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Architectural Psychology

Definition values by existology

Our research team applies methods that are being developed (or developed) by Direct Ahead psychologist Oleg N. Mazurov. Many methods are long-term development that is now being applied in the field of architecture. This, of course, does not mean that only the methods are taken and used, it is often the other way round, when the need for a given method to expand, define, or build on a completely different basis is based on the subject matter of our study - architecture. But always our starting point is Existology and its postulates defined by Oleg N. Mazurov [1, 3].

But now we have to give a little more attention to definition of architecture psychology, because this article is the very first public description of it and it is necessary to describe in more detail the way of thinking that led to its creation, but mainly to its application to the psychology of architecture.

Psychic phenomena, the subject of psychology research, are properties, states, and processes. This makes it easy to define in the psychology of architecture as follows:

Architecture psychology explores the psychological phenomena in architecture

The problem is that the long-term experience of our team's psychologists has shown that there are individuals who hold important roles in society, their characteristics fully meet the most demanding requirements for their career, in terms of how they can only be talked about in superlatives, even though they process all the necessary tasks for their profession, but they do not care. The problem is neither in their personality as such, nor in the fact that they burn out, the problem lies in their values.

Thus, while according to psychologists psychological phenomena are divided into properties, states and processes, in our view, it is necessary to extend psychological phenomena to values. Here, let us extend the well-known definition of psychology:

Psychological phenomena are values, properties, states, and processes

Now there is a fundamental problem of how to define values correctly. The official definition is quite inaccurate for us:

Values are results or scales of evaluation. In the natural sciences, the value usually refers to the numerical result of the measurement, the meter reading. Similarly, in economics, value means what can be expressed by price (exchange value). In common language and philosophy, they mean what individuals or groups value, value what they are willing to sacrifice or pay.
Again, the problem of this definition of verse is the same as in all other cases taken from this book from public sources. The definition simply lacks what it comes from and that is not enough for us. So we decided to try to define the values ourselves on the basis of Existology. Thus again using its basic terms, which are:

- Existence – life
- Sense – context
- Nature – phenomenon
- Content – form
- Inspiration – idea

Thus, according to Existology, this definition of value can be compiled.

**Values reflect the meaningfulness of existence in a set of personal preferences in the form of meaning or context.**

We are based on the premise that if something is worth it, it has a certain meaning for us based on certain personal preferences, but it is certainly impossible to ignore the circumstances in which we understand the value of an object or an event based on context, even if it itself it would be of no significance to us. It may be of great importance for me to hide my grandmother's saucer, whose real financial value is negligible, but for me, ridiculous paintings by Pablo Picasso and their meaning to me can be completely zero, but I understand the connection in the relationship of a famous name and the price of his canvas, so I am certainly fully aware of the financial value of such an image.

Paradoxically, this definition does not exclude cases where something that is wholly irrelevant to the public, that is to say largely out of context, can become meaningful for someone, and it is clear that in such a case society can view such an individual as a certain oddball. Thus, by this definition, values can reflect four forms of access:

- It has no meaning for me and I do not understand the context
- It doesn't matter to me, but I understand the context
- It's important to me, but I don't understand the context
- It's important to me, and I understand the context

If we were able to define a value based on Existology, we can return to architecture again and use this definition as a starting point for our thinking to move towards defining the artistic value of architecture.

**The artistic value of the architectural work**

I have recently lectured at a university before a full student lecture room, and my lecture started in a traditional way, first I introduced myself and then went to the definition of Psychology and Architecture to define the framework in which my lecture was moving. When the lecture was over, I asked the audience to comment on what I had just presented to them and one student surprised me with a question I was not very prepared for. She asked why in the definition of architecture I neglected to mention that architecture is also art. My definition, in a simplified form, said that "Architecture is a process (creativity) and a product. So, after a quick assessment of the circumstances, I said to a nice student that even art is a product, and at that moment we saved, but felt in the air, that neither I nor she is completely satisfied with this answer. However, this experience has been a warning to me and has prompted me to raise the issue of art in architecture in our team, or whether or not architecture is art.

Another reason was the coincidence when I recorded an interview with a prominent Czech architect on national television, who answered the question of the moderator whether architecture was an art, without the slightest hesitation, that he did. That architecture is a work of art in all cases. When I returned home from work that day and walked through our little village, I tried to get to a moment where I could at least partly consider the mixture of strange rural architecture to be art, but my aesthetic setting simply didn't allow me to. In addition, at that time, we already had the results of research that this my internal disagreement with the architect's expres-
sion pushed into the area of decision to analyze this issue with our team in detail and formulate scientifically based conclusions [2].

Since psychology is science, the psychology of architecture must be science. We must always base our thoughts on the results of our research. In this case, we were based on the results of surveys in the field of typology (see Chapter 2: Typology of the Architect), where architects were typologically the same as the majority population, i.e. approximately 25% of architects represent each temperament. And as most of us seem to agree, the most artistically oriented type of temperament is an introvertly unstable melancholic. Even by the same circumstances, one Russian-born architect has recently told us that, according to her, the artists are those who are dressed as if they are wearing full-color artworks and then paradoxically creating products that are often black or gray. By contrast, architects prefer to wear black and their works are colored.

**Artists dress in colors and their works are black and gray, and the architects dress in black and gray and their work is colorful.**

With this funny shortcut, I just wanted to demonstrate that each of us can quickly recall someone from his neighborhood who would not be afraid to say that he is an artist, but it would certainly not be the majority. And if it were true that those architects who are so unoriginally dressed in black (and most of them are) are not a priori artists, it would again show the fact that architecture as a whole is not art.

But let's go back to the typology level, and we'll take our simplified temperament breakdown as a starting point for serious research, so we can quite easily conclude that architecture as a whole cannot be an art just for the simple reason that even a common population containing all temperaments it is not artistic as a whole at equilibrium.

Here we come to the fact that we also have to define exactly what is art. And here we come to the realization that art is established with the induction of emotions. And both the positive and the negative. But now we have to stop for a moment, because a plant, a tree, a product that is not created by man, can trigger emotions in us. We also do not perceive such a product or composition as art, so we can agree with the claim that art is related to human creativity and, in a way, mediates a touch of mystery that inspired its creator by evoking an emotional relationship.

The aesthetic experience of an architectural work is due to the establishment of an emotional relationship between the user and the touch of mystery, which was the source of inspiration for the architect.

Thus, we have a product that has been created by human creation, and which evokes an emotional relationship with the subject in humans. But this is not yet the definition of art. Such an object may be a picture from our child, who is not called art by the same reason, so there is no so-called collective agreement.

Let's help by example. The painter paints the picture, this picture is displayed in the gallery and a visitor to the gallery, who faces the painting, perceives the painting as a work of art. Why is it perceived as a work of art? First, because he knows he's in the gallery, and that he is looking at an exhibited object created by an artist. He is not only aware of the importance of such a work of art for society, culture, or even the creator. But even he understands the connection between the origin and the reason for such work. This means that he knows that the image has its artistic value, which it does not confuse in the least with the value of production. Thus, he knows that art is a conscious or spontaneous work of man, which evokes an emotional relationship in another person and at the same time a social consensus is applied to him, a consensus that it is a work of art.

It's quite obvious in the case of music. I go to a concert and music, regardless of quality, is considered an art because of the social consensus that it is a form of art. At the same time, it is the work of an author who mediates a touch of mystery that inspired the creator to write it, and thanks to the art of the artist, it is transmitted to the listener by bringing an emotional relationship to it.

Three ingredients are needed to create a work of art:
If we start with the author, here we can all imagine how the type is the person for whom art is the goal of his work. They are mostly people we call bohems, they are sensitive, elusive. They are simply artists. In terms of temperament, the dominant disposition of these people is just about melancholic types. They are introvertly unstable individuals with about 25% in society, and of course not everyone is so open to the source of inspiration that they actively create. But even if this were the case, then, as in the majority society, they would represent only one-fourth of the architects and thus, with a great deal of simplification, a good three-fourths of architects would not aim at creating architecture from architecture, and therefore not about architecture as a whole, in this context, we cannot speak of art.

We were on the side of the authors, what about the conditions for the emergence of art in architecture and social consensus?

Architecture should be functional and beautiful. It should therefore have its utility value and its aesthetic quality. The utility value is expressed by the ability of the architectural work to meet the needs of the users. The aesthetic value of an architectural work, on the other hand, gives the user a touch of mystery that inspired the creator and enables the work to establish an emotional relationship. But if we look at the difference between beautiful and useful objects on the one hand and among objects of artistic value, we will certainly notice that there are differences. Imagine the latest kettle designed by an industrial designer to quickly bring water to the boil while being so beautiful that the customer wants to buy it. And now, on the other hand, imagine a rusted pot poured into glass displayed in a modern art gallery. The most important difference, as it is obvious, is in the complete elimination of functionality as a qualitative value of the subject, as well as a substantial, social consensus.

- Utility value - ability to satisfy need
- Aesthetic value - ability to establish an emotional relationship

I can have a handmade knife on the wall at home that doesn't even need to be sharpened because it is intended to be a decoration. So be beautiful. I can have an emotional relationship with it because I could get it directly from the creator, or I could be it’s creator, but the artistic value of such an object is likely to be very low. But if the subject was created by a creator known in the art environment and such a decorative object would not be on my wall at home but on a wall in a modern art gallery, the artistic value of such an object would be completely different. The difference would be that in such a case there would be a social consensus that the subject is an artwork.

So let's go back to architecture now and take advantage of the definitions we've just explained to conclude the question of the artistic value of architecture. In order for something to be worthwhile, there must be a personal-level relationship with individuals, or at least an understanding of the corresponding context.

In order for architecture to have artistic value, it is necessary that it has an author who is capable of designing and designing architecture as a condition that would allow the work in the context of collective consensus to dwarf functionality beyond its aesthetic value. There has been no unity or confusion of content and form, aesthetics of and usefulness. Such an architectural work no longer satisfies a wide range of user needs. Establishing an emotional relationship and consuming aesthetic experiences becomes dominant.

If there is a collective consensus over the aesthetic form of an architectural work as its dominant feature, such work takes on artistic value in the eyes of users.

If we know that artistic value always exceeds acquisition value, it is clear that there are a number of obstacles in the case of architecture that objectively reduce the number of works that we can often call artistic. There are, of course, exceptions, such as the Sagrada Familia Cathedral in Barcelona. It is a totally unique work by world-renowned architect Antoni Gaudi, who is so
aesthetically and compositionally represented that the emotional transmission of the creator's genius completely overshadows the fact that it is a religious building and there is no doubt that there is a social consensus. A similar example is the famous Eiffel Tower in Paris, which is certainly more a symbol and a work of art than just an architecture or a lookout. While perhaps the fact that the Eiffel Tower became the symbol of Paris, it has taken this unique building to be seen as a work of art. However, if we begin to look for other examples of medieval castles or other cathedrals, you will already begin to feel that you lack the author's personality and then you will perceive significantly both the functionality of these buildings and their considerable historical value. It is simply no longer a work of art for you. The most exquisite example is the pavilions of states at Expo. Although they are preceded by very demanding architectural competitions, the result is completely aesthetically pleasing architectural objects, which, however, hardly conceal their essential function, represent their countries, and their dominant task removes the right to be viewed as works of art by the viewers.

**Conclusion**

So, if we summarize everything, architecture from a psychological point of view has only a minority group of creators whose primary focus is to create architecture as a work of art. Furthermore, due to the astronomical costs of architecture, it is not too common for investors to create sufficient conditions for the creation of architecture in the form of a work of art and, last, but not least, it is quite uncertain whether a social consensus will arise over the artistic representation of an architectural work. Architecture simply from the point of view of creating an artwork:

- Missing authors
- It does not receive adequate conditions
- And there is no social consensus

The fate of architecture is to be functional because it creates an environment for people, and this is an obstacle to being taken for something more than a product of many times master creative activities.

An architect is not an artist, but a craftsman, and architecture is not an art, but a craft.

Architecture is the ultimate manifestation of craftsmanship, which is somewhat furthest by its materialization in the revealed world, and on the other hand, art is essentially closest to its source.
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