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The relationship between architect and client is the nucleus of the architectural design process. Recently there has been much discussion in the architectural profession concerning the importance of client participation in the design process, particularly the early phase. This increase in concern about client participation led to this study of the traditional architect-client relationship. This study was done to see whether or not there was a lack of client participation in the past, and if that situation still exists today. My hypothesis is that, in the past, the client played a relatively minor role in the design process because he was not considered to be essential and that today, though he is considered to be more essential, his role continues to be relatively minor: i.e., he is not participating in the right ways and at the right times.

The data for this Study was collected in two ways: first, by researching literature on the architect-client relationship, second, by interviews with six architects and three clients as a basis for obtaining information on the role of the client in the design process.

The study of the role of the client, past and present, generated the following questions: Is the client essential as a participant in the early phase of the design process? If the client is essential, how and when is he essential?

During the course of this study it was discovered that there was an insufficient degree of client participation in the past, and that this situation still exists today. Also, the reasons for this lack of client participation in the past were found to be linked directly to the historical development of architecture, since the Beaux Arts; and the reasons for this situation still existing today are linked to the changing emphasis of the architect-client relationship: i.e., clients and projects are different today than in the past.

It was concluded that the client is essential as a participant in the design process because he is a vital source of specific information that can be used to develop the criteria on which a design may be based. If the client is to make important decisions about his project based on a thorough understanding of that project, then he must be involved, especially in the early phase. An additional conclusion is that there are many clients who do not know how to be participants in the design process, and there are some architects who cannot show the client how he might participate. Therefore, there exists a definite need for some vehicle by which most clients, and some architects, can be educated about the design process and their respective roles in it.
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INTRODUCTION

In the past, the architectural profession has de-emphasized the role of the client in the design process. Even now, when there is a growing feeling that the client should participate to a greater degree in finding design solutions to his problems, the architect has a tendency to conceive of himself as the key participant in the decision making process. This conception of the architect-client relationship, which assigns to the client a relatively minor role in the design phase, can be related to the historical development of architecture itself.

In the 1800s, the Beaux Arts movement fostered an image of architecture as art and, correspondingly, of the architect as artist. The client, who was not an artist, was considered to be unsophisticated in the aesthetic aspects of design. As a result, he participated in the creative process to no greater degree than he would have had the product been a painting or a piece of sculpture. The client played the role of a patron of the arts rather than that of a working participant. This was a natural outgrowth of the 19th century's conception of architecture and was acceptable to both architect and client alike.

The turn of the century witnessed a new stage in the development of architecture - the emergence of "functionalism" - and with it came a new stage in the evolution of the architect-client relationship. Since the
emphasis of the functional approach was to design a structure whose exterior reflected the functions of its interior, the client became a useful source of information as to what functions were to take place in the building. However, since successful articulation of a building's functions was more important to the architect than the functions themselves, the architect retained much of his 19th century character as an artist. While the client began to contribute certain factual information to the design process, he still played a minor or nonexistent role in the aesthetic aspects of design.

Today, the focus of architecture is shifting from product (the building) to process (design as a problem solving technique). At the heart of the new approach is a recognition that structural expression of the spaces assigned to particular activities may be less important than the activities themselves. In today's increasingly complex society, a relatively permanent structure like a building must be flexible enough to accommodate a variety of activities in interchangeable spaces, as well as taking into account any predictable changes in patterns (e.g., in education and health care) that are likely to occur in the future. More than ever before, the architect and client are working together to design a building that fits the client's present and future needs. But in comparison to the scope of the architect's task, the client's role continues to be a relatively minor one. This brings up an important question - why aren't clients participating to a greater degree in the design process? More important, is the client really essential to the design process? If so, how?
The purpose of my thesis is to examine the role of the client in the design process in order to see whether or not his role is, in fact, essential. My hypothesis is that, in the past, the client played a relatively minor role in the design process because he was not considered to be essential and that today, though he is considered to be more essential, his role continues to be relatively minor: i.e., he is not participating in the right ways and at the right times.

It is assumed, for the purposes of this thesis, that the design process is a systematic approach to solving design problems, using analytic methods in order to obtain a clear understanding of the problem at hand. Before design solutions can be found, the problem must be well defined by the people involved, so that the solution chosen will be the best of the possible alternatives. Problem definition, then, is an essential step in achieving the optimum design solution.

It is also assumed, for the purposes of this thesis, that the term "client" includes both individual clients and group clients whose intentions are to seek the services of an architect in order to produce some type of addition to the man-made environment. The term "client" includes those people who will inhabit that addition to the environment - the users.

Methodology

The data for this thesis was collected in two ways: first, by researching literature on the architect-client relationship in general; second, by
interviewing six architects and three clients as a basis for obtaining information on the role of the client in the design process. The following questions were asked of the architects:

Was there a traditional client role in architecture? If so, what was that role? If not, why do you feel that there was not a traditional client role?

Does the client role of today differ from his role in the past? If so, how does it differ? If not, why do you feel that it does not differ?

Is the client essential to defining his problem in the design phase? If so, in what ways and at what times during the process is he essential? If not, why do you feel he is not essential?

The questions below were asked of the clients in order to obtain information on the role of the client from the client's point of view:

How do you feel that you are most effective in helping the architect develop a design program?

When are the times that you feel you are most necessary in helping the architect develop a design program?

How much do you feel you should participate with the architect in the design process?

The next step was to analyze the data to see whether a traditional or historical architect-client relationship existed and to determine whether there is a contemporary attitude as to what kind of relationship an architect does have with his client.

Finally, I tried to determine - in the event that I found support for a traditional role - whether or not the client was participating to a
sufficient degree in the right ways and at the right times in the design process. Further, in the event that I found some common opinion as to what the client's role is today, I tried to determine whether that role has been influenced by a feeling that the client's participation in the design process is essential.
1. THE INFLUENCE OF HISTORY ON THE ARCHITECT-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP

According to Robert Woods Kennedy, in his book THE HOUSE AND THE ART OF ITS DESIGN,

The person commissioning an architect makes three demands. He wants his house to be well-designed, both functionally and esthetically. He wants it to be structurally sound. And he wants his money dealings with architect, contractor, and subcontractors to be well run. 1)

Although Kennedy limits his discussion to houses, these three demands are for the most part applicable to every building type.

With respect to money dealings, the client has always understood what was at stake and has looked after his own interests by taking an active part in decision making. On the other hand, he has never participated in decisions relating to structural soundness because of their highly technical nature. In the area of design decisions, the extent of the client's participation has to a large degree been dependent upon the architectural profession's varying conception of the architect's role in design. The purpose of this section of my thesis is to examine the role of the client in the design process from the Beaux Arts era to the present, so that the architect-client relationship of today can be evaluated in the light of its historical development.

The Architect As Artist

Influenced by the Beaux Arts movement, the 19th century architect conceived
of himself as an artist whose special genius lay in the manipulation of a building's facade. As one author put it, the Ecole de Beaux Arts trained its members to be more interested in beautiful salon presentations, delicately washed in pastels and meticulously executed, than in viable solutions to real problems. 2)

For the architect, the natural possessiveness of any professional toward his work product was intensified by the feeling that he was gifted with a creativity that distinguished him from other men. This self-image was reinforced by the 19th century client, who tended to rely heavily on the expertise of the architect to produce an imaginative and tasteful design. Although the client reserved the right to express his dissatisfaction with a given design, his natural inclination was to involve himself as little as possible during the early stages of design and to place his trust in the architect. My own feeling is that in the 19th century - and today as well - the client might have involved himself to a greater degree had it not been for the mystery about the design process with which the architect has traditionally surrounded himself - a mystery which has stemmed from the failure of the architect to communicate just how it is that he translates information into spatial relationships. Whether or not this was the case, even the knowledgeable client of the Beaux Arts period was generally reluctant to become involved in what was essentially the architect's realm.

The Functional Approach

The impact of concrete and steel as structural materials and the new
thinking in all disciplines that came about during the aftermath of the Industrial Revolution began to be reflected in architecture. The ornamental facades of the Beaux Arts era became increasingly unpopular with a new breed of architects who were convinced that the functional organization of a client's life style or business could and should be expressed structurally. The emphasis on functional organization gave its name to a new approach to design - "Functionalism" - which until just recently was the paradigm of architecture.

Despite the fact that the client was a key source of information about his life style or the functional organization of his business, "functionalism" did not bring about any fundamental changes in the architect-client relationship. Although the new approach necessitated some initial discussion with the client, in general there was a mutual feeling that the architect could intuitively grasp the client's needs during the course of a few conversations or meetings. The client for the most part continued to stay out of the picture until the architect presented him with a design scheme for approval.

Like his Beaux Arts counterpart, the client relied on the architect's experience and skill in design and was reluctant to involve himself in an area in which he had no expertise. The client felt that he could not participate, even should not participate, in a solution to his problem because the means to the solution were in terms which were unfamiliar to him. On seeing a design solution for the first time, the client would
typically react to it more from emotion than from a clear understanding of how the scheme had been developed and how it related to his needs and desires.

The architect, in turn, continued to focus his energies on the aesthetic aspects of design. In 1964, Christopher Alexander in \textit{NOTES ON THE SYNTHESIS OF FORM} wrote that

\begin{quote}
...the average designer scans whatever information he happens on, consults a consultant now and then when faced with extra-special difficulties, and introduces this randomly selected information into forms otherwise dreamt up in the artist's studio of his mind. 3)
\end{quote}

Once the architect learned from the client how much space a given activity would require, he became more concerned with articulating the space assigned to that activity than with the activity itself. Indeed, even the space requirements were not always developed by the client. Many times they were generated by the architect. As recently as two years ago, when the functional approach was still the most popular one with the architectural profession, Constance Perin, in her book \textit{WITH MAN IN MIND}, pointed out that

\begin{quote}
the data for the design program are chosen and organized more by the architect than the client - who is most likely not even aware that the program by which the design will be conceived is under his control. Due partly to his ignorance, partly to client selection of famous names, partly to the lack of anyone else to do it, architects make the studies and write the program objectives - for in reality, the design program rarely ends up being more than an inventory of square feet standards applied to numbers of people. 4)
\end{quote}
Two architects who represent the hallmark of what Constance Perin is describing are Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier.

**Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier**

Two outstanding names in 20th century architecture are Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier. Although both men were advocates of "functionalism", Wright and Corbusier were so far ahead of their time in creative ability and architectural philosophy that it would minimize their achievements to say they "belonged" to any one school of architecture. That their influence has been profound is demonstrated by the fact that not only have Wright and Corbusier served as models for several generations of architects, but their fame has led the general public to identify architecture with their names.

In the light of today's design philosophy, it seems a paradox that Wright and Corbusier were so extraordinarily successful in creating livable and workable environments since, in general, they harbored a certain disdain for their clients. Both men regarded their clients as "roadblocks" to be negotiated in arriving at a design solution. In *TOWARD A NEW ARCHITECTURE*, which was written in 1923, Corbusier described his feeling about clients, saying,

> We are well aware that a great part of the present evil state of architecture is due to the client, to the man who gives the order, who makes his choice and alters it, and who pays. One can see these same businessmen in their own homes, where everything seems to contradict their real existence - rooms too small, a conglomeration of useless and disparate objects, and a sickening spirit reigning over many shams. 5)
For his part, Wright called conflicts between what the architect wants and what the client wants, vexatious, they are really only difficulties to be overcome. 6)

When asked if he thought buildings should be designed to suit the people who had to live in them and not to please oneself, Wright answered,

Yes, but as we see suitability, if we are consulted. People who live in buildings know strangely little about buildings, as a rule. They think they know what they want. Sometimes they do. If they come to you, wanting you, believing that you know, they do know that much. But, if they come to you to tell you how to build (design) what they want, that is something else. That could not work. Any architect builds a building to please his client, certainly; otherwise, why is he architect and the man his client? But, were you as an architect to go out seeking a job, go after a piece of work, try to persuade a man to let you build for him, then perhaps you would have to please your client against your will, do what he told you and serve you right, too! 7)

Several generations of architects have been taught to pattern their design philosophy according to the functional approach developed by Wright and Corbusier. In their admiration for the masters, these young architects have tended to equate personality with ability. While it is undoubtedly true that a person's genius must be studied within the context of his whole personality, it is not necessarily accurate to say that the attitudes of Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier toward society in general, and their clients in particular, in any way contributed to their genius. Yet, just as they copied the design techniques of these two men, many architects have also adopted their attitudes toward clients.
Both Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier have also influenced the way clients view their architects. Wright and Corbusier have been so well publicized that the average client has come to associate outstanding design ability with the kind of artistic temperament that Wright revealed when he said,

Things were as they were, I was as I was, and I built as I wanted to build. My client came to me to build for him, so he was mine too. ...No man can build a building for another who does not believe in him, who does not believe in what he believes in, and who has not chosen him because of this faith, knowing what he can do. That is the nature of architect and client as I see it. 8)

Because of their almost jealous insistence on design control for the architect, these two men have served to perpetuate the mystique that has traditionally surrounded the design process.

Once again, the architectural profession is beginning to rethink what architecture is all about. As the architect begins to question his role, he also questions the role of the client. His questions must be understood, however, in the light of his professional inheritance, which Forrest Wilson has described as a belief that

If a building is built well, works well, if the spaces are good and structure expressed, that was the architectural meaning of the building. 9)

The Contemporary View

In order to gain some additional perspective on what kind of role the
client has traditionally played in the design process, I interviewed six architects who are presently engaged in professional practice. The interviews were conducted so that both supporting and contradictory opinions regarding the hypothesis could be gathered. The two criteria which determined who was interviewed were the extent of the architect's experience in dealing with his clients and the architect's availability to the interviewer.

The supporting data from the interviews is seen in the following excerpts in answer to my question, Do you feel that there was a traditional client role in design? If so, what was it? If not, why not? Other data which does not fully support the hypothesis follows this section.

HERBERT K. GALLAGHER - President of a major architectural firm. 20 years experience.

"All any client has ever wanted was to have his problem solved. The architect has failed to illustrate his own way of solving problems. In the past a client usually gave me a one-page program of space needs. This was even true for fairly large projects such as schools. As innovations were developed over time the requirements became increasingly complex. This did not happen overnight. It happened as people decided to try innovative concepts dealing with their problem. As more innovations were tried this required that the client be more knowledgeable about his particular problem than he had been. Probably the only example where the program has not
changed very much is the case of housing. We still use relatively simple programs to design housing, yet we still design very poor housing that does not work. This shows a real lack of problem definition. I think that both the client and the architect are responsible for the lack of client participation in the past. The client being rather ignorant of the process the architect used, and the architect being rather egocentric about his aesthetic knowledge and abilities."

RALPH MONTGOMERY - Associate in a major architectural firm.
11 years experience.

A. "The traditional role is the basic one, and that is that the client pays the bills. From that role the client has always been traditionally a novice in building. In other words, he is in his first building project, and he was not aware of what his responsibility was and what he was to expect from the professional design consultant. The tradition has been that the architect has not assumed a responsibility of education to that client - to train him in what he had ahead of him in his project whether it was a one year, five year, or what have you. Very often the novice client entered into it without very much knowledge of what the right kind of responsibility of the design professional was or where he was going. At the same time, the traditional training of the design professional has been one of isolation from a real client. Architects have given lip service to client input, but only in a kind of restrained way; only as it met the needs of the means to get to a design. I think that as a tradition, it has been to the detriment of really meeting a need."
Q. Does that still exist today?
A. "It is sort of the "in" thing to talk about needs, but I'm not so sure that people are not just paying lip service to this and not really following through.

Q. Are you saying that in actuality the role of the client was really minor in design?
A. "It was probably subordinated."

Q. By the architect?
A. "Not intentionally. I think only because the sense of values in putting together a program fell short of what they should have. They focused on spaces and the sculpture of the thing and relationships in that sense, but not necessarily getting down to the fiber of how that thing was to be used and what the functional relationships really were. It is difficult to generalize about this because there have been sophisticated clients historically who had sufficient input on the building, and maybe those have been the successful buildings."

Q. Would you say that sophisticated clients are rare?
A. "I don't think that there is any doubt that they are rare. Also, the client sometimes in his oversophistication has assumed a dictatorial role in programming and in the overall way the building was built. The client quite often assumed the role of designer and many in the profession would be prone to do whatever was dictated by the client. That has resulted in some pretty terrible buildings. I think there is an equilibrium that has to be found, and it seems to be a need for mutual respect for one another, some kind of early communication at the outset that would crystallize
things that would optimize talent, including the client's. People should not try to do the other guy's job, which has been traditionally the case."

Q. You mentioned the sculptural qualities of architecture. Do you feel that had a great deal to do with the historical development of the client/architect relationship?
A."When you talk historically, I assume you mean the contemporary history of architecture. The departure from the history previous to the Beaux Arts has been the increase in technology recently, new acceleration in experimentation."

Q. Then you feel that the attitude that architecture as art had a lot to do with the breakdown in the relationship between client and architect?
A."Yes, I would say so."

ADEL FOZ - Presently a graduate student. 3 years experience.

A."I guess I believe there is. It is an assumption that in general the client came to the architect and told him what he wanted and then left him alone until the architect figured it out and came back with one or two solutions. Most probably, he only had one, and he told the client this is what it looks like. The client either said, yes I like it, or no, I don't like it, here, or here, or here. If the client didn't like it, the architect would take it back and do the same thing over again. In other words, the client hired the architect to design a solution,
and the client only altered it in minor ways. The architect was left alone as an artist and the client let him go at it. The assumption I made is that the client and architect were of same social class and, therefore, had the same goals. The basic concept of a design was usually all the architect's. The main part of a building was not of the client's doing, but the architect's.”

The following architects talked about a traditional role, but only in the sense that the architect-client relationship depended on the personalities of the particular individuals involved and varied according to those personalities. Although none of the interviews could be used to support my assumption that there has been a "typical" traditional client role in the design process, all of them basically agree that the historical architect-client relationship has influenced the relationship between architect and client today.

JIM ARMSTRONG - Architectural Designer. 3 years experience.

A."A lot of the inspiring architecture that I have seen has usually been an overstatement that's been done by an egocentric architect who probably, because of his nature, could not have designed that moving thing if he were otherwise. Saarinen believed that architecture should enhance a building's function. There are lots of ways to accomplish that, and one of the ways to enhance it that has been the traditional one is to make the building so unusual that people are aware of the existence of the building to the point that the functions that happen inside are almost
of a secondary importance.

Is there a traditional role? I don't know. From what I have read it appears that the traditional role has been just simply to say, "I want a house in the city, and you know what the crime in the streets problem is. I am a big person, I have lots of goodies I want to keep safe. Give me a model. Or, better yet, I'll give you a model - there's one down the street."

I think there has been no specific role. It has always been dependent on the relative intensity of feeling between what the client wants and how he feels about the competence of the architect; and what the architect wants and how he feels about the competence of the client. So I think there have been a lot of various attitudes. And I think what has shaped the traditional Beaux Arts kind of role-relationship between the architect and the client has been the detachment of the architect from the actual construction process. Then the architect came to be more of a designer-overseer. The engineering was built around the design the architect came up with. That attitude persists today among most architects. They are more interested in doing something monumental, doing something that is "an expression of their aesthetic beliefs". Let the engineering fall where it may. That kind of attitude almost necessarily means that the attitude of the architect toward the client is pretty disdainful.

Q. Does that really relate to traditional approaches?
A. "Yes, I do believe that it does. Historically, in the Industrial Revolution or when the Bauhaus came along, somebody recognized that the
machine was something that could work very well for man. Gropius starts designing straight line buildings and throws away all the "furbelows". The architect as artist, from that period, rejects it out of hand because there are counter-movements going on. The architect, at the time, rejected the machine. What happened was, I believe, that the engineers didn't. After a period of time engineers became the principal designers of buildings. The architect was relegated to the role of the person who covered up the engineering. I had a project where it was explicitly stated that my role as architect was to cover up the air conditioning. I was intent on analyzing their activity pattern and flow relationships. It was an industrial client. I like to think I gave them not only a suitable laboratory-office building but a suitable skin that reflected their international prestige.

There was a traditional client role, and there wasn't. It is very hard to pin down. There were different kinds of architects and different kinds of clients. The ideal thing is for the client to design because he knows what he wants. The architect, if he has been educated properly, has a broad view of what is possible. He might say to the client, "You don't want to choose a style from the past because you live in the present".

An anecdote. This chicken hatchery which I just mentioned. The production manager said to me during one of the early conferences, "Can we put a colonial facade on this building?" I had to say yes, of course. I let the conference go on and then came back to it. I asked this man what his friends abroad would think knowing that he does the most advanced chicken raising in the world and they see you in a brand new building with an
18th century facade on it? Are they going to think that you are pro-
gressive?
I think I had a decent argument for this. Slowly, this client came to
realize that architects can do much more than enclose the air conditioning."

DAVID SHEFFIELD - Associate in a major architectural firm.
12 years experience.

A."The main reason for the minor role of the client traditionally is that
buildings used to be very simple in terms of their physical organization.
The scale of projects was very small when compared to the size of some
projects today.
The traditional role of the client varied according to the client's own
awareness of his operations and how these operations might function in a
new facility. In other words, does building a new facility imply re-
evaluation of the organization of the client?
I think it is not right to make sweeping generalizations about the past
role of the client and the present role. In the past, there were very
involved clients and there were architects using analytical thought
processes in order to solve the client's problem. The key is that never
before has the total process had to be explicitly laid out in black and
white simply because the size and complexities of the projects did not
warrant it. Good solutions were arrived at by good, involved clients
and by good architects who used logical thought processes. The 'seat of
the pants' type designers worked then and work now through sheer personal
value judgements."
HOWARD ELKUS - Associate in a major architectural firm.
10 years experience.

A. "I suppose the basic nature of the client has changed over time due to the nature of the product changing. The client from the traditional times was a much simpler creature and as such was probably represented in terms of an individual rather than a group. The architect's job was much simpler also. It was probably more often a one-to-one relationship more than it is today. As a result, the client has a different kind of impact on a project today than in the past because he could have a profound influence on the shape of the thing produced. Whereas, the client today has an influence through his specific need. If the client today is a corporation, for instance, our bank client in Boston, where the whole attitude about the way the client viewed himself changed through the course of the project. This affected the product tremendously. The kind of goals we have as architects are shared. We are kind of products of our time. The notion of temporal architecture is an interesting one played next to the Beaux Arts where the goal was an architecture of eternity or permanence."

Q. Was the client really involved in design in the past?
A. "I suspect that the client has been involved in some way. It depends on if you're speaking of the client as community, then no, they weren't, but if you are speaking of the main person in charge of a project or whatever, I think they have. Interestingly, our corporate client in Des Moines did not want to interfere with our professional process. In a
very business-like way they assigned a task and expected a very clear-
cut answer. This was a result of a very intense programming stage."

In summary, the architect-client relationship in the past was a deriva-
tive of the Beaux Arts approach to architecture. Architecture was an
art and architects were artists who dealt primarily with aesthetic issues.
The client was involved in the process only to a minor degree, if at all.
Even with the later shift in emphasis toward structural expression of
function, the client was rarely involved in design decisions because
the focus of the architect was still on the aesthetic quality of this
structural expression.

The supporting data of the traditional client role, seen in the inter-
views of Herbert Gallagher, Ralph Montgomery, and Adel Foz, illustrates
the point that some architects today feel that the traditional architect-
client relationship is capable of being defined. More explicitly, the
traditional client role was directly related to the historical development
of architecture itself. Mr. Gallagher mentioned that the only real input
by the client was in the form of a one-page space program. He also infers
that the client has always wanted his problem solved by the architect,
but the architect has not shown the client how he solves problems. These
statements, I believe, can be attributed to the roles placed on client
and architect by the emphasis of architecture as art.

Mr. Montgomery gets at the issue better. He feels that clients, most of
whom are probably novice or first time clients, have little knowledge of
the responsibility of the architect to him. Also, Mr. Montgomery states that the relationship between the traditional client role and the history of architectural development is one of separation of client from architect when he says, "the traditional training of the design professional has been one of isolation from a real client". Mr. Montgomery goes on to conclude that architects talk a great deal about the need for more client participation, but "only as it met the needs of the means to get a design". I feel that the above statement is perhaps one of the most important reasons for the lack of participation by the client, traditionally. Mr. Montgomery also felt that the architect has not taken the responsibility of educating the client and that this is one reason why the client has not been involved very much.

Adel Foz, also, talks about the lack of client participation in the past. He refers to the basic concept of a design as a result of only the architect's input, not the client's. This, too, is related to history, as shown in his statement, "The architect was left alone (by the client) as an artist and the client let him go at it".

While not giving direct support for the existence of a traditional client role, Messrs. Armstrong, Sheffield, and Elkus did tie their thoughts to the historical development of architecture. Mr. Armstrong said, "...what has shaped the traditional Beaux Arts kind of role relationship between the architect and the client has been the detachment of the architect from the actual construction process. The engineering was built around the design the architect came up with. That attitude persists today among
most architects. They are more interested in doing something monumental, 
....that is an expression of their aesthetic beliefs."

As a result of these statements from the interviews, the conclusion is 
that because of the historical influence of architecture as art there 
was little client participation in the design process, especially in the 
phase that has become known as problem definition. More important, 
however, the major idea I have drawn from the interviews is that all 
architects interviewed felt that there exists a lack of client partici-
pation in the design process at the present time also. And they felt 
that this lack of participation today can somehow be connected to a 
difference in clients today and in architecture in general. This leads 
me to the next section of the thesis which deals with possible changes 
in architecture and clients as they relate to client participation or 
the lack of it.
II. THE CHANGING EMPHASIS OF THE ARCHITECT-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP

Today, architectural design has reached a stage of complexity undreamed of in the Beaux Arts era. Multi-million dollar projects, with the scale and scope that such a figure implies, are becoming relatively commonplace. The client, too, has taken on a new dimension. Where formerly the architect dealt with individuals, today his work is often overseen by one or more committees. Finally, increasing public demand for more basic services, as well as an increasing sensitivity to the environment, have been reflected in the rapid rate of change in living patterns and a new demand for people-oriented architecture. The purpose of this section of my thesis is to explore these new developments and evaluate their impact on the architect-client relationship.

Architecture's New Dimensions

When one thinks of architecture today, it is not the individual building that comes to mind, but rather the new communities, campuses, medical centers, and entire sections of cities that have recently been built or redeveloped. In the Boston area, for example, the 355 million dollar campus of the University of Massachusetts is just one of a number of large-scale projects in the planning, design, and early stages of construction.

In order to construct projects of this size and scope, the architect relies heavily on the expertise of specialists in engineering, cost control,
construction coordination, and computer technology. In the early stages of design, however, the architect today is equally concerned with information of a qualitative nature. A sociologist, psychiatrist, and/or other specialist in human behavior is often an integral member of the design team because the architect alone cannot hope to understand the interlocking network of human activities which his design must accommodate.

Although the client would seem to be a key participant in the early stages of design, in reality his role is still a relatively minor one. The architect's traditional conception of the client's role is partially responsible. The architect is overwhelmed with the innovations in design and construction technology that have evolved over the past few years. Without considering his relationship to the client, the scope of services which he is now expected to provide has vastly broadened. Although the architect pays lip service to the need for increased participation on the part of the client in the early stages of design, the ideal participation he envisions has no foundation in the past and would require considerable effort at a time when his energies are being consumed in trying to understand other complex aspects of design and construction.

Curiously enough, however, the client has also been instrumental in determining his limited participation by turning to firms specializing in operations research and systems analysis, rather than to the architect, to furnish predesign services. These firms study the client's operations and tell him what his present needs and future goals should be. The client
then comes to the architect with a ready-made report which leaves little opportunity for exchange between the two as to what the client's needs and goals may be. As one author explained this recent development,

Non-architects do the analytic work that often determines the size and shape of the building to be constructed. But, more important, they determine whether or not buildings are needed, what type they should be, when and where they should be constructed, what the budget will be, who the occupants will be and, often, what the manufacturing processes should be. 10)

The size and scope of architectural projects are apparently as overwhelming to the client as to the architect, but where the architectural profession has turned within itself to find new capabilities to handle the complexities, the client has begun to seek solutions outside the realm of architecture. In order to evaluate more fully the client's present role in the early stages of design, however, it is necessary to understand just who the client is and how he currently perceives himself in relation to the architect.

The Multi-Headed Client

Apart from the area of custom-designed homes, the individual has become an increasingly rare species among clients. Typically, in medium-to-large scale projects, the client is not a person, but an institution, corporation, or public agency, represented by committee members. According to Charles M. Nes, Jr., former President of the American Institute of Architects, this change from individual to multi-headed client has resulted in a less cut distinction between the roles of architect and client.
The customary way of creating environment in the past was for the client, who was also the owner and user to hire the architect. The client brought to the creative process his land, financing, and personal requirements. The architect brought to it his design skills, his accumulated experience in getting things done in the traditional ways, and his role as head of a team of specialists. But in the past few years this process has become less sharply defined. The owner today is often a group - a corporation, committee, board, or government agency - whose decision-making processes are complex and whose methods of operation sometimes encourage a 'turnkey' approach to building. 11)

The multi-headed client, then, is not the owner in a traditional sense, nor in many cases is he the user. Rather, he represents a fictitious person - the corporation, institution, or public agency - who supplies the land, financing, and personal requirements. As a result, the contribution of the group client to the decision-making process is of a different character than that of the traditional owner/user. Because it operates in a fiduciary capacity, the group client has a tendency to focus on the politics and economics of a project, rather than aesthetic aspects of design - one important reason being

the encouragement provided by the tax laws to build quickly and badly. 12)

Developing an architect-client relationship that is meaningful to the design process has additional built-in difficulties in the situation where the corporation or institution is the client. As one author described it,

Entrepreneurs, boards of directors, and committees make decisions in the U.S. every year that result in
the expenditure of billions of dollars for capital improvements that literally shape our environment - without consultation or advice of an architect. The architect may never meet the real decision-makers during his relationship with such a client. 13)

Although the multi-headed client is in a more powerful position in relation to the architect, today he continues to play a relatively minor role in the early stages of design because of changes related directly to his new group structure.

Architect's Apprehension As A Result of New Pressures

Instead of dealing primarily with the manipulation of forms in unique ways - with the emphasis on the building rather than its inhabitants - architects are finding that, in the shift from product to process, human needs are at least as important as aesthetic issues. In government and academic circles, more and more literature is beginning to appear which questions traditional patterns of living and delivery of services. As Constance Perin put it,

The concern has been housing, not how families live; and transportation, not why people move around. 14)

The concern has been hotels and hospitals, universities and office buildings, but society's conception of the living, learning, working, moving, playing process is changing at a rapid rate. Since a building is a relatively permanent structure, the architect is finding that not only must he take into account the complexities of the client's present needs and goals, but he must also consider any predictable changes in patterns
which are likely to occur in the future.

Even if the rate of change were not forcing the architect to focus on activities and human interrelationships, the biggest user of all - the public - would be forcing him to be more concerned with people-oriented planning and design. Community groups are demanding to be a part of the decision-making process for physical change in their communities. Government agencies and their policies (the client, but not the user) have created environments that have had negative effects, socially and culturally, on many urban communities. As Gordon Barclay put it,

Remember who used to attend public hearings? A couple of lawyers, a local assemblyman, and maybe a representative from the League of Women Voters. All this has changed dramatically. Last Spring (1969), for instance, at a hearing to debate a proposed highway route near Albany, a thousand citizens gathered to protect a small but friendly stream. At last report, the highway planners are looking for another route. This skirmish, and others like it, serve notice that the citizens, or large numbers of them, want a voice in the decision-making. 15)

On the one hand, then, because of the complexity of architecture today and the group client, both architect and client have brought about a situation in which there is a lack of client participation. On the other hand, the user - at least in the case of the public - is demanding to be involved to a greater degree. The result has been a kind of "role confusion" for the architect. The anxiety he has felt about his own role has contributed to his reluctance to complicate the process any more for himself by seeking new ways for the client and/or user to participate in the early stages of design.
The Interviews

In order to point out further the issue of complexities in architecture I present more from the interviews. The following excerpts have been taken from the same architects whose interviews were used in the previous section. Their responses were in answer to the question, "Do you feel that clients today differ from those in the past? If so, how do they differ? If not, why do you feel that clients are not different today? All of the architects felt that the client of today is different from the client in the past and all of them felt that architecture is far more complex today than ever before. One architect chose to discuss the effect of community demand for involvement in the decision-making process. Interestingly enough, of the three factors which I chose to emphasize, the architects interviewed seemed to focus on the client as a group - and the difficulties he presents for the architect - as the key factor influencing the lack of client participation in the early stages of design.

HOWARD ELKUS (The beginning of his answer should be understood in the light of the discussion which went before. Mr. Elkus has been discussing a corporation which is presently a client of his, specifically with reference to the programming stage of his involvement with this client.)

Q. Was the client involved in that stage?
A. "Very much so. So maybe that's one piece of the process that has become more refined today, where maybe there was no real programming stage in the past. The architect was considered more of a conceiver of an image rather than satisfying any checklist of needs."
A YMCA client is another example of a client we had. The definition of need was imperative. It is interesting to compare the first building with the addition a few years later. There was less of an organized client for the first part and much of the community had been removed by urban renewal. For the addition, there were people there and they made an effort to find out their own needs, etc. We had to prove ourselves again to the second group who needed to learn about our way of working, etc. There was quite some time devoted to producing something that reflected their proprieties, etc."

Q. You mentioned that clients are changing. Are there any other ways in which they are changing besides in size?

A. "First, most projects have taken on a greater complexity in one way or another. Funding has become more institutional than it was. The building process has become a more sophisticated one. Less permanence is desirable today than in the past. Many client bodies are producing larger projects such that it is a heavy allocation in terms of money and energy. Many clients could become financially broke if they embark on the wrong venture. Clients are trying to get people on their own staff who are experts in various building methods, etc. or they are hiring experts as consultants in this area. The architect is often dealing with a combination client. More and more the architect is put at a disadvantage as the picture compounds. There is more of a burden on the architect to "goal-tend" the quality of the product."
"The nature of today's client: - The rate of change has increased very sharply in a short time. Thus, it has been difficult for people to keep up with changes in even the most cursory ways. The rate of tenure of people in charge has changed just as drastically. Therefore, many times the architect must deal with two or even three different groups who are in the same decision-making positions during the course of a project. The rate of change of people in charge of a project used to have some sort of continuity, but today there is no continuity because of the competition to get better jobs somewhere else. Many clients want to build a building just to land a better job somewhere else by saying he was responsible for getting the building built.

Types of clients: - There are individuals, small groups (church committee is example), corporations with large administrative staffs, and then there is the government where sometimes there is no one person who has any final decision-making authority. Very often the client is not the ultimate user and the client's ideas of needs may not be even remotely related to the user's needs. This is one reason for client and user participation in problem definition. Little progress can be made without their participation."

A. "I do, basically, but one must make distinctions. Buildings have
become enormously more complicated and expensive. This is mainly true in institutional buildings with which I am familiar. New functions have been derived. The cost has become very important. A study was done, for instance, comparing office landscape arrangements with the traditional cellular office setup. The company client decided they liked the landscape arrangement better, not because of the way it works but because they could pack more people into the same space for less money. In other words, I think people have become more conscious of the cost/benefit aspect."

Q. Do you feel that clients in general are much more aware of the changes that have taken place in getting buildings built?
A. "I don't think they are aware of the changes. I think they are aware of the previous.... what they were given when they got in their present position and what they would like to have. There is very little feeling for historical descendence or relationships."

Q. Do you feel that the client is essential to the design process, specifically in defining his problem?
A. "I do. To go back to changes, I thought of something else. Clients today are more corporate. That is a big difference. In the old days I suspect the client was just one or two persons, usually one. Today responsibility is more delegated throughout a client group."

RALPH MONTGOMERY -

A. "Here, too, it is difficult to generalize. I think there are still
those architects who can get away with swooping in with the flowing cape and say, "I am here to take over. Call me at the end of the job." One thing, seriously, is the increasing sophistication on the part of the client -- the user. You see it magnified because there is a lot of money at stake. A lot of the mystique and veils of mystery are being pushed aside. People are saying, "Hey, I am paying a decent dollar here. What am I getting, and what is all the double-talk about?" Architects are not really medicine men. There is little mystery any more. It is good that the building profession has come into the public eye. There is exposure. People know who Frank Lloyd Wright and Corbusier are. But, the one thing is that it has made the profession of architecture be accountable, which is really healthy.

Clients want to place responsibility. They want more guarantee that they are going to get a building system, not using it in the recent catch-all buzzword. Clients want to be assured that they will be delivered a piece of hardware that they can use, that will be responsive to their needs and not get a surprise unwrapping at the end of a job. He is asking for more predictability - a performance kind of package. The key is that the architect either accepts the responsibility or he doesn't. If he doesn't, he is going to find that someone else has picked it up and the architect will find himself in a more subordinated role from what he has enjoyed traditionally. If the architect is not willing to work with the client in getting these performances etc., then someone else will do it who may not be as sympathetic or sensitive to some of the more important aspects of design. It is really critical that the architect do this. There is
enough being written about construction management, etc. Underneath all
the mystery is the heart of it - the idea of being a good listener to the
client and trying to fulfill needs and not getting on some ego trip.
The change is here and not by choice but because of the pressure."

Summary
The major problem for architects today is that clients are very much different with respect to their size, and to their wants, demands, and knowledge. All the architects interviewed were very specific in these differences between the traditional client and today's client.

Howard Elkus speaks explicitly about client projects. He said, "....most projects have taken on a greater complexity in one way or another. The building process has become a more sophisticated one. The architect is often dealing with a combination client". The statement above illustrates the reason for the emergence of combination or group clients, which is the size and complexity of today's projects. The client feels a need to have more than one area of knowledge and more than one responsible authority for making decisions about highly complex problems.

Herbert Gallagher brings out a very interesting point about the differences in clients today. Mr. Gallagher thinks that many clients are in positions of authority for a relatively short time compared to the client of the past. He spoke of his experience of having to deal with two or three different people as decision-makers on the same project. This growing tendency
is one of the changes today that has added to the feeling that architecture is much more complex than it was traditionally.

Adel Foz feels that one of the major changes in clients today is the fact that clients are more cost conscious, especially in relation to the benefits acquired by various costs. This leads to the real issue, of which cost is one important aspect. The major issue is the new demands being made by clients in general. Again, Ralph Montgomery describes this trend more explicitly. He speaks almost entirely of the client's demand for higher performance by the architect. In discussing his own experiences, Mr. Montgomery said that clients are more explicit about wanting to find out exactly what they are getting for their money. As he stated in his interview, "Clients want more guarantee that they are going to get a building system, they want to be assured that they will be delivered a piece of hardware that they can use, that will be responsive to their needs, and not get a surprise unwrapping at the end of the job. He is asking for more predictability." The new attitude by clients with respect to demands about performance is another major reason for the complexities that have developed in the architectural field. It has put a burden on the architect to do things and explain things in ways he has never had to before.

The present confusion and apprehension of architects toward clients is related directly to the emergence of new types of clients, who have new demands. Specifically, at the heart of the confusion is the feeling by
many architects that the client today should be more involved in the
design process, while at the same time being reluctant to cast away the
role imposed on both client and architect by traditional influences.
Mr. Montgomery describes this point in a statement from a previous portion
of his interview. He says, "Architects have given lip service to client
input, but only in a kind of restrained way". What he failed to mention,
I feel, is that there is a present lack of client participation in
problem definition even though there is this lip service being paid to
the notion of client involvement. I conclude that there is presently a
lack of client participation in problem definition because of the changing
and complex nature of architecture, specifically with regard to clients
and their project types; and the resulting role confusion and apprehension
about client involvement by architects.

After concluding that in the past there was a lack of client participation
in problem definition and that presently there exists a lack of client
participation in problem definition, I was still faced with the question,
Is the client, in fact, essential at all in problem definition within the
design process? This question arose because it became apparent that one
could not really discuss lack of client participation without dealing with
the question of the need for his participation in the first place. As a
result, I was led to the next section of the thesis.
III. IS THE CLIENT ESSENTIAL?

In a sense, it is irrelevant to discuss - much less express concern over - the issue of the client's past and present lack of participation in the design process, unless it can be demonstrated that the client is an essential participant in that process. As has been shown earlier in this paper design solutions were arrived at in the past without client participation because of the architect's conviction that he alone possessed the skills necessary to produce a building solution. This attitude on the part of the architect was expressed more recently at an AIA workshop entitled, "The Client and Society" where it was agreed that,

Design or environmental problem solving must often precede the appearance of the 'sponsor'. It is then necessary only to find the client/sponsor or .... 'design the client'. 16)

It is the purpose of this section of my thesis to examine whether or not the client's participation in the design process is essential and to examine just how and when it might be essential.

Three Ways In Which the Client Is Essential

In a series of articles in The Architectural Forum in 1969, Donald Canty outlined the contributions that the client makes to the architect-client relationship.

The client, first of all, brings the money to build the building, which is no small contribution. The client also brings an unmatched knowledge of how he
Although the client's economic contribution to a project only indirectly affects the design, it bears mentioning that many clients have little understanding of what they can get for their money, and by participating to a greater degree in the design process, such a client gains the opportunity to evaluate alternative design solutions by comparing the benefits of various aspects of the design with the cost of those aspects.

The second item which Canty mentions - "how the client likes to run his business" - is far more important in terms of its impact on the design process. The basic framework of a design is usually constructed from information concerning the client's business operations and lifestyle. In the past, as a result of their education and experience, architects were generally familiar with the way an office, school, or hospital functioned. It was a mark of professional skill to be able to put together a building from a list of space requirements. Today, however, many architects are beginning to realize that the rate at which concepts in business management and delivery of services are changing could make a building obsolete before it is even constructed, unless the architect learns from the client how the client envisions his present and future operations. The client is in the best position to be in touch with the latest developments in his own field; therefore, he represents a key source from which the architect can obtain the information he needs to
establish the framework of the design. In this respect, the client is certainly an essential participant in the design process.

The third contribution that the client makes to the design process is more qualitative and can be described as "personal tastes and desires". When one speaks of this type of data in design, one is referring to the areas of inner feelings and emotional reactions relating to values, mores, attitudes, and the like. These are intangibles and are not only difficult to elicit from the client, but are even more difficult to deal with architecturally once they have surfaced. As has already been pointed out, both architects and clients have always had a tendency to treat design criteria as quantifiable, focusing on "square feet standards as applied to number of people" rather than on activities and human behavior as they relate to the environment.

A situation involving a former associate of mine and one of his clients illustrates the necessity for incorporating the client's personal tastes and feelings into the design criteria. The client wanted the architect to design the master bedroom suite of his house so that his wife's closet and dressing area would be located on the other side of the bathroom from his dressing area. Further, the client wanted his wife's dressing area to be visually closed off. The wife was upset with this approach and could not understand why her husband wanted the area designed in this way. Finally, the client revealed that he could not tolerate his wife's tendency to be messy about her personal belongings. This example demon-
Strategies that qualitative data can be very elusive unless the client is willing to open up his character and become involved on a more personal level. And yet, my friend's client may have always been secretly dissatisfied with a design which did not incorporate his innermost feelings.

Peter Pragnell spoke of the difficulty involved in trying to incorporate intangibles into design in an article in The Architectural Forum, December 1969,

Do the authors of a building program (the client), by their inability to articulate 'intangible' qualities, prejudice the outcome of such a project? They set their requirements in such a fashion as to preclude any central place for 'intangible' qualities in their program, yet hedge their bets by requiring the architect to provide them nonetheless. Inevitably, many sacrifices are made during the development of any project....I believe we all suffer by our lack of ability to make those 'intangible' qualities of human association. If such qualities were given articulate and eloquent voice, we would not have to depend alone on the objective and quantitative criteria which form a restricted common ground at this time. 18)

It is difficult for architects to translate qualitative data into effective design criteria, but it is essential for a client to understand that his building should be developed principally around his tastes and desires and only secondarily around those of the architect. The goal is to create a situation in which the client contributes real insight into what should be the design criteria - very possibly revealing things the architect would otherwise be unaware of. In the typical situation, however, when the client expresses a preference for one thing over another, he does it in terms of a design solution. It is important for the architect to
establish a level of communication at which the client is encouraged to
talk about why he wants the executive offices on the top floor, or why
he would prefer a colonial house. Although in a very real sense, the
architect and client deal with each other at arm's length as businessmen
engaged in a business contract, their relationship must at the same time
include a deeper personal understanding in order for the final product
to be a truly unique solution to a client's unique needs.

When Is The Client Essential

Once it has been established how and why the client is essential to the
design process, the question arises as to when his contribution can be
made most effectively. According to an article in Progressive Architecture,
August 1967,

One important reason for the all too common delay
that occurs in getting a building underway is that
the client often does not furnish the architect with
enough information in the beginning as to the kind
of building that is needed and what it is to be
used for. 19)

The architects and clients interviewed for this project all had essentially
the same comment: the input of the client should be greatest during the
early stages of design. Once the problem is defined thoroughly, the need
for client participation diminishes, but if the architect does not have
all the information he needs during the early stages of design, he often
begins to develop a solution that he may ultimately have to "sell" to the
client. He may produce a very successful solution which he will have no
trouble selling, but the fact that such an approach may work well in some cases does not justify the occasions when the architect does not succeed in developing an appropriate solution to the design problem.

If the client is creative, open-minded, and knowledgeable about his own needs and desires, then architect and client can begin at once to establish design criteria. If, on the other hand, the client is unprepared to assume his role immediately, then he obviously cannot contribute effectively at the earliest stages of design. Rather than proceed without the client's participation, it may be better to re-evaluate the length of time allotted in the contract to the problem definition phase. Additional time would tend to alleviate the pressure on the client and create a climate more conducive to communication and effective participation.

While it is not the purpose of this thesis to redraft the standard contract for architectural services, it might be noted that the problem definition phase of design is not, as a general rule, a separate item in the contract. Instead, it is included as part of the 'schematic design' phase, in which the greater amount of time is devoted to rough diagrammatic sketches and site analyses. Since technically the architect and client review progress at the end of the entire schematic design phase, there is presently no built-in flexibility when it comes to tailoring the problem definition phase to the capabilities of a given client.

In conclusion, the client is essential as a participant in the design process because he is a key source of information regarding the functional
organization of his business or life style and his personal tastes and desires. His contribution can be made most effectively during the very early stages of design, but should he need more time to gain understanding and insight into what the problem definition stage is all about, then that stage should be lengthened to suit his needs. In no case, should his ability to participate limit his effectiveness. It is the job of the architect, or possibly a third party such as a person with expertise in problem definition, to educate the client to the point where he can contribute.

The Interviews
The following excerpts from interviews with both architects and clients help to illustrate the emphasis being placed on a closer architect-client relationship. All the statements in some way support the premise that client participation is essential to defining the design problem.

HERBERT K. GALLAGHER -

"Is the client essential? - If you want to get a problem solved at all or if you want to make any progress at all, the client is definitely essential to problem definition. The best buildings have happened as a result of a very knowledgeable and creative thinking client. Unfortunately, these types of clients are few and far between. I define a building as being "best" when it goes far beyond simply meeting the practical needs of the client. It is one which has really enriched the client in terms of how
he relates to the environment. It is an intangible thing, but the client feels something that makes him more aware of the responsibility of the environment to enrich his life a little more than it has been. I have some jobs that have a few technical problems (roof leaks etc.) but the client still loves the building and agrees that the roof leaks can be solved. This is not to justify technical drawbacks that are created for the sake of aesthetics.

I would say that the biggest criteria for how much participation a client should have in problem definition is the client's capability of decision-making under stress. Ideally, the client should be a member of the design team from beginning to end. But, the client's trust of the architect is the key to how much the client wants to get involved. I have clients who just don't trust me for one reason or another. It is a big part of my job to develop that trust and get the client wholeheartedly involved in the process.

Problem definition will have to be different for each type of client. An assumption has to be made in each case that it is a necessary thing that the client participates in the process. A danger in this is a client who knows explicitly what he wants because it has always been that way - what was sufficient then is sufficient now, why change. This is when client participation will probably hinder progress in problem definition because of the client's closed mind and narrow ways of thinking. It would be an incredible job to just get him to agree to basic things much less get him to participate in a very creative way in problem definition.
Techniques for getting more participation. - The key to getting any kind of effective participation is communication. If the ideas and information are not communicated properly to the ultimate decision-makers then it is likely that few will understand the ramifications of the alternatives. In schools a good way of getting communication is to play a three dimensional game with possible layouts and ways of changing these layouts and discussing alternate ones in three dimensions. The good result is that people begin to realize and understand everyone else has problems too. Also, they begin to understand possible ways to solve those problems. This generates another level of communication because people will then discuss their problems with each other which very often they have not done previously.

The problems arise when the client make-up lacks continuity, which I mentioned before. You may be on the way to defining a problem and making progress when the present client is voted out or decides to accept a better position somewhere else. Then you must start all over and get the communication process going again among entirely different personalities. This is a major problem for architect-client relationships today. This will be the biggest block to the problem solving process because problem definition is next to impossible in this kind of situation."

RALPH MONTGOMERY -

Q. Do you feel the client is, in fact, essential to defining his problem for design? If so, in what ways and when is he most essential?
A. "The second part of the question is particularly fascinating to me because of the team work approach. The idea of problem solving must be one of team work. There is no single individual who can be sensitive or talented enough to respond to all the important considerations with equal weight. It takes team work. The team is made up of many people with very different areas of talent. At the beginning of the job there is a real need for the user to get his rigid requirements, even some of his emotional involvements, in the project. He must be in a give-and-take with the architect. On the other hand, it doesn't mean he should lean over the drafting board every minute of the job. He should be able to have periodic input as other members of the team are moving ahead with the project."

Q. Specifically, what kinds of input is the client most valuable in having?
A. "The direct ones and also the intangible ones. Whether or not an open or a cellular type of environment is most appropriate. It is difficult because buildings today may go over several generations. An architect may design some elaborate research facility for one particular client, then that guy may get another grant and he is in some other city by the time the building is complete. The architect has tuned into the client all right, but the client is gone. There should be some sort of way to find who is the client or user. Somehow there must be built-in change-ability or something in order to respond to different clients over time. The design profession maybe has to educate the client in these areas"
because the client is dealing with one moment in time when he has the
desire and money to build. The client may really be fixed on something
that may not be his real need. A client for a science lab, for instance,
may have the idea that the architect should design the science lab that
he taught in previously in some school, rather than being analytical and
objective and asking himself what is it he really needs. Sometimes the
client doesn't always know best. It must be give-and-take between client
and architect.
When should the client be involved? He should be involved mainly at those
critical points when the give-and-take occurs. He should be entitled to
reviews to make sure those initial priorities have not been lost site of."

Q. Would you be more specific about those critical points you spoke of.
A."It goes back even before initial contract signing. There should be
mutual understanding of goals and objectives and responsibilities. Too
often the architect jumps into design before the goals and tools are in
order. If this was done, then we could tailor the contract to fit the
goals and objectives. It is very important to do this in the beginning.
Then the program can be attacked with the previous info in mind. It is
most critical that the client be involved as early as possible. The ear-
liest and most intense input is at the beginning."

Q. Are there other areas you think the client might or might not be
essential in the process?
A."The phases of design are too often isolated from each other. You can't
really separate the building design from environmental equipment and
furnishing, etc. Continuity is the thing, as far as the client is concerned, so that the early objectives are not lost sight of. Too often the client is not involved after the fact. There should be a followup mechanism between client and architect so clients can respond to their new environment and let the architect know these things."

ADEL FOZ

"Is the client essential? Yes, he is very essential. What I am about to say is based on my thesis plus some experience. The early stage of programming, as far as I can tell, is one of simulation. In other words, people imagine what a place would be like. When they feel they have some certainty about it, they decide it should be a certain way. The trick seems to be to make this decision-making easier. What usually happens is the architect tries to project himself into the situation. What sometimes happens as a result is that the project ends up reflecting the architect's values whatever they might be, and not the user's values. I think the client has to be there in person. He is essential to the simulation so that it can be realistic and help make the decisions to be good ones. Whenever someone's opinion is not represented, it will not be reflected in the final thing. If the eventual users are not involved in the decisions, then it is very likely that the building will be hard to maintain for one thing. The initial leap that is made from program to form is the architect's. I think it should be the user's also. But the user needs a great deal of education in this area because he is not accustomed to thinking about reading drawings and even models with respect
to how space is to be used, and what it will do for them. The feeling I have is that most clients or users are simply untrained in trying to perceive space and the uses to which it might be put."

Q. At what specific times is the client essential?
A. "When architects are ready to decide how to approach the problem, then the client is necessary. Give the architect a few days to come up with some alternatives, then the client should sit down with him and talk about it. Talk about implications of use relationships with the client. Eventually, I think, the client might begin to respond and give a lot of feedback on the character of the project. All the details and problems that arise from this have to be hashed out and discussed. Then at every stage when decisions need to be made, the client should be brought in. He should make the choices of alternatives or resolve the ambiguities about uses, etc."

JIM ARMSTRONG -

Q. What do you think about the essentialness of the client?
A. "Well, ideally the client should design the thing himself. It is improbable that that can happen. So the next best thing is to have intimate contact with the architect. On the other hand, the client can screw himself up by not knowing about possible new solutions. So many clients start out by getting things from magazines or trying to compose their own house by modifying things they have seen. That is an acceptable solution in my eyes. The client has to rely on the architect's ability to project
what the thing will be like and whether it fits his needs. The big difference between client and architect is that the architect knows what he is doing when he makes a line. All along the line the architect has to consult with the client. There are problems, however. Some clients, if you give them too many solutions, it is a problem for the architect. When there are so many solutions, the architect must impose some of his own selectivity about them to make decisions easier for the client.

Q. What are those specific things the client can give the architect to help with the process?
A. "Part of the process is for the client to think about his problem in a different way than he normally does. The uninformed client will come along with things he has seen. You must get the client talking, not about what the thing is going to look like, but what he wants to do there. I had one client make up a list of the activities he wanted to do in the house. Then I had him make some basic decisions about what activities relate to others. I came up with some suggestions about this also."

Q. Do you feel the client should not make aesthetic decisions at first, but concentrate on what he does or what he will do?
A. "Right. And the solution might be a tract house in some cases. But, he has gone through the process of thinking about it, and he might realize how he might use it better."

Q. What specific times is the client more essential in design?
A. "He is essential right at the very beginning. You have to have a mutual
education session with him at this time. During certain phases of thinking about possible solutions or alternatives, he is no help at all because you have to do your thinking at those times. But any time the architect commits something to paper he goes to see the client. Also, sometimes unforeseen situations come up, even during construction, that require the client's thoughts."

DAVID SHEFFIELD -

A. "The client is essential to problem definition for one very practical reason -- so that the architect does not present the client something that is completely foreign to him and then be forced to sell it to him. The client should be involved in problem definition. If the process by which the architect solves design problems is an analytical one and one that has a systematic approach the client will usually be involved in the right kinds of ways. This is true because a systematic approach to solving problems is the process that is most easily communicated to all concerned and is, therefore, easier to understand by all concerned.

On the other hand, if the architect uses nothing but personal values or only those things he likes or thinks are right then there are undoubtedly going to be problems because that kind of "seat of the pants" design can hardly be communicated to other people so that it is understandable."

HOWARD ELKUS -

Q. Do you think that the client is essential as a participant to defining
his own problem?

A. "Yes, I do. When we actually came face-to-face with our corporate client in Des Moines in the early stage of programming, I was looking forward to this meeting to find out what the client could offer in the way of information and thought about objectives. However, the client was not so interested in doing this. There was a sense of anxiety because they were looking for one answer right away. The more communication between client and architect, the better the project, I think."

Q. Specifically, what do you mean when you say communication?

A. "He can tell you about himself. There may not be any right or wrong in this, but it is an opinion. It is like a doctor and his patient. The doctor needs to know how the patient feels in order to diagnose a remedy. The user has to speak for himself. Often I find that some of the things a client knows about himself are the things an architect would not normally ask for. These are sometimes very intriguing things about a client that are so unique that no checklist provides the architect with that dimension. You might get into some aspects that the client didn't come to you for."

Q. At what specific times is the client more essential than at other times?

A. "I suppose that at sometime the architect has to produce the technical things required to get the building built. I think that can generally follow after a steady interchange between client and architect starting from the very first contact. I think there are other times when the client
is needed, but they are probably less. There are obvious times when client input is needed such as at the end of key phases of the work. It often depends on the nature of the job."

Q. Is there a need for the client as a participant more in the beginning, as you were discussing it?
A. "Problem definition and the time leading to it are the times of heaviest concentration with the client. There are times, on the other hand, when I think the architect needs to quietly study the problem. There has to be those moments of escape."

Q. You are saying that there should be a different situation for almost every client-architect relationship?
A. "I think so. When I look back at all the jobs, there are no jobs I have had that were alike. Personalities are different, sites are different, etc."

The following interviews were with clients. It is interesting to note how their views on this same subject parallel those of the architects. One of the main criteria for who was interviewed was the amount of experience the client had had with architects, ranging from a client with much experience to one who has only dealt with an architect once. The second criterion was the type of client, ranging from a single individual to a committee.
FRANK SESTITO - Commissioner of Public Works for the City of Sommerville, Mass. Has been the town's representative on three large scale projects in the last five years.

Q. In what ways are you most effective in helping the architect develop a program?

A. "The biggest thing I do is tell the architect what the town would like the functional uses of the project to be. You know, the activities that are to be part of the building. However, I feel that it is the architect's job to decide what is really important as design criteria, and what is simply something I would like to have in a project; my own personal desires. There is definitely the tendency to take what the architect says as fact. Why else do you hire him other than to rely on his judgement and expertise? I do feel that architects do use the - 'This is in the building because it is what the client wants', as sort of a way out. These things about function really should be a give and take between me and the architect."

Q. When are you most effective in helping establish a program?

A. "In the initial phase, when I give all the information that I have to the architect. Other groups of people are usually involved in this particular situation. For instance, the school board makes up space requirements for schools, but I participate heavily because, as Commissioner of Public Works, I must keep the lines of communication open to everyone concerned. Also, I am the one who ultimately deals with the architect
in getting the building built. Because the selling of a project to other
groups is perhaps my biggest job, I must be involved in the very beginning.
There should be a great deal of exchange of ideas between client and
architect at this time, and it all should be by talking directly with
each other. This should be done because phone conversations or letters
do not allow for much flexibility or give and take. It would mean much
more time involved if we did not talk on a person-to-person basis. Personal
feelings cannot be communicated unless client and architect are in direct
contact when making decisions that relate to programming.
If this type of communication does not take place we would be faced with
a situation where the client might not understand how the finished
building should really work or be used. The architect might throw in
some rooms that we didn't know should be there, or some similar situation.
The architect should be responsible for letting the client know exactly
how the building develops. Later on in the process, my input tapers off
as the need to make decisions about the design gets less. I still have
regular meetings with the architect and others about construction problems."

Q. How much participation by you is important?
A. "As much as possible so I can keep the lines of communication open to
others who are also involved. If I don't participate, I won't have any
understanding of what the building is to do ultimately. There needs to be
a great deal of flexibility to changes and new ideas when I get together
with the architect. This is true for both of us. The whole thing is in
constant motion - the whole process is a really dynamic thing, not at all
static."
CECIL ROBERTS - Client Representative for Harvard University, 14 years; for National Shawmut Bank of Boston, 3 years.

"Let me start by giving you a brief idea of what I did as Director of the Planning Office at Harvard. As head of building development at Harvard I used to interview architects, finding out what they were able to do for us in a particular assignment and send this ahead to the governing body for their recommendation. When the architect was selected at Harvard we were in contact with him to the extent that the Clerk of the Works for a given project was a Harvard employee and not working for the architect, as is usually the case. This is one way that gave us very close contact with the architect all the way through a job."

Q. How are you most effective in helping the architect to develop a program?
A. "By feeding him information on the owner's needs. That is, with respect to the use of the facility. I should say the owner's special needs."

Q. Who should set up what these needs are? Did Harvard usually set them up or did the architect?
A. "Harvard did the initial work as the user of the building. Then we sat down with the architect and put the information in front of him and together we developed a working program. Harvard always did the large part of the programming because we were capable of handling it."

Q. Is it better for the client and architect to develop a program together, or is it better for the client to develop a program before he
sees the architect?
A. "I think it is better for the client to develop the program providing he has the 'know-how'. On the other hand, if you have a client like my present employer - a large bank, who doesn't have the ability or experience to develop a program by himself, it would be better if the architect, with the client, develop the program. It all depends on the 'know-how' of the client. Harvard has built many buildings and been the client to many architects, while most clients such as banks are clients only once or twice. This is the difference in having the 'know-how' to develop a program."

Q. What are the times, if any, where you feel that you are most helpful to the architect in developing a program?
A. "I don't think there should be the need to get together much during the program development. Then when the architect gets into schematic design drawings the client should be in very close contact with the architect. This is because that when the client sees sketches or drawings on paper he can get more out of it than he can from words and numbers on paper. I may be reading some of my own experience into this."

Q. You feel, then, that an unknowledgeable client reacts more to drawings than to words?
A. "Yes, I believe so."

Q. Do you feel that clients should participate more or less with the architect in programming and in design also?
A. "Here again, it depends on the client. If the client is uninformed about architecture and design, I don't think he can offer very much about how to program for design. Harvard, for instance, always became more involved because of the planning office's experience in dealing with architects. We always had a close relationship with the architect. An unknowledgeable client, however, would not be able to do this. In fact, it might just upset the client. Things would be happening that he does not know about, and nobody likes to be in that position. This type of client would most likely be confused, I think, because of the very technical things being dealt with."

Q. Would the unknowledgeable client hinder the programming process, in your opinion?
A. "I think it is entirely possible."

Q. Are there any instances when that might occur that you can think of?
A. "I can't because I haven't been involved with the bank long enough to have seen this happen. There is a distinct line of demarcation between clients who do have the "know-how" and those that don't. Those that don't might definitely hinder progress."

Q. Do you think that the client really is essential as a participant with the architect in developing a program, or do you think the client could get something he was happy with without being involved?
A. "It is just a matter of human behavior. If the architect gets the commission and comes in a year later and says, "Here it is, how do you
like it?", my reaction would be that I don't know whether I like it because the architect finished it and hasn't even seen me yet.

In speaking of the bank and how it handles its dealings with architects is that we set up a team with the architects. We examine costs of everything and talk with the contractor about these costs. The financial aspect of projects, especially large-scale projects, is the paramount issue; not what architectural effect can be achieved. On the other hand, I am not degrading the architect because I am sure that within reasonable costs great architecture can be developed. Now it won't be the classical styled type any more because those frills cost over twice as much today as they did in the past."

Q. What is the most important aspect of a client hiring an architect?
A. "Most important to Harvard, other things being equal, we would like to have local architects. But, we really like to get architects who have a reputation for doing good work. However, clients are motivated by financial and functional aspects much more than architectural niceties, and I am sure of that fact. We try to get architects who can understand this idea. Clients are going to be sure that they get their dollar's worth in a building."

DAVID GIELE - Client of an Architect for a House.

"When one goes to any professional in the area of design, in the largest sense of the word, one is going with a problem which one defines as carefully and specifically as one can. I think that when there is a
failure to define a problem it is usually because of incompleteness. You say, "Well, we want whatever it is you're designing to meet this, this, and this requirement". Then, when it is done you might come back and say, "You forgot something. I think you should include this."

The architect is really going to be putting certain elements into the problem, particularly if you would be adding to the requirement that the solution be one that is aesthetically satisfying. I don't think many clients would go to an architect and tell him to make it well integrated and pleasing to the eye. They are going to assume that it is going to be there."

Q. In what ways should a client help an architect to define the problem?  
A. "I think the client can offer the practical requirements. There are, after all, certain ......., for instance, we are putting a porch onto our house. It is high on a down slope and has a high bannister that blocks the view down the slope. We wanted to be able to see the view and to enter the porch from a different way than that which exists now. Further, we wanted sun shading of some sort. We did not know exactly what we wanted in that respect. The problem then became defined in terms of flexibility. We wanted to be able to move in several different directions. We thought we would like planters in some places. One defines the problem, not in the sense of creating demands, but creating alternatives. Then one would want the architect to question the wants based on his experience. He might say, 'You don't want planters there because you can't get to something else'. Also, we wanted a little more variety than there is at
present. And, we wanted whatever we decided to do to be economical.

Q. Did you say that the designer's job would be that of presenting alternatives to you so that you could analyze them and make decisions?
A. "That definitely is one aspect. Each of the choices should be realistic in trying to meet the design criteria. I think that in practice it must be difficult for architects to keep from saying, "Well, there is only one solution". After a lot of careful thought the architect might say, "There is only one solution".

Q. Might this situation be different, better or worse, if you participated in the development of the alternatives with the architect?
A. "I think a skillful or experienced architect can help you to define the problem. I might want a two-car garage and the architect might say that it is possible that, because of my style of living, I might need a three-car garage. In other words, the architect with experience would question my definition of the problem. I would expect him to offer good reasons for it. Another example is that I might want something of a gimmick or a bit egocentric incorporated in the design. The architect might say, 'You think that you need this gimmick, but it could keep down the resale value of your house because nobody else would really want that in their house'. He ought to be participating and the client ought to be participating all the time."

Q. So you really feel that the client must define the problem by offering the practical aspects and his own wants?
A." Oh, very definitely. I don't think all clients are going to care about this. There might be one who wouldn't care what the architect did as long as it had a livingroom, a bedroom, and whatever. I would think the more typical situation would be the one where it is not architect with client, but architect with clients. In my case the architect had to deal with my wife's wants also. Typically, with a home, and more so with a corporate structure, an architect is going to be working with many different opinions. The architect's contribution will be to pull those together."

Q. Which times in the process of defining the problem do you think the client is most helpful to the architect?
A." At the beginning. I think the participation would continue right along, but I think that when a client is most helpful is right in the beginning. Now, if he doesn't know what he wants, then clearly there is going to be more of an evolution of the decisions because the client will not be able to make decisions as easily as one who does. There will be some review point where the client decides what he wants to do."

Q. Do you feel that the client is definitely essential to the process?
A." I would think so. I would think that the kind of architect I would want to work with would see me, the client, as more essential. I think that the architect who doesn't want the client to have any more involvement than that ought to be a painter or a sculptor. It becomes more self-expression at that point. Architecture involves somebody else who is also participating."
The Architect Interviews

The major idea that came from the interviews with the architects was that the client - at least most clients - need to be educated about the process of problem definition and the client's role in the process. This does not negate the original idea regarding the essentialness of the client but rather reinforces it even more because to be concerned enough to educate a client is to be concerned about the importance or essentialness of the role of the client in the first place. In addition, all the architects agreed that the client is, in fact, essential as a participant in defining the problem. It seems that the key to how successful the process will be is whether the client has the ability to understand and perceive the goals to be achieved and how to achieve them. That is what Mr. Montgomery suggested when he spoke of the necessity for teamwork, and the team should include the client. But, Mr. Montgomery qualified that series of remarks when he mentioned that the client should not be constantly leaning over the architect's drafting board either. Also, he stated the need for the education of the client in many instances, the reason being that the client deals with only one moment in time and, therefore, may be quite fixed in his ideas at that time. Although he did not mention it, I believe Mr. Montgomery would suggest that the architect should show the client that the building he will build will extend beyond simply the present. This is a primary consideration when attempting to expand the client's ability to understand the implications of the project. Client participation in problem definition is essential to his gaining an understanding of his problem. Mr. Montgomery suggests that the client
must be educated to know how he can participate.

Speaking from over twenty years experience, Mr. Gallagher gave the clearest reason for the client to participate when he said that the client must be involved if the problem is to be solved or any progress made at all. I believe Mr. Gallagher also suggested the need for educating clients by his statement that his best buildings were the result of a "knowledgeable and creative thinking client". An important point made by Mr. Gallagher was his definition of his best buildings as those that extend beyond the point of simply solving functional needs. He felt that somehow the client should be enriched by the environment created. Mr. Gallagher's definition of architecture is the one which has carried over from the Beaux Arts. It is illustrated in the following quote made by Le Corbusier in 1923,

> The purpose of construction is to make things hold together; of architecture to move us. 20) 

The essentialness of the client to the process of creating good architecture seems to be the reason that architects definitely feel the need for some type of client education about the design process.

Messrs. Foz and Armstrong also said that they felt the client should be educated in some way. But their reasons were less abstract than the other architects. Mr. Foz felt that most clients are not trained to perceive and think about spatial quality or even use beyond the simple functions required by a program. The same reasoning was put very nicely by
Mr. Armstrong when he made the following statement in his interview, "...the difference between client and architect is that the architect knows what he is doing when he makes a line".

While Messrs. Sheffield and Elkus did not mention directly the need for client education in problem definition, they did suggest aspects of the process such as the need for some type of understanding about how to solve problems in general. The most interesting aspect of Mr. Sheffield's interview was his statement concerning the reason for the client being essential. He felt the architect might be forced to present the client with something that he has not seen and does not fully understand, then be put in the position of having to sell the idea to the client. In short, the architect would rely on his traditional methods of design.

In summary, the primary points from the architect interviews were the need for educating the client before he can participate in problem definition in meaningful ways. The key to successful client involvement in problem definition is perhaps the client's ability to make decisions under stress situations. Architects seem to feel that by educating the client, the client will trust the architect more and rely on his professional expertise and experience in finding proper design solutions.

The Interviews With Clients

The most important aspect of the client interviews was the clients' con-
currence with the architects' statements regarding the need for client education. The clients also felt that they should be involved more in problem definition, and, interestingly, they too acknowledged the need for clients to be educated about the process. This is especially true in those cases where the client has little or no experience dealing with architects.

The education of the client who has no experience was perhaps the most important idea that both the clients and architects agreed upon. One client, Mr. Sestito, said that he felt the architect should be responsible for getting the client involved and in making the decisions, while still emphasizing the need for client participation in the process. This may seem contradictory, but I sense that Mr. Sestito relies on the architect to help him make sound judgements. In other words, the degree to which the client can contribute - without some sort of 'coaching' from the architect - may be a function of how capable or knowledgeable the client is with respect to understanding himself, his goals, and the method of attempting to define and solve the problem. This same point was made more strongly by Messrs. Giele and Roberts. Both spoke of the differences between a client who is experienced in dealing with an architect and a client who is experiencing the process for the first time. This is what Mr. Roberts meant when he said that it depends on client "know-how". He also made a clear distinction between those times a client should participate very heavily with an architect and those times when the client's participation is not so intense. He felt that the
client with experience should not participate with the architect very heavily at the beginning of problem definition, even to the point of developing the entire program before seeing an architect. On the other hand, he felt that the client who does not have the benefit of experience should participate heavily with the architect. Due to Mr. Roberts' emphasis on costs, I believe that the tendency to want to develop the program without the architect might be one of attempting to keep costs down by eliminating some of the programming time that would normally be required by the architect.

All the clients mentioned the importance of the financial aspects of design. The important thing here was that it was in this area that all the clients felt that they should definitely be involved. The obvious reason is that he can better understand what he is getting for the money spent.

As a contrast to the architects' contention that a building should go beyond simply meeting practical requirements, the clients suggested that the primary area of consideration for them is the functional requirement. Mr. Giele tended to equate needs with desires. This is very interesting because it supports my contention that client desires are important aspects of problem definition. By the fact that clients very often tend to express, architecturally, what they need in terms of what they want. The reasons behind client desires generate the design criteria. Thus, client desires are important.
In summary, the clients agreed with the points that the architects made. Very important is the point that the clients want the architects to consider them essential as participants in the process of defining a problem because they can understand the problem better and, thus, can make decisions based on that understanding. The clients also expressed the need for knowing something about problem definition before being able to participate in it. They see that the possibility of success is greater if they have some sort of control over the decisions. This control can only come from a thorough understanding of the problem and the goals.
CONCLUSIONS

The traditional reliance on aesthetics by architects as the primary focus of design will not necessarily result in effective problem definition because it is not a method with which clients are familiar, and it rarely considers the contributions they can make to the process. The past and present over-emphasis on aesthetic issues as the means to design criteria has literally seduced the client into believing that therein is the essence of his problem. Because of the hold of the traditional methods of design on architects, and because of the resulting client attitudes toward architects and the design process, there has been a general lack of client participation in problem definition in the past. Also, the design process is much more complex than was previously thought and the shift in emphasis by many architects to the study of the design process as a problem solving technique has contributed greatly to confusion by clients and architects about the process and their roles in it. Today, this confusion, combined with the fear by some architects that additional complexities will result from a client who participates, have resulted in a general lack of client participation in the problem definition phase of the design process.

The client must participate in defining his own problem because, if he does not participate in the right ways, the definition of the problem probably will reflect only the architect's input. The architect's reliance on his accumulated knowledge and preconceptions elicited from
previous problem definitions and previous problem solutions leads him in a particular direction that may not have any bearing on problem definition for this specific project. The way the client can participate most effectively is by maintaining a close dialogue with the architect and thus supplying the kinds of specific information than can help generate the criteria that, in the client's and architect's judgement, best defines the problem at hand. The specific information which the client supplies is not only in the area of function and practical needs but also in the area of the client's personal desires. With the focus now on human needs it is important for the problem definers to understand why the client desires a specific thing, and not just the fact that he wants something architecturally. The reasons that motivate a client to desire something, which he expresses in architectural terms, might very well be the substance for formulating the proper problem definition, and ultimately the proper solution. Therefore, the client is essential to problem definition as a supplier of specific information that the architect could not be able to attain by himself.

The client must participate in defining his own problem because, if he does not do so at the right times, decisions will be made based on information that was not supplied by the client. The critical points in the process occur when these decisions are made at those times when a direction will be taken and a commitment will be made in terms of time, energy, and money. The lack of client participation at these critical times will result in 1) a loss of the essential kinds of information the client can
supply, and 2) a lack of client understanding of his problem. Therefore, if the client does not participate at the right times, and in the right ways, problem definition will be no more successful nor meaningful than when there is a lack of his participation.

In order that the client has the capabilities to participate in problem definition, the client - the ones with little or no experience - must have some degree of education about the problem definition process. Obviously, this will require that either of two persons will be able to do it - the architect, if he is capable, or a third person who is experienced in both areas of human behavior and architectural design. In either case, educating an inexperienced client with respect to how he might participate in defining his own problem will require more time and energy than that necessary for experienced clients. Defining a problem with the participation of the client will be a different process with each client and architect. Therefore, there may be no set rules or guidelines for achieving success. One thing is certain, however, and that is that the client is essential to the process and he must be helped to acquire the necessary ability to understand the complex process of problem definition and his role in it.
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