

<Formbild>

- opening the 'black box'

Marte Gulliksen

The purpose of the concept 'formbild': a venture into form studies

Why does a group of people so often agree upon what a 'good form' is? Walking through the exhibitions at the University College where I work, whether they are exam-exhibitions or public exhibitions, a certain kind of kinship is visible in the artefacts¹ displayed by the single groups. It is often possible to see which group has had which teacher. At the same time, different groups often disagree with each other. This phenomenon is recognisable in the history of the school subject Arts and Craft. From the subjects 'sløyd', 'håndarbeid', and 'tegning' (sloyd, handicraft and drawing), via 'forming' to today's subject, different ideals have existed *over time* and *at the same time*. Hence, what in one area of the subject is regarded as good form was and is in other areas regarded as poor.

This may be the same phenomenon that can be observed in art history and in the material culture, which is referred to as 'style'? In society different styles are recognisable in different periods of time, and it is possible to recognise different styles at the same time in different areas of the society. Why is this so?

Challenges to research into these questions

Questions concerning form or 'styles' are usually addressed by researchers in cultural science. Within this field of science the classical-modern theoretical perspective has a strong tradition.² Agreement and disagreement in form ideal are, in this perspective, often explained by changes or development in the individuals and in the society (as new techniques, functions,

¹ 'Artefact' is used here as a collective term for all man-made objects: "something created by humans usually for a practical purpose; especially : an object remaining from a particular period <caves containing prehistoric artifacts>" (Merriam Webster's dictionary in Encyclopædia Britannica Online: <http://search.eb.com/dictionary>).

² Illeris distinguishes between: 'classical-modern' and 'post-modern' optics in her Ph.D, to enlighten the dualistic difference between 'known' (traditional) and 'new' mode of thought. This theoretical move is made to address central leading-differences (Luhman) that may clarify her chosen perspective. The four leading-differences she uses are: essentialism/anti-essentialism, objektivism/relationism, universalism/pragmatics and antropocentrisme/polycentrisme. (Illeris, 2002:14-15)

types of artefacts and art forms, etc.) All these explanations assume to some extent that there is some kind of *essence* in the artefacts, individuals, society etc. They rely on explanation of meaning, as in art historical styles, in aesthetic theory, and in the Kantian subject-object focus: ‘das ding an sich, das ding für mich’. Such explanations are complex, and easily attached to statements of value as ‘something is better than something else’. In a post-modern society value statements are made more relative. To the sentence ‘something is better than something else’ one adds the limitation ‘in a certain context’. Hence: what is best/true in one context is wrong in another context, leaving both solutions equally good/true (or wrong). This relativization may continue indefinitely (Illeris, 2002:26). As a statement gets more relative, the less meaning it conveys. Consequently this reduces the usability of the explanation the statement may give.

Whether this is or is not a valid objection to such studies, the phenomenon of different form ideals remain. We still need to discuss this phenomenon and find answers that, although they may not be defined as true as such, may function as descriptions of what is going on, and why. Is it possible to discuss development of form, choice of form expression, without focusing on already known (and problematic) concepts as ‘style’ and ‘genre’? Without being diverted by the artefacts themselves, or ending in sidetracks of ethical, aesthetical, moral or other questions concerning the *meaning* of this ideal?

A possible solution and it's consequence: the concept 'formbild'

Styles, art and design forms as ‘renaissance’, ‘classicism’ etc, are examples of stagnant form ideals, set in its ways. They are ‘black boxed’. The science theoretician Bruno Latour (1987) uses the metaphor ‘black box’ to explain how we understand scientific facts. When something is recognised as a scientific ‘fact’, it means that we accept that it is so, or, at least, that we accept that this way of understanding it is a well functioning explanation. Thus it is unnecessary to remember or know how the fact became a ‘fact’. This black-box-strategy is often used about functions or mechanisms that are highly complex (as x-rays, atoms, the specific link between certain enzymes and certain hormones etc.). ”In its place they draw a little box about which they need to know nothing but its input and output” (Latour, 1987:3). Black-boxing facilitates further discussion, because one can accept the black box as truth, and use it as a brick onto which new knowledge may be built. It is, in fact, the actual transformation of a field of knowledge to science, Latour writes. Consequently, when wanting to study science per se, as Latour does, the challenge is to open these black boxes and study them specifically, detailed and structured in order to discover how the singular ‘scientific fact’ maybe began as an idea, a hunch, a hypothesis, and through checking, testing, re-checking and re-testing, were formulated and transformed to a functional scientific explanation.

It is possible to understand art and design ‘styles’ as black boxes, as they too are most recognisable post-facto: after an artefact is produced within a style, or after enough artefacts are produced to develop certain recognisable form indicators as style features.

In such a perspective, another way to study form ideals may be possible. Instead of studying form post-facto in artefacts or in specific styles, the focus may be turned to the construction of the form ideals. To circumscribe Latour: when wanting to study *form* per se the challenge will be to open the black boxes of form and discover how they *function* and how they *change*. This may render it possible to answer questions such as the above asked; why different groups agree or disagree on what a ‘good form’ is etc.

In order to address these questions on a *function* level and to maintain the chosen perspective, we need tools: We need functional concepts by which to discuss the matter. Concepts already existing in the field of form studies (as ‘style’, ‘genre’, ‘ideal’ etc) all have several connotations and adhered meanings. This makes them problematic as tools in our particular setting. A possible answer to these considerations is to introduce *a new concept*. A new concept is free of already adhered meanings, and may have its meaning constructed in this particular perspective. Consequently, the concept ‘*formbild*’ is introduced. Next two sections of the article is an introductory discussion to the concept *formbild*’s content and theoretical foundation.

What is understood by the concept *formbild*?

A *formbild* is a philosophical notion, easiest understood as a type of ‘ideal’ of form. It is something that shows a relationship or an affinity to a certain ‘style’, ‘genre’, ‘artistic direction’ etc. In an artefact, some recognisable features display kinship to other artefacts. The features recognised are often visual, but is not necessarily restricted to what is visible to the eye. Two- and three-dimensional forms may be perceived by more senses than vision. And it is the *forms* themselves that are of interest here, not the senses or the perceptions.

Formbild may be recognised in all types of artefacts: pictures, installations, sculptures, other three-dimensional objects as utility articles etc, and other designed (art) expressions.

Formbild is situated in the interspace between individuals, via artefacts:

Formbild is developed and arises in the interspace between individuals. Often an artefact is the medium connecting us with the other. The artefact displays recognisable features of the *formbild* the creator of the object had. Hence artefacts function as representations of a person’s *formbild*.

The individual has two roles: the maker and the observer.

- the maker (makes artefacts in the *formbild* he has and develops his *formbild* as he makes the artefacts)³
- the observer (understands or recognises the artefact’s *formbild* and develops his *formbild* in the meeting with these artefacts)

The maker is always also an observer. The observer is always also a maker.

A *formbild* is a conception of something. The *formbild* guides the artist or the designer in the creative process both before and after the actual production. It is not necessarily a conscious creative force in the maker, but may as likely be a vague idea that is continually developing. This idea is gradually showing – after some time has passed or in a long series of products – as *form indicators* in the product. Form indicators may either be recognisable influences from or to the contemporaneous society, indicators of personal expression i.e. individual style, or both the above.

A *formbild* is personal, but it is related to larger directions. This is due to the fact that the maker is always a part of a social practice that he continually observes, and expresses himself in relation to. Whether this is consciously utilized or not, will vary from individual to

³ ‘making’ is used in this article as equivalent of ‘creating’, as in ‘the creative process’. But, by choosing the word ‘making’, I also connect my perspective to the ‘making professions’ and ‘making disciplines’ (Dunin-Woyseth and Nielsen, 2004).

individual and from situation to situation. Through specific creative actions, the formbild is constructed in this social practice.

A formbild is constructed

A formbild is continually constructed:

- By the individual in his creative process: through the continual negotiation in the making of an artefact.
- By the individual in his contact with other individuals: through the continual communication (through verbal-, symbolic-, visual-, etc. language) about form.
- By the individual in their contact with other artefacts: through the continual observation, evaluation, admiration or aversion of certain forms.

Since the formbild is constructed in a social practice, it is a socially constructed phenomenon, dependent on the acting individuals, their positions in the field, the structures in the field and the communication in the field. Formbild construction therefore covers both the *selection* (of a form ideal) and *development* (of artistic expression) that is constructed by the creative individual and is reflected in the created artefact. The concept formbild is related to other concepts such as: form expression, form development, style, genre, *intermediate design object* (Boujout and Tiger, 2002) and Bergson's concept: *image*⁴ (Bergson, 1991).

Theoretical foundation

Constructivism and discourse theory

The premise for the concept formbild is in the basic presumption: the individual is constructing his own understanding of the world, and develops this in communication with other individuals. 'Reality' is henceforth only accessible through our categories, or our constructions, and our knowledge of the world is therefore a product of our ways of categorizing it. The concepts we choose to name these categories cease to be descriptive, neutral labels on artefacts, phenomenon or ideas. They are contributing to our construction of what these artefacts, phenomenon or ideas *are*.⁵

The concepts we choose when naming the world are not random, nor neutral, but are constructed in a specific social context. At the same time they take part in changing this social context by continually changing themselves (Andersen, 1999; Jørgensen og Phillips, 1999; Alvesson and Sköldbberg, 2000). The concepts are a part of a discourse. The concepts or the 'text'⁶ is the *product* of a communicative process. The 'discourse' on the other hand is the particular *communicative process*. The communicative process is a social practice. But social practice is more than only communication.

This understanding of the concept discourse comes from Jørgensen and Phillips (1999) who, in tradition with Foucault, define discourse as "a way of speaking of and understand the world

⁴ Med "billeder" mener vi en slags eksistens, der er mere end det, idealisten kalder en forestilling, men mindre end det, realisten kalder en ting - en eksistens halvvejs mellem "tingen" og "forestillingen" (Bergson, 1991).

⁵ A Norwegian apropos: selve ordet 'begrep' får dermed en konkret betydning: vi *griper* verden gjennom de *begrep* vi bruker om den.

⁶ 'text' is used here in a wide understanding, covering all verbal, visual and symbolic expressions. In critical discourse analysis, where this three dimensional model: text-discourse-social practice is found, there is an opening for such an understanding (Fairclough, 2003).

(or a part of the world).”⁷ Discourses constitute the world at the same time as they are constituted by the world. Foucault specifies:” Discourses are practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak [...] Discourses are not about objects; they do not identify objects, they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own invention” (Foucault, 1974:49). This way of understanding concepts, discourses and social practice, is social-constructivistic, related to French, post-structuralistic theory (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Burr, 1995), and in particular related to critical discourse analysis after Fairclough (2003).

When applying a discourse perspective on the development of an ideal of form, certain consequences follow: The same way as a concept is the product (‘text’) of a communicative activity, the formbild may be understood as the product (‘text’) of the communicative activity (discourse). This communicative activity takes place in a specific social practice. This specific social practice is the creative process. The form that is developed in this process is not random or neutral, but a product of ‘our ways of making and understanding form’. These ways evolves in the relations between individuals and the individual’s artefact through the maker’s ‘making’ and ‘observing’.

This means that different formbilds as ‘texts’ therefore are products of different discourses: Like the minimalistic formbild in a modernism-discourse, and the elaborated and complex formbild in a baroque-discourse. By positioning oneself in a discourse, one relates ones formbild to this discourse. This make up what are recognisable form indicators in the artefact. Consequently, as with other ‘texts’ in other discourses, formbild may be understood as something that *constitutes* the artefact that is created in the process, at the same time as it *is constituted by* it. By making something, the maker produces an artefact in his formbild, at the same time as his formbild is changed by the artefact.

Other studies with a discourse perspective on the artistic field

Several studies take a discourse perspective on the artistic field. Therefore specific examples exist on how such a perspective may function within the artistic field⁸ and the consequences this might herald. It is most common for theorists from different traditions within the social sciences to assume such a perspective (Mangseth, 2004; Jonas, 2004; Foucault, 1969; etc.), but also theoreticians from cultural sciences or theorists that also are makers or in other ways participants in the different artistic fields have worked within this perspective (Sarfatti Larsson, 1993; Hubbard, 1995; Krüger, 2000; Takala-Schreib, 2000; Nerland, 2004; etc).

Sarfatti Larsson emphasizes the importance of the discursive battles within architecture. She implies that they may have stronger significance there, than in other areas because ”the utility, the visibility, and the public character of architecture tend to give its battles a metaphorical significance greater than in other arts and even other professions” (Sarfatti Larson, 1993:18). Takala-Schreib on the other hand underlines the significance of discourses in the making activity *itself*. She goes as far as to allege that:” the discourses and its authorities are doing the design work, not the intentional designers” (Takala-Schreib, 2000).

⁷ Jørgensen og Philips (1999:9) original danish quotation: ” – en diskurs er en bestemt måde at tale om og forstå verden (eller et udsnit af verden) på.” This is an extended variant of Foucault’s definition: ”Vi vil kalde en gruppe af ytringer for diskurs i det omfang, de udgår fra den samme diskursive formation (... Diskursen) består af et begrænset antal ytringer, som man kan definere mulighedsbetingelserne for” (Foucault, 1969:153,172,117 refered and translated by Jørgensen og Philips, 1999:22).

⁸ ‘Artistic field’ is used here in a wide definition, covering fine arts, design, music etc.

My purpose in bringing up the discourse perspective here is not to be as extensive as these studies. I want to open new perspectives on how the process of making a form progress: To understand formbild as a social construction circumscribes and systemizes the complex relationship between design and cultural identity. It is a philosophical shift, moving the focus from the objects or the Kantian relationship between subject – object, to the relationship between individuals, or between individuals and their social setting. To understand formbild as a socially constructed phenomenon allows a perspective on the aesthetic judgement as something dependent on the single persons, their position in the field and the communication in the field.

Connections to Bourdieu's field theory

A formbild lies *between* individuals, and between individuals and the artefacts (as representatives of other individuals). It is therefore situated in the *relations*. “The real is the relational”, Bourdieu says (Bourdieu and Waquant, 1992) when explaining how a social field is built through the meeting of subjects.

The description of formbild as a construction have likenesses to Bourdieu's concept ‘habitus’ It function in much the same way: Habitus, Bourdieu writes, may be understood as the ‘bridge’ between the field and the social, cultural, economical or symbolical capital owned by the agents in the field. It is not a fixed structure, but a system of creative patterns adapted to the objective conditions for its development. This system is capable of generating thought, perceptions and actions corresponding with these conditions (Østerud, 1994:409). As such, habitus is both a structuring structure, and a structured structure. With his habitus concept, Bourdieu emphasizes the understanding of the individual as one that creates and is created by the culture he is a part of.

When pointing to these similarities in function between formbild and habitus, it is important to note that the sociologist Bourdieu never explicitly takes on a discourse perspective. Though he is closing in to such a perspective when he gives;” the agents self-presentation in different discursive performances an ever increasing importance in maintaining social distinctions”⁹ (Illeris, 2002:33). This interpretation is my own, and should not be mistaken as a direct correspondence. Besides, formbild is a situational conditioned concept for what is being developed as a form ideal by the individual, and is not a part of a larger theoretical framework as the concept habitus is.

Nevertheless, also the artistic field as Bourdieu describes it is relevant to a ‘formbild as a construction’ perspective:

The artistic field is the site of an objective oriented and cumulative process engendering works which, from purification to purification, from refinement to refinement, reach levels of accomplishment that decisively set them apart from forms of artistic expressions that are not the product of such a history. (Jameson, 1990:132 as referred to Bourdieu and Waquant (1992:87))¹⁰

⁹ (My translation). Original danish quote: ”agentenes selv fremstilling i forskellige diskursive fremførelser større og større vægt for opretholdelsen af sociale distinktioner”.

¹⁰ This answer was given by Bourdieu on a question from Waquant of Jamesons claim that his work expressed a “blanket condemnation of the aesthetic as a mere class signal and as conspicuous consumption” (Jameson, 1990:132 as referred to Bourdieu and Waquant (1992:87)).

The construction of formbild may be understood parallelly to such a description. In the creative processes the artist develops his formbild, and creates a formbild that reflects this formbild through a purification- and refinement-process. But there is no purification, nor refinement, without context. In the artistic field there are certain recognisable periods or styles, such as 'baroque', 'renaissance', 'classicism' etc. Still, the artists, the architects, artisans or designers in these periods did/do not necessarily regard their work as situated within a set of 'style rules'. Equally likely is it that they work from their own principles or individual, intellectual program. Lawson writes: "Many architects today regard the styles of architecture more as inventions of the critics than a set of rules which they themselves follow" (Lawson, 1990:165), and he quotes Venture saying: "Bernini didn't know he was Baroque... Freud was not a Freudian and Marx was not a Marxist" (Ibid). This perspective supports this article's definition of formbild: as a (possibly unconscious) guide in the creative process. And it still makes it interesting to ask: how do makers develop these individual programs/formbilds, and why are the form indicators in their products so similar that critics may recognise it as a certain 'style'?

The art Bourdieu describes is the 'high-culture-art', made by artists. But formbild can, as a concept, also function in 'lower' or more utilitarian contexts. For example, something as prosaic as the choice of a way to dress is something that constructs a formbild and reflects according to which identity-discourse you want to position yourself. By choosing certain clothes (or furniture or house) you can 1) express an (already chosen) belonging to or distance to a group. This has a social function, a signal effect. Or you can 2) build your (cultural, social, ethnical or personal) identity by carrying visual 'clues' to build an inner structure of self. This selection and development of formbild has an individual function for the person (Jacobson, 1994).

These utilitarian contexts are neither unique, nor random, but they are necessary and unavoidable for the human individual. Sarfatti Larson (1993) describes them as a part of 'the total pattern of life', and refers to Suzanne Langer. The concept formbild is therefore linking sides of the human life to sides of the artists and designers activities. There are certain parallels here, possible to observe and discuss by means of this new concept.

"Not everything is possible in every period"

The focus on formbild as a construction will also cover another aspect. Since formbild is created and re-created by individuals, it is a product of the social practice the individual participates in. This social practice has specific limitations. Gombrich (1993) formulates this as: "Not everything is possible in every period". The question becomes; what is actually possible to do in this particular period, in this social practice? Bourdieu's theory also contains analyses of this kind. He claims that when developing habitus, some realizations seems more or less desirable. The third step in the analysis of a particular artistic field in relation to the field of power covers this aspect: "The analysis involves the genesis of the habitus of occupants of these positions, that is, the systems of dispositions which [...] finding in this position a more or less favourable opportunity to be realized" (Bourdieu, 1996:214).

A comprehensive study of the construction of formbild should cover both the description of the dynamics of the constructive mechanisms, and a description of the limiting and controlling frames around this dynamics. All the time the construction of formbild takes place in the relation between individuals, the main frames controlling the construction will also be found in these relations.

Connections to Foucault's power/knowledge concept

All relations are power relations, according to Foucault (1980). In Foucault's theories power in itself is not 'evil'. It is a functional mechanism *in* the relations between all individuals, and controls how different positions and roles are related to each other. Power relations are henceforth unavoidable. Consequently, what is important to clarify, is how these power-relations function in different situations. If one in a specific situation is not conscious of this power, it will affect randomly. The important object would then be, to use this power without misusing it.

Power is closely linked to knowledge. Foucault constructed the concept *pouvoir-savoir* (power/knowledge¹¹) to describe this relationship. The person 'having' the knowledge, have power because he knows what the 'truth' is and, vice versa, the person having the power, has the power to define what true knowledge is. As 'the gatekeepers' in the different paradigms of science, e.g. they who act as 'peer reviewers' in the most important scientific publications.

This also applies within the artistic field. Some are 'gatekeepers' deciding what is defined as art or not. Who inhabits this position has varied throughout history, from the church and nobility, via museums/galleries and artist's societies, to those having the ear of the right media today. This is neither a simple nor a straight forward issue: if you don't break through the gates of art today, you may just as well continue making your art as a counter-culture, opposition etc. History repeats itself (cf. Van Gogh).

In an educational perspective, which I usually apply in my work, the same questions are asked again and again: What is deemed worthy of teaching, and what achieves good grades. Some are given power to define this through their role in the situation, while others are not. What is interesting is that this is a delicate issue both in education institutions and in the art field in general. We still have a belief in 'free art' and the 'free artist', expressing himself independently of the opinions of others, or what is fashionable. Michl argues strongly against such a view of the maker (in his case, the designer) in his article: *Form follows what? – the modernist notion of function as a carte blanche* (1995).

The more he (the functionalist designer) trusted that the functional starting point guaranteed an objective aesthetic, the less he understood that his aesthetic solutions were in fact addressed to the aesthetic sensitivities and preferences of his peers plus a minority of others endowed with "cultural capital" who shared these sensitivities. (Michl, 1995:12)

In a later article *On seeing Design as Redesign* (2002) Michl elaborates his perspective: "although in one way it is correct to say that designers start from nothing, in another sense it is equally correct to maintain that in practice they can never start from scratch", (Michl, 2002:2). Such a stand is a basis for the understanding of *formbild* as a social construction. This construction is taking place in a social practice with clear limitations as to what is or is not possible.

In 2000 detailed empirical support was given such a perspective by the previously mentioned PhD study of Takala-Schreib (2000). Not surprisingly this was done in Finland, where they

¹¹ In the English translation is the hyphen substituted by a slash: power/knowledge. A much debated change, although Foucault himself used a slash once in a publication. Cf. Colin N Gordon on the Foucault mailing list foucault@lists.village.Virginia.EDU, 13.03.2004

have a long tradition of national engagement in design and strategic use of design as a tool in building a national identity. Takala-Schreib shows how the state-financed institution *Design Forum Finland* argued when choosing what to present in the national design exhibitions in the 1980ies. She concluded:

To be a designer in Finland one has to express attitude and manifest one's theses about the national character of Finnish Design. The dreams of a designer can become significant in Finland when they are understood to have a relationship with the national character of Finnish Design. The national character of Finnish design becomes a delimiting authority of design discourse in Finland. The discourses and its authorities are doing the design work [...] not the intentional designers. The discourses also influence the dreaming of the designer. (Takala-Schreib, 2000)

This is a drastic conclusion, depriving designers much freedom in their process. My intention with the discourse perspective and the concept formbild is not necessarily to conclude so harshly. The main point is to study how this perspective facilitates a study of how the formbild is constructed, not to see this construction as a product of this or another (governmentally approved) discourse.

Closing comments

The concept formbild was constructed to address and maintain a certain perspective when studying form. This perspective focused on the construction of a form ideal (a formbild), hence the *functional* side form ideal, not the *essence* in the formed artefacts (or individuals /society). That is: How the formbild is constructed in the social practice.

It is suggested that such a shift in perspective may make it easier to answer questions like: Why does a group so often agree upon what a 'good form' is?', and why what in one area of society is regarded as good form was and is in other areas regarded as poor? With this particular focus the questions may be answered without ending in indefinite relativism, because, in stead of describing what 'good form' *is* (as something recognisable in the person, the artefact or society), one can describe 'good form' as a *stand* (as a position in a discourse). Thus a chosen form-expression is regarded as a chosen form-position, and as such a contribution to the debate about form. Then focus may move from 'what' to 'how': how do we choose and develop this position. By shifting the focus, the black box 'formbild' may be open. The focus may be turned to the maker whom, the same way as a scientist, begins with an idea, a hunch, a hypothesis, and develops it by checking, testing, re-checking and re-testing it until it becomes a finished artefact.

This does not mean that I claim that scientific studies of the creative process never have been done previously. But I claim that it is possible to understand the processes *another way* with this perspective, and that this way of understanding is freer. It makes it easier to pinpoint what is happening before something is finished, before it becomes something recognisable as an essence (a black-box) in an object, a style or an individual.

Litteraturliste

- Andersen, N.Å. 1999. *Diskursive analysestrategier- Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*. København: Nyt fra Samfundsvidenskaberne.
- Alvesson, M., and K. Sköldbeg. 2000. *Reflexive Methodology - New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1967. *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.
- Bergson, Henri. 1991. Stof og hukommelse. En afhandling om forholdet mellem legeme og ånd. In *Bergson*. Oslo: Tano.
- Boujut, Jean-François, and Henri Tiger. 2003. A socio-technical research method for analyzing and instrumenting the design activity. *Journal of Design Research* 2003 (2).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and J. D. Waquant. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *The rules of art*. London: Blackwell.
- Burr, Vivien. 1995. *An introduction to Social constructionism*. London: Sage.
- Dunin-Woyseth, Halina., and Liv Merete Nielsen. 2004. From Apprentice to Master - Some Notes on Educating Design Scholars and Developing Design Scholarship. In *DesignDialog - designforskning i et demokratisk perspektiv*, red. L. M. Nielsen. Oslo: HiO.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1974. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Travistock.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 - 1977 by Michel Foucault*. Edited by C. Gordon. Brighton: The Harvester Press.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1993 (1953). *Art & Illusion - A study in the psychology of pictorial representation*. London: Phaidon.
- Hubbard jr., Bill. 1995. *A Theory for Practice - Architecture in Three Discourses*. London: MIT-Press.
- Illeris, Helene. 2002. *Billede, pædagogik og magt: postmoderne optikker i det billedpædagogiske felt*. Fredriksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
- Jacobson, M. 1994. *Kläder, språk och handling - om unga kvinnors användning av kläder som kommunikationsmedel*. Ph.D., Umeå Universitets etnologiska skrifter, Umeå Universitet, Umeå.
- Jonas, Wolfgang. 2004. *Mind the gap! - On knowing and not-knowing in design*. Bremen. <http://www.verhaag.net/basicparadox/>
- Jørgensen, M. W. og L. Phillips. 1999. *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode. Samfundslitteratur*. Fredriksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Kruger, Thorolf. 2000. *Teacher Practice, Pedagogical Discourses and the Construction of Knowledge: Two Case Studies of Teachers at Work*. Vol. 1/2000. Bergen: Bergen University College Press.

Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. 1986. *Laboratory Life. The construction of scientific facts*. New Jersey: Princeton University press.

Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action - How to follow scientists and engineers through society?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard university press.

Lawson, Bryan. 1990. *How Designers Think - The Design Process Demystified*. Oxford, Auckland, Boston, Johannesburg, Melbourne, New Delhi: Butterworth architecture.

Mangset, Per. 2004. "Mange er kalt, men få er utvalgt": kunstnerroller i endring, Rapport / Telemarksforskning. Bø; nr 215. Bø: Telemarksforskning-Bø.

Michl, Jan. 1995. Form Follows What? The modernist notion of function as a carte blanche. *Magazine of the Faculty of Architecture & Town Planning*. Winter 1995, 31-20.

Michl, Jan. 2002. On seeing Design as Redesign. An Exploration of a Neglected Problem in Design Education. *Scandinavian Journal of Design History* 2002 (12):7-23.

Nerland, Monika. 2004. *Instrumentalundervisning som kulturell praksis: en diskursorientert studie av hovedinstrumentundervisning i høyere musikkutdanning, NMH-publikasjoner; 2004:1*. Oslo: Norges musikkhøgskole.

Sarfatti Larson, Magali. 1993. *Behind the postmodern facade: architectural change in late twentieth-century America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Takala Schreib, Vuokko. 2000. *Finland designs (exhibitions)- Dreaming in Power of Discourses*. Ph.D, Faculty of Industrial Design, University of Art and Design Helsinki UIAH, Helsinki.

Østerud, Svein. 1994. Handlingsteori: fra livsverden til habitus. I *Politisk kultur: misjon og revolusjon frå Bremnes til Buenos Aires*. Reds. Per Selle og Einar Berntzen. Oslo: Tano

Summary

Artikkelen er en introduserende drøfting av begrepet 'formbilde'. Først presenteres en formstudiekontekst, hvor et behov for å diskutere formideal som konstruksjon blir beskrevet og en mulig måte å gjøre dette på blir foreslått med basis i Latours metode for å åpne 'the black box'. Formbildebegrepet blir introdusert som et redskap for å innta og fastholde perspektivet fra Latours metode. Deretter presenteres og diskuteres begrepet formbilde. Formbilde er en betegnelse på et 'ideal' for form. Det oppstår i mellomrommet mellom personer, ofte via gjenstander. Personene konstruerer sitt formbilde ved aktivt å skape former og observere former. Formbildet fungerer som en, ofte ubevisst, guide i den skapende prosessen. Formbilde betraktes som en konstruert posisjon i en formdiskurs: en vist stillingtaken i forhold til bestemte 'stiler' i samfunnet. Med å betrakte formbilde som en sosial konstruksjon rettes forskningsfokuset på hvordan denne posisjonen inntas og konstrueres. Konstruktivistisk teori, diskursanalyse, Bourdieus felt- og habitusbegrep og Foucaults makt/kunnskaps begrep bringes inn for å diskutere det teoretiske grunnlaget for begrepet formbilde.