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The different contributions to this special anniversary issue show clearly that, during the last 25 years, IAPS has achieved a lot and it still has a fantastic potential. As Roderick Lawrence states, “the contribution of IAPS members to both theoretical and applied research has been significant”. Byron Mikellides points out that the substantial multidisciplinary knowledge in this field has contributed to a change in teaching programmes and practices in architecture.

The recent shift to green psychology shows how much people-environment relations is in phase with societal concerns. This shift also shows that the basic factors that made IAPS exist and functioning are still working. On one side, from its beginnings, the main concern of IAPS has been driven by architects around the question of how architects can respond to individual and collective needs, and to the “quality of life” of residents well before this crucial concept became mainstream. The fact that such questions can only be answered by looking at real people in the real world was, without any doubt, an important reason for the interest of psychologists, and as a result, as Rikard Küller notes, “IAPS mainly deals with environmental psychology”.

Considerations that architectural psychology deals with the impact of the environment upon people whereas green psychology deals with the impact of people on the environment are misleading. The relation between social sciences, specifically psychology, and the building professions still is not as clear as one might expect. Are the social sciences expected to respond to questions formulated by architects, or is their task to point to problems concerning the relation of people to their living spaces? Of course, IAPS contributions can only be of some utility to society if we are concerned by this second rational. It is not looking at what people do to the environment, nor what the environment does to them, but looking at people’s interaction with the environment that allows us to respond to societal problems. It is in this framework that David Canter advocates the pertinence of the psychology of place.

The human dimension is very valuable within IAPS. Thanks to its central position IAPS can remain what it is now, a unique interdisciplinary and intercultural platform for the study of people - environment relations. Indeed, IAPS is an outstanding place for interdisciplinary discussion. This is certainly one of the main achievements of IAPS during the past 25 years. IAPS has not only been a platform for discussion among disciplines, it has also opened space for interdisciplinary collaborations, even if, as Sue-Anne Lee states, such collaborations sometimes turned out to be more difficult than expected. Those exchanges are only possible if they take place around a unifying rational. This common reference is the concept of “Quality of Life”. People-environment studies deal with quality of life, whether it is in the framework of architectural psychology or the concerns of green psychology. We can only agree with David Uzzell when he notes that we have to be more aware of consequences, and put even more emphasis on the importance of the quality of life of everybody. Of course, quality of life also challenges architecture and the design professions by underlining the importance of constructing healthy environments which fit all users. In other words, to design with “people in mind”.

IAPS presidents have to endorse the essential role of building and maintaining bridges between all the disciplines that are concerned with people-environment relations. The challenges for the future will be to emphasize cultural differences even more, and to look increasingly in the direction of the developing countries in order to better understand and integrate the problems that, using the words of David Uzzell, the people from the two-thirds world are facing. What can they teach us and how can their problems be integrated in order to better understand the conditions of quality of life and sustainability? Indeed, our task, as Arza Churchman says, is to contribute to make the world a better place for people, wherever they live.

Gabriel Moser
President of IAPS
email: gabriel.moser@univ-paris5.fr
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The current IAPS Board has invited me to edit this special issue of the IAPS Bulletin dedicated to the 25th anniversary of the Association. The main purpose of this publication is to recall the origins and initial development of IAPS and highlight some achievements during the last 25 years. This short history has not been recorded elsewhere and it may be unknown to younger researchers and practitioners. Unfortunately, there is not enough space in this issue to identify and explain the key contributions and major changes in research topics since the 1960s, but this is a worthy enterprise that could be completed in the future.

It has been an interesting and enjoyable task to invite the Past President’s and some of the founders of IAPS to recall the foundations of the Association and its development. Although IAPS was formally constituted 25 years ago, the emergence of the Association is earlier, as several of the authors in this special issue remind us. Since the 1960s, there have been numerous developments in the field which started with the shared concerns of psychologists and architects who founded “architectural psychology”. Today the field has become more diversified and is often referred to as “people-environment studies” with theoretical and empirical contributions from several disciplines and professions.

It is worthwhile recalling that IAPS was founded and has developed owing to the devotion and commitment of people who have given their time for unpaid work as an elected Board member, as a co-ordinator of an IAPS network, as a contributor or editor of an issue of the newsletter or bulletin, as an organizer of or an international conference, a symposium, or a young researchers workshop. On behalf of all past and present IAPS members, I express sincere thanks to each and everyone of them.

I served on the IAPS Board for 16 years, and in the role of Treasurer from 1994 to 2002. I founded the IAPS Housing Network in 1988. Since then this Network has held meetings at each of the main IAPS conferences, and it has organized a number of international symposia on other occasions. At the IAPS 19 Conference in Alexandria, for example, participants at the IAPS Housing Network Meeting debated the main benchmarks in housing research since the 1960s. The result of this debate confirms that the contribution of some IAPS members to both theoretical and applied research has been significant.

At the beginning of the 1990s I wrote that IAPS was at the crossroads. Fortunately, the IAPS Board listened to that message. Since then the achievements of IAPS have been numerous, and membership of the Association has grown in number and geographical distribution.

The last 25 years of IAPS clearly shows that there is a need for an international association that serves as an open forum for the sharing of ideas and research results by people concerned with people-environment relations from all continents of the world irrespective of their ethnic origin, their religious beliefs or their political affiliations. There is little doubt that if IAPS continues to provide this open forum, which can be facilitated by new communication technology, then the Association will...
be sustained as an international, intercultural and interdisciplinary platform.

I hope that all readers of this special issue will find the content of interest. I sincerely thank David Canter, Rikard Kuller, Sue-Ann Lee, Gilles Barbey, Martin Symes, Arza Churchman, David Uzzell, Byron Mikellides and Duncan Joiner, for their contribution to commemorating the 25th anniversary of IAPS.

Figure 1: The IAPS 25th Anniversary session held during the IAPS 19 Conference in the Bibliotheca Alexandrina. From left to right: Roderick Lawrence, Gilles Barbey, David Uzzell and Gabriel Moser.
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Dalandhui is the name of the country retreat owned at that time by Strathclyde University, on the shores of Loch Lomond, a short drive North of Glasgow. Its idyllic isolation made a curiously intense setting for the 50 or so people who met there for the first conference to introduce Architectural Psychology into Europe, over the weekend of 28th February to 2nd March 1969. I had organized what became known as the Dalandhui Conference having just completed my PhD on the psychological implications of open plan office design, after a degree in psychology at Liverpool University. I was working as a psychologist within the School of Architecture at Strathclyde in the Building Performance Research Unit established by Tom Markus. So the label “Architectural Psychology” with direct analogy to Educational or Industrial psychology seemed an obvious one for a conference to launch the new discipline we were developing.

I had just turned 25 and had all the confident optimism of my youth. I thought Architectural Psychology was an inevitable area for the development of psychological theories and methods in ways that would help architects to do their job properly. I and the others who readily agreed to give papers had the arrogance, so often found in the behavioural sciences, that our empirical research would effortlessly open the way to a new humane architecture.

Looking back on the papers that were published in a book by the Architectural Press for the sum of £2 15s (Canter, 1970) it is interesting to see the variety of topics which were covered, all of which are still relevant today but most of which have fallen out of fashion as “green” studies have taken over. For example, there were laboratory based experimental studies such as that from Ian Griffiths on thermal comfort or Ifor Payne’s innovative comparison of pupillary responses of architects and non-architects when looking at pictures of buildings.
There were also reports of field studies including David Walters’ examination of railway noise annoyance and Gordon Best’s forward looking study of direction-finding in buildings. I reported a study of space use in lecture theatres with different seating arrangements to show how students actively make use of space in relation to their understanding of what they think will happen in that space.

The emphasis was distinctly at the scale of building and the focus on the users of buildings. Only Terence Lee, recounting the studies he had carried out a few years earlier, of the meaning of “neighbourhood”, dealt with larger scale environments. But even this work only dealt with local aspects of people’s experience rather than broader environmental implications.

There was a lot of soul searching in many presentations; a call for appropriate theories and methodologies, consideration of the differences between psychology and architecture, and how psychology could influence architecture. Importantly, I recall no discussion of how architecture could influence psychology other than the plea to get psychologists out of their laboratories.

This was an era when some psychologists in the UK were beginning to shake off the chains of behaviourism and the aping of what they thought were the methods of hard science. For me this was most clearly articulated in George Kelly’s Personal Construct Theory. The title of one of my papers captured this; “should we treat building users as subjects or objects?” Reflecting a perspective on models of how people treat each other that I realise still exists in my work today 35 years later when I consider whether serial killers treat their victims as people, vehicles or objects.

The Prologue I wrote (under the title Environics in the wild, pity but the term never caught on) for that volume resulting from this first conference captures some of the healthy enthusiasm of those early days in which all involved saw the clear potential for a productive interaction between architecture and psychology and our desire “to entice the outsider into the field of architectural psychology”. Part of this enthusiasm arose from no-one being at all sure what the field really covered or what the appropriate methodologies or theories were for the development of the field. There was also interesting, and I think still relevant, discussions of what the roles of architectural psychologists should be. Bill Hilier, notably, who went on to develop the widely used “space syntax”, raised the fundamental point of what architecture should be taken to be, criticising psychologists for being too lax in their definition of environment.

The whole consideration of a psychology of buildings and architecture had been gaining momentum since Peter Manning set up the Pilkington Research Unit in the Department of Building Science and employed a psychologist, Brian Wells (my PhD supervisor) to contribute to multidisciplinary studies of Schools and Offices. This work had its roots in surveys conducted after the Second World War for the UK government as preparation for guidelines on housing design, due to the awareness of the need for the rebuilding of the country after the devastation of aerial bombardment. However, it was the establishment of a unit with the clear aim of evaluating the performance of buildings by Tom Markus that drew me into a milieu where I could see the wide range of possibilities for psychological contributions to architecture.

The affiliation of the dozen contributors to the Dalandhui volume shows how much this field was the child of developments in architectural thinking. Gordon Best, Ivor Stilitz, and Peter Stringer were at the Bartlett School of Architecture and Bill Hillier was soon to take up a post there. David Walters was at Birmingham School of Architecture and Ifan Payne at the Welsh School of Architecture in Cardiff, from where Tom Markus had recently come to take up the Chair in Building Science at Strathclyde University. He moved there after association with Peter Manning’s Pilkington Research Unit, where he had worked on the building science and perceptual challenges of window design. Ian Griffiths,
that were being introduced into schools of architecture. By the mid 1970’s, most Schools of Architecture in the UK had a reasonable amount of psychology being taught by psychologists. Indeed when I meet practicing architects today who qualified during the 1970’s they speak of their awareness of a psychological perspective on architecture that they imbibed during their training. In contrast, on the rare occasions when architecture students contact me these days they express surprise that there is actual a named field of scholarship that links psychology and architecture. 

The attraction to many psychologists, and certainly to me, of the opportunities provided by Schools of Architecture was that they opened up the possibilities of a psychology that was not so rigid and experimentally based as was then (and sadly often still is) the norm in many Departments of Psychology. We did not need to study the behaviour or pigeons, goldfish, or rats, or get undergraduates to press buttons in response to flashing lights, or even get psychiatric patients to carry out obscure tests that bore little relationship to their personal pain or difficulties in dealing with the world. In architecture we had ordinary people in real life. They may be patients in hospital, or children in schools, people relaxing in their living rooms, or walking their dogs in the park, office workers trying to cope with heat and noise, or elderly residents of a nursing home trying to find some interest in life. The people we studied were not to be constrained by the demands of some rigid set of hypotheses or some artificially contrived experimental setup. For me this freedom opened-up a pathway that has taken me to a very wide range of topics, as varied as human behaviour in emergencies, the study of serial killers and rapists, and more recently prisoners’ experience of incarceration.

There were, almost inevitably, many different cross-currents that undermined the possibilities of the field of Architectural Psychology achieving its potential at the core of architecture, planning and design, as we all had hoped, and some had believed, was possible at Dlandhui. One of the problems we discovered very early on was that in simple direct terms, outside of extreme conditions which can be easily determined, the environment does not directly affect behaviour. So the architectural quest for a few pointers on how to design
a building that would make people happy was doomed to failure. Of course social scientists are adept at inventing labels for this discovery, talking about environmental “interaction” or “transaction”, to capture the fact that it is social processes that influence what is acceptable in any location, and thus how it is experienced, and the physical surroundings may either help or hinder that, but they do not cause the actions or reactions.

This realisation set in motion the natural process of psychologists and other social scientists drifting towards studies of people and their reactions, or indeed examination of what they do to environments, rather than what the environment does to them. Such studies quickly lose interest to an architect who may want, for example, some evidence to support his desire to make the external wall of a building curved even though his client may tell him it will make the building twice as expensive. If the influence of the physical environment is indirect at best, and possibly non-existent, then social scientists are free to indulge their old addiction for opinion questionnaires and attitude surveys. The whole field therefore slipped away from being an applicable branch social science drawing on many different disciplines to being just another area of social psychology focusing on attitudes and how to change them. This lends itself well to the social scientists’ interpretation of “sustainability” but reduces our influence on these crucial matters for human survival in the same way that we lost any influence within architecture.

To my mind our central weakness in architectural psychology was that we insisted on defining our research problems in terms that were drawn from psychology rather than engaging directly with what it is that architects do. To give a concrete example, instead of my earlier fictional one of curved walls, I was once asked to give guidance on the design of a casino. To provide this guidance I observed what went on there and interviewed staff and management as well as going round a number of casinos with a friend who was an experienced (and reasonably successful) gambler – described in my book Psychology in Practice. From this I built up a model of the patterns of activities and their interrelationships, the particular physical demands that some of these activities required and some of the preferred modes of us, for example gamblers, like to face the croupier across the gaming table, not from the side if possible. In addition I explored the meanings of the place to the various users and expressed that in a way that the architect could draw on to influence his own creative invention of the appropriate design. This whole bundle provided a framework for the architect to engage with, but specified very few hard and fast details.

What is especially interesting about this approach is that what is being offered are systematic summaries of a complex process informed by a theory (The Psychology of Place) of how people interact with and make use of their surroundings. The contribution for science is not a set of facts or finding but a way of thinking about processes. This may seem very abstract but as Kurt Lewin said “there is nothing so applicable as a good theory”. I have recently seen the power of this in a Scottish court case in which I appeared as an expert witness, specifically employed as an environmental psychologist. The case was brought by a Mr Napier who claimed that his imprisonment was inhuman and degrading and therefore illegal under Article 3 of the European Convention on Human Rights. It is instructive to quote directly what the judge said in his argument for why he found in favour of Mr Napier, quoting directly from my evidence:

1. Within the cell, the lack of opportunity to create appropriate “places” for activities, most notably the lack of a distinct place of excretion and associated washing facilities.

Figure 3: A prisoner’s cell, for Mr Napier and many others, who are obliged to appropriate this institutional setting as a personal space. Appropriation has been an important topic in architectural psychology.
2. The sharing of the cell, causing the lack of possibility for creating a “personal space” and distinct area or “territory” for his own activities.

3. The pressure of overcrowding and lack of enough facilities, on the landing and in the block, on the opportunities there might otherwise have been for hygiene, recreation and “psychological release”.

4. The arbitrariness yet excessive control of the regime over the minutiae of daily activities.

5. The impact of Mr Napier’s eczema on his ability to make use of coping strategies that may have alleviated the brutalising quality of his incarceration.

6. The uncertainties associated with being on remand.

7. In my opinion, these conditions interact to create circumstances that in total are more debilitating and dehumanising than could reasonably be expected for imprisonment.”

He said “that view is consistent with the impact that the conditions did in fact have upon the petitioner”. In other words, as any student of architectural psychology will recognise, the judge completely accepted the relevance and importance of a conceptual analysis that was derived directly from a quarter of a century or more of the study of how people use and experience their surroundings.

Besides the theoretical challenges of determining how the environment has an impact, and the weaknesses of a perspective that ignores what the decision makers we are trying to interact with are actually doing, there is a third process that has undermined the possibilities for the development of the field. This is rarely mentioned because we pretend science is neutral and untrammelled by mundane concerns. But the simple fact is that very few architecture departments are willing to promote people who are not trained architects. There are exceptions and a notable few (many whom I suspect may read this essay) have risen to senior levels in architecture without being “architects”. For the less effective and/or fortunate career development is only possible within a social science department. There are a few consultancies, mainly in the USA, that employ psychologists on design and planning projects, but it is the nature of consultancy that it does not contribute a great deal to the development of the discipline. Anything of commercial value is kept in-house and there is often no time or particular incentive to develop for publication the non-commercial work. So psychologists interested in architecture and the environment drift into university departments of many different hues, whether it is psychology, health studies, or education. Once there they have to hold their own against colleagues in the department’s discipline, removing them even further from direct engagement with environmental decision makers.

Within this framework the rather ambiguous term “environmental psychology” is much more attractive than the limited professional orientation implied by “architectural psychology”, or the even vaguer variants on “people-environment studies” or even “social ecology”. Once released from the pull of architecture I and other psychologists began to explore issues that were more obviously within the realms of the behavioural sciences. My book The Psychology of Place was one of the first results of this, really combining aspects of Barker’s “ecological psychology” and Kelly’s “personal construct theory” (although perhaps I did not realise at the time I wrote it how much I had drawn on their pioneering work). This looked at the larger scale environment following up some of the issues Terence Lee had raised in his studies of neighbourhoods, drawing on the work of Bartlett to consider the mental representations people developed and used to help them make sense of their surroundings. The strongly cognitive component of these issues meant that they were soon absorbed into mainstream psychology in the work of such leading psychologists as Niesser or Gibson.

A particular strength of this work, though, remains from the early initiatives within the profession of architecture. Rather than turning the study of mental maps into a laboratory based problem, which would have been so easy, the psychology of place is still very much an exploration of how
people do actually make sense of their world. This meant that when I was asked if I could “help catch a man before he killed yet again” (as I discuss in my book Criminal Shadows) I thought of this criminal as making use of his surrounding like anyone else in his situation might.

This enabled me to make sense of the pattern of rapes and murders in order to determine where the offender may have lived at the time of his offences. This turned out to be very helpful to the police.

With that intervention I realised there was a whole range of applications to police work that paralleled what we had thought through with architects. Police were also decision makers like architects were supposed to be, so I started to develop the idea of an “Investigative Psychology”. But I determined from the outset that we would not make the same mistake as we had made in architecture. From the very beginning we sought to work directly with the police and to understand not only their decision processes but also the most effective ways of supporting those decisions. To be fair, it is probably much easier to contribute to the core of police work than to the core of architecture. We are concerned directly with the actions of people, even though they are criminals, rather than with the indirect consideration of building forms that may or may not have relevance to human actions, but certainly have relevance to how architects are evaluated by their colleagues and potential clients. Their evaluation by prospective clients may have little to do with the issues to which psychologists can contribute directly, but the understanding of where an offender may live is of immediate significance to a detective.

It also turns out, as I discovered very fortuitously in the case that led to the conviction of John Duffy, that many criminals have patterns of spatial behaviour that yield interesting results when interpreted from the point of view of the sort of mental maps they imply. I was able to explore this possibility in direct application to a number of investigations as I describe in my recent book Mapping Murder. We have now been able to take that even further and develop decision support systems, such as my software Dragnet, that can be used directly by police officers.

All this may seem a long way from the Dalandhui conference, but the pathway feels very straightforward for me. However, along the way I, like many other architectural and environmental psychologists have left aside very many important questions. This is a pity because I fear the current explorations of psychological contributions to sustainable environments are making many of the mistakes we made at Dalandhui. They are exploring abstract global attitudes in isolation of what it is that environmental decision makers actually do. They are holding onto the “professional arrogance” which sees the world’s problems in peoples’ cognitions or attitudes rather than recognising that economic and political processes, as well as entrenched and often irrational value systems, and daily habits, all need to be incorporated into any consideration of any interventions. But most fundamentally they are missing the point that was clear to us at Dalandhui and is still valid today. It is in the day to day experience of buildings and the proximal surroundings that people interact and transact with their environment. Heating, lighting, noise levels, space use, privacy, crowding, way-finding, the symbolic meaning of built and natural forms, and how we move around between them, and all the other details that make up the direct experience of architecture and landscape, are where humanity influences the earth.

We may have been wrong to look for the influence of architecture on people as we realised at Dalandhui. We may be correct now to redress this balance and concern ourselves more with how people are influencing the nature of the environment, but unless we put as much effort as possible into understanding the interaction between these two processes we may find that in another forty years social scientists are still struggling to have their important messages heard.

© David Canter 2006
The Architectural Psychology Conference in Kingston-upon-Thames in 1970 was my first international scientific experience. On its last day it was agreed that the next conference was to take place in Lund, Sweden three years later. When editing the book of proceedings from the Lund Conference I labelled it the 2nd International Architectural Psychology Conference. There had been two previous conferences, one in Lund, 1967, and another in Dalanchui, 1969, both of which had been mainly national. However, this has caused considerable confusion in the numbering of IAPS conferences ever since.

During the last day of the Lund Conference we discussed whether to establish an international association. Considering the number of already existing organisations in psychology, sociology, ergonomics and architecture, we decided to take no step in this direction, at least not for the time being. Instead, a few of the delegates were asked to make preparations for another conference in two or three years’ time. The delegates recommended that since there had been several conferences of this kind in Britain and Sweden it would be a good idea if the next one were to take place somewhere else.

The encouragement for delegates to arrange the next conference led to Strasbourg, 1976, and Louvain-la-Neuve, 1979. Then things started to happen. During the last day of the Louvain Conference it was decided to form an international association. In a plenary meeting the delegates nominated and voted for a provisional board. Much to my surprise I was proposed as Chairman, and, less astonishing, David Canter was nominated as Secretary. During meetings that followed the outlines of the new association were drafted, and in 1981, IAPS became formally established. This was 25 years ago.

I must confess that I was not in favour of a formal organisation at the time. Instead, the idea of spontaneous new conferences seemed very appealing. However, on hindsight I believe the formation of IAPS was a wise decision. David Canter
was a formidable organiser and, even if he has sidetracked into criminal profiling, his many contributions to Environmental Psychology will not be forgotten. Thanks to past and present Board members, not least some outstanding Chairpersons, IAPS is now prospering as never before, and we have had some really excellent conferences.

In the beginning, IAPS stood for the International Association for the Study of People and their Physical Surroundings. It took many hours of discussion at a meeting in London to get this together, one purpose being to keep the two middle letters, AP, which previously had meant Architectural Psychology. Later the formal name was changed into the less cumbersome International Association for People-Environment Studies. As most will acknowledge, IAPS mainly deals with Environmental Psychology, which meant a widening of the original field of Architectural Psychology. Unfortunately, this may have made IAPS less interesting to some architects.

Until 20 years ago Environmental Psychology almost exclusively dealt with the impact of the environment upon people. It can have escaped nobody that the focus has now shifted to the impact of people upon the environment. Sustainability and ecological behaviour have become key concepts. Both of these mainstreams are certainly important. During an animated discussion 50 years ago one of my teachers pleaded that knowledge of the brain would never reach a level, where it would benefit psychological theory. I did not agree then, and I do not agree now. I am more convinced than ever that if psychology is to survive, it will be as a branch of the fast-developing brain sciences. Already in the middle of the last century physiology was brought into the psychological context in terms of sensory deprivation and stress research, and these ideas were integrated into Environmental Psychology, where they now form the basis for a number of theoretical approaches.

Environmental Psychology research includes a plethora of methods, from interviews and questionnaires to behavioural observations and physiological techniques. All of these methods may be justified at one time or another, but I would like to see a more diversified use of them. For instance, the widespread use of measurement scales for this and that, when entered in a regression analysis, might yield stunning correlations that are due mainly to response bias. Scales, which correlate with scales, which correlate with scales! Psychologists used to be excellent experimenters, but in recent studies much of this seems to have been lost.

Another trend in Environmental Psychology is the use of advanced statistical techniques, for instance, factor and regression analysis. One may conclude that the ‘scientific rigor’ has increased, generally. On the other hand there is the risk of ‘rigor mortis’. All the correlations and coefficients can make one choke to death. I remember the fascination I felt, when I read about Abraham Maslow’s and Norbett Mintz’ study of how a beautiful and an ugly room made people’s faces look different, or Robert Sommer’s intriguing experiments on how persons interacted in space.

Today, when Environmental Psychology has reached maturity, I seldom experience the same excitement.

Sampling is fundamental for our science, and most studies nowadays are made on large, representative groups. Actually, the probability of statistical tests is all about whether the result is also valid for the general population. Thus, we are dealing with population studies, and rightly so. But it seems to me that something is about to be lost here, namely the individual. When Sigmund Freud developed his model of the Id, Ego and Superego, he did this out of a deep interest for the human mind. This is what fascinated him and has fascinated most psychologists ever since.

I will put forth the proposition that IAPS is an appropriate international forum to initiate discussions about these and other issues. Unfortunately, there seems to be little space in our major journals for discussion. However, early in our history Sue Ann Lee undertook to edit the Architectural Psychology Newsletter, and its modern offspring, the IAPS Bulletin, seems to be an excellent periodical for such discussions.

REFERENCES

It seems timely for me to be asked to reflect on our field of people-environment studies as I have just recently retired from Kingston School of Architecture where, 37 years ago, as a psychology graduate, I started as a research assistant in the Architectural Psychology Research Unit.

1969 was an exciting time. We knew we were at the beginning of something new and were full of optimism. At Kingston we ran the 2nd Architectural Psychology Conference and took on the “Architectural Psychology Newsletter”. There were lots of debates in the (embryonic) field: were we suggesting Architectural Determinism or not? Should it be architectural or environmental psychology? “environment and behaviour” or “people and environment”? Should we set up an organisation equivalent to EDRA or not? We agreed not to - at first. When we did decide to set up IAPS then it was a question of a name (we wanted to keep the established AP initials) and which language or languages? We settled for English and French at the time and spent hours trying to agree a constitution and its translation (IAPS initially stood for the International Association for the Study of People & their Physical Surroundings, partly because of the debate arising from the use of the word “environnement” in French).

In 1989, I was asked to reflect on 20 years of people-environment studies at the EDRA 20 Conference in North Carolina – in terms of “what do we know and what do we not know, after 20 years” – so I have had a look at what I said then (Lee 1989) and – a further 17 years later - I am surprised to find that this would still be how I would describe our field.

I said then – with 20 years of hindsight – that we were over optimistic in 1969 about the study of the people-environment relationship and the contribution it would make to policy and design practice – but that this was probably a good thing at the time because it carried us forward.

What we had found is that the people-environment relationship is much more complex than we had anticipated – we had found that it is dynamic and culturally and personally variable.

We had also had to develop methods and theories to address this complexity. We had started with short term empirical studies but, over time, had come to realise the benefits of longitudinal studies and of replication. We had recognized the different benefits of quantitative and qualitative data and realised that we needed a breadth of approaches to build a whole picture. We were still trying to develop theoretical frameworks into which the whole jigsaw would fit.

I also said that we had learnt that effective cooperation across disciplines and between organisations is more difficult to achieve than we had thought at first. Also that the application of our research findings in teaching, environmental policy and design practice was much slower and more difficult than we had originally anticipated.

I concluded by saying that – in spite of the difficulties – we had learnt that it was nevertheless worth

...we had learnt that effective cooperation across disciplines and between organisations is more difficult to achieve than we had thought at first
It was worth carrying on - with the lessons of hindsight – and acknowledging that we needed more time than we thought to deal with the complexity of the people-environment relationship and more time to make an effective contribution to policy and practice.

My views in 1989 – so where are we now and what of the future?

More research is needed in environmental psychology generally and there is a need to stimulate more interest from within psychology in particular. This will not be easy as environmental psychology is still not seen as a major area of specialisation within psychology. The recent increase in the popularity of psychology as a subject for university study in Britain, for example, has not been reflected in a proportional increase in interest in environmental psychology.

The same is true of “people-environment” research from within a range of disciplines other than psychology. The environment does seem to be given more prominence as a research focus in other social sciences - particularly geography, and some architects and designers - particularly Landscape designers and some Product designers – are interested to know more about human behaviour – which is a start.

At a recent conference concerned with Architecture Research Futures in Britain I was struck not only by the lack of emphasis on the social aspects of architecture (it was mentioned in the final summing up session!) but also by the lack of clarity (and therefore basis for discussion/agreement) as to what constitutes, or might constitute, research, or types of research, in architecture. I anticipated the former - in spite of the efforts of people like Frank Duffy & DEGW, but I was surprised by the latter.

What has always been a concern is how few people within architecture or psychology worldwide – relative to the overall numbers in these disciplines - have pursued our research area – given its self-evident importance (to me at least!).

I am often asked to review the development of our field but recently I was asked by Gabriel Moser and David Uzzell to review my own career and personal contribution to the field – it was an interesting if somewhat chastening task! One of the questions to be answered was “What would be your priorities for future people-environment/environmental psychology research?” I identified 3 main priorities:

1. To encourage more people-environment/environmental psychology research to be done, for both theoretical and methodological developments:

2. To aim to get more of the research that is done into environmental policy and design practice and to make the research that is done and its application/s, more evident:

   I realise that this is a Catch 22. If there was more research, more of it would influence policy and, if it was then seen to be useful, then more research would be commissioned.

   It is also a challenge to make existing research and applications more evident in environmental policy and design practice. It is difficult to find people-environment contributions explicitly acknowledged in government environmental documents and policies although some researchers are contributing to them. This is part of a general problem with commissioned research and advisory roles.
Also where commercial interests in design practice or otherwise sensitive material is involved it may not be possible to publish the work.

Another reason that some environmental psychology research is not more evident is that it has become diffused into other types of psychology or into other disciplines. This is raised by Stokols (1995) as a paradox for the field and is also considered to be problematic by Bonnes et al. (2003), who chart theoretical approaches in psychology chronologically with the aim of clarifying the theoretical roots of environmental psychology. They also hope to help to guarantee its continued integration in psychology and to show its specific contribution, alongside other social sciences, when applied to environmental problems.

There are still differing views, and some ambivalence, as to whether our field is a part of psychology or an interdisciplinary subject in its own right. In a special section of the “Handbook of Environmental Psychology” edited by Bechtel & Churchman (2002), the links to, and differentiation from, other disciplines are explored. There are chapters on Environmental Sociology, Environmental Anthropology, Environmental Psychophysiology, Pathology and Urban Planning.

In terms of dealing with the complexity of the people-environment relationship that I have referred to above, people-environment researchers are increasingly taking a “transactional” approach (Werner et al. 2002). Others such as Despres are suggesting a “transdisciplinary” approach (Despres 2005). In a recent article in the IAPS Bulletin she argues from a study of the progress of doctoral theses in our field, that many students start with the aim of dealing with the complexity of the people-environment relationship, but that many lose sight of this complexity as the thesis nears completion. She argues that this is not a simple matter of overestimating time and resources but an effect of “disciplinary confinement”. She has noticed that those (few) students who do not lose the complexity tend to be affiliated with multidisciplinary research groups with broader research programmes. She argues that the complex models of people-environment relations that we have begun to develop, including a transdisciplinary approach, should help to support students undertaking such “complex” empirical research. (see also Lawrence and Despres, 2004). She also identifies Architecture and Planning Schools as ideal bases for transdisciplinary approaches, but in Britain at least, in spite of the social aspects of design being a required element of the curriculum throughout the EU, there are few social scientists teaching or researching in architecture schools and it saddens me that my expertise will not be replaced at Kingston.

3. To give priority to research on issues of sustainability:

In my view a priority area for future people-environment/environmental psychology research would be on issues of sustainability in its broadest sense. I feel that there are real threats to both the physical and social environment ahead of us.

An interest in sustainability can be seen to be growing in our field, (this is clearly demonstrated if one compares the overview of environmental psychology research by Stokols & Altman in 1987 with that by Bechtel & Churchman 15 years later in 2002). What is perhaps surprising is that there is not more applied research being undertaken in this area.

At the 4th EPUK conference “Putting environmental psychology research into practice” I argued that there are a number of ways in which environmental psychology - in particular - can contribute to our understanding of issues of sustainability, both general and specific. (Lee 2005 and in press). More broadly in the context of this article, I would argue that people-environment studies can make a wider contribution to the study of issues of sustainability overall.

Nickerson (2003), a psychologist, argues that both more research and more application of research is needed. There has been relatively little research that focuses on the effects that human beings have on the environment - particularly the natural environment and its resources. The main thrust of environmental psychology research has been on increasing the understanding of the effects of the environment on human beings. So he argues that more of the first kind of research is needed.

With regard to the application of existing research, Nickerson (2003) suggests that we need
more people to review the existing research to find its practical applications and more people who start with the (environmental) problems and then design research which helps to solve them. Either strategy is a challenge for us.

The number of summary texts is growing and that edited by Becker & Jahn (1999) brings together a range of contributions from a number of social sciences, including environmental psychology (Werner 1999), specifically on the topic of sustainability.

There are relatively few psychologists specialising in the study of sustainability, but the number is expanding and the publications are increasing. Winter & Koger’s (2004) book “The Psychology of Environmental Problems” is specifically concerned with the relationship between psychology and issues of sustainability. They review the major theoretical frameworks in psychology and show how each one can contribute to our understanding of some aspects of sustainability.

Controversially they also see a unifying role for the discipline of psychology in the topic of sustainability:

“How to sustain human existence on the planet could become psychology’s core question, offering an intellectual coherence to a discipline increasingly fragmented by diverse concerns” (Winter & Koger 2004, pp 211-212)

Besides theoretical contributions to this area, Oskamp (2002, pp322) and others, outline particular methodological contributions to be made by environmental psychologists:

“A first task is to help specify more clearly how sustainable behaviour can be defined and how its key dimensions can be measured. Second, psychologists can demonstrate that human patterns of behaviour can be changed and research can delineate goals and effective means for changes toward sustainability.”

In conclusion - I hope that the next 37 years are as exciting and fruitful for our field as the first – it is clear to me that there is much research still to be done, more applications of existing research to be made, and some major challenges ahead for people-environment studies.
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In the late 1960s, architectural psychology originated in European countries to study how people perceive their environment and behave inside and around buildings. Originally, Britain and Sweden were leading the field, with the organization of several research conferences and the establishment of diverse academic programmes conceived for the evaluation various environments.

In North America, the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA) was founded in Washington DC in 1969. IAPS was founded as an international association following the initiative of a group of British psychologists active at the University of Surrey, Kingston Polytechnic and at Strathclyde. IAPS was established as a charity according to British law in 1981 following a series of international conferences related to architectural and environmental psychology. The founding Executive Board included David Canter, Rikard Kuller and Sue-Ann Lee.

During the 1980s most IAPS Executive Board meetings were held in London. From 1984, the year I was elected IAPS President, the IAPS Executive Board included Martin Symes, Secretary, Peter Ellis, Treasurer, Lenelis Kruse and Niels Prak. Our tasks involved: the adoption of a legal constitution; membership draft registration and collection of members subscriptions; identification of the future biennial conference organizers; formulation of guidelines for future conferences; adoption of proposals by organizers of specific theme-oriented symposia; setting up of permanent research networks, on housing, education and other themes; publication of the IAPS newsletter and a membership directory; and various administrative measures linked to the statues of the association.

The administrative tasks of the IAPS Board did not leave enough time to explore priorities on research, or to speculate on future strategies to advocate this new field. It is important to note that although IAPS originated in Britain, it was founded without any prejudiced view or preconception of what Environment Behaviour Research (EBR) or Man-Environment Studies (EBS) should be. This open-mindedness proved to be worthwhile. For example, there was hardly any rejection of positivism, or commercially oriented research linked to office design. However, environmental research was essentially performed in academic institutions and most IAPS members were employed in higher education. From the outset, the cultural and geographical diversity of IAPS members may have been responsible for the wide variety of subjects explored in the latter decades of the 20th century. In addition to the presentation of scientific papers during conferences, personal contacts were essential and rewarding. The specialized theme oriented symposia which occurred between the major biennial conferences had a polarization effect and helped to encourage heuristic perspectives of research. Some state of the art reports mention the “invisible networks” linking IAPS members who share similar views.

The history of IAPS can be traced by accounting for the debates and themes of its conferences.
However, it seems that there is some reluctance for people-environment researchers to adopt historical perspectives (hardly any historians among IAPS members!) in order to interpret the conception and use of the built environment or specific buildings. Longitudinal research has been rarely applied. In addition, it is rare for researchers to discriminate between social and environmental history and the personal biography of individuals as I stressed at the EDRA conference in New York in 1985.

IAPS members have included a majority of psychologists who have consistently outnumbered other social scientists. This has framed the legacy of IAPS, with more emphasis on the individual than on social groups or collective behaviour. It is factual that unprejudiced views prevented any dogmatic or ultra-subjective position to rise. Political disagreements have been minor, even in such extreme situations such as the Greek-Turkish conflict concerning Cyprus, when preparing IAPS conferences in Ankara (1990) and Porto Carras (1992).

Today, the cumulative knowledge of people-environment research does not seem to discourage newcomers from re-exploring well known subjects at his risk of what Amos Rapoport called “reinventing the wheel”. The co-ordination and storage of research data has not been a task that IAPS has assumed. In fact, nothing could be more alien to IAPS goals than to attempt a general consensus on preconceived mainstreams in research. People-environment studies is nearly 50 years old, but the intellectual distance between the founders and the newcomers remains relatively short.

**A CONTEMPORARY VISION OF IAPS**

An ideal conception of people-environment research can be illustrated by the contribution of the late Jonathan Sime. A most sensitive person, Jonathan was able to achieve an objective analysis of facts and, simultaneously, describe his personal and subjective vision of things he observed. His well-known research on fire hazards and prevention is totally different from his intimate exploration of his affiliations to his home. However, both research approaches taken together summarize Clare Cooper Marcus’s view of research “from the pragmatic to the spiritual”. Researchers ought to differ from each other while establishing their priorities in Environment-Behaviour Studies. The wide variety of approaches is a strong asset for IAPS and the field. Still, an obvious difficulty may consist in preserving a balanced diversity within IAPS between more speculative research and conventional empirical studies.

Balanced diversity in People-Environment research is inherent to different cultures. We know that North Europeans are more inclined to favour pragmatic approaches, whereas those researchers from Southern Europe tend to adopt more philosophical approaches. These two kinds of research are complementary. Individuals conceive their environment, which reflects an echo on their behaviour. Conception and reception of the environment are the nec-
ecessary components of environment-behaviour studies. The present popularity of sustainable development can be interpreted as a reaction to existing environmental threats now well documented. At the same time, sustainability seems to be in fashion, almost in an excessive way. However the global situation in this world has reached such a critical stage that any attempt to moderate current pollution levels may prove adequate. The edge between concrete and ideal situations is sharp. Benefits from people-environment studies should ensure epistemological progresses. The relative independence of environmental research from commercial interests is a much debated subject in universities today because influential sponsors of research tend to impose their biased vision of people-environment relations.

IAPS can play a role in demonstrating examples of orthodox and human oriented research in contrast to the pursuit of exclusive material advantages. The Association’s strong links to academic institutions should prove beneficial. It is desirable that the design research themes of people-environment research are retained in the future. Previous IAPS conferences were successful in echoing current ongoing research in this vast field. Since 1992, the IAPS Board has managed to run the Association quite effectively with a substantial increase in its membership from all regions of the world. It is very satisfying that IAPS has extended its influence beyond the boundaries of Europe by organizing an intercontinental meet-

ing of researchers in Alexandria, Egypt during this anniversary year.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

One of the main challenges faced by environment behaviour studies is the application of research for the benefit of existing and future environmental situations. The contributions of Carole Despres and her colleagues in advocating measures to accommodate a changing population to its residential environment is one good example of applied research in our field.

This kind of research should be encouraged in spite of the difficulty of deriving relevant conclusions from a site survey, in order to adapt the built environment in accordance with improved behavioural conditions. It is also preferable that much more attention is attributed to the experimentation of building and planning prototypes as a direct consequence of our research.

Although a general and comprehensive perspective of the last 25 years cannot be provided here, it is noteworthy that a considerable volume of research findings and recommendations is available today. IAPS can and should be instrumental in disseminating this epistemology of people-environment studies. Hopefully, the membership and financial resources will continue to increase in order for the collective pursuit of the now well established objectives of this international association.
IAPS has reached its quarter-century. We expect that it will continue for the next quarter-century. But no-one thinks it is the same now as it was when meetings began, and it would be a brave person who would say what kind of organisation it will be in the future. This uncertainty over aims and characteristics is surely a good thing. We would like to have a way of bringing together people who are excited by discussing our place in the physical environment (and the place of the environment in our lives) but we do not need a rigid structure to enable us do this.

The history of IAPS has being written elsewhere. For the purpose of the present debate, it is useful to remind ourselves that the group has changed its name a number of times, has defined its subject matter in a number of ways, has had members from a changing array of disciplines, and with differing allegiance to academia and to practice, has used a number of languages, has met, independently or in conjunction with other groups, in North America, Asia and Africa as well as in Europe, and has sponsored a variety of different forms of publication. It does not seem to me that this diversity is either an accident of the process of growth, or a conspiracy to avoid commitment, or mere academic, or even financial, opportunism. It is rather, in my opinion, the product of an extremely lively exploration of a set of interactions which concerns us all because, fundamentally, it is not, and cannot be fixed.

Can the environment be fully defined? Can the world of people be fully understood? Can the need to act and the need to reflect be balanced for ever? These are questions for which there will only ever be provisional answers. Such questions are, and surely should be, continually reviewed. And, it follows, continually in flux, especially when discussed in relation to each other. IAPS is fluid, and needs to remain so: IAPS is not about finality.

This is not a plea for avoiding decisions: at any one time the organisation must have a position on the matters listed above. Nor is this a plea for eternal relativism: we have core values and should (and I believe can) make the decisions we need to make at any one time in the light of those values. But let us not forget that they are a core, and not the whole thing. An example of a value which is in the core is to avoid discrimination (at one time we debated this at length in regard to the acceptance of members from South Africa). Another is the idea that the physical environment cannot be truly understood if treated as a freestanding object, with no human dimension (this was one of the disputes which arose at the time of the Guildford versus Louvain-la Neuve “schism”). But non-core values include (probably) whether IAPS should initiate its own refereed publications rather than sponsor those of other organisations. Or whether the research community should only communicate in one “international” language: it having been argued that this discriminates against participation by persons who (as a few years ago in Eastern Europe) would have been very unlikely to have access to scientific English.
At the time of writing (Autumn 2006) issues which clearly need resolution include:
- The need to concentrate on global issues such as climate change.
- The opening up of debate on issues affecting the less developed countries.
- The preferred methods for engaging in political debate.

Others which could become important for IAPS, but might be left to others, include:
- The “War of Civilisations”.
- Security.
- Corporate Responsibility.

It would be interesting to hear the views of other IAPS members on these issues.

Finally, from a personal perspective I would like to raise two academic questions:

First, have we had a surfeit of recent studies of cities. Does the fact that the forces of urbanisation are now world wide mean that the lessons of Simmel, the Chicago School, or even Castells, need to be so often restated in case studies from new geographical developments? Should we not look, more patiently, for new insights, even if they do not arise from every IAPS meeting?

Secondly, isn’t it time that the area of environmental studies which stemmed from Kenneth Boulding’s classic book “The Image” was revisited? This work was published in 1961 (forty-five years ago) and remains, rightly, on many reading lists, but the processes by which images are created, perceived and manipulated in the world in which we now live are both very different and very important to us all. I suspect we do not really understand what is going on around us, but should.

Rome would be an excellent place in which to reopen these debates!

Figure 9: Call for papers in English and French for the IAPS 13 Conference on “The Urban Experiences” held at the University of Manchester, England, from 13-15th July 1994.
IAPS to me is:
- A community of scholars
- A safe place to develop ideas and discuss them
- A place to face challenges
- To make new friends
- To expand horizons
- To contribute to the field

IAPS for me is people: friends, colleagues and future friends. Many of these friendships are professional friendships, built around our common interests, that over the years have become much closer and more emotional friendships. IAPS exemplifies the continuing importance of person to person interactions. Most of us have access to the telephone, fax, and e-mail. However, it is very clear to me that these cannot replace face-to-face meetings. Virtual exchanges do not offer multi-dimensional stimuli, and they cannot give you smiles and hugs.

IAPS is a peer group, a support group and a reference group. It is a warm ‘home’, that offers acceptance, support and, yes, criticism. Many of us work in situations where we are the only environment-behavior person around. We need to constantly explain the importance of what we do and to argue for the inclusion of our ways of thinking. In IAPS we no longer have to do this. We know that, on the most basic level, we all think the same way. I know that on other levels, we have different interests, different approaches, and different emphases. But, we know that we have come together because we agree on basic principles and that we will not be laughed at or rejected, because of these principles.

We have also been able to transcend international conflicts. Within IAPS it does not matter where we come from and whether our countries are friends or enemies. We have a common professional goal that allows us to meet as individuals and interact in as friendly a manner as we choose.

For people new to the field and to the organization, as I was many years ago, it offers an introduction to the field, in a broader fashion than any course of study can do. Attending the conferences allows one to connect faces to ‘names’, and gives a human dimension to the articles and books we read.

IAPS for me is intellectual challenge. We can start our discussions in the middle, without having to explain the basic principles. We understand each other’s concepts and share a common literature. Thus, we can challenge each other on theoretical, methodological or ideological grounds, without being perceived as a threat to each other’s basic professional identity. It offers us opportunities for learning from others, for hearing about on-going work, for exposure to different approaches and to different ways of doing things. It enables us to recharge our batteries, and go back to the ‘real world’ refreshed and with new energy.

IAPS is what people make of it, or what they do in their own work. IAPS as an organization can only attempt to provide an environment within which people can find support, acceptance, challenge and new ideas.”
result in terms of the topics addressed or the kind of research or design undertaken, is an individual one for each of us, and depends on social, cultural and individual factors. We could try and set an agenda, but then people will or will not accept it, work on it and further it.

To my mind, the major contributions of people-environment studies from a theoretical point of view have been:

1. the rejection of a deterministic relationship between people and their physical environment;
2. the emphasis on context and the need to continuously be aware of it and relate to it;
3. the need to understand the links between the physical, social, individual and other factors, which are all part of any setting that we study;
4. the recognition that we can make the world a better place for people in small ways and that we should try to do so;
5. that we must consider the differences between people, mainly in an aggregative fashion, and make sure that these differences are reflected in our research and our practice.

Embedded in our approach, although not always evident enough is the fact that research in one country, or culture, or area, may not be transferable to other places. In other words we need to be ever on our guard not to assume that results from one place will be the same in a different context. This presents a challenge, since the purpose of ‘science’ is to enable the accumulation of knowledge and the ability to make generalizations. I think one can do so, but only very carefully. This warning is particularly addressed to researchers in the United States of America and Britain, because they represent the earliest and largest group of people in the field.

The directions I have been working on could be taken as suggestions for the future, should others choose to accept them:

1. The examination of our/my assumptions and whether or not they are justified – for example with regard to the relationship between women and environments; open space and children; the meaning of density and so forth.
2. The expansion of our work to deal with issues relevant to urban planning and to policy-making, and particularly with regard to public participation in design and planning.

My conclusion is that the most important thing IAPS has done in the last 25 years is to exist. Of course that doesn’t mean that it is perfect, or that it does not have to continue to develop. It does mean that it has to continue to be the kind of ‘place’ that offers the qualities I have described, and it should try to ensure that all members, as much as possible, find what they are looking for. As is clear from what I have said, I place a strong emphasis on the conferences that IAPS holds. Only some of the meanings of the organization are realizable for those who do not attend the conferences, and such people miss out.

This is what IAPS has meant to me. I hope that each of you has found within it what is important for you and will continue to do so.
People-environment research seeks to have impact. This impact has six defining qualities.

Firstly, people-environment research is necessarily interdisciplinary. The problems we face in both the built and natural environment require the co-operation and collaboration of many disciplines—psychology, sociology, architecture, planning, geography, economics, the environmental sciences, education, archaeology, landscape architecture, interior design and engineering. It is difficult to conceive of people-environment research that could be undertaken without interdisciplinary collaboration. Bringing together such diverse disciplines in a commonwealth of scholarship is probably unparalleled in the academic world.

Secondly, people-environment research is multi-method. There is not one single method that is appropriate to use all the time for the range of work research that we undertake. People-environment research uses both qualitative and quantitative methodologies; for example, questionnaire surveys, in-depth interviews, focus groups, simulation studies, behavioural mapping, laboratory and field-based experiments.

Thirdly, people-environment research is policy-oriented. In other words, much of the work aims to inform government policy on the most pressing social, environmental and economic issues of the day. This has never been more true with the current contribution of researchers to issues of sustainable development.

Fourthly, people-environment research is necessarily applied. While much research seeks to increase our fundamental knowledge about people-environment relationships, much of this is done in the context of addressing real-world problems. People-environment research is contracted by governments, industry and the voluntary sector to generate solutions which address the problems of everyday life in our cities and rural areas and enhance the quality of life.

Fifthly, one of the defining characteristics of people-environment research is that it is context-aware. One of the shortcomings of so much psychological research is that it treats the environment simply as a value-free backdrop to human activity and an empty stage upon which we act out our lives. People-environment researchers know that the environment is a crucial part of the equation. We cannot understand human perceptions, attitudes and actions without reference to the social and environmental context in which they are formed. The environmental context in which perceptions, attitudes and action occur also has a temporal dimension; we cannot understand people, spaces and places without taking into account time.

Finally, people-environment research is transnational. As it is difficult to conceive of people-environment research undertaken in disciplinary isolation, so it is only slightly less difficult to think of people-environment research undertaken in national isolation. IAPS has been in existence for 25 years which is testimony to the enduring value of international collaboration. For example, I have ongoing projects with colleagues in France, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden. There is not a single week, sometimes a single day, when I am not in communication with colleagues from these countries. It is through the international exchange and collaboration that ideas, methods and findings are disseminated, cross-fertilised and developed.

One of the defining characteristics of people-environment research is that it is context-aware.
countries. We work in a comparatively small field, certainly within our own individual countries. I am sure that this has only served to encourage international collaboration and transnational projects.

In conclusion, people-environment research has IMPACT. But does it have the degree of impact that we believe it has or aspires to? Could it have more? I am sure that we think about these issues every day in our work. What I wish to discuss now are concerns which arise out of this impact. We have patted ourselves on the back with regards to our outward-looking and collaborative approaches, but I think we need to look closer and more critically at what we do as people-environment researchers, and in particular the ethical, political, and relational questions and issues which emerge out of these six defining qualities.

2. MULTI-METHOD:
A ONE-WAY STREET?

The social sciences in general and psychology in particular have provided people-environment studies with a raft of methodologies for exploring people's perceptions, attitudes and actions in the environment, and the effect of the environment on people. This flow of methodologies has been useful in furthering the relationship between the social sciences and the design professions. But how reciprocal is this relationship? What has been the flow of environmental and architectural investigatory methodologies to understand people-environment relationships from the design disciplines to the social sciences?

What are the methods of architects and urban designers to understand place and space that could provide people-environment researchers with the kind of insights that would meet the criticism often levelled at the social sciences that there is not enough environment in people-environment studies and that researchers should have a greater awareness of environmental processes and structures. Ian Bentley and colleagues’ book, Responsive Environments (1985) discuss the concepts of perme-
ability, variety, utility, robustness, visual appropriateness, and richness as environmental concepts. If we, as people-environment researchers, are to put the environment back into people-environment research, we need to develop methodologies that incorporate environmental, architectural and spatial concepts such as these. We need the help of designers and architects to achieve this.

3. POLICY ORIENTED: INDEPENDENT OR AGENTS OF GOVERNMENT?

By virtue of the potentially highly practical research we do, addressing the societal problems of the day, we are constantly in demand by governments to undertake research on their behalf. This is to be welcomed as it means that we may have an impact on social and environmental policy. But what worries me is, are we really independent researchers or just agents of government?

I am not suggesting that we are biasing the collection and analysis of data, or coming under government pressure to deliver the results and recommendations government wants to hear; this is another issue. My concern lies more with the questions we are asking. In other words, are we asking the questions we want and need to ask and that theory demands, or are we asking the questions that government wants answered to further their policies and agendas? Of course, there will be some research that falls into the latter category, and this is perfectly legitimate, but I am concerned that with scarce and highly competitive research funding, especially from the independent (?) research councils, and the pressure on academics in universities to secure research funding and show ‘relevance’, researchers in fields such as ours will be constrained from undertaking critical and questioning research.

4. APPLIED: UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

Sometimes research has unintended consequences. Several years ago I undertook a study at the request of a local authority to examine a small public space in a town centre. It was a small area of circular seating, known as the ‘concrete circle’, and occupied by street drinkers, the homeless, the young unemployed, and the occasional elderly shopper. This was not a particularly attractive area but became ‘home’ to a loose, fragile community of souls who represent a particularly vulnerable section of society. I likened this space to a room with glass walls – the users spent the day talking and watching the passers-by, while to the passers-by this motley group were invisible. The local authority were concerned to improve the space, and they asked me to undertake a small study to investigate who uses this space and how. One of my researchers spent a week observing and talking at great length to these people; the importance of this place was unquestionable. We wrote a report for the local authority and emphasised the role and significance of this space for its users. The local authority responded by removing the seating. Of course, they did not solve what they perceived as a problem, but merely displaced it elsewhere.

Research can have unintended consequences. How our research is used may not always enhance people’s quality of life, especially the more marginal groups in society. How do we assess the potential impact of our research? Should we formulate criteria for making a risk assessment of the consequences of our research findings? What are the criteria that one might employ to assess the outcomes of applied research? Should we be making clear statements against these criteria so that there is transparency and accountability? Do we have a responsibility for how our research is used? These are questions which are frequently asked in relation to science and technology – should we not be asking the same questions in people-environment research as well?

5. CONTEXT-AWARE: HORSES AND CARTS

The environmental setting is culture bound. If this is to mean anything it is that values, attitudes, norms and actions are not created in a social and economic vacuum. So much people-environment research focuses on these psychological constructs which are regarded as drivers for behaviour. In other words, it is argued that people’s attitudes are, for example, the motivation for why certain people engage in particular behaviours. But to use the language of statistics, are not dependent variables being used as independent variables? Values, attitudes, norms and behaviour are derived from people’s social and cultural context which is defined by class, gender, race and, of course, their environmental/physical setting. Whether such values, attitudes and norms are decisive for people’s actions will be contingent upon the degree to which people are in control of their lives and the degree to which opportunities are
provided or taken for self-determination and empowerment. Consequently, if we are to truly understand the transactions between people and their physical environment, then we need to take into account the cultural and socio-economic context in which psychological variables are formed and developed.

stemming the tide of violence at regional and international levels; the impact of technological change on individuals and groups; environmentally based strategies of community health promotion; implications of societal ageing for environmental design and community planning. Many of these issues have assumed increasing significance over the past decade and are receiving research attention. It was also suggested, in a footnote, that research on the Third World may be a priority along with the design of environments for living and working in outer space. It is as if these two types of environment – the Third World and outer space – have, at least, a semiotic equivalence. I am not suggesting that simply the reach of people-environment research is extended in a somewhat paternalistic fashion so that the First World can ‘help’ the Third World. Critical people-environment research and environmental psychology would pose questions about the impact of the First World’s actions and policies in relation to Third World people and environment, so that research on and by the Third World would really be on the unequal relationship between the two.

CONCLUSION

IAPS and its members have played a significant part in the development of people-environment research over the past 25 years and more. I believe, contrary to what is often claimed, there is not an applicability gap, particularly in many important areas of application and policy-making. If there is an applicability gap in some areas, it may in part be due to the problematic issues identified above. But even outside the framework of the applicability debate, there is a need for people-environment researchers to address these issues if this area of academic endeavour and practical relevance is to have an impact over the next 25 years.
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The aim of this paper is to critically evaluate the impact that research in Architectural Psychology, and human aspects of design has had in the teaching and practice of Architecture, over the past 37 years. During this period there have been over 20 international conferences on the subject, numerous symposia and Ph Ds, dedicated international journals, books, articles and other publications. What has been the major contribution of this research to our understanding of people-environment relationships from both the theoretical and practical perspectives? Has this increased knowledge resulted in changes in legislation or directives by the appropriate professional bodies and institutions? It is argued that this significant multidisciplinary body of knowledge had contributed to a change in attitudes within the architectural profession towards a more humane environment. One of the main problems identified is how to communicate this knowledge to both students and practitioners. A case is made through the teaching of the subject over the past four decades to more than 5000 students who, not only appreciate the psychological and cultural aspects of design, but consider the subject fundamental to their education. This is supported by annual feedback studies on a longitudinal basis, as well as many examples of students putting this knowledge in practice when they qualify.

Architectural psychology, environmental psychology, people-environment studies, human factors of design or environics, call it what you may, has been concerned explicitly over the past 35 years in making better and more humane environments. These preoccupations have also strong and varied undertones and appeal to the social and behavioural sciences including psychology, sociology, neurophysiology, geography, and anthropology. To what extent is the architect better off now and how much do we know and practice this new knowledge?

The aim of this brief account is to provide the reader with a critique based on the knowledge and experience of teaching Architectural Psychology to architecture students since the subject was born in 1969 at the House of Black Dell in Dalandhui, Scotland, the first conference proceedings were published by the RIBA, edited by David Canter until the last IAPS 19 Conference in Alexandria, Egypt.

There at least four questions which need to be addressed:

1. Have research, conferences, books and journals contributed to an increase in our knowledge?
2. Has this knowledge been communicated to designers of the built environment as witnessed through the practice of architecture?
3. Has there been a change in attitudes towards a more humane architecture, after putting this research knowledge into the educational curriculum.
4. Have professional groups and institutions including local authorities and professional organisations such as the RIBA and the ARB influenced legislation and directives on such issues as acces-
sibility, disability, crime prevention, human rights and sustainable development?

In 1969 there were very few books from mainstream psychology or sociology which designers found inspiring or relevant to the practice of their profession. Richard Gregory's *Eye and Brain*, first published in 1966, was one such book from experimental psychology. Michael Argyle's *The Psychology of Interpersonal Behaviour* published in 1967, which considered psychological needs and motivation in social psychology was also important. Ervin Goffman's book *Behaviour in Public Places*, published in 1963 was another major contribution from Sociology. *The Hidden Dimension*, by anthropologist Edward Hall, published in 1966, was another such book discussing ethological issues, proxemics and cross-cultural differences in space requirements. Nico Tinbergen, John Calhoun, Robert Ardrey, and Konrad Lorenz were the predecessors of Oscar Newman and Alice Coleman in the ’70s, ’80s and ’90s, discussing the modern equivalents of territoriality and personal space within the new concepts of defensible space, surveillance and vandal-proof architecture.

Roger Barker's pioneering work in ecological psychology in his book *The Stream of Behaviour*, published in 1963, Kevin Lynch's *The Image of the City*, from 1960, and Terence Lee’s work on mental mapping applications were significant landmarks of what was to follow. In the field of experimental aesthetics, Daniel Berlyne’s book *Aesthetics and Psychobiology*, as well as Rikard Kller’s *Semantic Model for Describing Perceived Environments* came after the first conference.


Schools of architecture introduced the subject in various guises ranging from human aspects of design to courses in architectural psychology, or as part of history and theory. Terence Lee and David Canter moved from St Andrews and Strathclyde to the University of Surrey to offer the first MSc course in environmental psychology outside the context of a school of Architecture. In Lund, Sweden we saw the first Department of Theoretical and Applied Aesthetics formed, which hosted the third international conference on the subject. In fact, the development of the subject can be seen in the 21 conferences on architecture psychology, as well as in various organisations established to promote research and communication of these concerns about people and environments in theory and practice. Future historians will be able to assess objectively the contribution of this subject during the last 35 years within the various relevant social sciences as well as its impact on the design of cities, social life and sustainable development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Dalandhui, Scotland</td>
<td>AP1: Courtship in the House of Blackdell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Kingston, London</td>
<td>AP2: Apprehension in the Convent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Lund, Sweden (May)</td>
<td>AP3: Revitalised Hope in Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Surrey, England (Oct.)</td>
<td>AP4: Psychology and the Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Louvain La Neve, Bel.</td>
<td>IAPC 7: Conflicting Experiences of Space: “Conflicting Experiences of Space and Place”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Surrey, England</td>
<td>IAPC 7: Conflict &amp; Narcissism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>IAPS 8: Perspectives on Environment and Action “Talking to Plants and Mother Nature”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Haifa, Israel</td>
<td>IAPS 9: Environments in Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Delft, Holland</td>
<td>IAPS 10: Looking Back to the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Ankara, Turkey</td>
<td>IAPS 11: Culture-Space-History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Halkidiki, Greece</td>
<td>IAPS 12: Socio-environmental Metamorphoses “Late Night Confessions in Marmaras”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Manchester, England</td>
<td>IAPS 13: The Urban Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Stockholm, Sweden</td>
<td>IAPS 14: Evolving Environmental Ideals - ways of life, values, design practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Eindhoven</td>
<td>IAPS 15: Shifting Balances – Changing Roles in Policy, Research and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>IAPS 16: Metropolis: Cities, Social Life and Sustainable Development Inter-mulitran-disciplinarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Corunna, Spain</td>
<td>IAPS 17: Globalization &amp; the new millennium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
<td>IAPS 18: Coral Anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Alexandria, Egypt</td>
<td>IAPS 19: Environmental health and sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** – A chronological listing of Architectural Psychology (AP) and (IAPS) Conferences from 1969 to 2006.
1969 Dalandhui, Scotland. Courtship in the House of Black Dell


1973 Lund, Sweden. Revitalised hope in Diversity (and Herring)


1975 Sheffield, England. Education, participation and Carl Marx
1976  Strasbourg, France. Space Appropriation / Misappropriation


1988  Eindhoven, Holland. Shifting balances and changing roles

2000  Paris, France. Sustainably Yours...

2006  Alexandria, Egypt  Environmental Health and sustainable development

Figure 13: Louis Hellman, a well-known architectural cartoonist illustrates with humour the collaboration between architects and psychologists since the 1960s.
professions. At this early stage, one can only undertake a “content analysis” of its development reflected in the papers presented and published at the various conferences, as well as the title themes of these events. The location and theme of these conferences are given in Table 1 and the atmosphere of several of these gatherings is illustrated vividly by the best-known architectural cartoonist, Louis Hellman throughout this article.

In addition to these books and conference proceedings, there have been many papers in the psychological and the architectural Journals with specific themes on the subject. The Journal of Environmental Psychology was published in the UK and Environment & Behaviour in the USA; the Architectural Psychology Newsletters, published by Sue-Ann Lee at Kingston followed by the IAPS Bulletins, have kept researchers in touch with each other over the years. International organisations such as IAPS, EDRA, MERA, PAPER were established. In the USA, The Journal of Architecture and Planning Research won publishing awards and Raymond Lifchez’s special issue entitled Designing with People in Mind, was followed by his book Rethinking Architecture, highlighting his concern about accessible architecture to disabled groups.

The verdict on the first question raised at the beginning of this paper is that a considerable amount of new knowledge and research has been accumulated over the years in books, conference proceedings and scientific articles. How this knowledge has been communicated to designers practising their profession, and to students of architecture aspiring to influence our future living environments, is the second question which needs to be addressed.

When we look at the real world of architecture, a considerable amount of this research has gone unnoticed. Some architects are sceptical about its value in design and, as a consequence, design awards are given primarily for imagination and originality at the expense of the users’ health and well-being. In 1984, Niels Prak’s book “Architects, the Noted and the Ignored” provides us with a useful analysis of the self-image and self-esteem of the professional as opposed to the user. However, a growing number of established and up-and-coming architects are offering us hope for the future, because they combine both originality and aesthetics with an understanding and catering for people’s needs. In some of these cases, the architect put their clients needs at the top of their list.

Ralph Erskine is one such architect. In the Pägans bakery in Malmo, Sweden, he has considered that occupants’ psychological needs such as the balance between “contact” and “privacy” as well as “identity” and “personalisation” while remaining very much aware of the occupants’ differences in terms of personality and values, as well as the need to change the open-plan Office Landscape for various activities, whether co-operative or competitive. His comment at the bottom of the page that “neither buildings nor furniture solve social or psychological problems, but hopefully they can help”, shows that he has grasped the concept of “architectural determinism” just right (i.e. he does not make extravagant claims, nor does he reject the role of the creative and caring architect in improving and facilitating more humane environments).

There are other architects who should be mentioned in this context who have contributed through their architecture and writing to designing with people in mind through their own idiosyncratic approaches to making healthier and happier places for people to live in.

Christoph Schulten’s sensitive participation projects in Aachen and Bavaria; Walter Segal’s projects in Lewisham and Stuttgart University self-build housing for students; Phil Biddy’s work with unemployed groups in the north of England; Herman Hertzberger’s attempt to get people involved with their surroundings, each other and themselves; Lucien Kroll’s motto “no inhabitant participation, no plane” and the late Charles Moore’s dictum that “buildings, if they are to succeed, must be able to receive a great deal of human energy and store it and even repay it with interest” are genuine non cosmetic attempts to consider, interpret and translate in their own way the concepts of human needs aesthetics, health and well-being at their drawing boards. These days some of these concepts are referred to as “sustainable architecture.”

However encouraging this example may be of architects designing with people in mind and even though there have been a few experiments here and there, by far the best way of communicating the new body of knowledge is through education. Architectural students may see and study some these successful architectural experiments but, while a few may be inspired and attempt to emulate their masters. The opportunity of critically evaluating the validity and reliability of their work in formal teaching and studio projects is so unique that to ignore it is to perpetuate the naive view that architecture is only an art at the expense of articulating form which reflects human life and emotion.

I believe that by far the main contribution of psychology in architectural education is made in the
first three years of the course. Once the groundwork has been laid down it does not matter what formal course in psychology or human factors the student pursues afterwards. The fact is that by this time all the students of architecture have been instilled with a “psychological eye” and are better equipped to search for those aspects that they have not considered in their designs before. The criterion of success is not to be found in the practical rules of thumb that are acquired, but in the general framework and awareness of the nature of science in relation to our aesthetic and social needs. A few of the students will pursue some of these ideas and objective methods of evaluation further; others will concentrate on a more theoretical interest somewhere along the people-environment continuum, and a tiny majority will apply for a higher degree in environmental psychology. By far the greatest majority of architects will not do that but will instead, practise their profession. It is this group of architects that we are most interested in. For example Mats Egelius award winning participation projects in Sweden are well documented. While a student at Oxford he attended the Lund Conference, did research on the subject, wrote articles in the architectural media, a book on Erskine and above all put this knowledge in design influencing peoples’ well-being: he even lives in an apartment in the same housing block he designed for people through active participation. The impact of Mats and other people like him is difficult to quantify but very crucial of this research in making a difference to peoples’ lives. Other examples include the work of Gus Grundt, leading the team who won the European Sustainable City Award for Oslo in 2002; the work of Phil Bixby enabling poor families in the north of England to build their own homes by extending his traditional architectural role; the work of Chris Trickey who for the past 20 years has been designing with people in mind in the south of England; in his firm’s latest project – designing the Police Headquarters in Herfordshire in 2005 he included in his design the latest research in colour and light psychology. Examples from non-Oxford graduates include Omretta Romice’s ongoing successful participation experiments in Glasgow, as well as Roderick Lawrence’s full scale simulation experiments in Switzerland, and his ongoing concern about environmental health and healthy cities in collaboration with the World Health Organization. So, in answer to the third question raised in the beginning of this article, this subject can change the attitudes of the new generation of architects, and has done so where it was taught.

I held this belief in 1968 when I started teaching the subject at the Oxford School of Architecture. Over the past 37 years we have produced thousands of graduates in architecture who have studied architectural psychology, not as an option but as an integral part of their three-year course in architectural studies. Students like the subject now no less or more than they did then, and they see its relevance to architectural education. Architectural psychology has not been just a fashionable topic like many other trendy theories, philosophies or subjects, such as semiology, phenomenology, deconstruction, ergonomics, simulation, virtual reality, chaos and catastrophe theory, quantum physics and nowadays sustainable development and digital culture. Architecture should not only cater to selfish hooligan interventions but also, and to a larger degree, to pragmatic and habitable and healthy buildings which may not win design awards but can provide the inhabitants with pleasure and joy.

Unfortunately, despite the positive contribution that psychology could have in architectural education, there is little evidence that it is taught. The fact is that psychology could have little or no practical usefulness whatsoever (because he/she
fails to understand it), or may view part of it with unrealistic enthusiasm, awe, or even see it as panacea for the complex problems of modern society. This is aptly illustrated by the Government’s eagerness to apply Alice Coleman’s ideas on solving crime and vandalism overnight as an easy, short term solution. The emphasis should not be on psychology after the architect has qualified in terms of research projects, post-graduate courses or higher degrees, but on it being of his/her development of other concepts of architecture should also develop concepts of psychological nature too. The old proverb “prevention is better than cure” applies here as well. Perhaps we should move some of the emphasis away from architectural psychology towards a psychological architecture. For example, the concepts of accessibility and disability issues, fire behaviour (by the late Jonathan Simes), housing guidelines including Ingrid Gehls’ psychological needs of identity, control, security, experience and pleasantness as well as different concepts of participation can be easily related and integrated in studio projects.

It is one thing to know about psychological needs and another thing to isolate the relevant ones for a defined problem within a particular social or cultural context. Knowing about human needs is an important first step, understanding these needs a vital second, but evoking and expressing them through their translation in built form is a culminant third. It is at this stage that the creativity and aesthetic sensitivity that is demanded of the architect becomes the critical factor. At this point, the architect may need to be inspired by nature and art, or go out to learn from experience what natural structures people find beautiful, as well as from architectural precedent and Post Occupancy Evaluation studies. Then he or she may return to the drawing board and try to emulate these structures in design not by naively mimicking natural objects but by being inspired by the ‘relations between the artificial elements exhibiting the felicitous rhymes of natural beauty’. It is in this marriage of interests, and in this understanding, that the architect’s truly creative role resides.

Finally, in answer to the fourth question, there is no better time than now to consider the impact of this research on human needs and aesthetics, to the design professions. By far the best way is through education. The European Commission Directive, Article 3, prescribes that architects should be trained and educated, in addition to design and technical expertise in aesthetics and the human sciences. In fact, six out of the eleven requirements are about these aspects. Nor is it a coincidence that the RIBA strategic study carried out in the UK by a previous President, Frank Duffy in the late ‘90s saw that the top priority for change perceived by staff and students in schools of architecture is “a greater focus on design from human/social needs”. There is the realization, more than ever before of the potential impact of this research to different professionals in both education and practice that has changed over the years. Different countries have been more successful than others. In UK this knowledge is incorporated in both legislation and different types of Directives. For example, the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, the Crime Prevention Act 1997, the Human Rights Act 1998 and currently the various Sustainability Directives and Agenda 21 are further examples where IAPS research over the years has become an important part in the education and practice of the design and planning professions. This has been achieved under the leadership of the IAPS Presidents, Rikard Kuller, Gilles Barbey, Arza Churchman, David Uzzell and Gabriel Moser.

The fact that well over 5000 students over this period have studied Architectural Psychology as an integral and mandatory part of their education at par with Design, History and Theory, Structure and Technology, despite the economic climate, philosophical and personality traits of five different Heads of School over the years is a test of the validity and reliability of the value of Architectural Psychology on a longitudinal basis. This was achieved because the consumers of this work considered the subject in annual student feedback in 36 years as essential, relevant and interesting in their education.

Charles Moore once wrote that when people do visit a place and like it or feel some connection with it, they send postcards to their friends to indicate their pleasure. Over the years I had letters from students and at Architectural Alumni Reunions informing me with pride of the projects they designed with “people in mind”. This is a difficult test to quantify and administer but it is another way of showing the profound influence that Architectural Psychology has had on their lives and the ways they want to share it with the people they are designing for.
Environment-behaviour studies and IAPS emerged amidst discussion about the need for a coherent theory of design which would account for human wants and needs. What I think we now have is something much more robust which includes a multiplicity of theoretical and practice-based approaches bound by a common ideology. This is the contribution of IAPS in its first 25 years.

The impacts of IAPS and the environment-behaviour studies it represents have been profound and wide-ranging. IAPS has fostered an approach to environmental decision-making which accounts for users’ beliefs, behaviours and expectations, and this is now well understood in many design practices. Technical building approaches to architectural theory have been overturned, and there are now many examples of how environment-behaviour studies have, for example, been applied directly to designing for security, safety and comfort. Participatory environmental decision-making and design practice methods have now become institutionalised in many places. They are applied under frameworks of general design and policy-making, as well as specific applications in housing, health, education, workplace environments and other settings.

The dissemination of this kind of thinking into architecture and other kinds of environmental decision-making, in many parts of the world, has taken place through the engagement of researchers and scholars in agencies involved in programming and design of public facilities. It has influenced curricula and research in architecture and design schools. This probably would not have happened without the organization of IAPS to provide a continuing point of engagement, a forum for discourse, and perhaps most important, a shared ideology for social scientists and design practitioners.

The development and maintenance of the discourse by IAPS through its publications, conferences, networks, and its affiliated organizations in Asia and the Pacific, is an achievement that all who have devoted knowledge, time and energy to IAPS can be proud of. As an international organization it has, and continues to be, well served by its presidents, board members and officers. They have, in effect, changed the course of environmental research and practices.

However we are not there yet. As the theme and keynote talks of IAPS-19 in Alexandria reminded us, there are immense global issues urgently awaiting the attention of those who understand how environment-behaviour studies can improve and sustain the human condition.

Although we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of IAPS, the activities of some of the people who helped to make the association of disciplines it represents, were influential 40 years ago. It is interesting to reflect and speculate on how the association started.

The collective disciplines represented by IAPS were initially called Architectural Psychology, and indeed the initials originally stood for (I think) International Architectural Psychology Association. Before the
collective of IAPS came together, there were probably many psychological studies which related human behaviour to physical environments. Architects, by definition, have always been interested in what people do in their buildings, even if their design theories and rationales did not account for this in appropriate ways. But the formal, documented and focused collaboration between architects and planners – designers of physical environments – and social scientists, seems to be recent, and dates from about 40 years ago, with the activities of the people who began IAPS in Britain and Europe, and the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA) in America. IAPS and EDRA have prevailed on related by divergent paths.

The Hawthorne studies, conducted by the Harvard Business School over 70 years ago became a classic in the literature of environment-behaviour research, although their intentions at the time were related to business studies issues of human resources, performance and productivity (Mayo 1945). In 1941, British architect Erno Goldfinger wrote a series of papers in the Architectural Review, in which he was advocating a scientific approach to understanding people's emotional responses and behaviour in relation to architectural space. "It is not necessary to elevate aesthetic emotion onto a pedestal of its own, and to make it the sublime phenomenon that it is. It is part of other natural phenomena, and as such, can and must be scientifically analysed. (Goldfinger 1941).

However, it was probably the unprecedented expansion in publicly funded housing and institutional buildings of all kinds in Britain and Europe following the second world war, that encouraged the development of research-based standards for building and planning.

Although building oriented in their approach, research studies, and the organizations that carried them out at that time, were pioneering environment-behaviour studies. Examples of this are the work of Ralph Hopkinson and his establishment of psycho-physical studies at University College London, Peter Manning at the Pilkington Research Unit, University of Liverpool, who published seminal studies on office environments and primary schools (Manning 1965)(Manning 1967) and the work of Thomas Markus at the Building Performance Research Unit, University of Strathclyde.

In 1969, the University of Strathclyde hosted the first conference on Architectural Psychology – the Dalandhui Conference. But before that there was the Portsmouth Polytechnic Symposium on Design Methods in 1967 organized by Geoffrey Broadbent and Tony Ward. This symposium, where I recall there were a number of participants from continental Europe, was perhaps where the idea of establishing formal, theoretical and research connections between social science, and the design and environmental policy-making disciplines was first seriously proposed and debated. Until then, the activities by academic and professional architectural institutions directed towards improving the quality of built environments had typically been building studies and building research. Along with this, architectural theorists had become interested in modelling design methods, as a way of potentially improving the effectiveness of design.

Although the Portsmouth Symposium was an international conference on design methods, there emerged from it a clear call for a better understanding of people's behaviour in relation to physical environments. For many, the Portsmouth Symposium was an opportunity to discuss what would be become a more important and prevailing issue than design methods. In his paper at this symposium, Amos Rapoport said, "...because the discussion of design methods has tended to concentrate on how to handle information, some very important questions as to the nature of this information, its content and the relevant image and value systems have been neglected, and that these aspects may be equally, or even more important – the best method will fail if we lack the information to use it." (Rapoport 1967). Raymond Studer's presentation included a similar message, "Human behaviour provides us with a reliable datum for formulating environmental problems, and environmental characteristics can only be specified to the extent that human behaviour can be specified." (Studer 1967). Psychologist Jane Abercrombie was perhaps more direct, "The spatial aspects of architecture have become lost in the methods used for designing these very spaces..." (Abercrombie 1967). Papers by Gordon Best “Method and Intention in Architecture” (Best 1967) and by Thomas Markus, “The Role of Building Performance Measurement and appraisal in Design” (Markus 1967) carried similar messages.

It is clear that at that time, there were already a number of successful research collaborations between architects and behavioural scientists. Carl Axel Aking at the Lund Institute of Technology in Sweden had published work on spatial perception
and preferences (Acking 1967). Canter was publishing on these issues in the Britain, and Alan Lipman published his work on user requirements and case study enquiry in Lipman (1967). There was also theoretical speculation in the field, for example, in an unpublished paper of 1965, Robert Sommer had said “…every building that is constructed makes implicit assumptions about the nature of human needs and behaviour. Architects have developed certain rules about spatial requirements which are only slightly the products of empirical behavioural evaluation.” In 1966, writing in the Transactions of the Bartlett Society in 1966, he noted that there is a need for a common language and tools for communication between designers. (Sommer 1966). In 1965, Peter Manning, who had authored major building studies, published his paper on the Human Consequences of Building Design Decisions. (Manning 1965).

The antecedent to IAPS, the International Architectural Psychology Association, began at, or soon after, the Architectural Psychology Conference AP-70 at Kingston Polytechnic, Kingston upon Thames, in September 1970. AP-70, organised by Basil Honikman, established the important Kingston connection for IAPS with Sue-Ann Lee who for many years developed and maintained the newsletter and membership records, and provided the focal point for IAPS.

Some would say, however that IAPS was born at the Dalandhui Conference on Architectural Psychology, 28 February to 2 March 1969. I remember Dalandhui, which is a facility of the University of Strathclyde, as a very beautiful and very cold location at that time of year. But the discussions and shared interests in architectural psychology were warm. Like early spring lambs, staggering and bleating, the ideas about environment-behaviour studies seemed at that time important, but speculative and still awaiting the support of a larger collective of scholars and practitioners - the warmth of the flock. (Note the obligatory New Zealand reference to sheep.) Dalandhui was a small conference. There can’t have been more than 30 or 40 participants, possibly less, including representation from early research leaders in the field, practitioners, and members of public agencies such as the Ministry of Public Building and Works. There were strong presentations on empirical studies which showed that the field was already diverse and flourishing. And there was important debate which would persistently occupy IAPS for the next decade or so – probably without resolution - about the need for a connecting theory on Architectural Psychology.

Terence Lee’s keynote address during the Dalandhui Conference questioned the need for a theory (Lee 1969). This was in the context of arguments by others at that time when the search for a theory which would connect psychology and architectural design seemed important. “We need a coherent theory about the dimensions and proportions of space that would be more than merely fashionable aesthetic doctrine.” (Parr 1969) “…there is a need for a systematic account of building implications for their users and the classification of human wants and needs.” (Canter 1970).

The search for a coherent theory which linked the work of architects and psychologists, continued as an issue for discussion and debate for perhaps the first ten years of the Architectural Psychology Association, as a background to development and the proliferation of empirical studies and research.

Figure 14: The IAPS Bulletin No.19 was a special issue on housing edited by Jeanne Moore and Roderick Lawrence published in autumn 2001.

With the formal establishment of IAPS in 1981 (the event we are commemorating) the collective scholarship and engagement of behaviour and environmental disciplines which it represents was identifiable. It was understood by, and having an effect on, a range of design and policy-making arenas in many parts of the world, and affiliated organizations were established (MERA and PAPER). The need for a connecting theory seemed less important, as what had emerged was an ideology which could guide and bind research,
practice, policy-making and politics. Hundreds of scientists and design practitioners were drawing strength from the knowledge and the collective called IAPS, and that is what has made it work. IAPS had become a forum, a record, a membership for a common set of beliefs and ideology about human-environment relations. For 25 years this has been the strength and effect of IAPS. The challenge clearly stated during the IAPS 19 Conference in Alexandria in September 2006 will now test this at the global scale.

REFERENCES


- Manning, P. (1967) The Primary School: An Environment for Education. Pilkington Research Unit, Department of Building Science, University of Liverpool.


IAPS NETWORKS

The Networks are interest and research groups formed by IAPS members. They carry out debates, discussion groups, publications, often possess their own website and organise symposia and conferences. Find below a complete list of those currently operating within IAPS, and get in touch with them for more information!

Housing
- Roderick Lawrence, CUEH, University of Geneva, 102 Boulevard Carl-Vogt, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland; Tel: 41-223798174; fax 41-223798173; Email: Roderick.Lawrence@cueh.unige.ch
- Rolf Johansson, Built Environment Analysis, Infrastructure and Planning, KTH, SE-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden; Tel: 46-8-7908498; fax 46-8-7908590; Email: rolf@arch.kth.se
- Listserver for the housing network is available through the coordinators.

Education
- Necdet Teymur, (Emeritus from METU, Ankara) / 31 Lauradale Rd, London N2 9LT / UK; Tel: +44-20-8883 496 / E-mail: n@teymur.co.uk
- Ashraf M Salama, Adams Group Consultants, 10020 Park Cedar Drive, Charlotte, NC 28210, USA; Tel: +1 704 341 0303 ext 103, Fax: +1 704 341 0652, E-mail: salama@theadamsgroup.com
- Joy K Pothish, Bowling Green State University, 305 Johnston Hall, OH 43403 Bowling Green, USA; Email: jpothish@bgsu.edu

Landscape
- Ulrica Berglund, Soderfors hogskaola, Box 4101, SE-141 04 Huddinge, Sweden; Tel: 46-8-58588143, fax 46-8-58588440; E-mail: ulla.berglund@sh.se
- Ton Rooijers, Centre for Environmental and Traffic Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands; Tel: +31 50 3636773

Spatial analysis
- Bill Thompson, University of Ulster, School of the Built Environment, Newtownabbey, Co.Antrim, BT37 0QZ; Tel:+44 28 9036 8599; Email: wj.thompson@ulster.ac.uk
- Jesse Voss, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning, PO Box 413, Milwaukee WI 43201, USA; Tel:+1 414 229 6721, fax +1 414 229 6976; Email: voss@uwm.edu

Communication Technology and Place
- Gary Gumpert, Communication Landscapers, 6 Fourth Road, Great Neck, New York 11021, USA; Tel: 1-516-466 0136; fax 1-516 466 1782; Email: ggumpert@ix.netcom.com
- Susan Drucker, Hofstra University, School of Communication, Dempster Hall, Hempstead, New York 11550, USA; Tel: 1-516-463 5304;fax 1-516-466 0136; Email:SPHSJD@hofstra.edu

Children, Youth and Environments
- Gary Moore, Faculty of Architecture, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia; Tel: 61-2-93516924; fax 61-2-93516665; Email: g.moore@arch.usyd.edu.au
- Maria Nordström, Department of Human Geography, University of Stockholm, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden; Tel: +46 8 164839; Fax:+46 8 164869; E-mail:maria.nordstrom@humangeo.su.se
- Network shared with EDRA

Culture and Space in the Built Environment
- Hulya Turgut, Istanbul Technical University, Faculty of Architecture, Taskisla Taksim 90191, Istanbul, Turkey; Fax: +90 212 2514895; E-mail: space@itu.edu.tr
- Peter Kellett, School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK; Tel:+44 191 2280203; Fax:+44 191 2226008; Email:p.w.kellett@ncl.ac.uk
- Go to the Culture and Space in the Built Environment webpage http://www.iaps-association.org/Culture/CSBE.htm

Gender and the Built Environment
- Liisa Horelli, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, Helsinki University of Technology, Hopeasaalmentie 21B, 00570 Helsinki, Finland; Tel: +358 9 684 8867; Fax: +358 9 684 5224; Email:Liisa.Horelli@hut.fi
- Ana Manchena Gren, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden; Email:anamgren@infra.kth.se
- Listserver for the gender network is available through the coordinators.

Environment and Gerontology
- Mark del Águila, Aged Services, Victoria University Melbourne Victoria, MC 8001, Australia; Tel:+61-3-9889-9148; Email:mark.delagualia@vu.edu.au
- IAPS-EDRA Environment and Gerontology Network Webpage: http://archweb.tamu.edu/gero

History and the Built Environment
- Jacob Kimaryo, 47 Cricket Inn Crescent, Sheffield, S2 5AQ, UK; Tel:+44 114 2758488; E-mail: kimaryo@btinternet.com
- A listserver is available for network members. To subscribe, contact the coordinator.Webpage: http://www.urban-research.net/iaphistory.html

Sustainability
- Birgitta Gatersleben, Department of Psychology, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, UK; Tel:+44 1483 689306; Email:b.gatersleben@surrey.ac.uk
- Linda Steg, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands; Email:l.steg@ppsw.rug.nl

Go to the IAPS-Association website http://www.iaps-association.org/
IAPS AIMS and OBJECTIVES

One of the priorities of the IAPS Board is to encourage more young researchers to join and be active within IAPS. Apart from special student rates for joining the Association (half the normal cost) and reduced rates for attending conferences, we have instituted a Young Researcher Award which recognises the best paper from a young researcher at the IAPS Conference. We also have a Doctoral Student Workshop linked to the Conference at which doctoral students can discuss their work with leading EB researchers and fellow students in a supportive environment.

We are also looking to further and facilitate international collaboration. This is best achieved by working with other EB organisations, but we are also currently looking to see how we can facilitate the setting up of a network of EB Research Units and Laboratories. This could potentially be highly beneficial for both international collaborative research funding and the teaching and training of young researchers.

In particular the Objectives of IAPS are

- To facilitate communication among those concerned with the relationships between people and their physical environment.
- To stimulate research and innovation for improving human well-being and the physical environment.
- To promote the integration of research, education, policy and practice.

To Achieve its Objectives the Association

- Facilitates contact and exchange of ideas between members all over the world.
- Holds regular conferences and specialised symposia and seminars in English and French.
- Publishes a newsletter, conference and seminar proceedings and a membership directory.
- Develops relationships with similar organisations (EDRA (N.America); MERA (Japan); PAPER (Australasia).
- Maintains study networks which regularly organise Network Symposia and publish Newsletters.

Benefits of Membership Include

- The right to vote and stand for membership of the Board and Strategy Committee.
- Reduced fees for attending conferences and seminars.
- Free copies of the IAPS newsletter. This contains research summaries, articles, reviews, letters, lists of references, and general news of the research field.
- Reduced subscription rates for specified journals.
- The right to be listed in and receive a copy of the Directory of IAPS members.

DISCOUNTED JOURNALS FOR IAPS MEMBERS

Several journals offer discounts to IAPS members. The procedure for subscribing is different in each case. IAPS members are best advised to go to the relevant website and get subscription information there. When they write to the Journal they should mention they are members of IAPS and claim their discount rate.

- **Environment and Behavior**
  Individual Subscription to IAPS Members 20% discount.
  For information: http://www.sagepub.com/Shopping/Journal.asp?id=4727

- **Environments by Design**
  IAPS members can purchase back issues, or packages of back and current issues at a discount of 25% on standard Individual rates
  For information: http://www.kingston.ac.uk/by_design/title_p.htm

- **Journal of Architectural and Planning Research**
  The current annual discounted member’s subscription rate is USD 73.60.
  For details: www.lockescience.com

- **Journal of Environmental Psychology**
  Individual subscription rate to JEP = 92 € / 103 USD (approx.20% saving)
  For information: http://www.academicpress.com/jep

- **Open House International**
  Normal Price £ 40 / USD 60, IAPS Members £ 30.
  For information: http://www.openhouse-int.com/