of professional women are the impact of children/childcare and patterns of household duties. The following section summarises the basic findings with regard to these topics.

4.50 Half of the respondents in the survey have children and a third have more than one. By and large those respondents with school-age children care for them themselves, or with help from their spouse. However, most after-school childcare is handled by the women themselves or by the children themselves. Spouses appear to play a very small role in childcare for most of these women. Similarly relatives and childcare programmes also play a small role in the lives of the respondents. A substantial 86% of the women concerned indicated that these arrangements were satisfactory to them but only 55% of them had decided these arrangements jointly with their spouse.

4.51 When asked to indicate who took care of major household tasks the results suggest that, in the main, the respondents are functioning in fairly traditional role relationships in addition to the demands of their professional careers. The results in Table 4.30 show the modal response patterns for a variety of household task categories.

TABLE 4.30 DIVISION OF MAJOR HOUSEHOLD TASKS

(for this question, respondents were asked to estimate the percentage share of total time spent on each task by each spouse. For example a husband may do an estimated 30 % of all cooking, while a wife may do 70% of the cooking. The figures in Table 4.30 are the two most common categories estimated by respondents. For example, respondents most commonly did 100% and 50 % of the routine household shopping, whilst spouses most commonly did 0% and 50% of the same task.

task	*two most frequent categories for task*			
	respondents		*spouses*	
routine grocery shopping	100%	50%	0%	50%
routine other household shopping	100%	50%	0%	50%
routine cooking	100%	90%	10 %	10%
cooking for special occasions	100%	50%	0%	50%
shopping for kids clothes	100%	0%	0%	0%
car maintainence	0%	50%	0%	100%
indoor housework	50%	60%	0%	50%
outdoor housework & maintenence	50%	0%	50%	0%
gardening	50%	0%	0%	50%
care of sick kids	100%	50%	50%	20%
attending school functions	0%	50%	0%	50%
taking children to doctors	100%	50%	0%	50%
taxiing children around	0%	50%	50%	20%
washing clothes	100%	50%	0%	50%
home admin., paying bills	100%	50%	0%	50%

4.52 With regard to household activities, other than childcare , it appears that there are two relatively distinct groups of women in this sample; one group tends to split tasks relatively evenly with their spouse (with some exceptions as to what might be termed "hard core" traditional roles) while the other tends to divide tasks very much along traditional lines. The majority of all respondents with children appear to follow traditional role patterns with regard to the care of the children. These patterns suggest that, at best, women architects are, in addition to their careers carrying only a little more than half of the household running responsibility while at the worst they are carrying their careers and most of the burden of running the household. (It should of course be kept in mind that the spouses did not have a chance to present their view of the household tasks division, but the perceptions of women are the primary concern in the present study). While there are clearly egalitarian households, there appear to be a substantial number that are less so.

4.53 One major interest in professional socialization is the presence or absence of specific role models. For respondents in this study there were few reported instances (11.3%) of special female role models for architecture, and, perhaps not surprisingly, most such models were either the respondents mother or a friend (as indicated in Table 4.31).

TABLE 4.31 ANY SPECIAL FEMALE ROLE MODELS

response	*% of respondents*
yes	11.3%
no	88.7%

4.54 However, what is more interesting overall is that relatively few of the the women reported having female role models for their architectural interests.

4.55 In more general terms Table 4.32 shows the percentage of women who personally knew "any architects" before they began studying architecture. This, in terms of socialization influences, reflects a more important source of influence for most of the women, with 41.1% knowing some architect personally before starting their course. Of these respondents over 90% reported that the person known was a relative, a friend, or a family friend.

4.56 Somewhat surprisingly, very few women indicated that they had helped their spouses financially while they (the men) were undertaking their education. In fact only 9.5% of the women had helped their spouses in this manner. However, the patterns of taking career breaks for ones partner fell into a far more traditional pattern. For the 96 respondents for whom this was a salient question, 21.8% had taken career breaks to help their husbands but only 2% of husbands had taken career breaks to help the respondents.

TABLE 4.34 WERE YOU EVER ADVISED NOT TO STUDY ARCHITECTURE?

response	*percent*
yes	46.6%
no	53.4%

Of those who said yes, the majority of such advice came from the following sources:

parents	12.9%
father	12.9%
mother	1.6%
teachers & lecturers	14.5%
friends/acquaintances	16.1%
architects	11.3%
guidance counsellors	11.3%
other	19.4%

4.57 In the anecdotal literature there is often an indication that women are systematically discouraged from undertaking architecture as a course of study. In Table 4.34 we have summarised the responses to a question concerning this issue. As can be seen there is some truth in the anecdotal claims - nearly half of the women report that they had been advised not to study architecture by some person. Mothers as a separately mentioned group were the least likely to have offered such advice but friends and teachers seem to have less hesitation to keep such comments to themselves, while guidance counsellors and fathers seem to be almost equally represented in giving such advice. Taking the totals of parental categories for advice against architecture it is clear that, overall, 27.4% of the women who were warned-off architecture were so warned by immediate family.

4.58 Having ignored such advice our sample also asked questions concerning the impact of various events on their career progress, with particular attention to issues often raised in regard to the impact of life events on women's careers. The responses often indicated in Table 4.35 indicate that the women, for whom the issues are salient, find infants, toddles and pregnancy to be the three most disruptive events for their career progress - having secondary was the least disruptive.

TABLE 4.35 REPORTED IMPACT OF VARIOUS MAJOR EVENTS ON CAREER PROGRESS

event	*very sig.*	*mod. sig*	*neutral*	*mod. insig.*	*not sig.*
pregnancy	20.8%	13.9%	15.3%	13.9%	36.1%
infant	64.8%	12.7%	7.0%	9.9%	5.6%
toddlers	41.5%	26.2%	18.5%	7.7%	6.2%
primary school	16.7%	14.8%	40.7%	11.1%	16.7%
maternity leave	14.0%	8.0%	4.0%	40.0%	30.0%
2ndry school	10.3%	10.3%	30.8%	20.5%	28.2%

4.59 One solution to such disruption which is, potentially, easy for architects to try to work from home. In fact 72.5% of the women who are parents try to use this option. However, as can be seen in the subsequent table (Table 4.37) it is likely to prove a mixed solution.

TABLE 4.36 DO YOU COMBINE PARENTING AND YOUR CAREER BY WORKING AT HOME?

response	*% of respondents*
yes	72.5%
no	27.5%

4.60 A related question of interest concerned whether or not the respondents could "work effectively with their own or other peoples children around. Responses to these questions are indicated in the Table 4.37 and while clearly it is easier to work with one's own children in the house it is by no means successful for even half of the women who try working at home.

TABLE 4.37 CAN YOU WORK EFFECTIVELY WITH

	yes
own kids	41.7%
other kids	22.4%

4.38 HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS OR BY THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE?

area	*% responding " yes"*
secondary school	12.9%
architecture course	34.2%
architecture work	40.3%
place of employment?	36.0%
registration boards	6.2%
potential employers	35.5%
tradesmen	39.6%
contractors	28.0%
clients	29.5%
support staff	27.7%
lecturers in architecture course	36.1%
male students in course	26.4%
female students in course	4.2%
employment agencies (if used)	34.1%

TABLE 4.39 WHEN DISCRIMINATION HAS BEEN EXPERIENCED THE RESPONSE IS USUALLY TO :

response	*% of respondents*
do nothing	13.6%
say something to person involved	40.9%
complain to close friends but do nothing	18.2%
tell my spouse	20.0%
tell my employer	6.4%
tell the persons employer	0.9%
threaten legal action	0.0%

4.61 In response to a question on whether they were aware of State and Commonwealth options for dealing with instances of discrimination only 41.8% said they were familiar with the possible courses of action. This seems a moderate percentage indeed given the fact that these are to be available on the awareness levels fro professional women generally so it may be the case that the nearly 42% is in fact fairly substantial. Further research would be necessary to clarify this.

TABLE 4.40 REPORTED EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARRASMENT IN :

area	*% yes*
work as a student	12.7%
work as an architect	19.9%
being accused of using sexual favours	4.7%

TABLE 4.41 HAVE YOU EVER BEEN TOLD ANY OF THE FOLLOWING " FACTS"?

women architects are offended by pin-ups in site offices & therefore cannot do site inspections	14.7%
women cannot spare enough time from their family to succeed	53.4%
women would be offended by construction workers language & therefore should no do site work	27.3%
architecture is a demanding profession and women do not have what it takes to succeed	33.3%
women lack the right perspective for doing commercial architecture	26.0%
women are best left to domestic architecture	54.7%
women do not understand building materials as well as men	31.3%

4.62 As can be seen in Table 4.41 a substantial proportion of the women have, at least on occasion, been given direct messages about women and architecture, particularly about their motivation to succeed, their understanding of building materials, and the type of architecture most suitable for women to do. While considerably more information would be required in order to determine whether action associated with such messages was discriminatory under the law, there is no doubt that they purvey stereotypic views which imply that women are second class architects and that they have a "proper" place in the profession.

4.42 DURING YOUR UNIVERSITY COURSE DID LECTURERS OR TUTORS EVER COMMENT IN DISPARAGING WAYS ABOUT WOMEN WITH REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING TOPICS?

topic	*% yes*
qualities of good architects	11.5%
suitability of architecture for men	15.8%
ability of men versus women at drafting	8.8%
ability of women to do architecture full time	26.5%
courses which are most suitable	9.6%

4.63 In a related question respondents were asked whether during their course, they had encountered disparaging remarks about women. The number recalling experiencing such comments was smaller than those recalling the previous "facts" comments with the most substantial category being those (26.5%) who had heard negative remarks about women's ability to do architecture full time. No doubt these results bear on the drop-out rates of women as well as on their performance in architecture courses.

4.64 In order to extend the study of stereotyping the survey included a number of questions about the women architects perceptions of male and female differences in architecture, as summarised in Table 4.43

TABLE 4.43 PERCEPTIONS OF MALE/FEMALE ISSUES IN ARCHITECTURE

topic	*% yes*
are there systematic differences in design style	25.0%
are there major differences in values in design	34.4%
do women have special strengths in architecture	53.6%
would architecture benefit from more women architects	60.9%

4.65 As can be seen, the women's responses reflect perceptions that also indicate a range of differences between men sand women in the profession. Of those saying there are differences in design style, the differences are primarily attributed to women being more sensitive to clients needs (30%) and preferences and to 'traditional" feminine values (eg. softer designs, less aggressive designs) (34.6%). Not all differences were positively loaded - 7.7% said the differences were negative (eg, women more flimsy, weaker designs, less bold, etc) As for the differences in design values the majority felt there were differences, and they attributed the differences to women being more sensitive to users (67.5%)

4.66 On the matter of women having special strengths in architecture compared to men this was attributed primarily to women being generally more sensitive (25%), having better understandings of user needs (17%), and being more dedicated and conscientious (10.3%).

4.67 From these patterns it is apparent that a sizable proportion of the women believe that there are important differences between male and female architects and that on the whole these differences are positively balanced.

4.68 In both the English and American professional associations there have been a number of policies undertaken to specifically improve the status of women in the profession. Some similar policies have also been implemented in Australia, though perhaps with less fanfare. In order to probe these topics a number of questions were asked about the role of the RAIA in promoting the status of women in the profession. In response to the question as to whether the RAIA should develop an affirmative action programme a majority (59.6%) said it should.

TABLE 4.44 IF AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY WAS DEVELOPED IT SHOULD ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF:

topic	*% responding yes*
public awareness of contributions by women architects	84.3 %
increased enrollments in architecture schools	46.3%
promote equal opportunity	83.6%
increase number of women RAIA members	68.1%
ensure participation of women at all RAIA levels	82.1%
actively discourage discriminatory practices in architecture	79.7%

4.69 Clearly among the women believing the RAIA should have an affirmative action programme a very substantial number believe that it should actively address the issues listed, though it is interesting that there is less support for the idea of increasing the enrollments of women in architecture courses.

4.70 In another set of items the women were asked to indicate whether they thought there were more women in architecture or in another profession. The results, shown in Table 4.45, indicate that the majority of respondents believe that medicine, pharmacy, law, and accounting have more women proportionally than architecture. The majority of the respondents believe themselves to be a larger proportion of the profession than their counterparts in veterinary medicine, dentistry, and engineering.

TABLE 4.45 RESPONDENTS INDICATIONS OF WHETHER THERE ARE MORE WOMEN IN PARTICULAR FIELDS COMPARED TO ARCHITECTURE

field	*% saying more in architecture*
medicine	92.6%
pharmacy	88.2%
law	85.8%
accounting	63.4%
vet science	41.4%
dentistry	40.9%
engineering	5.1%

4.71 While other issues were addressed in the survey, the results presented here cover the major issues of concern to the research focus on discrimination. The implications of these patterns are discussed further below

4.72 In the course of the project we discovered that the Department of Architecture at the West Australian Institute of Technology had, for some years collected data from incoming students on their reasons for studying architecture. While unstructured data of this type are difficult to analyze it was considered worth trying as content analysis of this data set had never been undertaken to determine if there were systematic differences according to gender. Consequently this analysis was done under the auspices of the RAIA and the results forwarded to the national headquarters of the RAIA for inclusion in this report.

4.73 Essentially male and female students appear to enter architecture for the same basic set of reasons and these appear to have changed little over the period of time for which data are available.

4.74 Due to the lack of systematic differences no further analyses are reported herein.

CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION

5.1 In all three surveys there is little direct evidence to indicate that in architecture in Australia in the 1980s discrimination based on gender is a burning issue for the respondents. Despite the lack of strong comment by the respondents themselves at least 20% of the women architects responding to the questionnaire reported experience of sexual harassment and a minimum of 54% reported sex-based attacks on their professionalism. While the questionnaire does not enable us to determine the incidence (if any) of legally defined discrimination, it is clear that there are many patterns related to incomes, employment, education, and other issues (specific to the surveys) which point to deeper, more systemic discrimination and socialization issues. Such issues, whether they are related to patterns of employment levels, childcare, expectations of specialization or inherent abilities, are more difficult to address precisely because of their obscure basis and origins. Many are related to broader issues of male and female socialization, traditional family patterns in Australia, availability of role models, educational and career guidance advice, and employment practices.

5.2 Furthermore, while there was little evidence of the vigorous feminism of the mid 1970s in respondents' comments there were sufficient statements of disadvantage, degrees of sexual harassment, and other problems related to gender that concern is still warranted. The actual extent of such problems is difficult to establish, in part because of the return rates for the survey of women, and in part because to explore properly the real nature of such comments would require a far more expensive research using interviews and case studies.

CHAPTER 6 - ISSUES OF SPECIAL CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION'S TERMS OF REFERENCE

6.1 There is little by way of substantive proof of discrimination in the sense of the Commission's fundamental concerns. However, this is not surprising given the nature of the research programme and the difficulty of obtaining the type of "proof" as conventionally understood by the legal profession and those who write legislation. Of more interest in social science terms is the pattern of systematic evidence that the women perceive themselves to have been the subjects of a variety of discriminatory practices, harassments, and other inequitable treatment, both during their courses as architecture students and as practicing professionals. In general terms the sole practitioners may have reaped the benefit of their independence, at least in part, through less experience of discrimination in the workplace, as one might expect. It may also be that they have opted for the sole practitioner role as a result of their experiences of discouragement and discrimination but the pattern of causality cannot be established in this study.

6.2 The National Survey data suggest that women are not equal in the architectural profession in either employment patterns or incomes. In both instances they show significantly different patterns than their male counterparts. While such patterns may be similar in other professions, that is of less interest here than our primary concern of how things stand in architecture in Australia. Clearly at the national level important improvements to the status of women could be made.

6.3 The student data indicate that, in general, they seem to experience little, if any, active discrimination or harassment - at least insofar as our items tapped such questions. The possibility remains that an interview study might find somewhat different patterns but we have no grounds for asserting that it would or would not do so. However, it is also reasonable to argue that even the patterns of 10% of the students experiencing harassment and 36% feeling some sense of discrimination is a very serious and socially significant finding to which the Commission should turn its attention. A percentage of both males and females clearly believe that their lecturers do not treat male and female students equally. Furthermore, they attribute somewhat different types of advantage to the lecturers' treatment of each gender. Without more substantive evidence it seems unwise to conclude that there is need for serious action in this domain. (Architecture courses tend to be relatively close and intense, particularly in later years as students become more involved in design and studio courses - one possibility is that such proximity, through its inherent public nature, actively discourages patterns of discrimination which might be experienced in courses with less in-front-of-the-group activity.)

6.4 The data from the Survey of Women Architects do not suggest blatant major systematic problems of discrimination for women in the architectural profession in Australia, but rather the data point to pervasive and less visible patterns of difference which are no less important for their subtlety and these problems would be of concern to the Commission, as well as to the profession. There is some evidence of discriminatory behavior and pressures from various groups with whom women architects have to deal - including other architects, clients, tradespeople, employers, and employment agencies.

CHAPTER 7 - SUMMARY & POLICY IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

7.1 The data from the 3 surveys suggests a range of possible areas for action. Most of these actually are within the domain of existing organisations and structures - the RAIA (at both State and national levels), the schools of architecture, and the various other professional groups. There are some areas in which possibly the Commission or the Office of the Status of Women might take further active interest, both at the research level and at the legislative level as discussed in Chapter 7.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

7.2 In general terms there seems little need for specific public policy development with regard to women in the architectural profession in Australia. It is more likely that for the profession there is a need to improve various aspects of architectural courses (e.g., removing subtle harassment and discrimination from courses, raising the level of awareness of staff with regard to the discouragement of women students), advising (e.g., regarding careers selection, job advancement), and some employment practices (e.g., the patterns which leave women architects primarily in the lower status and lower income positions). At the Federal level there seems little likelihood that any sensible policies can be developed by government which pertain specifically to women architects. However, this in no way means that policies of general benefit to women professionals cannot be, and should not be, developed by the RAIA and similar organisations.

7.3 Areas in which activity by the Commission and similar agencies at State or Federal level can be most useful seem to fall in three main areas:

- Education of the public and of professional women themselves is likely to provide the best basis for the detection of discrimination and harassment in architecture or elsewhere. Obviously such public education is already occurring on a broad scale. However, it is possible, as suggested by the moderate awareness level of the women in this study, that more specifically targeted educational messages can be directed to professional women concerning areas where discrimination might occur, signs of such discrimination, and means of redress under the law.

- The possibility exists that there is a greater need for more visible procedures to be developed which enable students in educational institutions to pursue instances of harassment and discrimination. The comments of many of the respondents in open-ended questions indicate that, at least for them, a need existed for avenues to pursue the occasionally errant lecturers and tutors. There is somewhat less evidence from the student survey that this is still the case. Development of specific awareness programmes in educational institutions should be a policy concern at both State and national levels.

- Perhaps the most important policy concern of all for the Department of Education is to establish even more clearly the particular patterns and barriers which exist for women who seek to enter the professions in Australia. While much of this selection occurs during primary and secondary schools, and presumably reflects traditional role expectations and socialization patterns (as evidenced by our survey data about who discouraged women from doing architecture), there are clearly other points at which barriers to men and women differ. The generally low percentage of women in architecture course final years (even compared to first years, much less in absolute terms) indicates that this is a serious problem area.

7.4 With regard specifically to women architects in Australia little of the possible action for the Commission appears to lie in a legislative direction. Most of it appears to run a course towards education and awareness campaigns, and the raising of awareness of the options for prosecution of offenders of particular laws and regulations.

7.5 In the present study of women architects in Australia this (the educational activity) seems to be the only way in which any major contribution to further improvements in equality can occur. There is insufficient evidence that systematic discrimination against women architects occurs with registration boards. However with other bodies, employers and clients the data certainly indicate problems. However, the sources of reported instances of discrimination are many and varied and presumably reflect the highly individual experiences of each respondent. Many of the issues to which they refer suggest that their experience relates to stereotypes held by different people (parents, friends, schools, guidance counsellors, etc.) about women and architecture.

7.6 As far as more formal procedures are concerned, there is perhaps a need for professional women in all areas to be more aware of the extent to which they are entitled to pursue particular lines of action with regard to experiences of discrimination or harassment. Whether or not women will use such options is of course another matter - the evidence in these studies suggests that, overall, the mid-1980s show a different pattern of social and political activity with regard to these concerns than existed a decade ago. Both the particular written comments and the generally low level of response to the Survey of Women in particular indicate that it is not currently a "hot" topic. Indeed, some comments returned to the RAIA by the handful of women who chose not to answer the survey but who returned the uncompleted questionnaire suggested (rather bluntly in fact) that they were simply too busy getting on with their careers to worry too much about these matters - that things were not too bad for them and that doing architecture was far more important. The tone of the written comments was perhaps more persuasive than this incidental information but both are indicators of a quite different mood than existed in the mid-1970s as can be seen in a number of article in the attached reference list.

RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

7.7 At the research level slightly different conclusions are appropriate. In all three surveys there are patterns which suggest systematic differences in the professional experiences of women in architecture. Most of these occur in the spheres of education and career selection.

7.8 In summary the research reported here indicate needs for better (i.e., research based) understanding of:

- differences in income patterns between men and women architects;
- informal pressures on high school girls to avoid architecture as a career choice;
- patterns in particular schools of architecture which seem to indicate greater than average experiences of harassment, derogation, or other negative treatment of women (or the topic of women) in architecture;
- the extent to which women architects who are also mothers need any particular supports in the form of childcare or provision for maternity leave;
- how patterns for women architects compare with patterns for other women professionals (e.g., women in law, women in accounting, etc.) - there is no basis, other than basic descriptive statistical evidence, of the degree to which women in architecture are relatively well or badly off compared to their counterparts in other professions.

7.9 A number of smaller scale research projects could also be based on the data summarised here, depending on the particular question being studied in depth. The extent to which this is desirable depends, as is always the case with social policy research, on the particular concerns and needs of the groups concerned with such research questions. The work presented in the bibliography and the work of the RAIA and its consultant can provide other researchers with a useful foundation for any more detailed studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Affirmative Action Resource Unit (Office of the Status of Women, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet). "Equality for Women at Work : A survey of 10 OECD Countries" Canberra Publishing and Printing Company, 1985.

American Institute of Architects "Bridging the Gap for Women in Architecture" (pamphlet) 1984.

American Institute of Architects. "Affirmative Action Plan for the Integration of Women in the Architectural Profession". 1975.

Archer Jacky. "Accounting for Half the Seidler Architectural Team" The Weekend Australian, May 1-2, 1982, p 28.

Australia. Sex Discrimination Act 1984, NO. 4 of 1984, Part 2,Prohibition of Discrimination.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. "National Schools Statistics Collection" Australia 1984, Catalogue No. 4221.0

Australian Bureau of Statistics. Catalogue No. 4220.0, National Schools Statistics Collection , Australia, 1985 (preliminary)

Australian Society of Accountants. 1985 Annual Report

Balm, Diana "Beatrix Farrand at Dumbarton Oaks". Heresies 1981

Beverage,M., James,M., and Shute, C.,. "Worth her Salt - Women at Work in Australia". Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney, 1982

Broom, D. "Out of the Frying Pan : Technological Change and Domestic Work" Proceedings of the Women and Technological Change Conference, Melbourne, July - August 1982

Building Construction Materials and Equipment. "Fighting for the Right to Build", BCME, vol.28, no.6, June/July,1986, pp 30 - 44

Bureau of Labour Market Research "Labour Market Prospects and the Implications for Engineers". Paper presented to National engineering Conference, Melbourne, March 4 1985, Conference Paper No. 52

Bureau of Labour Market Research. "The Labour Market for Professional Engineers" Report No. 6. Australian Government Publishing Service, 1985

Bureau of Labour Market Research "Women in the Labour Force - the Proceedings of a Conference". Monograph Series No.4

Carter, Margaret. "Justice for the Older Woman". A letter to "The Australian", 16-5-1984

Chiplin,B and Sloane,P.J. Management and Industrial Relations Series - 2: Tackling Discrimination in the Workplace.
Cambridge University Press,1982

Cockburn, Cynthia. "Brothers - Male Dominance and Technological Change".
Pluto Press, London, 1983

Commission of the European Communities. "European Women in Paid Employment - Their Perception of Discrimination at Work"
Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, 1980

Cranz, Galen. "The Sharon Building - The Transformation of Women's Recreational Needs in the Late Nineteenth-Century City"
Heresies 1981

CSIRO. "Report to the CSIRO Consultative Council by the Sub-Committee on the Employment of Women"
October 1985

Cunningham, Anne. Conference Paper. 1982

Cutler, E.J. "Professional Women in Contemporary Australia - a Survey of teachers and Architects". Paper presented to the Deakin University "Contemporary Australia" course, 17-11-1982

Dean, J. and Darroch, R. K. "Profile of the Profession, 1984/85" Royal Australian Institute of Architects, Canberra, 1985.

Dept. of Employment and Industrial Relations. "Women in Professional Engineering"
(pamphlet). Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1982

Dietsch, Deborah. "Lily Reich"
Heresies 1981

Editorial. "Women's Place"
Progressive Architecture. March 1977

Elliot,L. "Women in the Professions" IN Mercer,J., "The Other Half - Women in Australian Society".
Penguin Books, Australia, 1983

Emmons Maccoby,E. and Nagy Jacklin,C.. "Myth , Reality and Shades of Gray - What We Know and Don't Know about Sex Differences" IN Psychology Today, December 1974, pp 109 - 112.

Ferrier, Mercia. "Sexism in Australian Cities: Barrier to Employment Opportunities" IN Women's Studies International Forum, Vol. 6 No 1 pp 73-84, 1983

Fogarty, M.P., Allen, I. and Walters, P. "Women in Top Jobs 1968 - 1979".
Policy Studies Institute, London, 1981.

Game,A and Pringle,R. "Gender at Work". Allen and Unwin, 1984

Greer, Nora Richter. "Women in Architecture: A Progress (?) Report". AIA Journal, January 1982: 40-51.

Hargreaves, Kaye. "Women at Work". Penguin Books, Australia, 1982

Harlan,Ann and Weiss, Carol L. "Sex Differences in Factories Affecting Managerial Career Advancement" IN Wallace, Phyllis (ed): "Women in the Workplace". Auburn House, Boston, 1982, USA

Hayden, Delores. "The Feminist Paradise Palace". Heresies 1981

Greenbaum, Joan: "Kitchen Culture/Kitchen Dialectic". Heresies 1981

Holmes Boutelle, Sara. "Women's Networks : Julia Morgan and her Clients". Heresies 1981

Hoy, Mavis (editor). "Women in the Labour Force" The

Proceedings of a Conference, 12-13 August 1982 "Bureau of Labour Market Research.Monograph series No 4" . Australian Government Publishing Service, 1984

Human Rights Commission. "The Sex Discrimination Act and You". (Pamphlet). 1985

Human Rights Commission (in collaboration with Office of Status of Women and Attorney-General's Dept). "A Guide to the Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Legislation". Human Rights Commission, 1984.

Human Rights Commission. "Human Rights - Newsletter of the Human Rights Commission", No. 10, July 1984. Australian Government Publishing Service, 1984

Institute of Chartered Accountants (Australia). 1985 Annual Report

Kanes Weisman, Leslie. "Revisions of the Man-Made Environment". Paper presented to the EDRA Conference, April 24th 1983, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA.

Kanes Weismman, Leslie. "Women's Environmental Rights : a Manifesto". Heresies 1981

Keller, Suzanne (ed). "Building for Women". Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1981.

Kok, D.A. "The Changing Role of Women in the Profession". a paper presented to the Australian Society of Labour Lawyers - Fifth Annual Conference.

Leake, Janine. "The Effect of Gender on the Career Choice of Students Enrolled in Architectural Drafting Certificate Courses at Sydney Technical College.

Malveaux,J. "Moving Forward, Standing Still : Women in White Collar Jobs" IN Wallace, P.(editor): "Women in the Workplace". Auburn House, Boston, USA, 1982.

Matrix. "Making Space: Women and the Man-Made environment". Sydney: Pluto Press, 1984.

Mattfeld J.A. and Van Aken C.G. (editors). "Women and the Scientific Professions - The M.I.T. Symposium on American Women in Science and Engineering". The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1965

Mayer, Helen. "Women in Architecture". a paper presented to the Salaried Architects Group Meeting on 21 May 1982.

McArthur, J.T. "Pharmacy Manpower In Australia", Australasian Pharmaceutical Publishing Co., Melbourne, 1984

McGroarty,Jane and Torre,Susana. "New Professional Identities : Four Women in The Sixties" IN Historic and Contemporary Perspective pp 115 - 131

Morris, Ellen. "Vignettes in Architectural Education - A letter from the Ivory Tower". Heresies 1981

Morris, Penny. " Dual-Career Families". Paper presented to the RAIA Off Shore Convention Seminar : "Women in Architecture" Tuesday 15th June 1982.

Mulvey, Charles and Short, Christine. "The Supply and Demand for Veterinarians 1984-1991". Refer to The Australian Veterinary Association, 1983

National Council of Independent Schools. Newsletter, vol. 4, Number 3, June 1986

Neil, C. C.. "Survey Report to the Consultative Council Sub-Committee on the Employment of Women (Part B: Tables)

Nevins, D.F.. "Eileen Gray"
Heresies 1981

Nuer, Lorna. " The City within the Landscape"
Heresies 1981

O'Dean, Andrea. "The Board Acts on The Role of Women in Architecture",
AIA Journal, vol. 63, no. 3, March 1975, pp 33 - 34

Otis Stevens, Mary. "Struggle for Place : Women in Architecture"

PE NEWS. "Ways Sought to Attract Women to Engineering"
PE NEWS, October 1983, pp 10-11

Perkins Gilman, Charlotte. "The Passing of the Home in Great American Cities"
Heresies 1981

Personnel Branch, Equal Employment Opportunity Unit, CSIRO. "Preliminary Presentation of Certain Data by Gender over a Two Year Period in CSIRO - June 1983-June 1985"

Pettingill, George E.. " How AIA Acquired it's First Woman Member"
AIA Journal, vol. 62, no. 3, March 1975, p 35

Price, Gail. "Cubes in the Sahara". A second year student project done in 1975 at the New Jersey School of Architecture

Progressive Architecture. "The Women behind the T-square". March 1977

Robertson, Donna. "The Bessie Smith Memorial Dance Hall Located Somewhere in Harlem". Heresies 1981

Roth Walsh, Mary. "Doctors Wanted No Women Need Apply - Sexual Barriers in the Medical Profession,1835 -1975". Yale University Press, New Haven and London,1977

Selby Smith, Joy. "Women, Employment and Technological Change"

Sexton, M. Review of "Victoria's Lawyers" by Margaret Hetherington IN Legal Service Bulletin, vol. 7 no. 3 June 1982.

Siddons, M. "Women in Law : Then and Now, Where Are We?" IN Law Institute Journal, November, 1985, vol. 59, no. 11, pp 1156 - 1159

Smith, R.E. "The Subtle Revolution - women at work". The Urban Institute ,Washington

Steinberg, J.A. "Climbing the Ladder of Success in Highheels - Backgrounds of Professional Women". UMI Research Press, Michigan, 1984

Sturgess, G. "Lawyers Seek Equality for Women". an article in "The Age", 4-7-1983

Sydney Women's Health Students Group. "Sensible Women - Not All Doctors Want to be Men" Sydney University Medical Society, 1978

Torre, S. "Women in Architecture : A Historic and Contemporary Perspective" Whitney Library of Design, New York, 1977

Torre, Susana, "Space as Matrix". Heresies 1981

Torre,S. "Women in Architecture and the New Feminism" IN Torre,S. (editor), "Women in American Architecture : A Historic and Contemporary Perspective" pp 148 - 161

Turner Shaw, Mary. "Education of a Squatter's Daughter" IN Grimshaw, P. and Strahan, L. (editors) "The Half Open Door". Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney, 1982

White, Deborah. "Women and Architecture : A Personal Observation" IN Meanjin Quarterly, Summer 1975, pp 399 - 404

White, Naomi R. "Where Are They Now? Architecture graduates 1957-'62"

Women's Bureau (Department of Employment and Industrial Relations). "Facts on Women at Work in Australia in 1983" AGPS, Canberra, 1985

Women's Bureau (Department of Employment and Industrial Relations). "Women in Engineering - An Oral History" A paper prepared for a symposium on women in Engineering and Computer Science, 15th August 1983.

General background

1. What was your age last birthday? _____ years

2. Marital status:
   - ☐ 1 Single
   - ☐ 2 Married
   - ☐ 3 Married but living apart from your spouse
   - ☐ 4 Living in de facto relationship
   - ☐ 5 Divorced and now single
   - ☐ 6 Divorced and remarried
   - ☐ 7 Other (please specify) _____

3. What is your home postcode? _____

4. Where were you born?

   City _____ State _____ Country _____

5. Do you have any brothers and sisters?
   - ☐ 1 Yes
   - ☐ 2 No

   If YES, how many sisters or brothers do you have, and what are their ages?

	Number	Ages
Sisters	_____	_____
Brothers	_____	_____

6. What age(s, if married more than once) were you when you got married? _____ years

7. If your mother is/was in paid employment, what is/was her main occupation?

8. What was your mother's highest level of education?
   - ☐ 1 completed primary (elementary/state) school
   - ☐ 2 attended some secondary school
   - ☐ 3 technical college or vocational training (e.g., nursing)
   - ☐ 4 some university of CAE education
   - ☐ 5 completed university or CAE degree or diploma

9. If your father is/was in paid employment, what is/was his main occupation?

10. What was your father's highest level of education?
    - ☐ 1 completed primary (elementary/state) school
    - ☐ 2 attended some secondary school
    - ☐ 3 technical college or vocational training (e.g., trade certificate)
    - ☐ 4 some university of CAE education
    - ☐ 5 completed university or CAE degree or diploma

11. Was your mother born in Australia?
    - ☐ 1 Yes
    - ☐ 2 No

    If NO, in which country was she born? _____

12. Was your father born in Australia?
    - ☐ 1 Yes
    - ☐ 2 No

    If NO, in what country was he born? _____

13. In what states are you registered as an architect?
    - ☐ 1 NSW
    - ☐ 2 VIC
    - ☐ 3 SA
    - ☐ 4 TAS
    - ☐ 5 WA
    - ☐ 6 QLD
    - ☐ 7 ACT
    - ☐ 8 NT
    - ☐ 9 Not Registered
    - ☐ 10 other (please specify) _____

14. In what year did you first become registered? 19_____

15. Are you a member of the RAIA?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what year did you join? 19_____

If NO, why have you not joined?

16. Did you have any problems becoming registered?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, were any of these problems related to you being a female architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what types of problems did you have?

* * * * *

IF you are married or living in a de facto relationship please answer the following questions about your spouse. Otherwise please GO TO Question 26.

17. What is your spouse's age last birthday? _____ years

18. What is your spouse's occupation? _____

19. Does your spouse work?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

If YES, does he work
☐ 1 fulltime
☐ 2 parttime

Does he work from home?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

20. What is your spouse's highest level of education?
☐ 1 some secondary school
☐ 2 completed secondary school
☐ 3 some tertiary education (university, CAE, technical)
☐ 4 completed tertiary education majoring in _____
☐ 5 postgraduate education for
☐ 6 a postgraduate diploma in _____
☐ 7 a Masters degree in_____
☐ 8 a Ph.D. degree in _____

21. Approximately what is your spouse's taxable income this year? _____
(use RAIA survey categories here)

22. Did you support your spouse financially while he was doing his education?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES,what did you do? for how long?

23. Have you ever had to interrupt your career because of your spouse's job?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how did this affect your career progress?

24. Has your spouse ever had to interrupt his career because of your job?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how did he feel about it?

25. Was your spouse born in Australia?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, in what country was he born? _____

* * * * *

Education/secondary

26. What type of school did you attend for secondary school?
    - ☐ 1 public, government
    - ☐ 2 private, non-Catholic
    - ☐ 3 private, Catholic
    - ☐ 4 other (please describe) _____

27. Was this a co-educational school?
    - ☐ 1 Yes
    - ☐ 2 No

28. In what year did you complete secondary school? 19 _____.

29. In which state or territory did you do most of your secondary schooling?
    - ☐ 1 NSW
    - ☐ 2 VIC
    - ☐ 3 SA
    - ☐ 4 TAS
    - ☐ 5 WA
    - ☐ 6 QLD
    - ☐ 7 ACT
    - ☐ 8 NT
    - ☐ 9 other (please describe) _____

30. Please recall your years in SECONDARY SCHOOL. For each of the following subjects please indicate how well you performed academically by placing a tick or cross in the appropriate space on the scale. Assume that the middle space represents average. If you did not take one of the subjects mentioned, please leave that item blank.

For example:
TECHNICAL DRAWING
Very well :_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly

MATHEMATICS
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
ENGLISH
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
CHEMISTRY
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
PHYSICS
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
BIOLOGY
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
ECONOMICS
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
ART
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
INDUSTRIAL ARTS/GRAPHICS
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
HOME ECONOMICS
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
GEOGRAPHY
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
HISTORY
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
MUSIC
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
SOCIAL SCIENCES
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
BUSINESS STUDIES
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly

Education/tertiary

31. Was architecture your first choice of course?
    - ☐ 1 Yes
    - ☐ 2 No

    If NO, what was your first choice?

32. Were there any female role models who influenced you to take up architecture?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, who?

33. Before you began studying architecture, did you personally know any architects?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, was the architect:
☐ 1 A relative
☐ 2 A friend
☐ 3 A family friend
☐ 4 An acquaintance from a work experience program
☐ 5 An architect working for your family
☐ 6 Other (please specify) _____

34. Which school of architecture did you attend? _____

35. What year did you begin your architectural course? 19_____?

36. Did you complete your architectural course?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, in what year did you complete it? 19_____?

If NO, why were you not able to finish your course?

37. Were you ever advised by anyone NOT to study architecture?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, who so advised you?

What reasons were given to you for not studying architecture?

38. Did you do your architectural training full or parttime?
☐ 1 Fulltime
☐ 2 Parttime

If Parttime, why was this?

39. How did you support yourself financially during your architecture course?
☐ 1. My parents paid my way.
☐ 2. I worked to pay my way.
☐ 3. My spouse supported me.
☐ 4. Government support scheme (e.g., TEAS).
☐ 5. I held a cadetship.
☐ 6 A combination of numbers _____ above.
☐ 7 by other means (please specify) _____

40. Recalling your TERTIARY EDUCATION, please indicate your academic strengths on the scales for the following subjects. If you did not take any of these subjects please leave the item blank.

STRUCTURES
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
CONSTRUCTION
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
ARCHITECTURAL SCIENCE
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
HISTORY
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
COMPUTING
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
MAN/ENVIRONMENT STUDIES
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly
DESIGN
Very well :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very Poorly

41. Which subject area within your architecture course did you most enjoy during your course?

42. Approximately where in your class did you rank at the end of your final year of studies?
☐ 1 In the top 1%
☐ 2 In the top 5%
☐ 3 In the top 10%
☐ 4 In the top 25%
☐ 5 In the top 50%
☐ 6 Somewhere else

43. Have you attempted, or completed, any other tertiary education?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, please indicate what degrees or other qualifications you have obtained:

Qualification	Topic area	Institution	Year completed

If NO, would you like to do further training?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

If YES, what topics would you like to study?

Do you intend to actually do this?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

If NO, why not?

* * * * *

Parenting and childcare

PLEASE NOTE: If you have parenting responsibility for any children (including step-children) please answer the following questions. IF you do not have any children please go to QUESTION 58.

* * * * *

44. What age(s) and gender(s) is/are your child(ren)?

Age of child	Gender (Circle as appropriate)	
_____	M	F
_____	M	F
_____	M	F
_____	M	F
_____	M	F
_____	M	F

45. Do any of your children *not* attend school?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

If YES, who takes care of the child(ren) mostly?

☐ 1 I take care of them myself.
☐ 2 My spouse/partner and I do.
☐ 3 I have my child(ren) minded by a friend.
☐ 4 I share childcare with other working women on a:
☐ 5 for pay basis
☐ 6 share-time basis.
☐ 7 I have my child(ren) in a creche or nursery school for _____ hours per day, _____ days per week.
☐ 8 I have my child(ren) minded by a relative
(Please specify relationship _____)
☐ 9 I pay someone to mind them
10 ☐ at my home
11 ☐ at their home

46. For your children that are in school, what usually happens after school?

- ☐ 1 I pick them up.
- ☐ 2 I am at home when they come from school.
- ☐ 3 My spouse picks them up.
- ☐ 4 My spouse is at home when they come from school.
- ☐ 5 I have them minded by
  - ☐ 6 a babysitter
  - ☐ 7 a childcare centre
  - ☐ 8 a relative
  - ☐ 9 a friend
  - ☐ 10 other _____)
- ☐ 11 The children mostly take care of themselves until I arrive home.

47. Please indicate what percent of the time each of the following people take care of your child(ren) during the typical working week (i.e., Monday to Friday, between 8 AM and 8 PM):

Myself	_____%
My spouse	_____%
Child care person	_____%
Relatives	_____%
Full-time creche	_____%
Part-time creche	_____%
Other (_____)	_____%

(N.B. The answers should total to 100 %)

48. Do you feel these arrangements are satisfactory for you?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

49. Do you feel these arrangements are satisfactory for the child(ren)?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

50. Who decided on these arrangements?
- ☐ 1 I did.
- ☐ 2 My spouse and I together.
- ☐ 3 Other (please explain) _____

51. Do you think that children are adversely affected by having working parent(s)?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

If YES, how?

52. What would be your ideal childcare situation or arrangement?

53. Do you think women architects are more inclined to care for their own children than other women professionals?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

If YES, why do you think this is?

54. Do you think that women architects are more inclined to work from home than male architects?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

If YES, why?

55. Given your experience to this point in your life, is there anything you would do differently about child care if you had to do it over again?
- ☐ 1 Yes
- ☐ 2 No

If YES, what would you do differently?

56. For many women the inherent conflicts between motherhood and career prove very significant. How would you describe the impact of each of the following on your career progress.

Pregnancy itself.

Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

Having an infant in the household.
Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

Having toddlers in the household.
Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

Having primary school age children.
Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

Maternity leave provisions.
Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

Having secondary school age children.
Very Significant :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Not at all significant

57. Some women combine parenting and career by working part of the time at home. Do you do this?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, are you able to work effectively with your own children around the house?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
Are you able to work effectively with children which are NOT your own around the house?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
Please go on to the next section - Question 60.

* * * * *

For those without *children, please answer the following:*

58. If you do not have children, do you intend to have them at some future time?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 3 Don't know
If YES, when?
☐ 1 Next year
☐ 2 In the next 3 years.
☐ 3 In the next 5 years.
☐ 4 In the next 10 years.

59. If you have children or a child, do you think you will work fulltime?

	Yes	No
when the child(ren) is/are very small	☐ 1	☐ 2
when the child(ren) is/are school age	☐ 1	☐ 2
when the child(ren) is/are in high school	☐ 1	☐ 2
when children are grown and have left home	☐ 1	☐ 2

Household and related issues

60. Please indicate for each of the following categories the percentage of the time you and, if it is applicable, your spouse (or partner) do EACH task (i.e., *each task* should add to 100%):

	Me	Spouse	N/A
Routine grocery shopping	____%	____%	____
Routine other household shopping	____%	____%	____
Routine cooking	____%	____%	____
Cooking for special occasions	____%	____%	____
Shopping for clothes for children	____%	____%	____
Car maintenance	____%	____%	____
Indoor housework	____%	____%	____
Outdoor housework & maintenance	____%	____%	____
Gardening	____%	____%	____
Care of sick children	____%	____%	____
Attending school plays, concerts	____%	____%	____
Taking children to the doctor	____%	____%	____
Taxiing children around by car	____%	____%	____
Washing and organising clothes	____%	____%	____
Home administration, paying bills	____%	____%	____

61. If there was a conflict in your household between preparing meals and professional activities (e.g., thinking, drawing) how do you deal with the conflict?

62. Approximately what is your own total taxable income? _____

63. What percentage of your *household's* total income do you earn? _____%

64. Would you need to increase your income if you were the sole income earner in your family?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 3 Not applicable, I am the sole income earner

65. Do you feel that you keep up adequately with the following:

	Yes	No
daily news	☐ 1	☐ 2
professional reading	☐ 1	☐ 2
professional development (e.g., seminars)	☐ 1	☐ 2
advances in building technologies	☐ 1	☐ 2
advances in computers and CAD	☐ 1	☐ 2
your social life	☐ 1	☐ 2

66. Do you ever feel that you need 'permission' from your spouse in order to do the following:

	Yes	No
attend meetings locally	☐ 1	☐ 2
attend meetings interstate	☐ 1	☐ 2
stay back to work late	☐ 1	☐ 2
meet with work colleagues after hours	☐ 1	☐ 2

67. If there is a conflict between the demands of your job and that of your spouse, whose job usually takes priority?
☐ 1 Mine.
☐ 2 My spouse's.
Would your spouse agree with this assessment?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

Employment

68. Which of the following best describes your current employment situation?
☐ 1 Sole practitioner
☐ 2 Partner or director of a firm
☐ 3 Salaried architect in private sector
☐ 4 Salaried architect in public sector
☐ 5 Academic
☐ 6 Other

IF you are a sole practitioner or principal please answer the following questions. Otherwise please GO TO Question 77.

69. Do you work only from an office based in your home?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, do you think clients feel more at liberty to call you at any time of day because of this than if you worked at a separate office?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

70. Have you ever been involved in a job which has been subject to a writ for negligence?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

71. Do you or your firm carry professional indemnity insurance?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not?

If YES, approximately how much does it cost per year? $_____

Is this a major financial burden in terms of your practice's turnover?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

72. If you are in private practice, do you do a large amount of public sector work?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why is this?

73. Do you actively promote (market) yourself or your firm in any way?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

74. Some well known architects prepare articles and other materials for major glossy magazines. Do you do this?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
Why or why not?

75. Are there any types of clients that you actively seek because you are a woman architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what kind?

76. What is your standard hourly rate? $____

* * * * *

77. A. Are you currently working as an architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, what type of work are you doing? Please describe.

B. How did you get into this work?

C. Do you think you will ever work as an architect in the future?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why? If NO, why not?

78. On average, how many hours would you work each week? _____ hours

79. How would you describe your job position using the following categories?:
☐ 1 an upper management position
☐ 2 a middle management position
☐ 3 a lower management position
☐ 4 not a managerial position

80. Have you worked continuously since completing your architecture course?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not?

81. In the following chart please briefly summarize your job history (use a separate sheet of paper if necessary):

Year(s)	Job description	Full/parttime	Reason for leaving

82. Do you think women are more likely to do unpaid architectural work than men?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

83. Do you think that female architects are generally more inclined to maintain their ethics values than male architects (for example with regard to environmental or urban redevelopment issues)?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why is this?

84. Do you think that female architects are freer than men to do their own thing in their careers?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

85. Do you have an ultimate career goal?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what is it?

If NO, is there a reason that you don't?

86. Do your job responsibilities routinely require:

- site inspections?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
- client contacts?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
- development of briefs?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
- design work?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
- documentation?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

87. Do you take on additional freelance/parttime work over and above your regular job?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 3 Not applicable
If YES, is this mainly for extra income?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

88. Have you ever handed work on to a male architect because you thought it would be better handled by him just because he is male?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

89. Have you ever been pressured by others to hand work on to a male colleague just because he is male?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, by whom?

90. Do you think that male architects are better able:
to handle disputes with builders?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

dealing with local councils or authorities in building disputes?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

91. What percentage of your clients are women? _____%

92. Have you ever used an employment agency to get yourself a job?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, were you given any special advice because you are a woman architect what kind of advice were you given as a woman architect?

Did you ever feel discriminated against by the agency?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, in what way?

Discrimination issues

93. Do you feel that you have ever been discriminated against because you were female in:

- secondary school?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- your architecture course?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- your work as an architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- your place of employment?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

94. Do you believe you have suffered discrimination from:

- registration boards?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- potential employers?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- tradesmen?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- contractors?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- clients?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- support staff (e.g., secretaries)?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

95. Have you ever felt positive discrimination (discrimination in your favour) because you are female?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, under what circumstances?

96. Have you ever been the subject of affirmative action of any kind?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what?

97. At dinner parties or other social events do others talk with you seriously about your work?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

98. Do you ever feel that you are the 'token' woman architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, when?

99. In work situations are you often:

	Yes	No
asked to be the secretary?	☐ 1	☐ 2
asked to fix tea/coffee?	☐ 1	☐ 2
made the subject of female jokes	☐ 1	☐ 2
asked to do the photocopying	☐ 1	☐ 2

100. If you are an employee does your firm have a formal policy on discrimination in employment?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 3 Not applicable - I don't work for a firm
If YES, does it follow government or other specific guidelines

101. During your architecture course did you ever experience discrimination because you were female from:

- your lecturers?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- male students?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

- other female students?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

102. Have you ever felt sexually harassed in the course of your work as:

- student?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, in what way?

- architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, in what way?

103. Have you ever been accused of using sexual favours in order to obtain architectural jobs or clients?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

104. How often, if ever, do you deliberately use femininity to advantage in your work?
☐ 1 Never
☐ 2 Very seldom
☐ 3 Occasionally
☐ 4 Very often
☐ 5 All the time

105. When I feel I have been the subject of discrimination due to being female I usually:

☐ 1 have done nothing.
☐ 2 say something to the person involved.
☐ 3 complain to my close friends but do nothing.
☐ 4 tell my spouse.
☐ 5 tell my employer.
☐ 6 tell the person's employer.
☐ 7 threaten legal action

106. Are you familiar with your options under state and Commonwealth law for dealing with instances of discrimination?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

107. In Australia, for each of the professions listed below please indicate whether you think there are proportionally more women than men in that profession than there are in architecture

	More than in Arch.	Less than in Arch.
- law	☐ 1	☐ 2
- medicine	☐ 1	☐ 2
- engineering	☐ 1	☐ 2
- vet science	☐ 1	☐ 2
- accounting	☐ 1	☐ 2
- dentistry	☐ 1	☐ 2
- pharmacy	☐ 1	☐ 2

108. Have you ever been told any of the following 'facts'?

Yes	No	
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women architects are offended by pin-ups in site offices and therefore cannot do site inspections
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women cannot spare enough time from their family to succeed
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women [pregnancy issue] architecture
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women would be offended by construction workers' language and therefore should not do site work
☐ 1	☐ 2	Architecture is a demanding profession and women do not have what it takes to succeed
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women lack the right perspective for doing commercial architecture
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women are best left to domestic architecture
☐ 1	☐ 2	Women do not understand building materials as well as men

109. Were you ever given advice by your lecturers which was clearly intended to discourage you from pursuing architecture as a career?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what was the advice?

110. Did your lecturers/tutors ever comment on the following topics in a way disparaging women?

Yes	No	
☐ 1	☐ 2	qualities of good architects
☐ 1	☐ 2	suitability of architecture for men
☐ 1	☐ 2	ability of men versus women at drafting
☐ 1	☐ 2	ability of women to pursue a fulltime profession in architecture
☐ 1	☐ 2	courses which are most suitable (e.g., electives, workshops, etc.)

111. In your work have you ever had your job or professional behaviour criticized, explained, or put down by reference to:

	Yes	No
PMT?	☐ 1	☐ 2
menopause?	☐ 1	☐ 2
pregnancy?	☐ 1	☐ 2
being emotional?	☐ 1	☐ 2
being neurotic?	☐ 1	☐ 2
any other 'female' conditions?	☐ 1	☐ 2

112. How would you define professional success?

113. If all else is equal would you yourself rather use a male or female professional in each of the following areas?

	Male	Female
accountancy	☐ 1	☐ 2
general medical practice	☐ 1	☐ 2
gynecology	☐ 1	☐ 2

114. Do you think that you use your network of contacts as deliberately as most men do?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not?

115. Do you think that female architects have an advantage over male architects when it comes to designing domestic architecture?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

116. Have you ever been prevented from doing your work to the best of your ability because of restrictions placed on you because you are a woman?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

117. Do you often feel excluded from professional groups or activities because you are a female?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what groups do you feel excluded from?

118. Do you think most female architects are less egotistical than male architects?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, does this help or hinder them professionally? Why?

119. Do you feel that overall (including benefits) you are paid at the same rates as male architects would be for the same work?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, can you document the differences?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No

120. In your career how do you feel your rate of professional advancement compares to that of men that finished with you in your architecture course?
☐ 1 much faster
☐ 2 somewhat faster
☐ 3 about the same
☐ 4 somewhat slower
☐ 5 much slower

121. What to you are the advantages of working in the private sector in architecture?

122. What to you are the advantages of working in the public sector in architecture?

123. Would you encourage other women to enter the architectural profession?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not?

124. Please indicate the type of building design that you most enjoy doing?
☐ 1 domestic
☐ 2 commercial
☐ 3 medium density housing
☐ 4 industrial
☐ 5 recycling
☐ 6 teaching
☐ 7 other

125. What in your opinion are male values in architecture?

126. Have you ever received publicity specifically because you are a female architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why?

127. How would you rate your own level of awareness of issues specifically concerning women in the architectural profession?
Very aware:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: Very unaware

128. Has such awareness influenced any of your own actions or decisions as a female architect?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, how?

129. Are you a member of other professional associations?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, please list them:

130. In England and America the RIBA and AIA respectively have extensive programs concerning affirmative action for women in architecture. Do you think that the RAIA should develop similar programs?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
Why or why not?

131. If the RAIA developed such a program do you think the following issues should be addressed?

Yes	No	
☐ 1	☐ 2	increasing public awareness of the contributions of women architects
☐ 1	☐ 2	increasing the percentage enrollments of women in architectural schools
☐ 1	☐ 2	promoting equal opportunity employment practices
☐ 1	☐ 2	increasing the membership of women in the RAIA
☐ 1	☐ 2	ensuring active participation of women at all levels of the RAIA
☐ 1	☐ 2	actively discouraging practices from discrimination against women architects
☐ 1	☐ 2 other	(specify)_____

132. Do you think there should be any special recognition for women in the architectural profession, such as an RAIA Best Female Architect of the Year Award?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
Why or why not.

133. Which of the following best describes your employer's provisions and supports for working parents?
☐ 1 not applicable
☐ 2 no considerations
☐ 3 some considerations
☐ 4 no formal policy but works out arrangements
☐ 5 maternity/paternity leave
☐ 6 day care facilities
☐ 7 salary or other loading for child care
☐ 8 flexible work hours as policy
☐ 9 flexible work hours as needed
☐ 10 shared jobs (e.g., 1 job/2 people half time)

134. Do you think architecture would benefit in specific ways from more women working as architects?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, why and in what ways?

135. If you were starting your career again would you choose architecture?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not? What do you think you would choose instead?

136. What would you estimate the percentage of female architects to be
- in your state?_____%
- nationally?_____%

137. How many female architects do you know personally?
☐ 1-2
☐ 2-5
☐ 5-10
☐ 10-20
☐ 20-50
☐ more than 50

138. How many male architects do you know personally?
☐ 1-2
☐ 2-5
☐ 5-10
☐ 10-20
☐ 20-50
☐ more than 50

139. Have you ever been asked to become an associate or partner in an architectural firm?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 3 Not applicable
If NO, why?

140. Do you join clubs, associations, etc. for business reasons and contacts?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If NO, why not?

141. Do you think there are any major and systematic differences between male and female architects,
- in design style?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what?

- in values in design?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what?

142. Do you think that female architects have particular strengths, compared to male architects?
☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
If YES, what?

143. In a survey of this kind it is especially difficult to contact women who have dropped out of the profession. Can you supply contact information for women in either of the above categories so that they may be sent a survey form? The contact information will be handled with the utmost confidentiality.

Name Address City Postcode

144. Despite every effort to make this a comprehensive survey of issues concerning women in architecture you may feel a topic has been omitted, please add any such comments in the space below or on a separate sheet of paper.