plenaries

IAPS Sponsored Plenary
Cultural Awareness: Transatlantic Perspectives On Environment-behaviour Research

Papers:
David Uzzell
Jan Teklenburg
Gabriel Moser
Discussants:
Gary Evans
Cornell University
Andrew Seidel
Texas A&M University

The coming together of EDRA and IAPS for the EDRA32 Conference in Edinburgh is a unique occasion. Both organisations have a relatively short but distinguished history in terms of the role they have played in the development of environment-behaviour research. Virtually every significant figure in EB research since its inception in the 1960's has been a member of one or other organisation. For this invited Board Session, the IAPS Board has the wish that it should symbolise in both nature and outcome the coming together of both organisations so that they learn from each other and see opportunities for closer collaboration either at an institutional or an individual member level over the coming years. It is also our intention that this session should be as involving as possible for both memberships. The three papers in this session - analysing the research background, interests and activities of the IAPS membership, a content analysis of recent contributions to the IAPS Bulletin and a content analysis of the papers submitted to IAPS16 Conference in Paris - will provide an overview of the interests of IAPS members and perspectives on current international environment-behaviour research. This will be followed by reflections on the presentations from leading EDRA members who will discuss the presentations from the perspective of North American research and EDRA interests. We would like to use three contributions as a starting point for a discussion about similarities and differences between EDRA and IAPS, and how our organisations may assist and support each other in the future.

A Commonwealth of Perspectives

David Uzzell
Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, UK
IAPS President

IAPS has just over 270 members from over 40 countries with each continent represented. It is equally catholic in terms of the disciplines from which it draws its members. When the membership database for the Association was designed a few years go, it was decided to collect information on the disciplines, the research interests and current research projects of the membership. IAPS endeavours to publish this information in the Membership Directory every two or so years. We see this as a useful service that we can provide the membership as it aids communication and networking amongst our members, one of the principal published objectives of the Association. This paper will discuss the results of a discursive analysis of the membership database for what it tells us about the research interests of IAPS members and by implication the current orientation and priorities of environment-behaviour research internationally.

Keywords from IAPS16: Opening Doors on Current Environment-Behaviour Research

Gabriel Moser
Laboratoire de Psychologie Environnementale,
Université René Descartes-Paris V, France
IAPS Conference and Network Co-ordinator and Organiser of IAPS16

The last IAPS conference held in Paris in July 2000, was an occasion to look at the state of the art of environment-behaviour research from the point of view of IAPS. The conference theme "Metropolis 21st century: Cities, Social Life and

Sustainable Development, Which Perspectives?" provided an opportunity for social and environmental scientists as well as researchers and practitioners from the planning, engineering and design professions from 40 different countries, to discuss the way they see tomorrow's metropolis in the light of sustainable development. A content analysis of the 298 papers and symposia presented at the conference reveals three main directions:

(1) Cities at the crossroads (cities in transformation, cities in extension, urban transformations); environmental management; urban policies; towards sustainable urban environments; history and memory of places.

(2) People-built environment interactions (transport behaviour; urban way of life; housing and neighbourhood; specific environments and environments for specific groups (workplaces, therapeutic environments, environments for children, for elderly, etc.); urban diversity and place identity; residential satisfaction and quality of life.

(3) People's relation to nature and natural resources; human experience and behaviour; public and natural spaces, parks, recreational spaces, etc.; ecological concern.

Reflections on the IAPS Bulletin

Jan A.F. Teklenburg
Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning,
Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
IAPS Bulletin Editor

For a large part the current state of research interests of the IAPS membership is reflected in the Bulletin of People-Environment Studies. A series of feature articles, research reports and announcements of activities can be summarized in a concise number of topics that cover the current research interests and practices of the IAPS membership (alphabetical order):

• Children and youth, topics being applied to home, school, playground, and urban environments;

• Cyberspace and the influence of new technologies on the meaning of place, home and urban ways of life.

• Environment and health issues, including gerontology;

• Environmental cognition, both from the individual's point of view and as seen from the impact of the environment on environmental cognition processes, including the meaning of place;

• Housing, including housing policy, management, and the meaning of home;

• Sustainable developments, including environmental management, risk and safety, the meaning and preservation of traditional environments, and the role of architectural history;

It is typical of IAPS that these issues are being addressed both at the level of the individual and at a group (or societal) level. No topic seems to be exclusive to any specific scientific field. They are, on the contrary, addressed by social scientists, designers, planners and practitioners alike.

Cultural Identity And The Natural Environment: From Parliament To Park

Professor Seaton Baxter OBE
Emeritus Professor, Faculty of Design, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland

The Scots from Loudon to Geddes and Muir to Fraser Darling have made major contributions to the evolution of environmental sentience and its public recognition. John Muir in particular played a major role in the establishment of the North American National Park system and was lauded in N. America long before he was finally applauded in Scotland. Only recently has it been decided that Scotland should have its own unique form of National Park system and consultations are currently the focus of attention for the Cairngorms, one of Scotland's key mountain areas. The idea of National Parks in an international context contains multiple meanings and to this the Scottish system has added a new dimension by linking National Parks with 'Sustainable Development', rather than with 'wilderness'. How will this reflect an old or new identity for Scots?

In this session, participants will be presented with a brief history of the debate on National Parks in Scotland culminating only recently in an agreement to establish several National Parks beginning with Loch Lomond and the Trossachs and then the Cairngorms, Key features of the Cairngorms debate will be outlined and an overview of the preparations and consultation process will be discussed. However the main issue for discussion with participants will be the fusion of two concepts - national park and sustainable development. The advantages and disadvantages and

9

the ideals and difficulties of trying to wed a new concept - sustainable development - with an old one - national park - which carries a variety of historical and cultural associations will be explored. International debate and comment will be encouraged and examples from countries other than Scotland will be welcomed. The relationship of cultural identity and natural environment will be used to bind the multiple aspects of the discussion.

People In Design Education: Emerging Paradigms And Cross-cultural Visions
Necdet Teymur, Magda Sibley, Sandra Horne, Ashraf Salama and Martin Edge

Most people who attend either the EDRA or IAPS conferences and work in a design environment, particularly within universities, express some delight at finding themselves amongst so many like-minded individuals. Many bemoan the fact that they feel isolated amongst their peers back at the University, as one of only a very few people doing environment-behaviour research. Again and again we hear the view that such research, and indeed any rational consideration of the role of people in the design of the built environment, is considered to be a marginal activity amongst the mainstream of architects in education. We have heard views expressed, by studio teachers, such as - "Oh, participation in design, that's so sixties" - as though whether or not one designs for people were merely a matter of fashion. A session at the IAPS conference in Paris in 2000 concluded, more or less, that environment-behaviour research had made no real advances in becoming accepted into the mainstream of the architectural studio in the last 25 years.

Many views have been expressed about the reasons for this bias, but whatever the details, it is clear that they reside in the tradition of architectural education as it has evolved over the centuries, primarily in Europe. The old idea of architecture as craft and the architect as master builder gave way to the Beaux Artes tradition and romantic ideas about 'creative genius' and high art. This fundamentally western approach has not lent itself well to the detailed consideration of the social and psychological consequences of design decisions.

Whilst the problem might thus be said to lie in a paradigm deeply embedded in European and North American approaches to architectural education, attempts to address it have also largely come from people working in the same areas. Attendance at EDRA and IAPS

conferences is dominated by people from developed, mostly western countries. When people from the developing world do attend it is perhaps with the implicit assumption that they have come to learn, in one way or another, from the more 'advanced First World'. This is not specifically a criticism of EDRA or IAPS, it is the predominant approach taken, in many disciplines, by people from richer countries to people from poorer countries.

In the case of environment-behaviour studies in design education however, the irony is that it is the paradigm adopted, and aggressively exported, by the west, which creates the problem in the first place.

This Plenary investigates whether in this area the developing world may have something to teach the developed world. In parts of the world with less of a tradition of architecture as 'high art' and a pragmatic need to deliver liveable, affordable built environments, are there different paradigms in operation which can inform the improvement of the situation in western architectural education?

The four presenters are from Turkey, Algeria, Brazil and Egypt. Each has experience of introducing a human, social dimension in design education. More general conclusions for the educational process can be drawn from their specific examples, challenging Western thought on architectural education. The Plenary presents a critical analysis of studio teaching practices of the west and their impact on the design studio in the developing world.

Abstracts of Individual Contributions

Built Environment Education and the 'others'
Necdet Teymur, PhD
Professor of Architecture, METU, Ankara

Is the world a divided or a unified one? Alternatively, as an Indian sage is reported as saying, is it pointless to try to bring things together when they are already together? If this wisdom is true, the question would be, what sort of togetherness things are in?

The world is full of variety and differences - geographical, biological, cultural, political and economical. Yet, for the past fifty years, a convenient tripartite classification was imposed on this variety: three Worlds the 'First' and the 'Second' ones of which are seldom mentioned and the 'Second' one seems to have disappeared in the late '80s! In any case, there are as many differ-

ences within each as between them, and there could be pockets of all the 'worlds' within each society, country or city.

Where does (or do?) the (so-called) 'built environment' stand in such a complex world? Who does what and where to what? Can there be a uniform object of study, design or education, or a manageable method of studying, designing or teaching/learning it/them? Who defines, designs, builds, unbuilds, perceives, maps, appropriates, uses, ... them and how? What is the role of research - theoretical or empirical? And, where do the architectural, planning, design, social sciences, humanities, or built environment education stand with respect to the dominant forces operative in these 'uneven' worlds?

Is so-called 'globalisation' that new, or has it always existed in buildings, cities, cultures (and academic culture for that matter!)? Who patronises who, who purchases who, who dominates who and what? Who actually builds (and unbuilds) 'environment'? In this context, can education be 'performed' anywhere, say, as a neutral procedure with standard templates of objectives, content, methods and outcome? And, can and should this relative unevenness within and between the numbered 'Worlds' be of any concern of education? If so, why is there so little in E-B and similar areas of research on these issues? More crucially, are the present E-B studies, BE research and mainly professional architectural and planning education capable of tackling such issues with their existing tools and traditions? Finally, assuming that there is the will to pay more attention to the whole world, is it possible to bridge the knowledge gaps in education without bridging the gaps in the very knowledge of education?

References:

Further discussion by the author on these matters can be found in
* 'Architectural Education in a Divided World', in Architectural Education, No.2, 1983, pp. 84-93 * Architectural Education - Issues in educational practice and policy, London, ?uestion Press, 1992.

* 'Designs on a European Edifice', in P Neale (ed): Facing the European Challenge - the role of the professions in a wider Europe, Vol.2: Issues for Professional Practice, CPE, Leeds, 1996, pp.104-112.

* 'Housing as the 'Other'', in E Komut (ed): Housing Question of the Others, Habitat II / Chamber of Architects, Ankara, 1996, pp.7-36.

* 'Uneven development of people and places', in A Awotona and N Teymur (Eds), Tradition, Location and Community - Place-making and Development, Aldershot, Avebury, 1997, pp.21-29.

* 'Third World Urban Development', in P L Knox and P Ozolins (Ed.s), Design Professionals and the Built Environment, N York / London, J Wiley & Sons, 2000, Ch.14, pp.141-149.

The International Dimension in Architectural Education

Dr. Magda Sibley
Senior Lecturer in Architecture,
The University of Huddersfield, UK

Based on the experience of the Department of Architecture at the University of Huddersfield (UK) in running a unique International course, the paper illustrates the educational benefits of running intensive study periods abroad in a totally different social and cultural environment. The students (mostly British) live and work together for a period of four weeks in an overseas location. The academic programme is usually hosted by a local school of Architecture and allows the Huddersfield University students to interact with the local students through a series of small projects. The academic program overseas comprises daily lectures, seminars and architecture and urban design studio sessions, based on sites that illustrate the different challenges the city under study faces. Previous locations included Cairo, Amman and Fez.

Students spend the first two weeks analysing different urban infill sites in view of developing a master plan proposal, which is finalised before returning to the UK. Individual buildings within these proposals are subsequently developed in Huddersfield and form the basis of the students' final year comprehensive design project.

This experience has widened the students' perspectives, encouraging them to examine certain concepts in architecture and urban design, which remain otherwise unchallenged. The interaction between students and the local staff, through a series of studio sessions, has helped to establish the link between education and practice, theory and reality. The feasibility of certain proposals was discussed in the light of the experience of the local staff and the complexity of the various factors that are at play in real life. This interaction with the local students and staff triggered some innovative which gave a new perspective and a fresh approach to a particular problem.

The paper makes an appeal for encouraging the bringing together of architecture students from different schools, from the North and South to work together on sites located in a different geographical and cultural region than their own. The educational benefits are enormous for all those involved.

The Evolution of Environment-Behaviour Studies and Architectural Education in Brazil

Dr Vicente del Rio
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Dr Sandra Christine Horne
Goldsmiths College London, UK
Dr Paulo A. Rheingantz
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

This presentation will attempt to track the evolution of environment-behaviour studies in Brazil, with emphasis in the application in architectural education. E&B studies and applied research in the design process is still dealt with only by a small group of researchers and is scattered and fragmented throughout the nearly 200 schools of architecture in Brazil. Although the modernist approach to design methods still prevail, in the last decade there has been a growth of interest in the production of more responsive and responsible architectural process, reflecting in the strengthening of areas such as POE and in Environment and Behaviour studies. The first international seminar on "Psychology and the Built Environment" that took place in Rio de Janeiro in August 2000 represented a first attempt to identify the state-of-the-art, and to contribute to the discussion of possible directions in collaborative research and teaching. We will briefly evaluate the results of this seminar as a means for the development of a more cohesive field in Brazil. Our brief study of the evolution of E&B studies and architectural education in Brazil mapped groups that have been developing research for the past decades, from a variety of theories and approaches, inspired by authors such as Piaget, Sommer, Vigotsky, Tuan, Lynch, Lowenthal, Bachelard, Bechtel, Sanoff, Rapoport, Ponty, Geertz, Freire, etc.

Toward a Knowledge Based Architectural Pedagogy and Practice:
The Design Studio under the Microscope!

Ashraf M. A. Salama PhD.
Chairman of the Department of Architecture,
Misr International University, Cairo, Egypt

Architectural education, as other kinds of educational disciplines, conveys, conserves, and transmits the values of its profession and society at large. Since architecture is created in a field of tension between reason, emotion, and intuition, design education in architecture is the manifestation of the ability to conceptualise, co-ordinate and execute the idea of building rooted in the tradition of humanism. Although considerable differences in the process of educating future architects around the world do exist, there is one striking similarity; the overriding primacy given to the studio as the main forum for creative exploration, interaction and assimilation. The design studio is the melting pot of different types of knowledge thereby occupying the core of the education of architects. It is the kiln where future architects are moulded. It is the primary space where budding professionals explore their creative skills. Thus, the attitudes imbibed in the studio are those that young graduates take to the profession. In essence, it is the testing ground for all other types of knowledge gained to make purposeful and meaningful built environments. It is no longer a debatable issue that while architects are able to manage individual buildings well enough, the overall built environment is increasingly mismanaged.

This paper is culled from a wide spectrum of issues I have explored throughout my research, investigation and teaching over the last decade. The objective is to introduce futuristic polemics for architectural pedagogy and practice by examining the role of the design studio in shaping the future of the profession. It bases its argument on the importance of internalising relevant social and ethical approaches to the design studio that elucidate the role of the architect in society and that form a basis for future professional judgement. It envisions the present value system imbided in design studio as inappropriate to the professional milieu, which in turn results in the reduction of the effectiveness of the profession in society.

The paper investigates the paradigm shifts in architecture as educational and professional discipline, and introduces five architect role models that are analysed in terms of attitudes and characteristics, then reflected

and compared with these shifts. Three basic changes exemplify the paradigm shifts. These are 1) things vs. relations between things, 2) isolating economy and ecology vs. integrating them and 3) mechanistic pedagogy vs. systemic pedagogy. The role models contrasted with these shifts are the egoist, the pragmatist, the technical assistance giver, the advocate, and the facilitator.

The current architectural/design studio pedagogy (conventional approach) has been assessed by employing two basic strategies, a content analysis of the available theoretical literature, and a literature review of the results of the surveys conducted over the last two decades. The results of this assessment are decomposed into content, process, and teaching style. The assessment of the conventional approach reveals very alarming negative tendencies and shortcomings. In response to this situation several revolutionary concepts have been developed by several educators who attempt to respond to the new demands placed in the profession by society and to the changing role of the architect. They are analysed and contrasted with the conventional approach, which is a direct inheritance from educational systems not equipped to face contemporary developments. The models are presented as studio-teaching methods committed to identifying the studio objectives, problems and processes, as important factors for making the process of decision making clear and transparent. This in turn can enhance students' abilities in controlling the quality of their designs, allowing them to questions environmental needs and constraints. They are also committed to incorporating knowledge with its application in solving particular environmental design problems, with emphasis placed on setting pedagogical objectives and utilising teaching techniques that help develop critical and contingent thinking abilities.

The parallelism of the emergence of these revolutionary concepts as teaching models and the emergence of new architect role models asserts that some corresponding changes in design studio teaching practices are in high demand. In order to result in change, it is essential that these models be adopted, redefined, and adapted to specific norms defined by cultural, environmental, and social needs, rather than new models being developed, in similitude to reinventing the wheel. The paper ends by two frameworks, each of which represents a set of assumptions. On the one hand, the first model places emphasis on the impact of the current design studio on future architects, portraying different influences of studio culture on students, practitioners and the overall environment of the profession. On the other hand, the second introduces ways in which the knowledge base of the studio can be expanded toward a better future professional practice.