ARCHITECTURAL THEORY AND THE USER’S MIND
An exploratory study on perception of users’ rationality in seminal texts of architectural theory
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This study is a part of a research on architects’ perception of users’ psychological makeup. 115 texts of architectural theory were selected and analyzed for keywords and contexts to establish architecture’s theorists’ extension of interest, and perception of users’ rationality, irrationality, and two modes of thinking, using selected theories of modern psychology as a baseline. It was found that, despite a relatively large interest in the subject, architectural theory did not form a comprehensive theory of the users’ rationality. It was also proposed that architecture’s theorists were selective and likely to be influenced by the intellectual discourse of their times.

Keywords: architectural theory, perception, psychology, user’s mind, rationality, irrationality

1. Introduction and context
Understanding the user and meeting their needs is one of the central problems in architecture. Reaching to other disciplines of human knowledge for solutions to those problems has always been a part of architects’ craft. However, as the knowledge is constantly expanding, architects, like experts in other fields, must regularly revise and update their professional set of mental tools. In some cases, those revisions can go as far as creating alternative disciplines altogether. For example, in economics it was long assumed that the agent of economic interactions was the perfectly rational 

homo economicus. This approach has changed drastically when psychologists took interest in the field and forced economists to alter their assumptions. Psychologist D. Kahneman recounts his initial realization about vast differences in how psychologists and non-psychologists viewed human beings:

‘[To an economist] The agent of economic theory is rational, selfish, and his tastes do not change.’ […] To a psychologist, it is self-evident that people are neither fully rational nor completely selfish, and that their tastes are anything but stable. Our two disciplines seemed to be studying different species (Kahneman, 2011)’

Acknowledging those differences led to the creation of an entirely new field dubbed behavioral economics. It also greatly improved our understanding of the economic agent. Subsequently, more and more fields are conducting research on how to apply psychology’s findings in order to benefit those involved in them, such as advertising, game design, public policies, and now, architecture.

2. Research rationale and objectives
With regards to architecture there is no sufficient research on users’ rationality, nor is there a widely recognized theory corresponding to that of behavioral economics in relation to classical economics, however studies linking behavioral sciences - such as psychology - to architecture do exist. According to Tschumi (1975) there was interest in behaviorism in the first half of the 20th century, but as he points out, it was merely "a blind belief in an interpretation of behaviorism according to which individual behavior could be influenced by the
organization of space” and was soon to be replaced with more “realistic proposals”. In recent years, Lang (1987) identified the void between worlds of psychology and architecture and suggested it to be the heritage of the Modern Movement. He mentioned that humans’ rationality was overestimated at that time, however he did not explore this issue. Bay (2001) studied the problem of cognitive biases in architecture, however he primarily focused on how they affect the rationality of the architects, not users. Therefore, our understanding of the role of psychology in architectural theory can, and should, be furthered. Especially, as new discoveries in cognitive and behavioral psychology are made every year, whereas architectural theory, as taught in architecture schools across the world, is still largely based on a rarely revised canon of seminal texts.

To address this issue we shall first explore seminal texts of architectural theory and determine the extent of interest in users’ mind (psychological makeup). This is therefore the initial objective of this paper.

The second objective is to examine the resulting image of users’ mind for mutual consistency across various texts of architectural theory using the findings of modern psychology regarding rationality as a benchmark. This is to determine if the image could be revised and updated in order to produce better spaces for the users.

3. Methods

115 texts seminal to the theory of architecture constitute the data source for this analysis. Texts are collected in Source A: U. Conrads’s *Programs and manifestoes on 20th-century architecture* (n=68 texts) and Source B: K. Michael Hays’s *Architecture Theory since 1968* (n=47 texts). Exceptions being Le Corbusier’s *Towards a New Architecture* (aka *Toward an Architecture*) and H. Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* which were analyzed in full due to the impact of these authors and the multitude of references to human psychological makeup described in those texts. Since there is no universally acknowledged canon of texts of architectural theory, Conrads’s and Hays’s compilations were selected as they are well-known, published and widely accessible anthologies compiled as deliberate attempts to present a cross-section of seminal texts of architectural theory (thereafter referred to as ‘architectural theory’). Moreover, due to the exploratory nature of this study, both the abundance of data and the diversity of texts are desirable, since they provide a more accurate overview of the problem of users’ psychological makeup in a larger context.

3.1 Analysis

To pursue the research objectives the following steps have been taken:

1) After reviewing the literature, a selection of texts constituting the theory of architecture has been inspected for sections in which architecture’s theorists describe or imply assertions on users’ psychological makeup. Those sections were selected in order to establish an image of users’ mind in architectural theory, as well as the extent of theorists’ interest in the subject.

2) Next, due to its experimentally testable nature, the psychological theory of the human mind and rationality described in 3.2 was chosen as a reference framework to examine the texts. Assertions on users’ rationality, irrationality, and two modes of thinking were selected and compared across texts of architecture, as well as between architectural theory and psychology. Similarities, differences, and omissions found were the subject of this analysis. Note that the architecture texts are not written as a study of human psychology per se and so it is not to be expected that the authors address the specific psychological issues consistently, using appropriate terminology that strictly corresponds to that of modern psychology. In many cases, the context or overall implication of the text was the basis for comparison, in others it was the specific keywords.

3.2 Overview of rationality and irrationality in psychology

Modern psychology distinguishes two modes (systems: processes) in which thoughts come to mind (Talks at Google, 2011) and provides the distinction between the two systems described in Table 1. The relevant psychological research is still ongoing and there are many discoveries yet to be made, however for the purpose of this study it is important to understand the following: human beings use two modes of thinking. The first being implicit, fast, and intuitive. The second is conscious, slow, and rational. In daily life, people continuously appropriate both intuitive and conscious systems (Kahneman, 2011). However, humans do not intuitively feel which mode generates any given thought, and thus often act upon thoughts that they themselves would consider irrational after careful deliberation. In social science, ‘rationality’ is a normative notion (Stanovich, 2011), akin to perfect internal consistency (Kahneman, 2011). It can also be described as the absence of irrationality, defined as a deviation from the optimum in a given normative model (Stanovich, 2011). In short, due to the constant interplay between the two modes, there can be no such thing as a rational individual - *homo economicus*, and every human has the capacity to be occasionally irrational. The above approach was selected for this study as it already proved to be employable in fields other than psychology – such as behavioral economics (e.g. Kahneman & Tversky, 1979) – rendering it prospective for architecture.

4. Findings

Findings are divided into three sections: 1) describing the
The overall interest in users’ psychological makeup among architecture’s theorists, 2-a) the problem of users’ rationality, and 2-b) views corresponding to the two-system approach.

1) Interest in psychological makeup of the user

61 out of 115 (53%) examined texts deal in an explicit or implicit way with users’ psychological makeup, for example, by including assertions like: “clients, the public, still think in terms of conventional appearance and reason on the foundation of the insufficient education” (Le Corbusier, 1927). It is important to notice that due to a multitude of texts some liberties had to be taken, and simplification in the interpretation had to be made. Since this study is limited only to the psychological makeup of the user, when authors speak of “us”, “humans” or use the passive voice it is assumed that users are included in the group being described, unless it is clearly stated otherwise. As the texts have no predetermined form and originate from various schools of architectural theory, it might seem understandable that some do not contain descriptions of users’ psychological makeup. The fact that 54 (47%) texts have no mentioning of this topic is problematic though. Since, as Habermas (1981) points out, “architecture had always been a use-oriented art” it might be expected that some form of assertion on users’ mentality would be an integral part of most architectural texts. The fact that roughly half of the examined texts do not contain any attempts of establishing to what kind of user the architectural space in question is being designed for, indicates that to many theorists the subject of users and their psychological makeup is so self-evident or so irrelevant that there is no need to touch upon it. As Fig. 1 shows this pattern is fairly consistent across the sample of 115 texts. This seems to hint that theorists assumed that there was some sort of consensus among architects as to the kind of user the architecture is being built for, but a careful examination of any large enough sample of architectural texts makes it evident that in reality no such consensus has ever existed.

2-a) Views on or corresponding to users’ rationality and irrationality

The views on users’ rationality and irrationality in the theory of architecture are multiple, diverse and often stemming from larger contexts of their respective periods, rather than from one comprehensive school of thinking. Out of 115 examined texts 47 contain statements regarding this topic. As Fig. 2 shows, attitudes towards rationality and irrationality shifted significantly over the course of 90 years. Initially, there seemed to be a widespread belief in humans/users to be inherently rational beings, closely resembling the homo economicus, though occasionally in need of some education to

---

### Table 1

Differences between two modes of thinking (see Stanovich & West (2000)\(^n\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System 1</th>
<th>System 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associative system</td>
<td>Rule-based system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic processing</td>
<td>Analytic processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacit thought processes</td>
<td>Explicit thought processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit cognition</td>
<td>Explicit learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional intelligence</td>
<td>Analytic intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential system</td>
<td>Rational system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick and inflexible modules</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive cognition</td>
<td>Analytical cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition-primed decisions</td>
<td>Rational choice strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit inferences</td>
<td>Explicit inferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic processing</td>
<td>Controlled processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic activation</td>
<td>Conscious processing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associative</td>
<td>Rule-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively undemanding of cognitive capacity</td>
<td>Demanding of cognitive capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively fast</td>
<td>Relatively slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition by biology, exposure, and personal experience</td>
<td>Acquisition by cultural and formal tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly contextualized</td>
<td>Decontextualized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized</td>
<td>Depersonalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational and socialized</td>
<td>Asocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional (conversational implicature)</td>
<td>Analytic (psychometric IQ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

Number of texts concerned with psychological makeup of the user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of texts:</th>
<th>Time period when texts were published (first to last):</th>
<th>Number of texts concerned with psychological makeup of the user:</th>
<th>Number of texts where description of the psychological makeup of the user was not found:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source A</td>
<td>1903 - 1963</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source B</td>
<td>1969 - 1993</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1903 - 1993</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

Number of texts concerned with users’ rationality and irrationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of texts:</th>
<th>Time period when text were published (first to last):</th>
<th>Number of texts concerned with users’ / humans’ rationality and irrationality:</th>
<th>Number of text where references to users’ / humans’ rationality and irrationality was not found:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source A</td>
<td>1903 - 1963</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source B</td>
<td>1969 - 1993</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1903 - 1993</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reach their rational self. It gradually shifted towards a more complex image of only conditionally rational human beings, whose judgment can easily be influenced by external factors.

Looking at the selected texts, three phases can be distinguished – first roughly corresponding to early to middle Modernism, second to middle to late Modernism (Source A); and last roughly corresponding to Postmodernism (Source B). In the very first text of Programs and manifestos on 20th-century architecture Van der Velde (1903) encourages us to think rationally – implying that to him rationality is only a matter of choice. Since the beginning of the century was the age of rapidly booming industrialization and technological development, such optimistic attitudes are not difficult to understand. After all, the development of revolutionary machines such as cars, planes, and ships could convince people of their own capacity for rational thinking or even infallibility. This is particularly visible in Le Corbusier’s (1927) Towards a New Architecture significant part of which was dedicated to describing vehicles, marveling at rational rules of classical economy and drawing parallels to architecture. “Every modern man has the mechanical sense”, he writes, suggesting that in his understanding all humans are capable of rationality. This notion is echoed a few times throughout the text - Le Corbusier demands us to be “critical and objective”\(^5\), thus implying that he believes rationality is attainable to humans. And since rational objectivity can only be one, to Le Corbusier all humans are identical at their core\(^5\). It was noted however, that users are not eagerly accepting every rational object of architecture and thus the theory of rational humans needed some additional factors to bridge the gap between reality and theory. It was proposed that occasional irrationality (manifested in the lack of acceptance for “rational” architecture) was simply a matter of insufficient consumer education, and that such an education would help humans to reach their objective and rational self (Le Corbusier, 1927\(^5\); CIAM, 1928\(^\text{a}\)). However, psychology proposes that occasional systematic divergences from rationality is an inherent part of the way the human mind operates and that, depending on circumstances, experts are often rendered as prone to those errors as laymen (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982\(^\text{a}\)).

Since the era of Le Corbusier the attitudes towards users’ rationality among architecture’s theorists have shifted significantly. The inherent irrationality became more frequently acknowledged in architectural theory. As early as 1992, Meyer\(^\text{a}\) mentions “atavistic inclinations of the future inhabitants” and advises to have them in mind when designing architecture, rather than assuming that they can be easily corrected. Similarly, Pichler (1962) speaks of “primitive instincts of the masses.” As Modernism slowly started to evolve into Postmodern architecture, and the Modern Movement was being analyzed and criticized with ever increasing scrutiny, the shortcomings of assuming users to be highly rational beings became explicitly criticized as well. Scott Brown (1971\(^\text{a}\)) directly contradicts Le Corbusier by openly acknowledging differences between individual humans and the variety of their needs. Scott Brown also criticizes Modernists for their intolerant, “rationalistic” approach towards those differences. Also, Rowe and Koetter (1973\(^\text{a}\)) write: “We may claim rationality. We may insist that reason is always simply reasonable - no more and no less; but a certain stubborn totemic material will still refuse to go away”, implying that problem of rationality is much more complex than it was previously assumed.

Finally, in more recent years of grand postmodern contestation, the irrationality of the humans/users seemed to have been accepted as a fact of life. The belief in the “infinite power of reason” was openly criticized and it was accepted that things as complex as human behavior or creating architecture for real people cannot simply be “explained” and reduced to a set of mathematical rules (Perez-Gomez, 1983\(^\text{a}\)). Lastly, Anderson (1984\(^\text{a}\)) spoke of “fundamental arbitrariness of human thought” revealing his deep insight into the fact that
irrationality might be an inalienable part of the human condition.

In brief, views on users' rationality if considered individually are often inconsistent with each other, and if grouped and looked upon as trends over time – erratic. This may be due to the impact of larger intellectual trends of their respective eras. If entireties of Source A and Source B are read in chronological order, patterns can be found when looking for specific concepts, such as rationality and irrationality (see Fig. 2). In everyday life, however, some of those texts get much more exposure than others, and since they vary in the amount of attention paid to rationality and irrationality, to a selective reader said patterns might be invisible and the overall impression of attitudes towards these concepts greatly distorted. Similar problems can be seen when we inspect views on users' modes of thinking in architectural theory.

2-b) Views corresponding to the two modes of human thinking

Views indicating or explicitly stating the notion of duality between the two different modes of thinking are not absent from the architectural theory, but do not elicit any profound conclusions regarding the improvement of architecture. At the turn of the century, theories of the mind proposed by Sigmund Freud were slowly coming into prominence, attracting various kinds of readers. Paramount to Freud’s theories was the concept that there are processes occurring in our mind of which we have no conscious awareness, yet they still influence our emotions and behaviors – the intuitive unconscious (e.g. Freud, 1915[3]). This idea was potent as it allowed people to explain many unusual psychological phenomena by associating it with this hidden mode of operating. It is thus of no surprise that references to the conscious and the unconscious appear in architectural theory as soon as the 1920s when Le Corbusier (1927[4]) wrote: “Our minds have consciously or unconsciously apprehended these events and new needs have arisen, consciously or unconsciously.” Statements analogical to this duality appear in 16 of 115 examined texts, indicating that it was a somewhat acknowledged phenomenon. Since the 1950s and 1960s a number of significant research was done on how our conscious and unconscious minds might render contradictory results (e.g. Wason, 1960[5]). It is no surprise that those discoveries echoed in the theory of architecture as well. Tafuri (1969[6]) wrote: “Le Corbusier’s Algiers entails the total involvement of the public. It is worth noting, however, that here this involvement is predicated on a critical, reflective, intellectual participation. An “inattentive reading’ of the urban images would in fact produce an obscure result”. Similarly, it was inferred that human behavior dynamically changes depending on the circumstances (Scott Brown, 1971[7]), implying that there was some level of understanding that two modes of thinking exist in any user, and that those two modes might generate different attitudes and behaviors. However, even though many texts of architectural theory can be interpreted to be referencing the duality of the human conscious and unconscious mind, those references are only mentioned for their explanatory value or as an argument for or against a given intellectual position. This study found no attempt to categorize or systematize various forms of possible effects or tendencies caused by said duality, possibly resulting in proneness to irrational behaviors. Nor there were proposed any concrete solutions of how to design accordingly in order to improve the users’ experience.

5. Conclusion

The contribution of this exploratory study to our understanding of the perception of user's minds, rationality and irrationality in seminal texts of architecture theory is twofold. First, it was found that 47% of the examined texts made no attempts to tackle the problem of users’ psychological makeup. It suggests that many architecture’s theorists assumed that this subject is irrelevant or self-evident, however the variety of opinions found in texts that dealt with problem of the human mind renders this assumption false. This study also found that views on users’ rationality are multiple, diverse, and change in time, which means that they might be influenced by the intellectual ambience of the time they were written, which makes it impossible to collect them into one successive theory of the mind. Moreover, the study found that whereas the idea of interplay between two modes of thinking was often mentioned or hinted at in many seminal texts of the theory of architecture, it did not take form of an explicit comprehensive sub-theory, explaining the occasional lack of rationality in users’ behaviors.

Architectural theory is the first place to look for answers and ideas for the majority of practicing architects, as well as a starting point in professional lives for students of architecture. It is thus clear that the theory should not be lacking a comprehensive and scientifically accurate description of users' rationality, written and customized specifically for architects. The above analysis illustrates however, that the core texts of the architectural theory are inconclusive in this regard. Few attempts to counter this situation, such as Lang’s or Bay’s work, are yet to be fully embraced by the broader architectural community. Hence, further investigation of other architectural texts and relevant themes from the field of cognitive psychology would be beneficial for architects to acquire a deeper understanding of users’ needs, the way they reason, choose, evaluate, and interact with architecture in order to propose more relevant designs. Moreover, existing theory of architecture should always be presented in the light of recent findings in
cognitive studies to ensure that image of users’ mind is not taken for granted or distorted.

6. Further research

Human beings have systematic tendencies to act irrationally (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982[37]) and thus can be categorized and in certain circumstances countered or used to humans’ benefit by devising specific tools and practices. Identifying and employing user-applicable tendencies (e.g. cognitive biases) is the subject of further investigation, as architects – much like other professionals – can use this knowledge to their advantage by studying such tendencies and designing accordingly.

NOTES
i) Texts date from 1903, and cover time frame including Modern, Postmodern and contemporary architecture, because unlike architecture of previous periods, those philosophies can be regarded as architectural theory (not merely documents of architecture history) and thus bare practical relevance for present-day architects and students.

ii) Analyzed texts should not be regarded as a representative sample of opinions or interests of architects or scholars in the corresponding periods. They are only individual observations and opinions of their authors, relevant due to their overall importance on architectural theory as well as their accessibility and impact.

iii) For the sake of this analysis the information presented in ‘3.2 Overview of rationality and irrationality in psychology’ is assumed to be true and accurate and its validity is not the subject of this investigation.

iv) Table by Stanovich et al. (2000) was recreated using word processing software; emphases were added; sections irrelevant to this analysis were omitted; table was retitled.
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和文要約
1. はじめに
利用者のニーズを理解し、それに応じることは建築の本質的な課題の1つである。また、他分野、例えば心理科学から学び、実際の人間とは不合理な思考傾向をもつものであることを認め、建築デザインについて考えることも必要である。

2. 研究の目的
建築学の分野では、「建築利用者の思考傾向（user’s mind）」を考慮に入れた建築理論はあるが、その合理性・不合理性について焦点をあてたものは少ない。現代心理学で人間の思考傾向について難しい発見がなされ人間像が改められている一方で、一般的な建築理論での建築利用者側の人間像は以前と変わらず、その両者の間には隔たりがある。本稿では、20世紀の建築家が考えていた建築利用者像と、実際の建築利用者との間の隔たりを明らかにし、今後の建築家の活動に役立てる目的とする。以上より次の二つを示す。
1) 20世紀の代表的な建築理論を分析し、その中に記されている建築利用者に対する建築理論家が人間の傾向の程度を明らかにする。2) 以上の建築利用者に対する建築理論家がの記述の軽度を明らかにする。そのため、現代心理学から「合理性・不合理性」と「二つの思考モード（two modes of thinking）」という二つの概念を用いて建築理論での建築利用者像を分析する。

3. 研究方法
20世紀の著名な建築理論を抜粋し包括的にまとめた以下の2冊『Programs and manifestos on 20th-century architecture』（68編）と『Architecture theory since 1968』（47編）を収録されている代表的な建築理論115編を分析対象として選定した。加えて、Towards a New Architecture』（70）と『The Production of Space』（65）の分析も行う。

3.1 分析方法
研究目的に対して1) 上記の115編と2冊の中にある建築利用者の思考傾向について詳しく調べた。具体的には、テキストからキーワード・文章またはコンテクストを選び、表を作成した。そこから中心・関心・無関心を明らかとした。2) 選定した対象から建築利用者について現代心理学の二つの概念である「合理性・不合理性（2a）」と「二つの思考モード（2b）」に関するキーワード・文章・コンテクストを抽出し分析すると共に、建築利用者に対する建築理論家における認識の分析を行った。

3.2 分析に用いた心理学理論について
現代心理学によって、すべての人の頭の中でアイデアが生まれるため二つの思考モードがある。一つの思考モードは、努力の必要はなく直観的かつ高速で生まれるもの。二つのモードは意識的に時間を利用しう、また理詰めを考えることである。日常で人間は絶えず意識をもつ二つのモードが相互に作用している。この思考モード是矛盾していても、どちらの思考モードがアイデアを出すかは、識別することが不可能である。つまり、二つのモードの相互作用が人間の内在的な不合理性の原因である。以上の理論は、経済などのように心理学以外の分野で用いられ成功したことから、建築分野でも用いる可能性が高い。以上より、建築利用者は人間であるので、不合理な部分を持ち合わせている。建築家は設計をよりくするため、建築利用者の不合理な部分を考えに入れると必要がある。

4. 分析結果
1) 建築利用者的研究傾向に関する分析
115編のテキストのうち、61編には、建築利用者の思考傾向に関する記述があった。建築理論家がすべての人間の思考傾向を述べた場合、その中には、建用利用者が含まれていると解釈した。他の54編のテキストには、建築利用者が思考傾向に関する記述が見つからなかった。このことから、建築理論家が利用者の思考傾向に興味がないので記述しなかったか、あるいは、建築理論家が建築利用者の思考傾向について書かなかった、その思考傾向を皆暗幕に同意できることが考えているという2つの結論が導かれる。

2-a) 建築利用者の合理性・不合理性に対する認識
Fig.2 は、20世紀に建築利用者の合理性と不合理性についての建築理論家の考え方を、変化したことを示している。モダニズムの時代は、急速な工業化、技術の発展の時代であったため、合理性の信用度が高く、当時は消費者教育の不足が建築利用者の不合理性の原因だと信じていた。しかし、現代心理学によれば、不合理性は、教育の問題というよりも、人間の内在的性質によるといえている。モダニズムへの批判とともに、人間の合理性に対する考え方が大きく変わった。心理的な傾向または本能まで、合理的ではない人に基づく思考方法について述べられることが多くなり、人間には不合理性が内在していることが明らかになった。建築理論でも建築利用者の合理性と不合理性について多く書かれていることが認められる。しかし、建築理論家の言葉は個々によって独自性を残り、それぞれが一貫して一つの総合的価値を形成していないかが分かった。建築理論家は時代的、他分野の思惟の影響の受けやすいと考えられる。そのため、多くのテキストを対象として分析すると、Fig.2のようなパターンが出てくる。一方で、建築理論の中には、普及した影響力のあるテキストもあれば、そうでないテキストもある。建築理論における不合理性の研究がまだ足やろうと考えられる。建築理論家は不合理性に対して正しく対処していなかったと考える。

2-b) 二つの思考モードに対する認識
115編のテキストのうち、16編には、二つの思考モードに関する記述がある。20世紀への変わり目は、S.フロイトが主導した心理学的な理論が広まったことから、建築理論にも「意識」・「無意識」などの二つの思考モードの考えが取り入れられ言及されている。しかしながら、建築理論家が二つの思考モードを認識していたとしても、それが合理性と不合理性に関係あるという記述は無い。つまり、建築理論家は不合理性に対して正しく対処出来ていないと考える。

5. 結論
本稿では、現代心理学の概念を用いることによって、建築理論家が考えている利用者の思考傾向、つまりその合理性と不合理性にたいする認識があるのに、建築理論家はこれに対し、科学的・正確な思考傾向を考慮する考えである。本稿の分析から現在の建築理論では十分でない。今後は、本稿で示したのが建築理論や、他の心理学による理論検討を必要とする。そのことによって建築理論での建築利用者の人間像と心理学での実際の人間像の隔たりが徐々に解消され、建築家が実際の建築利用者のニーズに対しての理解を深め、それに応じることができるようになるだろう。

(2016年8月5日原稿受理，2017年2月24日採用決定)