

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design
Viewed Through Three Case Studies of the Process of Licensure

Marilyn Corson Whitney

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Environmental Design and Planning

Joseph V. Rees, Co-Chair
Terry L. Clements, Co-Chair
Humberto Rodriguez-Camilloni, Member
David Dugas, Member

April 18, 2008
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Interior design, professions, professionalization theory, licensing, built
environment and gender

Copyright December 3, 2008

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design
Viewed Through Three Case Studies of the Process of Licensure

Marilyn Corson Whitney

ABSTRACT

Since the 1950s, interior decoration evolved into interior design. Throughout the 1970s, all of the components for professionalization were in place, but it was not until the 1990s that the final transformation made interior design into a profession. This dissertation documents these changes and posits that is the conflicts inherent in the process of licensure transformed it into a profession.

The transformation of interior design is examined through the lens of the theory of professions, especially Andrew Abbott's delineation of transformation through conflict. The historical case studies of the legislative process were of the District of Columbia, which has practice legislation; the Commonwealth of Virginia; which has title legislation; and the State of Ohio, which has no licensing of interior designers as of 2007. Data collection was by interviews with participants of the process of licensure and with the leadership of the interior design community. In addition, primary and secondary documents examined include books, journals, trade magazines, and documents from professional organizations.

Specifically, this dissertation addresses these questions: Is interior design a profession? If so, what forces transformed interior design into a profession? And, how is interior design different from architecture?

This dissertation posits that interior design is unique from architecture because it developed in home economic programs at state universities during the 1950s, 1960s and

1970s. In this locale, the primary focus of interior design was the micro-environment based on the theory of behavior. This gives students and practitioners a unique viewpoint that allows for the consideration for each end user as integral to the design process. These attributes contribute to the unique qualities of the services interior design offers and separate it from those of architecture.

A simplified definition of interior design that I developed is that interior design utilizes the theory of behavior to design spaces in a micro-environment that function at a safe and efficient level for every end user and are aesthetically pleasing. Finally, interior designers need to understand that the strength of their position in the built environment is in the unique services they offers and celebrate their qualities as outlined in this document.

Acknowledgements

There are so many people to thank that one hardly knows where to begin. Special thanks to all of the professionals who were interviewed as part of this process. Their dedication to their professions is documented here. In the order that the interviews took place they were: Barbara Goodwin, Brian C. Collins, Jeff Kenney, Kathy Cook, Mark Courtney, Gary Volz, Gayle Kreutzfeld, Terri Maurer, Kayme Dunn, Holly Mattson, Michael Alin, Deanna Waldron, Vincent Carter, Andrea Kelly, Janet Kane, Robert Boynton, Anne Putney Manson, Stacey D'Aquila Hatfield, Eric Weidegreen, Cynthia Faulhaber, Marci Zimmerman, Terry Clements, and Dr. Crystal Weaver.

I must also thank my committee for their guidance. Dr. Joseph V. Rees, Terry L. Clements, Dr. Humberto Rodriguez-Camilloni, and Dave Dugas. I would also like to thank Dr. Marilyn Casto who guided me through the proposal process and literature review and Chriss Coon for all of her support and help with the myriad of forms required in this process. Dr. Jim Jones and Dr. Peter Wallenstein who gave me moral support and invaluable guidance as my dissertation progressed. My experience at Virginia Tech was life transforming even before the events of April 16, 2007. A part of my heart will always reside in the beautiful rolling hills of Virginia.

I must thank my transcribers for their hard work of writing out 700 minutes of interviews. They include Sreevidya Subramanian, Suzanna Ward, and especially Laurie Good who alone did half of the transcriptions and made this dissertation possible when work had come to a standstill for lack of a transcriber.

Thank you to my English editors Cynthia B. Faulhaber, and K.C. Arceneaux, and my content editor Terry Cements and Hannah Mendoza-Torres. I cannot thank Cynthia

and Terry enough for the hours spent shaping and honing my writing into something that is a semblance of scholarship. Cindy's exquisite consultation about all aspects of my dissertation refined my thinking and clarified my thoughts, which of course transformed my writing. Her editing guided me into a more scholarly mode and sometimes even made me laugh with her pithy comments. Terry examined the content with a fine-tooth comb to make sure it was reflecting her detailed knowledge of licensing and licensing issues. I could not have done this work without their support and hours of endless editing.

I also would like to thank Mary Agnes G. Carter, who hired me at the age of 25 as an interior designer. She encouraged me to take the NCIDQ exam, join ASID and worked with me on many ASID projects to advance our profession in western Michigan. Her mentorship, support, and encouragement set me on my personal road to professionalization.

I know that I would not have been successful in completing this document in a timely manner without my study group the Mad CAUS. Our group studied, brainstormed, commiserated, and celebrated together. I owe a large part of my success to these beautiful, smart, young women. Some of their names have recently changed with Doctor of Philosophy added: Dr. Nancy Cordova, Dr. Sarah Elmasry, Dr. Elizabeth Grant, Dr. Tao Huang, Kristin Maki, Dr. Ceylan Oner and the honorary Mad Claves, Katya and Bidou.

Index

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Index	vi
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Literature Review	14
Section 1 – Introduction	14
Section 2 – Theory of Professions	22
Section 3 – History of Interior Design	42
Section 4 – Professionalization of Architecture	54
Section 5 – Differentiation of Interior Design and Architecture	66
Chapter 3 – History of Professionalization of Interior Design	73
Table 1: Comparison of Google Search about Theory	77
Chapter 4 – State of the Profession	89
Section 1 – Position of Interior Design Professional Organizations on Licensure	89
Section 2 – Position of the American Institute of Architects on Interior Design Licensure	113
Section 3 – Gender Issues	128
Section 4 – Building Codes	137
Section 5 – Justification for Licensure	146
Chapter 5 – Case Studies	153
Section 1 – Washington, D.C.	153
Section 2 – The Commonwealth of Virginia	180

Section 3 – Ohio	196
Chapter 6 – Conclusion	229
Bibliography	243
Appendix	250
Appendix A – Interview Waivers	250
Appendix B – Interview Questions	253
Appendix C – List of Appellations of Organizations	254
Appendix D – Timeline History of Interior Design in United States	256
Appendix E – Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline Washington, D.C.	258
Appendix F – Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline Virginia	270
Appendix G – Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline Ohio	281
Endnotes	301

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Beginning in the 1950s, interior decoration evolved into interior design and in the process of licensure became a profession. Interior designers continued to perform the services of interior decorators, selecting all of the materials that the building occupants touch, see, or use. This transformation to interior design expanded the concerns about aesthetics to incorporate space planning. This new profession applied psychological and sociological theory to enhance the environment and to modify the behavior of end users, which allowed each end user to function at an optimal and safe level. This document establishes the history of the professionalization of interior design and examines efforts to seek licensure in three jurisdictions in the United States¹ using the framework of the theory of professions.

For the purpose of this study, the use of the words “regulation” and “licensing” were generic terms indicating a governmental action. Nonetheless, when discussing individual jurisdictions² the use of different terminology in relation to that specific jurisdiction indicates a precise meaning as defined by local laws and regulations. For example, when referring to licensing in Virginia, use of the term “certification” denotes the specific level of regulation related to the scope of work in Virginia.

Licensure is a legislative process that establishes minimum criteria for the practice of a profession in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. It allows the client who hires a registered professional to know they are hiring someone capable because of proven education, experience and examination. Licensing is at a state or jurisdictional level and generally there are two kinds of licensure. The most restrictive type is a practice act. A practice act prohibits unlicensed individuals from performing the

duties and activities of a given profession. A title act prohibits an unqualified person from calling him or herself a member of the profession. For example, physicians have both practice and title legislation – unlicensed persons may neither practice medicine nor call themselves physicians.

With the passage of legislation, the steps to obtain a license move to the executive branch of government. Usually it is in the form of a regulatory board, which sets up rules and regulation for applicants to become licensed. The steps for procuring a license involve the following: (1) application by a person wishing to be licensed; (2) provision by the applicant of proof of sufficient educational background and sometimes experience in the profession; (3) proof of the successful completion of an examination approved by the regulatory body. The regulatory body reviews the applicant's documentation and issues or denies the license. While still in the executive branch, the granting of licenses is separated from the enforcement and prosecution of violations of the law in order to eliminate conflicts of interest.

This dissertation examined case studies of the events associated with the licensing process for interior design in three jurisdictions. These jurisdictions were the District of Columbia, which passed a practice act in 1986, the Commonwealth of Virginia, which passed title registration in 1990, and the State of Ohio, which as of 2007 does not regulate interior design.³ The research methods included examination of regulatory differences among these three regions as determined by interviewing individuals active in the process of regulation in each jurisdiction and by reviewing primary and secondary document sources.

The theoretical basis of this research is the book, *The System of Professions*, by Andrew Abbott, which continues the work of others regarding the theory of professionalization. One of Abbott's key assertions was that conflict, which is inherent in the process of professionalization, creates and shapes a profession into something that it was not before.⁴ This study uses this premise to trace changes in interior design in association with the efforts for licensing in three jurisdictions. I posit that the conflict involved in the professionalization process made interior design into a profession.

Specifically, this dissertation will address these questions: Is interior design a profession? What forces transformed interior design into a profession? How is interior design different from architecture?

In order to understand the evolution of interior design, it is important to understand how the profession currently describes itself. What follows is the official definition of the practice of interior design as stated by the National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ) retrieved from their web site in 2006:

Interior design is a multi-faceted profession in which creative and technical solutions are applied within a structure to achieve a built interior environment. These solutions are functional, enhance the quality of life and culture of the occupants, and are aesthetically attractive. Designs are created in response to and coordinated with the building shell, and acknowledge the physical location and social context of the project. Designs must adhere to code and regulatory requirements, and encourage the principles of environmental sustainability. The interior design process follows a systematic and

coordinated methodology, including research, analysis and integration of knowledge into the creative process, whereby the needs and resources of the client are satisfied to produce an interior space that fulfills the project goals.⁵

A simplified definition of interior design is that interior design utilizes the theory of behavior to design spaces in a micro-environment that are both functional at a safe and efficient level for every end user and are aesthetically pleasing.

Although practitioners of interior design have been in evidence in one form or another for centuries, interior designers first began working on licensing in the 1950s. Olga Guelf stated in her history of the American Society of Interior Design (ASID) that California and New York, among other states, were some of the first jurisdictions to work toward licensing.⁶

The 1970s saw two initial steps toward the professionalization of interior design. They were the establishment of a nationwide examination by the National Council for Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ) and accreditation of educational programs by the Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research (FIDER). In the early 1980s, changes to the building codes stopped the ability of interior designers to submit documents for building permits. For example in 1981 the alteration section of the Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (BOCA) changed the remodeling clause to require the seal of an architect or professional engineer to submit documents for a building permit. This affected interior designers' right to practice.⁷ Prior to this change, interior designers had been able to submit documents for projects that did not involve a structural component and receive building permits. Afterwards,

many interior designers could not submit documents to building departments and had to hire architects or engineers to seal drawings at an additional cost to their clients. This altered code inspired many independent interior designers to work for licensure in their field.

During the mid-1980s, I believe in response to the changes in the building code the quest for licensure began in earnest throughout the United States. Part of this process included the need to establish that the practice of interior design protected the health, safety, and welfare of the occupants, or there was no basis for licensure.⁸ The American Society of Interior Designers' (ASID) took the position that licensure allowed a client to select the correct professional for their project by being able to examine qualifications certified by their governmental jurisdiction. I propose that the challenges inherent in attempting to achieve legislation transformed the profession. This process made interior design an independent profession in its own right.

Allen Tate and C. Ray Smith stated in *Interior Design in the 20th Century* that interior design is grounded in behavioral theory.⁹ An interior designer's primary concern is for the occupant of the space; the focus is on the individual and his/her need to function at an optimal level in the designed environment. Thus, the general concerns inherent in interior design include a commitment to develop an interior environment that reflects client's needs and behaviors, as well as aesthetic concerns.

Interior design is a profession whose practitioners consist of many more women than men. In fact in 2004, the ASID's statistics reports 80% of their membership were women.¹⁰ This feminization had its historical roots the fact that many interior design programs developed in home economic departments, which were the almost exclusive

domain of women. I posit that although the training is not exclusive of male students the values taught and internalized by the students are imbued with feminized connotation by the programs' previous academic location in home economics. By the 1970s, when many home economic programs changed their names to reflect the scientific nature of the field the theoretical basis of the field had already been established. Over the years, these values have cross-pollinated with other programs located in schools of art and architecture through scholarly publications and presentations at the Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC) conferences.

Feminist theory encourages us to define feminine professions by establishing what they are rather than what they are not. Thus, this research will also discuss what the female point of view brings to the profession of interior design that helps define it as distinctly feminine. Indeed, I argue that the feminization of the profession gives interior design innate and highly desirable feminine traits that are indispensable to and indivisible from the practice of the profession.¹¹ These traits differentiate interior design from other professions by humanizing the built environment. They are an integral part of the building team offering a specialized viewpoint and unique service.

In addition to a discussion of the feminization of the profession, this study also includes an examination of the forces that led to the development of interior design as an independent profession, beginning with the rapid expansion of projects in response to the building boom after World War II. Tracts of new homes arose during this period of unparalleled growth of suburban development. These new developments had a few basic models, which then needed to be personalized by their owners. Interior designers helped personalize these houses. The growth in commercial interior design was even more

explosive with projects ranging universities to hospitals, restaurants to hotels, and retail spaces to office spaces. This building explosion produced a need for a new service – the design of the interior. These developments, coupled with an expanding educational system and women flooding into universities in the 1960s and 1970s, helped fill the need for university educated interior designers. By 1985, ASID estimated that there were 200,000 people in the United States working in interior design firms (ASID White Paper, 1987).

By the 1980s, architecture firms realized the potential of this new market and began to hire interior designers on staff, add interior design to their list of services, and bill for those services as a separate expenditure from the design of the building.¹² Other changes also affected this budding profession. In 1981, changes to the building code compelled building officials around the country to require an architectural or professional engineering seal on drawings submitted for permits, even those submitted for remodeling of existing buildings. By 1985, ASID and the Institute of Business Designers (IBD) were helping local chapters organize to work on licensing in their jurisdictions. This dissertation traces the process toward licensure in three of those jurisdictions: Washington, D.C., Virginia, and Ohio.

Importance of the Study

This historical study documents the process of professionalization of interior design using the lens of licensure. This is the first time that the history of the professionalization of the field has been compiled and analyzed. There are critical implications to be derived from this study that are important to the profession as it moves into the 21st Century. In this dissertation, I argue for the continued effort toward the

passage of new licensing and the tightening of existing laws. My research demonstrates that licensing is critical to protecting the independent practice of interior design. In addition, it proves that between 1985 and 2007, interior design became a profession by strengthening its definition and successfully differentiating itself from other professions.

This study provides interior design scholars and students with information on how interior design became a profession and describes the unique services it offers. Interior designers and other professionals working on the licensure process can use this study to understand the process of legislation, the issues involved, and the pressures inherent in the process. It is designed to help them better understand that the inevitable conflict is part of this process, thereby giving them the necessary preparation to face the conflict while pursuing licensure. In addition, by documenting these efforts, practicing interior designers can learn about the critical nature of the efforts made on their behalf by other interior designers to legitimize interior design as an independent and regulated profession. I hope this induces them to become licensed in their own states or jurisdictions. As Vincent G. Carter, of Washington, D.C., said in his interview the efforts for more strict legislation are impeded when few practitioners become certified under title legislation.¹³

Research Methods

The research examines the specific events that led to the licensing and/or regulation of the profession of interior design in three jurisdictions. In 2007, these jurisdictions had different levels of regulation: Washington, D.C. had a practice act, Virginia had a title act, and Ohio had no licensing. I choose to compare these three jurisdictions because of the variation in their levels of regulation, the length of time they

had been working on legislation, and their location in close proximity to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.¹⁴

The research methods utilized were historical case-study, including first-person interviews with interior designers active in the process of achieving licensing for their individual jurisdictions and with the leaders of several of the professional organizations. The interviews were done from 2005 through 2007. These interviews concerned events that occurred fifteen to twenty years before the interviews. Inevitably, the passage of time limits the accuracy of an individual's recollections because of personal interpretation of events. This research ameliorated this limitation by conducting three interviews for each jurisdiction to help confirm events. Despite that attempt, revisionist thinking by the group may have affected the accuracy of the information. Therefore, my research included the review of primary and secondary documentation archived at ASID National headquarters and generated at the time of the events. This allowed for triangulation to confirm the information collected through the first-person interviews. The interviews with the leadership helped to establish the state of the profession as of 2007.

The selection of interviewees was accomplished by contacting ASID chapters in each jurisdiction. For example, in Virginia, I attended an ASID meeting in Richmond and asked for the names of people who were active in the process. In Washington, D.C. and Ohio, an individual at the local chapter who answered an e-mail inquiry directed me to people they knew to be active in the process. Primary documents from ASID National confirmed the relevancy of these contacts, as these people were presidents of the coalition and their names appeared repeatedly on documentation collected by ASID over the years.

In Washington, D.C., two of the participants active in the process did not return repeated telephone calls, so a third interview could not be completed.¹⁵ In addition, attempts to interview the architects who had primary knowledge of the licensure process in the three jurisdictions failed to produce interviews in Washington, D.C., and Ohio. The actors in the process did not return repeated e-mails or telephone calls. One architect from Virginia responded and because he was active on the national as well as the state level, his interview represented both the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and AIA Virginia viewpoints on licensing issues for interior design during the this period of time.

The primary documentation used in this study came from the files archived at ASID Headquarters in Washington, D.C. They were collected in 2005. These documents included memorandums, faxes, hand-written notes about telephone conversation, letters, testimony and emails from the participants in the effort for or against licensure. There were also documents from the coalitions, professional organizations and governmental bodies including draft and final copies of legislation, rules and regulations, newsletters, surveys and other documents with no specific author. Volunteers who worked in each jurisdiction sent these documents to ASID. However, as with any voluntary activity of busy people, they did not always forward all of the material. Although the documents captured different periods-of-time when critical activity occurred, they may have afforded a less than perfect record of events. The pertinent text of these documents is included in Appendices H, I and J. These documents reflect the high and low points in the process of licensing and the maintenance of the acts.

This study also relied on secondary sources contemporary to the process including books, trade magazines, scholarly journals, and documents prepared by ASID, IBD,

International Interior Design Association (IIDA), and the American Institute of Architects (AIA). Most of the literature review was complete by 2005. The other literature included examination of newsletters and handouts from other relevant professional organizations operating at both the local and national levels.

Limitations of the Research Methods

In addition to the limitations discussed above, the scope of this project was limited to three jurisdictions active in the legislative process from 1985 through 2007. This period of time is particularly important because it represents an era when 70% of interior designers practicing in the United States lived in a jurisdiction that allowed them to become licensed. The jurisdictions with licensing include: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, D.C. and Wisconsin.

Additionally, personal bias must be considered as I am an interior design educator who practiced interior design for twenty-five years and was a member of a statewide legislative coalition supporting licensure in Michigan from 1990 to 2003. I served as president of the Coalition for Interior Design Registration (CIDR) for four years during two unsuccessful attempts to achieve licensing in Michigan.¹⁶ The choice of the three jurisdictions and the historical nature of the study attempts to mitigate the bias of the researcher. I engaged in a critical reflective approach that created an awareness of my bias that allowed me to be conscious of its operations.¹⁷

Continuing Research

This research represents a comprehensive history of the professionalization of interior design until the end of 2007. It is a beginning to the study of the licensure process for interior designers. Other professions working on licensure can learn from this information. Continued work is needed to document the process toward licensure in other jurisdictions. Other research will help to understand the opinion of rank and file interior designers regarding the effects of licensing on practice and other issues related to the professionalization of interior design.

Organization of the Dissertation

The organization of this dissertation establishes the history of the professionalization of interior design through the lens of licensure to compare and analyze the information in the study. This introductory chapter outlines the problem, methods, bias, and some of the results. Chapter 2, the literature review, has five sections. Each section focuses on a different part of the history of interior design. The histories of the professions of interior design and architecture are critical to understanding the events described in the research component of this document. The last section compares the accreditation, examination, internship and theory base of interior design and architecture. These establish background and context for the information gleaned from the interviews. Chapter 3 establishes a history of the professionalization of interior design. The Chapter 4 consists of five sections, which examine the position of the main players, including interviews with the leaders of professional organizations. It discusses how gender informs the process and how the changes to the building codes threaten the independent

practice of interior design. It also includes a section justifying the licensure of interior design. Chapter 4 contains the three case studies involving the jurisdictions of Washington, D.C., the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the state of Ohio. Chapter 5 covers the conclusion of this dissertation and a complete analysis of the results.

Andrew Abbott stated in his book *The Systems of Professions* that the conflicts inherent in the battles for recognition of a new profession put pressures on all of the professions involved in the conflicts. These pressures change the professions as the practitioners meet the challenges of the work environment (Abbott, 1988). This dissertation examines how the conflicts within the profession, with other professions and even with governmental bodies transformed interior design into a profession.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Section 1 – Introduction

This literature review synthesizes the body of written material about the profession of interior design until 2005. Section 1 examines the general literature about interior design as it relates specifically to the nature of interior design as a profession. Section 2 introduces the theory of professions, which provides an established framework of sociological scholarship on which this dissertation will build. Section 3 is the history of interior design, which establishes the scholarship of others in the development of interior design. Section 4 is a short history of the professionalization of architecture because for good or ill, architecture has been used by interior design as a benchmark to its process of professionalization. Section 5 compares interior design and architecture in relation to accreditation, examination, internship and theories on which the professions are based.

While there are many books on interior design, a review of the literature reveals a dearth of information about the professionalization of interior design. While there are many trade journals such as *Interior Design Magazine* and even more shelter magazines such as *This Old House Magazine*, few articles delve deeply into issues of practice, professionalism, and licensing for interior designers. The *Journal for Interior Design (JID)* (formerly *Journal of Interior Design Education and Research (JIDER)*) features many articles on the education of interior designers and education's relationship to practice issues. Three articles dealt directly with the professionalization of interior design.

This review focused on the scholarly books available about the history of interior design, three articles from *JIDER, Interior Design and Identity*¹⁸ and *The Body of Knowledge of Interior Design*.¹⁹ A review of scholarly works as of 2007 demonstrated that many do not deal directly with the professionalization of interior design. Textbooks were included in this literature review only if they discussed the profession. Biographies of individuals practicing interior design were excluded because most were about times before the focus of this document. The following history is a synopsis of the published literature as of the beginning of 2007.

In 1982, Mario Praz wrote the history of the interior called the *Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: from Pompeii to Art Nouveau*.²⁰ In this ground-breaking work Praz stated that there were problems inherent in understand the aesthetic history of interior design especially before the invention of photography. Praz continued that part of the problem with documenting the history was the inherent transitory nature of the interior environment. Every ten years a new style came into being and obliterated the one that came before. In addition, the fact that the occupants used interior products on a daily basis meant they were be worn out and/or used up. For example, furniture was discarded when needs of the household changed or the furniture broke; paint, fabrics, and wallcoverings deteriorate and fade with use and exposure to sunlight; and carpets and other flooring material wear out. In addition, all interior products are subject to damage by fire, flood, and other natural catastrophes (Praz, 1982). The way Praz chose to deal with this situation was to use paintings to document the history of interior design before photography. He felt that the paintings depicted interiors of the time-period in which they were painted.

In addition, there are some critics that felt that interior design lacked a theoretical and philosophical basis and therefore lacks validity. Praz responded to these concerns with a statement that each interior was designed for the occupant he stated:

The house for the master, and the master for the house; this synthesis isn't found in philosophical treaties, because philosophers in general belong to the race of men who don't care about houses. Since the house is an expression, and expansion of the ego, being not only an articulated system of comforts, but also the private world in which the ego likes to be daily mirrored, possession, as first corollary, must logically follow. (Praz, 1982, 26)

In other words, the interior not only reflects the styles of the time, but also the tastes of the occupant. As a result, comprehensive philosophical evaluations of the interior environment are scarce.

There are many textbooks dealing with history, a few key books include, John Pile's *A History of Interior Design* that covers methods, details, and aesthetics of interior design.²¹ Sherrill Whiton's textbook, *Elements of Interior Design and Decoration* was used as standard for interior design history from 1953 until the well into the 1980s.²² Robbie Blakemore defined the mission of her book, *The History of Interior Design and Furniture*, in its opening paragraph:²³ "This historical survey of interior design and furniture is for readers interested in the evolution of space planning, interior architecture, decorative detail, and furniture design, and the interrelationships between these aspects of residential design." (Blakemore, 1997, vii)

Allen Tate and C. Ray Smith's discussed the aesthetics of design and traced certain movements in architecture and interior design in their book *Interior Design in the 20th Century*. In addition to aesthetics and styles, Tate and Smith delved into interior decorations change into interior design and included studies of innovative practitioners of interior design and their seminal projects. While these textbooks traced the aesthetic nature of design and design styles, they give little information about the profession of interior design or the process of its professionalization. As with many professions, the documentation of the professional seems to not have really begun until the 1980s.

By contrast, three articles from the *Journal of Interior Design Education and Research* did pertain to the profession of interior design. In 1991, Buie Harwood wrote an article, "Comparing the Standards in Interior Design and Architecture to Assess Similarities and Differences" that compared the standards of education for interior design and architecture.²⁴ There is also an article comparing graduate education, which is not included here because it is repetitive of Harwood's article. Jane Guice's article, "The Propensity of State Legislatures to License Interior Designers" examined the composition of legislatures most likely to pass interior design licensing laws.²⁵ Finally, the article by John E. Pearslee, Dennis James, and Ramona Simmons, "Litigation in Interior Design: Examining United States Appellate Court Cases in Professional Practice" examined lawsuits against interior designers over the period ranging from 1969 to 1996.²⁶ These articles specifically dealt with the profession of interior design.

Harwood's article compared undergraduate education of interior design and architecture in relation to: (1) the standards of the profession; (2) the standards of education, experience, and examination; (3) the legal registration requirements, and; (4)

the definitions established by each profession. The article also responded to “allegations, conflicts, and restrictions in the two professions” (Harwood, 1991, 5) and addressed “the underlying questions of whether interior design standards compare favorably when measured against architectural standards.” (Harwood, 1991, 5) Harwood concluded, “Interior designers are not educated, trained or tested to be architects. Conversely, architects are not educated, trained or tested to be interior designers. The professions are, however, complementary” (Harwood, 1991, 5). She discussed later in Section 4-3 of this dissertation, Harwood’s thoughtful and groundbreaking comparison of interior design to architecture has had unintentional negative consequences for the profession of interior design.

Guice’s article defined the conditions until 1992 that led to legislatures passing licensing for interior designers. The article summarized the history of licensing in general, citing multiple sources from other licensed professions. She also outlined the reasons for licensing, the reasons to oppose licensing, and outlined the criteria often used for licensure (Guice, 1993). Guice cited from the *Book of States, 1992-1993*, published by the Council of State Governments:

- (1) Unregulated practice of the occupation poses a serious risk to a consumer’s life, health, safety or economic well-being, and the potential for harm is recognizable and likely to occur;
- (2) The practice of the occupation requires a high degree of skill, knowledge, and training;
- (3) The function and responsibilities of the practitioner require independent judgment and the members of the occupational group

practice independently;

(4) The scope-of-practice of the occupation is distinguishable from other licensed and unlicensed occupations; and

(5) The economic impact on the public of regulating this occupation group is justified.

Failure to meet these criteria, in general, indicate that licensure is not justified, or that some less restrictive type of regulation such as registration or certification may be appropriate. (Brinegar and Schmitt, 1992, 568-569) (Guice, 1993, 4-5)

She used statistical records kept by legislatures that have passed licensing to compare with the same data from jurisdictions that do not have licensing. Some of the variables included: (1) number of designers in the state; (2) number of lawyers in the legislature; and (3) the political orientation of the legislature. Her research revealed that the only variable that seemed to predict a legislature's action was the number of lawyers in the legislature. The more lawyers in the legislature directly related to the greater propensity to pass licensing legislation.

Pearslee, James, and Simmons' article examined case law involving interior designers in different jurisdictions. They divide the cases into four - seven-year periods that began in 1969, ended in 1996, and compared the frequency of court cases in each of these seven-year segments. The authors of the study initially stated that they expected the study to demonstrate an increase in the quantity of litigation against interior designers in licensed jurisdictions versus jurisdictions that had no licensing. The also article identified sources of litigation during the time-periods. Their research had two goals: (1)

to inform designers about the kinds of litigation occurring and (2) to allow educators to inform professional practice classes as to litigation issues in interior design. Their research concluded that although the number of cases has increased over the years, the type of court cases, the comparative frequency, and the sources of the lawsuits did not change. Their research therefore concluded that achieving licensing does not increase the propensity for lawsuits against interior designers. These articles triangulate on the main issue, which is the need to study interior design as a profession, how that process happened and the role licensing played in this process.

By 2006, Caren Martin and Denise Guerin wrote a document entitled: *The Body of Knowledge of Interior Design*. Their study begins the process of documenting and defining the body of knowledge for the profession of interior design. It was published on the web sites of the various professional organizations. As part of the professionalization process, it established the parameters for the profession of interior design, but did not discuss the process of professionalization per se. As of the end of 2007, no book has fully addressed the development of interior design in the 20th Century regards to the professionalization process.

Conclusion

This literature review exposed a dearth of information written about the professionalization interior design. Three articles published in the *Journal for Interior Design Education and Research* about professionalization revealed a gap in information about professionalization and licensing in particular. Little information exists about the process by which interior design became a profession, why it is a profession, or why it needs licensure to continue to be an independent profession. This dissertation fills these

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

gaps by establishing the history of the professionalization of interior design and discussing why licensing is important to the independent practice of interior design through the examination of three case studies of the licensing process.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Section 2 – Theory of Professions

Because of the lack of scholarly work on the professionalization of interior design, I reviewed four seminal works on professionalism that form a foundation of the theories written on professionalism. They include, Eliot Freidson's 1994 book, *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy and Policy*, Magali Larson's 1977 book, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*, Andrew Abbott's 1988 book, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*, and Steven Brint's 1994 book, *In an Age of Experts: The Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life*. The selection of these authors reflects the fact that their works are often cited in other people's research of professions and professionalism.

The diverse viewpoints of Freidson, Larson, Abbott and Brint captured the complexity of the topic and ground this dissertation in sociological theory. Their work documented diverse fields of endeavor by establishing the parameters of professionalism, the process by which occupations become professions, the position of professions in the marketplace, and the forge through which professions meld into new forms to meet the needs of the ever-changing professional work place (Abbott, 1988). As discussed in this section, their theories were based on sociological studies that expanded work-related and class theory.

Freidson stated that it is impossible to define professions in a few words because of the complexity and diversity of the nature of the work. In addition, each profession came to its fruition by different paths and so even that process cannot help to differentiate professions from other fields of endeavor. Nevertheless, the following summary of the

theory advanced by these key authors allowed me to formulate a working framework of professions to use in gauging the professionalization of interior design.

Freidson wrote extensively about professions, the process of professionalization, and values that encompass them.²⁷ His work is considered the seminal work on professionalism because he separated professions from other work-related issues. He based his theory on those of the division of labor, occupational and class theory. His book, *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy and Policy*, is a collection of essays written between 1973 to 1993 that reflect the changes in his thinking in response to contemporary issues, and developments in sociology (Freidson, 1994).

Freidson redirected the study of professions to the “knowledge-based” nature of the work and the “unique shelters” commonly known as professional organizations that help organize and promote a profession. These professional organizations run by professional elites unified and controlled the profession from outside the employment arena (Freidson, 1994). Freidson stated his case in the following manner:

I suggest that a fruitful focus lies in analyzing the circumstances in which occupations become organized as social groups, in classifying them by the source, type and degree of their own organizations, and in analyzing them in such a way as to explain both how and why their form of organization came to be and could be maintained and what the consequences of that organization are for the productive division of labor of which they are part (Freidson, 1994, 79).

Freidson viewed professionalization as both a model and an ideology that protects and expands the profession. On the positive side, professionals were a specialized work

force with both a technical and an esoteric knowledge-base that society needed to function optimally. On the negative side, they formed exclusionary groups that interfered with free market practices and were not responsive to public needs. He stated that they were elitist in their use of monopolistic practices to capture their market and excluded others from participation. They attacked other professions whenever a conflict-of-interest arose, but they were also vulnerable to political and economic pressures (Freidson, 1994).

Freidson stated that his book responded to the fears of other sociologists in the mid-1980s that professionalism was dead or dying through de-professionalization. An example of this phenomenon was the reduction of autonomy of physicians by insurance companies that pre-approved treatment in an effort to cut costs and that the approval process drastically curtailed the autonomy of physicians. Freidson asserted that professions have been reborn because society needs the skills professions provide. He proposed that professions were not dying, only that they were changing in response to stressors. He stated that: "... [W]e must discriminate those claims to knowledge and skill that are genuinely valuable from those that are not, and create and maintain forms of institutionalization, which allow both knowledge and skill to be used to mutual benefit while preventing their becoming a source of exploitation and injustice" (Freidson, 1994, 168).

Larson's 1977 book, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*, was a pivotal work establishing a Marxist analysis of professions.²⁸ In this book, based on Karl Marx and Max Webber's views of monopoly, Larson proposed that monopoly and prestige were the driving forces behind professions and professional organizations.

Viewed in the larger perspective of the occupational and class

structures, it would appear that the model of profession passes from a predominately economic function – organizing the linkage between education and the marketplace – to a predominately ideological one – justifying inequality of status and closure of access in the occupational order (Larson, 1977, xviii).

Larson proposed that a profession's claim to have captured the knowledge-base, which she called "cognitive exclusiveness," works with the autonomy of the work environment "to achieve market monopoly" (Larson, 1977, 38). This is re-enforced because there was no way for a non-professional to judge the work of a professional. In addition, it was Larson's opinion that any code of ethics disguised self-interest behind a written code that stated concern for the welfare of the public, but was often not applied in practice. Larson stated that limited enforcement of codes of ethics by many organizations is "another element of social self-protection" (Larson, 1977, 38) to disguise the non-egalitarian practices of professions.

In addition, Larson believed that professions established a monopoly of the educational process. They captured the market by defining the knowledge-base through the establishment of university programs and formalized accreditation of those programs. According to Larson, increasingly stringent admissions criteria limited entry to training. The formalizing internships with set standards and qualifying examinations also limited access to practice. The manipulation of licensing examinations counteracted overproduction (too many practitioners) and helped the professions consolidate control of the market. Larson stated that although on the surface this movement toward education and examination seem to democratize the marketplace, these movements really re-

enforced the “dominant ideology” and further secured the market. The struggle between professions was not a class struggle, but a struggle within the same class between different professions and was an “ideological battle for recognition, for only through social recognition could personal superiority be securely affirmed” (Larson, 1977, 157).

Andrew Abbott’s book *The Systems of Professions: an Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*,²⁹ took a different view from both Freidson and Larson (Abbott, 1988). He examined how the professions capture and control the acquisition and application of knowledge. He discussed where and why groups achieve power, how the conflict between professions altered that power, and the way in which that conflict changed both the new and existing professions in the process.

Abbott stated that when a profession was established the practitioners had jurisdiction over the work related to their expertise. This formed the core of their jurisdiction where the profession has its foundation. New professions came into being in three different ways. (1) A new profession formed when new technologies established a new field of endeavor. For example: the computer era invented the profession of systems analysis. (2) Professions began when there is a gap in coverage of one profession; a new profession developed to fill in that gap and then worked toward professional status (Abbott, 1988). For example, it was Abbott’s opinion that landscape architecture filled a gap between architecture and land surveying. (3) Sub-divisions of professions developed to form new professions as technology improved or when increased demand started a new level of training. For example: when psychiatry could not meet the demands of patients, psychology and social work filled the gap.

Abbott also stated that while the core knowledge of professions was unusually solid, it was on the edges of that core, where professions and expertise overlapped, that competition existed among professions (Abbott, 1988). There were times when competition between well-established professions, while fierce, may have had no clear-cut winner. For example, the market for personal trust accounts had been brutal among bankers, trust accountants, insurance providers, and sales people who sell annuities, but all of these professions still offer the service because no profession became dominant.

Abbott stated that the competition between professions, the influx of new technologies, and the establishment of new professions altered all professions and kept them in a state of constant flux. In many ways, professions were like interlocking systems that vary with the diverse pressures from within and without. Every conflict moves each profession into new, unforeseen, and sometimes unrecognizable configurations and some of these stressors may have led to de-professionalization (Abbott, 1988). For example, the invention of Computer-Aided Drafting (CAD) altered the position of the draftsman in both architecture and industry.

Abbott further argued that the more organized the profession, the stronger the jurisdictional claim. He also said that most professions are strongest when there is a single national association (Abbott, 1988).

In his work entitled *In an Age of Experts: the Changing Role of Professionals in Politics and Public Life* Steven Brint took the approach of examining the educated middle class and its relationship to the larger society and the political order.³⁰ He proposed that professions changed from their role as the “caring profession interested in protecting the social welfare of society” during the beginning of the 20th Century, into the

trained expert of the 21st Century (Brint, 1994, 7). This transformation changed the focus of professions and made them more open to political influence, but also gave them the ability to influence the political and public aspects of life. At the turn of the 20th Century, the professionals were mostly from the upper-classes and acted as social trustees. Brint stated that focus had shifted to control of markets and financial gain (Brint, 1994).

In contrast to Larson, Brint stated that the process of professionalization opened professions to a wider sociological stratum because it used education and merit based examinations as the control point for entry (Brint, 1994). Brint added a twist to Larson's assertion by stating that while examination of professionals seemed to establish a more egalitarian or merit based evaluation, it actually helped to capture knowledge, which then further legitimized the profession through its inaccessibility. Brint continued that professions were constantly "evolving in a social and cultural context" (Brint, 1994, 8). Brint echoed Freidson and Abbott by arguing that in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th Century, professions were social trustees that effected important social ends. Brint expanded a code of ethics concern to state that by the end of the 20th Century, "expertise [was] now a resource sold to bidders in the market for skilled labor" (Brint, 1994, 15). This new position changed how the professions viewed government and how professional organizations initiated political activity to expand and protect their position in the marketplace.³¹ This expert labor model with a concentration on efficiency in the work place transformed of the professional work environment to "corporate capitalism" (Brint, 1994, 147-149).

Brint examined the political leanings and activities of professionals, (i.e. being conservative or liberal). He generalized that professionals were more conservative on

economic issues and more liberal on social issues. Much like Larson's Marxist point of view, Brint stated that while professions are "neither democratic nor capitalist, they play an important role in efforts to shape and [at times] to constrain capitalist development" (Brint, 1994, 16). The protective stance of professions and the political clout of their professional organizations altered free markets. Brint examined the social structure in which professions established their practitioners in relation to class, status, income, community, and authority, but in a cultural rather than a social context.

Professional Theory

Freidson made clear that the study of professions has been difficult to examine and understand because professions encompassed such a broad variety of careers and perform widely diverse work activities. A physician's work is very different from an engineer's, whose work in turn is different from that of a policy expert. In addition, there is no consistent path in the formation of the various professions and that makes it difficult to see the relationship among them. This section synthesizes the seminal works of Freidson, Larson, Abbott, and Brint into a "multi-dimensional concept"³² of professions.

Freidson established that certain predictable components play a part in establishing of a profession. For purposes of clarity and brevity, this dissertation treats these components as if they exist as a linear progression of steps but, as noted, not all professions follow all of the steps, nor do all professions follow them in any prescribed order. The process of professionalization is as diverse as the professions themselves. (Freidson, 1994). Historically, each profession accomplished these components in a different order and some even skipped components entirely. An example of this is the clergy. They were the first profession with university training even before the United

States formed a union,³³ but unlike other professions, their employer, the church itself, was the primary professional organization for clergy.

What is a Profession?

The theories developed by the aforementioned authors are assembled here to clarify what is meant by a profession in order to assess interior design's status as a profession in later chapters. Freidson stated that professions cannot be simply defined, but for the means of this dissertation, the following includes a complex set of components and parameters that taken as a whole reflect most professions (Freidson, 1994). Furthermore, professionalization is not a fixed process, but something that continues to transform each profession that comes into conflict (Abbott, 1988).

The multi-dimensional concept of professions begins with a definition of occupation. An occupation was an activity that someone performs as part of his/her daily life for which he/she receive compensation (Freidson, 1994). What elevates a profession above other occupations is that professionals: (1) use a distinct and unique body of knowledge that is cognitive, esoteric, technical and applied; (2) receive formalized advanced training, which conveys that knowledge; (3) have autonomy over the work that they do. The work process involves using their specialized knowledge to assess, diagnose, and find diverse solutions to a complex set of issues (Abbott, 1988). Additionally, professions increase the prestige of the practitioners. Prestige, once based on social or economic class, is now based on the level of education and the cognitive quality of the work (Freidson, 1994).

Professionals have autonomy over the work that they do. They control content, scope and the timing of execution of work on a day-to-day basis. In addition,

professionals look at the work as a reward in itself, rather than “just a job for a paycheck” (Freidson, 1994, 90). The formation of a professional organization is critical to the capture of a knowledge-base and, eventually, a market. Professional organizations are instrumental in expanding the profession, defending the profession from usurpers, and advancing the profession through licensing and other governmental activities (Freidson, 1994).

A partial list of components of professionalization include: formalizing a distinct body of knowledge, establishing, standardizing and accrediting educational programs; establishing professional organizations; and writing and administering national examinations; establishing. The following describes these components in more detail.

Body of Knowledge

One profession differentiates itself from other professions by forming a unique and esoteric body of knowledge (Freidson, 1994). Each profession works to control and consolidate its knowledge-base through the formalization of training, usually in a university setting. Professional organizations work hand in hand with educators to capture the knowledge-base, standardizing and formalizing its structure for sharing information. They advance the body of knowledge through theoretical development (Abbott, 1988).

Each profession has a distinct body of knowledge (Freidson, 1994). It is cognitive in that it involves higher levels of thinking. The professional assesses diverse information, processes that information, and decides on the best solution for the issues involved (Abbott, 1988). The knowledge is esoteric in that it was not intuitive, nor normally understood by a common person (Larson, 1977). The knowledge is technical in

that it is complicated and detailed, which require years of technical training, such as electrical engineering or geology. Finally, that knowledge is applied in that it is used on the job to solve complex issues or problems, but on a cognitive level, rather than with one's hands.³⁴ It is important to note that the problems solved by professions do not have one correct answer to any problem, rather the role of the professional is to weigh advantages and disadvantages of each decision to come to an optimal solution for a particular situation (Freidson, 1994). Where one profession's knowledge-base overlaps with another there was conflict (Abbott, 1988).

Education - the Formalization of Knowledge

The formation of a system of advanced education is another component of the process leading toward professionalization. Since the mid-1970s, formalized professional education typically has been based in a university environment. Advanced training continues the capture of information that defines the parameters of a particular profession. The university disperses the knowledge to students and expands that knowledge through the development of theories and research to test those theories (Abbott, 1988).

As more universities develop programs, there is a move towards the standardization of programs through accreditation. This effort reinforces the consistency of the core knowledge-base, that can be expected of graduates and continues to define that knowledge as belonging to a particular profession. University professors consolidate their positions of power by becoming experts in a particular field and the spokespeople for that profession (Larson, 1977).

The standardization process begins with educators or professional organizations continuing to elevate the field to a profession. Educators want to elevate the profession increasing their sphere of influence, and professional organizations hope to elevate the profession to increase membership and political power (Freidson, 1994).

Limiting entrants into the knowledge-base through the creation of entrance qualifications at universities is also a characteristic of professionalization. The process continues with the certification of educational programs and formalized internships for complex and hard to master knowledge-based professions. Continuing education requirements are also necessary for complex or technical professions where the knowledge-base is constantly changing (Abbott, 1988).

Examination

The establishment of a rigorous, post-baccalaureate examination solidifies and further captures the knowledge-base. The development of a nationwide examination consolidates the scope of knowledge and work of a particular group. It controls access to the practice of the profession and begins the credentialing of new members to a minimum standard of expertise. Administration of the examination is available only after a fixed period of experience in the field. Larson stated that licensing solidified this process of monopolization that is reinforced by government action (Larson, 1977). Two examples of governmental action protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public with regards to the built environment are the creation and enforcement of building codes and lawsuits instigated by boards of regulation for practice violations.

Professional Organizations

The establishment of professional organizations is another key aspect of

professionalism. The cornerstone activity of a professional organization is capturing and protecting the profession for its individual members. As part of that process, the organization guarantees a “life long, relatively secure position” (Freidson, 1994, 90) in the profession. Often, a professional holds more loyalty to the profession and the professional organization, than their particular employer. In the United States, ask a physician what he/she does, and he/she will respond with that they are a doctor. Only then, will they clarify where they work.

Professional organizations are elitist and exclusionary and protect the members from the encroachment of other professions and non-professionals (Larson, 1977). The development of a nationwide examination is started by these organizations to limit access to the field (Freidson, 1994). The movement towards capturing a body of knowledge and therefore the work continues with licensing and other governmental actions that are often initiated by professional organizations.

Professional organizations defend their members from encroachment by new professions and aggressively defend them from attempts to capture contested areas of practice where knowledge-base overlaps (Freidson, 1994). They attempt to capture territory from other professions as their own. For example, over the years the counseling aspect of clergy life has been usurped, first by psychiatrists and other mental health professions and now, by the medical profession with the development of new psychotropic drugs (Abbott, 1988).

Code of Ethics

Professional organizations establish a code of ethics. In the mid-20th Century, professions moved from serving the public welfare as a goal for the profession, toward

the more self-serving trained expert stance (Brint, 1994). It was at this time, in the opinion of the authors, that code of ethics became an unfulfilled promise of concern of a particular profession for the welfare of their clients. It existed to give the impression of limiting unethical practice with clients and among members of the profession. As some professional organizations did little in the way of enforcement of the code of ethics may be more a marketing ploy than an actual pledge of quality of service. The code of ethics continues the process of capturing of the professional territory, often concealing from the public and even from its own members the self-interest of the profession (Freidson, 1994). Larson was the most skeptical about the code of ethics when she stated it is, at best, self-serving and deceptive to the public in that it hides the real goal of the organization, which is to “monopolize the market for financial gains” (Larson, 1977, 52).

Freidson noted however, that the code of ethics can be used to indoctrinate individual members of a profession to the quality of service expected and the concern of the profession for the more altruistic welfare of the public rather than simply the motivation of self-interest (Freidson, 1994).

Autonomy of Work

One unique aspect of a profession is the extent to which its practitioners have control over their work and the work processes. This autonomy of work relates to the approach to the work, content of the work and the day-to-day accomplishment of the work (Freidson, 1994). A factory worker does not expect to alter the order of part's installation in a production line, whereas a nurse may apply professional judgment to determine the need to see one patient before another as part of his/her daily work. Although self-employment was once believed to be a cornerstone of professionalism,

most professionals today are employed by organizations such as hospitals, universities, governmental bodies, insurance companies, and corporations (Larson, 1977).

In addition, a professional's work involves a complex thought process where there often exists no single correct answer to an issue. Instead, many avenues exist to a variety of solutions, each with different ramifications. The work of a profession consists of balancing these ramifications. Thus, each task can be solved in a different manner (Freidson, 1994). In addition, the work of a profession can only be truly evaluated by another professional in the same field. This led to some professions instituting a peer-review process for judging work. It also meant that expert testimony from fellow professionals was necessary in court cases that hinged on the assessment of a peer's professional performance (Freidson, 1994).

Conflict Inherent in Process

Abbott's book discussed the many stressors that warp professions into different configurations in a constant balancing of self-interests and professional autonomy. A description of the major stressors that alter professions follows.

Existing Professions

Most professions have a solid base of operations and conflicts arise when there are overlaps with other professions. These conflicts will temper and change all professions (Abbott, 1988). For example, a conflict can weaken a profession such as when the clergy lost jurisdiction over the counseling of their parishioners. On the other hand, a conflict can strengthen a profession by uniting it and helping it to differentiate its services. Medicine at the turn of the 20th Century consolidated its base and vilified both chiropractors and other natural healing specialists. These efforts were successful because

there are still people who do not use chiropractors for fear that they will break their neck (Freidson, 1994).

New Professions

Some new professions begin when a gap in service exists not filled by other professions (Abbott, 1988). The new profession establishes itself in the space left by the older profession. Abbott reinforces Freidson by stating as the more established professions become aware of the competition they use their considerable resources to attempt to block the professionalization process of the new profession (Freidson, 1994). The resulting competitive process shapes and changes both professions. For example, because a lack of trained psychiatrists, the professions of psychology and social work developed to fill the gap in coverage, especially for the less privileged. According to Abbott, the psychiatrists sought to protect their field from the usurpers such as psychologists by controlling the dispersing of drugs. In addition, psychologists fought with social workers over such issues as “who can interpret diagnostic tests” (Abbott, 1988, xii). This process of competition altered each of these professions. Additionally the tensions between them continue over, things like the value of psychotherapy verses quick fix solutions of psychotropic medications (Abbott, 1988).

New Technology

Larson noted that new technologies change professions and can even result in the establishment of a new profession. The field of medicine changed with the discovery of bacteriology and the invention of drugs that transformed human health (Larson, 1977). Abbott stated that the development of computers led to the development of new professions such as systems analysis. New technology also transformed architecture,

engineering, and graphic design in their most basic dimension—the creation of the documents of design such as blueprints (Abbott, 1988). The profession of library science changed dramatically with the development of the computerized catalogues and on-line databases (Freidson, 1994).

Stratification within Professions

As Freidson stated, new technologies add new levels of complication to the work process of a profession. This can, in turn, led to the splintering of a profession into a variety of specializations (Freidson, 118). Abbott argued that the formalization of this new structure through education, examination, and licensure helps to reinforce and protect the new field (Abbott, 36). For example, as patient care grew increasingly complex, doctors had to cede some duties to others. Nurses took over daily patient care and pharmacists took over the mixing and dispensation of medication. As new technologies developed, such as, laboratory and pathological testing, and x-rays the medical field stratified further. Then new therapies developed, such as respiratory and physical therapy and the field divided yet again. Each of these new specializations developed into a new, highly-trained, highly-skilled, semi-autonomous profession. Competition continues where the professions' scope of work overlap.

The Market

Professions attempt to lessen the impact of economic forces on its members by creating a complicated structures of professional and governmental protections (Brint, 1994). Limiting access to university educational programs is an example of this practice. This is done in two ways. (1) By the accrediting of programs, which limits the number of programs offering the knowledge-base. It also defines that knowledge as integral to the

profession and consolidates the scope of work. (2) On an individual basis, by the portfolio reviews, which restrict and limit acceptance into specific programs.

As Larson mentioned, the free market stance and the code of ethics disguise the monopolistic structure hidden below the surface (Larson, 1977). Abbott added that true and open competition in professions, and between professions in close juxtaposition to each other, may be more of an advertising ploy than real competition (Abbott, 1988).

Aging Out of the Knowledge-base

As the professional ages, his/her training becomes dated. Professions handle this issue in two ways. Either the older worker moves into management or the profession may develop and require continuing education programs to keep the aging professional up to date (Abbott, 1988). In most jurisdictions, physicians, and other professions, require a certain number of hours of continuing education each year to continue to qualify for their license.

Pressures of Fragmentation

Freidson discussed the tendency for professional organizations to fragment and then to reform as pressures within the group evolve. This happens when educated professionals take over a larger part of the field than the professionals who learned on the job. Quite often, professional organizations split under these and other circumstances. Later in response to stressors from outside the profession they coalesce into one professional organization (Freidson, 1994). For example, in the chapter about history of the professionalization of interior design, I will discuss the breakup in 1958 and coalescing of interior design organization in 1975 only to break up into seven different organization in the mid 1990s.³⁵

De-professionalization

De-professionalization occurs when a profession disappears or its jurisdiction is subsumed under another profession. This happens to a profession when technology changes and the profession does not keep up with the changes. For example, the once viable profession of railroad engineer was no longer viable with the development of air and over the road transportation. In addition, when professions usurp overlapping jurisdictions, there can be a slide toward de-professionalization. Such as: the clergy losing counseling to the psychological establishment.

There is also the opposite effect to stratification of professions. Sometimes technology alters professions by standardizing information (Freidson, 1994). Where one parameter of professionalization is the need to balance decisions by using a specialized knowledge-base, the standardizing of information removes these choices. An example of this is Computer-Aided Drawing and Design (CADD), which has redefined the role of the person preparing drawings for the manufacturing of products. This effectively de-professionalized these tasks so a computer can perform the duties of production management once reserved for highly trained professionals.

Some sociologists writing in the mid-1980s proposed that professions were outdated. This belief came to the fore as discussions focused on the weakening position of physicians because of cost control issues. By the mid-1990s, bureaucrats working at insurance companies and governmental agencies controlled access to medical care and the procedures to be performed, further weakening physicians' control over the performance of their professional duties. Freidson however refuted this premise in *Professionalism Reborn* and he stated that professions change to counteract these

pressures (Freidson, 1994). Each of these aspects of competition constantly alters professions. Each pressure changes the configuration of the profession in superficial and profound ways. These pressures ebb and flow with the realities of daily life and exist as transformative forces within all professions (Abbott, 1988).

Conclusion

Examination of the theory of professions establishes indicators of professionalization and sets the theoretical framework for my study. The indication must be viewed as a continuum of components that move an occupation toward professionalization rather than a hard lined series of clearly defined events. This dissertation uses the theory of professions as the theoretical framework for analysis of interior design's movement toward professionalization for three reasons. (1) It grounds this work in an established body of knowledge. (2) It allows a framework with which to compare to interior design's progress toward professionalization. (3) It makes the comparison of interior design to the theory of professions rather than using another profession as a measuring gauge. This alleviates the subservient position that interior design has had when it compared itself to architecture.

This section establishes the complexity of the process of professionalization. It also establishes that conflict is inevitable and that conflict transforms professions. My premise is it was the process of working on licensure professionalized interior design.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Section 3 – History of Interior Design

This section provides an overview of the literature relating to the development of interior decoration and its metamorphosis into interior design. According to ASID's White Paper, this transformation took place during the building boom after World War II (ASID, 1989).³⁶ Prior to World War II, an interior decorator's concern was the aesthetic nature of the interior of a building. It involved the selection of material for floors, walls and ceilings and the selection and placement of furniture. While this generalization is accurate for the majority of interior decorators practicing from 1900 to 1950, there were decorators and architects who performed a wider range of duties that are now considered interior design. Interior design incorporated those early aesthetic interests into an extended scope of work that revolved around the interactions between people and space. Interior designers were concerned with the function and experience of a space as well as its relationship with the theory of behavior and psychological well-being of its occupants. This new direction and the university training that framed it began the transformation of the occupation of interior decoration into the profession of interior design. This broadened the expertise to include space planning, reflected ceiling plans, millwork detailing, and knowledge of building systems. This section examines the history of the development of the modern profession of interior design from the Industrial Revolution until 2007.

Body of Knowledge

It was not until 2006, that Caren Martin and Denise Guerin created a document to aid in the definition of interior design's body of knowledge. In *The Body of Knowledge*

for Interior Design, they proposed that interior design involved six distinct areas: (1) design; (2) human environment needs; (3) interior construction, codes, and regulations; (4) products and materials; (5) communication; and (6) professional practices (Martin and Guerin, 2006). While the authors discussed the scope of the work of interior designers, they did not address the profession or the process of professionalization over the years.

On the other hand, Tate and Smith established a wide range of historical background information about interior design in their book *Interior Design in the 20th Century*. They discussed the changes that affected the built environment as scientific, sociological, technical, democratic, and cultural revolutions of society. Their discussion began long before the 20th Century with an exploration of the transformation of the built environment during the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain and the United States. These changes included alterations to the structures in both the residential and commercial markets, access to a variety of inexpensive mass-produced interior products, and the increased wealth of the middle class to acquire these items (Tate and Smith, 1986).

In addition to the structural changes in the built environment, a differentiation of men's and women's roles developed in this new capitalist society. The relegation of the new spheres of influence for men and women changed the family work dynamic. Men, and to a lesser extent women and children, went off to work in factories or offices, and children went off to schools. Where once the home and farm were the centers for productive labor, in the new factory work environment, work and home became separated. According to McKellar and Sparkes, these developments led to a differentiation in environments.³⁷ For example, much of the current interest in interior

spaces as reflected in McKellar and Sparkes' 2004 book have grown from the work undertaken by social and cultural historians on the problematical 19th Century notion of the 'separate spheres.' One view is that with the advent of industrialization, middle-class men and women came to inhabit distinct environments – the public sphere of work for men and the private sphere of the home for women. These spheres, in turn, were imbued with different, gendered value systems that extended to the aesthetic languages used within them (McKellar & Sparkes, 2004). This dissertation will deal in more depth with the relationship between gender and interior design in Section 4-3.

Development of Interior Decoration

From 1700s to the 1900s, the built environment drastically altered in both commercial and residential buildings. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, commercial buildings designed by architects consisted mainly of ecclesiastical and civic buildings, as well as, a few domestic structures for the very wealthy. In addition, other structures designed by the owner or a master builder for specific commercial uses were offices, retail stores, theaters or hotels, as well as, new residences that fulfilled the needs of the burgeoning middle class (Tate and Smith, 1986).

Before the Industrial Revolution, a smallholder might build his own house or an owner might engage the services of a master builder, with or without the additional services of an architect to design the structure. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution however, mass production greatly influenced the nature of residential construction. By the 1900s, apartment buildings in Paris, brownstones in London and New York, and whole tracts of identical or nearly identical homes in suburbia later in the 1950s marked these changes in residential construction over the years (Tate and Smith,

1986). With this suburban neighborhood, rather than each home reflecting the needs and tastes of the owners it was a one-size-fits-all scenario.

The factories of the Industrial Revolution poured out goods for consumption by the mass market, much of it for the home. Because of income from management jobs in factories, the middle class could afford to build or buy a better home than had been possible before. They had the income to fill those homes with affordable mass produced possessions (Tate and Smith, 1986).

Tate and Smith continued that the responsibilities for the decoration of the interior and interior finish selection changed. Before the 1750s, the owner, architect, upholsterer or person who constructed the building, selected the look of the interior. In addition, furniture and interior products were one-of-a-kind pieces made by a craftsman or by the homeowner. Furniture inherited from one generation to another became heirlooms of great personal value to be listed in probate records of the deceased. After the Industrial Revolution, affordable furniture and interior products were made in factories and readily available to the masses (Tate and Smith, 1986).

A new conceptualization of the home developed. While the “female of the household” became the procurer of the interior environment during the Victorian Era decoration of the home became about much more than just decoration. Journals for women of the time espoused the philosophy that the decoration of the home was integral for creating and supporting the moral fiber of its occupants.³⁸ This meant that the interior took on a great deal of moral importance. Mary Guyatt documented this belief in relation to commercial interiors in her article, “A Semblance of Home: Mental Asylum Interiors: 1880 – 1914.”³⁹ In this article, Guyatt discussed changes to the interiors of mental

institutions. “This treatment was called ‘moral therapy’ and was based on the theory that patients fared best when offered a combination of light work and kind and attentive care. ... the asylum would provide a surrogate family, of which the provisions of homely accommodation was an integral part” (Guyatt, 2004, 49).

Development of Interior Spaces

As the nature of the built environment drastically changed the nature of the interior environment also changed. There were sets of factors at work to alter these environments. During the 1700s, the differentiation of rooms in a home for individual use and function became the norm for the middle class as well as the wealthy. Tate and Smith suggested the sociological changes that started in the 1700s accelerated with the Industrial Revolution. Prior to this time, rooms in manor houses were by necessity multi-purpose. Household servants converted the great-room of the manor house from a sleeping room into a place of eating in the morning, a place of industry such as sewing and weaving during the day, back into a place of eating and entertaining for the evening, and finally again into sleeping space at night. This lifestyle was no longer possible when factory work attracted tenant farmers and servants into the cities to make money and gain independence during the Industrial Revolution (Tate and Smith, 1986).

The lack of servants during the 1800s also led to a more private life style because servants did not interrupt the occupants of a room to put more wood on the fire or as they went about other daily activities. The development of hallways continued this move toward privacy, as people no longer had to pass through one room to get to another. Eventually the occupants of these houses became accustomed to the privacy of being alone in a room and expected that amenity in the building of new houses (Tate and Smith,

1986).

As the 1800s progressed, the growth in the middle-class and their ability to purchase homes led to a building boom. These new homes had differentiated rooms for individual tasks and contained correspondingly specialized furniture. There were separate rooms for every day living, entertaining, cooking, eating, and sleeping (Tate and Smith, 1986). The Small House Movement also applied pressure to downsize the size of houses, partially because of the lack of servants.⁴⁰ The Small House Movement in the United States, sponsored by the magazine *Better Homes*, also demonstrated the influence of the press in home design.

As early as the 1720s, changes to fireplace design allowed maximum heat transmission into rooms and affected how families used them (Tate and Smith, 1986). Parr took the technological developments a step further in his article, "Heating, Lighting, and Plumbing and Human Relations."⁴¹ He theorized that the invention of central heating and the general use of electricity led to the use of separate rooms for individual activities. His premise was that prior to these advances in northern climes, all evening activities during the winter centered on the fireplace and oil lamp. Once central heating warmed the whole house, people began to disperse to other spaces in the home, which led to the differentiation of rooms, such as kitchen, parlors and bedrooms. In addition, with the conversion to safer gas lighting and then electric lighting, children did not need as close supervision as before because of fire safety reasons and could play or do homework in their bedrooms. By 1900, the invention of whole house heating, plumbing, better lighting, and electrical appliances and their incorporation into the residential environment began to free women from the drudgery of household maintenance. Some of the

drudgery no longer necessary were cooking and heating with wood or coal fires; carrying water for drinking, cooking, cleaning, laundry, and bathing; and the need for outdoor privies and the daily emptying slop pots (Tate and Smith, 229). Another example is although people still made their own clothes, it was no longer necessary to make the cloth to make clothes.

Woman's Place

With the Industrial Revolution, the nature of work in the home changed as technologies were integrated into the chores that traditionally were the work of women or servants listed above. During the Victorian Era, home fashion became the focus of homemakers and matters of current fashion and taste became national pastimes in Great Britain and the United States. As Thorstein Veblen stated in *The Theory of Leisure* written in 1899,⁴² the female was “petted, and [was] permitted or even required, to consume largely and conspicuously – vicariously for her husband or ... natural guardian” (Veblen, 1899, 358).

Once women's leisure time became the norm for the upwardly mobile middle-class, women began to respond to the “human impulse for purposeful activity” (Veblen, 1899, 359). At the end of the 19th Century, women's rights came to the forefront in the woman's suffrage movement for political equality and the first wave of the feminist movement for economic equality. This led to the pursuit by women of work outside of the home. This movement gained momentum, but as late as the 1950s most of the careers for women were still limited to extensions of the responsibilities of the home, such as nursing, teaching, and interior decorating.

Development of Interior Design

At the turn of the 20th Century, two of the key women who became the first interior decorators were Elsie de Wolfe in 1905, and Dorothy Draper in commercial design in 1920 (Tate and Smith, 1986). Before this male upholsterers helped home owners choose items to decorate their homes.⁴³ De Wolfe and Draper established the first successful independent interior decorating studios owned by women. These women helped to make working outside the home more acceptable for the middle-class. As time passed many women and men began to do interior decoration. According to Michael Alin, the executive director of the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID), by the 1950s, the professional organization of interior designers had as many men members as women.⁴⁴ Those statistics have changed over the years. By 2004, 80% of interior designer who were members of ASID were female (*ASID Facts and Figure*, 2004).

According to ASID's White Paper, soon after the Second World War, interior decoration transformed into interior design. It was the building boom after the war that initiated the growth of large, open plan commercial buildings. These buildings provided a market for trained people to design the spaces in buildings that were already constructed. The education of interior decorators altered from aesthetics and a study of period furniture to space planning. Space planning could improve productivity for the occupants of these new kinds of spaces. The invention of systems furniture in 1970 allowed furniture to demark open offices. Space planning became critical to office design, which was 70% of the commercial marketplace (*ASID White Paper*, 1987).

This change in direction with its emphasis on space planning and design transformed interior decoration into interior design, taking on some of the attributes of

architecture. These attributes included examining three-dimensional spaces, preparing floor plans and reflected ceiling plans, developing millwork, and the details of the interiors of buildings. The practice and education of the interior designer changed to develop the new demands for the design in this new market.

Development of Education

Advanced education became one of the outlets in Veblen's search for purposeful activity for women. Brubacker and Rudy discussed the development of advanced education for women in their book *Higher Education in Transition*. They state there were many challenges in accepting women into colleges in the 1880s, including the fact that "many girls were unable to attain adequate secondary-school education. In order to attract paying students standards were often sacrificed (Brubacker & Rudy, 1997, 65). There were a few colleges that accepted women in the 1800s. Oberlin was the first co-educational college, established in 1833, where men, women, and people of color learned liberal arts. Vassar and other women's colleges developed at the same time as women-only colleges. Also, Normal Schools were separate institutions that educated women in the "womanly" pursuits such as nursing and teaching (Brubacker & Rudy, 1997). In the scheme of college life, these colleges and universities admitted a small percentage of female students.

It was the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 establishing land grant universities all over the United States that allowed a college education for many white males. But, it was not until the 1920s when these land grant universities opened their doors to women en masse. Their acceptance to universities reflected a more diverse student body and the universities' efforts to fill the seats vacated by young men who left college to serve in

World War I (Brubacker & Rudy, 1997). In addition, the land grant universities emphasized a more scientific or technical education. Some of the new programs expanded already established extension programs for women. They became new home economics programs and based their education on the scientific study of what was at the time a woman's realm.

These new programs were attempting to reduce the conflict with the prevailing "skepticism of the public with respect to the value of higher education for women. ... Better to teach young ladies to be ... correct in their manners, respectable in their families, and agreeable in society" (Brubacker & Rudy, 1997, 65). For example, Virginia Polytechnic Institute (later Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) began its home economics program in 1921.⁴⁵ The classes developed a scientific viewpoint based on social science, and included cooking, interior decorating, childcare, and other household oriented studies. Although these departments gave females entrance to the university, home economics departments soon came under pressure because they were too female oriented and the scientific nature of the disciplines was undervalued.

With the second wave of the feminist movement in the late 1960s, criticism of home economics departments split many programs apart from both inside the programs and from without. The criticism that came from within programs was that the name did not stress the scientific nature of the field.⁴⁶ The criticism from outside the departments was that the programs were too female-oriented and too home-based, which was not reflective of the interest of feminists to move women into the more general work environment. Consequently, in the 1970s, home economic departments began to change their names or move into other departments. For example, the professional organization

for home economics changed their name from the American Home Economics Association to American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences.⁴⁷ In 1970, Michigan State University's Department of Home Economics became the Department of Human Ecology. In addition, classes in interior design formerly based on the residential model altered to capture the newly developing commercial interior design market.

Because many of the interior design programs developed in female-oriented home economics and were based on the theory of behavior in a sociological model, they acquired a female outlook, which incorporated many strengths that women bring to the interior environment. Please note that even as late as the 1974 women were actively discouraged from attending schools of architecture.⁴⁸

Even as late as 1989, Vytlačil, who wrote an article about women in architectural studio model of education noted, that the feminine viewpoint was not always appreciated in the studio environment at many universities.⁴⁹ She discussed positive female characteristics and feminine skills that are invaluable to the built environment in the 21st Century. These include a, "sensitivity to existing context, willingness to accept and incorporate varying opinions" (Vytlačil, 1989, 268). She continued that women have strong skills in team and consensus-building, which is critical to the design team approach to the built environment. She concluded the chapter by stating while not appreciated by educators, "Paradoxically, the use of their particular ability to adapt and accommodate may offer women precisely the competitive edge needed for success in a field constantly subject to change" (Vytlačil, 1989, 268).

Conclusion

This section demonstrates how interior design developed as a separate profession

from architecture. It begins to confront three issues that have been seen as a negative in relation to the feminine aspect of the profession, but I see them as critical in establishing interior design as a unique profession from architecture. (1) It suggests that interior design may be a woman's profession because of some innate cultural remnant of the interior being a woman's sphere. If true, I suggest that interior design focus on the positive aspects of that cultural designation rather than trying to reform itself into some other configuration, such as changing its name to interior architecture. (2) Higher education for women became acceptable because of its location in home economics departments. This should be considered a positive, because its location in home economics grounded it in the theory of behavior. This alone makes it unique from architecture, which uses the theory of aesthetics as its driving force. (See Section 2-5) (3) The strengths of which Vytlačil speaks of as being feminine in nature are the very strengths that interior designers bring to the built environment: (A) Concern for existing context; (B) consensus and team building; and (C) the "willingness to accept and incorporate varying opinions" are integral to the practice of interior design and distinguish the profession of interior design from the profession of architecture.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Section 4 – Professionalization of Architecture

Interior designers used the profession of architecture as a measuring stick to judge progress of professionalization. This comparison happened because the fields have similar components, such as working with clients in the built environment. Architecture as a long established profession was a deceptively easy model to gauge the progress of the professionalization of interior design. An example of this was the article in the *Journal for Interior Design Education and Research* by Buie Harwood where she compared the education of architects and interior designers (Harwood, 1991). However, in Section 4-3 on Gender will demonstrates that this comparison is unfortunate, because it puts interior design in a subservient position to architecture. Because the comparison has been made in the past and in order to understand the conflict discussed later in this dissertation, I reluctantly establish a short history of the professionalization of architecture.

The process of the professionalization of architecture illustrated many precepts articulated by Freidson, Abbott, and Larson in Section 2-2. Documentation of process of professionalization of architecture was a recent development. As a matter of fact, it was only in 1977 that Spiro Kostof edited a book *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* about the professionalization of architecture.⁵⁰ It began in Europe and tracted the development to the United States. Mary N. Woods in her book *From Craft to Profession: the Practice of Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America* examined the process of professionalization in the United States.⁵¹ Her work discussed the development of architectural training, formalization of that training, establishment of

professional organizations and the consolidation of those organizations into the American Institute of Architects (AIA). Her work stopped at the turn of the 20th Century. The National Council of Architectural Review Boards⁵² (NCARB) web site provided an abbreviated history of the professionalization process from that time onward. It examined the development of an examination, the consolidation of education by accreditation, and continued with movement toward licensure of the profession.

Development of Education

Woods documented education as some of the earliest steps toward the professionalization of architecture in the United States. On the job training at construction sites was the main source of training for architects even into the middle of the 19th Century. Formal educational programs began in 1862 at universities but as late as the 1950s the architectural studio and office were the main source of training for architects. The 1972 Architectural Record Examination (ARE) was the first time a college education was required to sit for the examination.

Woods' book documented the first formal, fee-based education in the late 1700s, which took place at mechanics institutes such as the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia. The program consisted of a liberal arts education, which included some classes in architectural design. By the 1820s, a few colleges specialized in technical training in the science of architecture. In addition, some education of architects during the late 1800s took place in private studios conducted by practicing architects. For example, Richard M. Hunt taught the first studio classes in his office/studio in 1857. After the Civil War, apprenticeships in the office superseded apprenticeships at construction sites (Woods, 1999).

In 1862, the United States Congress passed the Morrill Act establishing land grant universities. Before this time, education was mostly limited to the people who could pay for it. After 1862, a university education was much more available to young white males. Engineering, architecture, and agriculture programs became the cornerstone of many of these new universities. William Robert Ware established an architectural program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1865. In 1871, the University of Illinois and Cornell University established two of the earliest programs in architecture (Woods, 1999). In Europe, university training continued to develop at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in France and at the technical universities in Germany. Universities in the United States often used the Ecole de Beaus-Arts model for their programs.

In Kostof's book *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*,⁵³ Joan Draper said,

The Ecole des Beaux-Arts served as a model for those Americans who sought to improve the practice of architecture through better education. Its influence became particularly strong in America at the end of the nineteenth-century when architects, like many other professionals, felt the need to set higher and more uniform standards for themselves. ... to create in America: a well organized curriculum, a rational design theory, and government patronage.

Draper continued however, that, "In the nineteenth century America there were few well-trained architects and only a handful of professional schools" (Draper, 1977, 212).

As the number of programs increased in Europe and the United States, more and more architects received formal training rather than apprenticeships in an office.

According to NCARB's history, the requirements of licensing laws, as they passed in each jurisdiction, added to the pressure for a formal education in the United States by requiring a degree in architecture. As late as the 1950s a mixture of university-trained and office-trained architects still practiced in the field. By 1972, however, a college education was a prerequisite for sitting for the ARE examination in most jurisdictions. Training outside the universities was becoming obsolete (NCARB, 2005).

Woods' book also traced the history of professional organizations, which is another component of professionalization as defined in Section 2-2. In 1837, the American Institution of Architects (AIA) was the first professional organization for architects, although it soon disbanded. In 1857, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) formed east of the Mississippi River. Soon after, the Western Architects Association (WAA) formed in the mid-west and west. Over the next thirty years, a diverse number of architectural organizations formed in different locations around the country. Eventually the organizations consolidated and in 1889 the WAA and AIA, the two largest organizations, merged to form the AIA in its current configuration (Woods, 1999). Woods' book ends at the beginning of the 20th Century, which is when NCARB's history begins.

NCARB began in 1919, its mission was to standardize licensing requirements across the country to make reciprocity between jurisdictions easier and, in doing this, to advance the profession. Although there is no timeline of the implementation of this process, NCARB's history stated that they worked toward the following: (1) standardizing and accrediting education; (2) consolidating, standardizing, and revising a

single nationwide examination; (3) consolidating seal requirements, (4) establishing standards for internships; and (5) laying down the rules of conduct for the profession.⁵⁴

The work of Woods and the less detailed history of NCARB documented these aspects of the conversion of architecture into a profession. By 1972, the adoption of university education as being the only conduit to take the ARE examination formalized the educational standards. As of 2007, some jurisdictions that have not adopted licensing for architects and the overall perception of the public was that architecture was a well-established and respected profession.

Divisions of Architecture in to Specializations

Abbott said the process professionalization is an on-going continuum of change. The pressures that affect professions were the development of new technologies, which expand the technical expertise beyond the scope of one profession and open gaps to be filled by new professions or a new branch of the old profession (Abbott, 1988). In the built environment, the expansion of technologies and of the knowledge-base led to the development of specializations. These specializations were necessary to deal with increasing level of complexity and led to interdependent professions. This part of the history of professionalization of architecture deals with the splintering of expertise in the built environment into various professions as part of the ebb and flow of professionalization.

During the Middle Ages in Europe a craftsman or stonemason designed and decorated the exterior and interior of public buildings.⁵⁵ Education was on the job training in a progression from apprentice, to journeyman, and to master builder as the skill levels and responsibility increased. Experimentation by the master builder brought

innovation over years of trial and error. The Gothic cathedral represents the height of the master builder's skill (Toker, 1985).

In 2002, Peter Schneider discovered an article of a lawsuit filed Utrecht, Holland in 1532.⁵⁶ He felt that this lawsuit established the first legal separation of architect from builder. It was brought by an architectural designer against a builder for payment for the design of a building. The court decided in favor of the architect. Schneider stated:

The record of the legal battle between Jacob van der Borch and Willem van Noort represents an early, documented example of litigation revolving around the modern concept of reservation of work and, by implication, the reservation of the title architect. It also provides us with a factual, historical example of the way in which the new and essentially platonic conception of the term "architect" framed by Alberti, and of the nature of expertise that that conception entails, was rapidly received, adopted and diffused in late medieval Europe.

The novel defense van Noort and his advokaat ende procureur (advocate and solicitor) mounted to counter van der Borch's allegations had the effect of recasting and redefining the legal status and the professional role and responsibilities of the architect in the Low Countries in the last half of the 16th Century (Schneider, 2002, 142).

According to Schneider, this lawsuit was the earliest documentation of the legal separation of the design of architecture from the construction of buildings.

With the Industrial Revolution, the ability of someone to be a Renaissance Man, such as Leonardo Da Vinci, Michelangelo, Alberti or Palladio, who were knowledgeable in many endeavors, was disappearing. In the mid-18th Century, the development of the machine age and new technologies expanded the knowledge-base of architecture and engineering. At that time, engineering split from architecture as a new endeavor.⁵⁷ In addition, the application of scientific methods to both architecture and engineering began the process of professionalization. By the mid-19th Century, independent educational programs developed for architecture and engineering.

Over the last two and a half centuries, new and increasingly more technical professions continued the fragmentation. Engineering split into diverse yet related areas of expertise, such as structural, mechanical, military, civil, mining, electrical and aeronautical engineering.⁵⁸ Architecture also splintered into new areas of expertise, such as urban planning, public policy and administration, landscape architecture, interior design and industrial design. In addition, construction and land surveying continue as independent areas of practice, with construction subdividing into residential builders and commercial contractors.⁵⁹ These professions have developed to deal with different aspects of the built environment each profession has its own core area of knowledge and skills. There was conflict where the knowledge and skill overlapped with another profession. Over the years, although conflicts abounded these different professions learned to work together as teams to plan and build projects. Even though they split in the mid-18th Century, there continued to be conflict between the professions of architecture and engineering for contested territory. Although this conflict has lessened considerably it can be seen as late as 2002 in a quotation from Jeff Gross the president of

Eastern Pennsylvania's AIA chapter in their Spring Newsletter. Gross stated as a "hot topic" the goal in the next year to "clarify language to the Architect's and Engineer's licensing laws, and identify distinct areas of expertise in order to further protect HSW (health, safety and welfare) of the public."⁶⁰ Please note that they are still trying to identify "distinct areas of expertise" between architecture and engineering in 2002.

Conclusion

My review of the history of the profession of architecture demonstrates that Freidson and Abbott's theories of professions hold true for architects. They said that professions evolve and change because of stressors both inside and outside of professions. A review of the profession of architecture demonstrates three points. (1) Architecture has a long and well documented past; (2) its road to professionalization is non-linear; and (3) its domain has narrowed as the built environment divided into many complementary professions as it became more complex. In contrast, although interior design has a relatively short history, I believe that interior design developed independently from architecture.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Section 5 – Differentiation of Interior Design and Architecture

One of the biggest struggles that interior design had in licensure efforts was to differentiate itself from architecture. For example, it can take twenty minutes to explain to legislators how what they do is more than the selection of colors. How not using a qualified interior design can adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the public. When they use blueprints and reflected ceiling plans to show the complexity of the work, it is hard for legislators to differentiate interior design from architecture. This problem is exacerbated when interior design also uses architecture as a comparison. As mentioned earlier, Harwood compared the professions by examining the curricula of interior design and architecture in 1991. She found that the differences were in the content of the courses and the depth of the detailed information. Harwood concluded that while their education is different, the professions are complementary in nature. This section examines the differences between interior design and architecture by looking at accreditation standards, internship program standards, examination criteria and the theories on which the professions are based.

Accreditation of Educational Programs

The following is a comparison of the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA)⁶¹ for interior design and the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) requirements for architecture. On the surface, the accrediting programs look very similar, but the accreditation process really examines two different things. Dr. Crystal Weaver,⁶² was the dean of the College of Building Arts at Savannah College of Art and Design while they were preparing for site visits from both CIDA and NAAB. She was familiar

with both accreditation processes because the college includes both interior design and architecture programs. She stated, “comparing the accreditation of CIDA and NAAB is like comparing apples and oranges.” She continued interior design’s accreditation through CIDA is quite prescriptive in its requirements. It includes a check-list of criteria that must be demonstrated in student work, as well as, curricula and syllabi for a program to be accredited. NAAB’s accreditation acknowledges that each architectural program is unique and compares everything to the mission statement of each program. It then examines the curriculum and outcomes of student work in relation to the mission statement (Weaver, 2008).

The accreditation process for both educational programs is very similar. For example, revisions of the standards for accreditation by both CIDA and NAAB happen every five to seven years. This revision process includes an examination of the changes to the actual practice of the professions. The comparison with the field allows the education to reflect current practice and means that the accreditation of educational programs is not static. The actual period of review of the program is six years and both have a three-year interim reviews if the program is lacking in some small way.

The methods of accreditation are very similar in that both accreditation processes include a self-assessment of their programs and site visits by peers. Both accreditation visits include a team of educators from other locations around the country, and a practitioner. The visiting team examines the program for a few days during, which time they look at the facilities and talk to the administration, dean, chair, faculty, alumna, and students. The visiting team reads the self-assessment report and then examines curricula and syllabi. They then compare the syllabi to the outcomes of each class as demonstrated

in the student work. Both visiting teams look for evidence of student understanding and/or ability as actualized in their work.

A report written by the visiting team is returned to CIDA or NAAB headquarters. The review by an independent body of educators recommends to accredit the program or not. The board makes the final decision after reviewing all of the recommendations. All site visitors are volunteers in that they are paid only for their expenses during site visits.

The details of CIDA's list of criteria that must be met by each program include eight standards.

Standard 1: curriculum is structured to facilitate and advance student learning. The program must demonstrate evidence of team approaches to design solutions, interaction with multiple disciplines and practitioners, variety of business approaches and have opportunities for design work experience.

Standard 2: The program leads students to develop the attitudes, traits and values of professional responsibility, accountability and effectiveness. This includes learning experiences that address client and/or user needs, professional ethics, appreciation for cultural diversity, designer's ability to affect people and the environment, and global thinking in relation to problem solving.

The program must include critical, analytical and strategic thinking, creative thinking, visual and volumetric thinking, professional discipline, including time management and organizational skills, active listening skills, effective interpretation of requirements and understand the importance of community and public service.

Standard 3: Fundamentals of art and design, theories of design and human behavior and discipline related history. There are an additional ten items listed under this standard.⁶³

Standard 4: Students must understand and apply the knowledge, skills, processes and theories of interior design. There are 26 points under this heading.

Standard 5: Students must communicate effectively. There are 13 items under this heading.

Standard 6: Students design within the context of building systems. Students use appropriate materials and products. There are seventeen items listed here including things such as power distribution systems, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) and plumbing systems, data/voice telecommunication systems, lighting systems and acoustics.

Standard 7: Students apply the laws, codes, regulations standards and practices that protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. This section includes the requirements that students must demonstrate appropriate application of fire safety issues such as compartmentalization, movement through the building, fire detection, fire suppression and codes, regulation and standards. They also need to be familiar with American National Standards Institute (ANSI), Building and ADA Codes, ergonomic and human factors data. They must also demonstrate an understanding of the impact on health and welfare of indoor air quality, noise, lighting, and universal design concepts and principles.

Standard 8: Students must have a foundation in business and professional practice. There are eleven sections under this standard (CIDA, 2008). The degree

reviewed by this process is the Bachelors of Arts or Bachelors of Science in Interior Design.

On the other hand, NAAB had each architecture program establish a mission statement by examining their program through thirteen conditions. These conditions establish “the program’s unique qualities and its students’ achievements satisfy the 13 conditions that all accredited programs must meet.”⁶⁴ The self-assessment includes introduction to the program, history and description of the institution and program, missions of institution and program, program self-assessment, progress since last visit and the responses to the progress or lack of it. The thirteen conditions of accreditation are framed around the self-assessment and mission document. Some of the conditions include program response to *NAAB Perspectives*. Each section addresses education in diverse aspects of: (1) architectural education and academic context, (2) architectural education and students, (3) architectural education and registration, and (4) architectural education, profession and society.

The self-assessment procedures reflect the programs mission statement and conditions as they relate to *NAAB Perspectives*. These conditions are public information, social equity, studio culture, human resources and development, physical resources, information resources, financial resources, professional degrees and curriculum. The degrees that they examine are Doctor of Architecture, Masters of Architecture, and Bachelor of Architecture.

In addition, NAAB examines student work using student performance criteria looking for attainment of the following skills: speaking and writing, critical thinking, research, formal ordering systems, fundamental design, collaborative design, Western,

Non-Western, national and regional traditions, use of precedents, human behavior and diversity, accessibility, sustainable design, program preparation, and site conditions. Then NAAB examines systems such as structural, environmental, building envelope, building service, building integration, and building materials and assemblies. They also look for construction cost control, technical documentation, client role in architecture, comprehensive design, architect's administrative roles, architectural practice, professional development, leadership, legal responsibilities, and ethics and professional judgment.

This is an example of why it is so hard for interior design to differentiate itself from architecture, because they use the same terminology and graphic standards. Although the qualifications of both professions reflect similar terminology, it can be seen that the interior design requirements are more prescriptive, because of the sheer number and detail of criteria that must be met. For example, electrical plans need to show data and communication locations and reflected ceiling plans need to demonstrate an understanding of HVAC by the appropriate placement on plans.

Structured Internships

When examining the criteria or outcome for structured internship a basic difference in the practice of interior design and architecture are apparent. Once an interior design student graduates from the university, he/she is expected to have the skills to be able to practice immediately. Therefore, he/she is taught health and safety codes, how to use Computer Aided Design (CAD), and professional practices while in school.

As of 2007, NCIDQ is developing a more structured internship called Interior Design Experience Program⁶⁵ (IDEP) to make sure new practitioners get a balanced experience in the field before sitting for the examination.

On the other hand, architecture requires a three year structured Intern Development Program (IDP). The ARE website states,

Internship is, in many ways, the most significant developmental period in your career as an architect. It's a time when you apply your formal education to the daily realities of architectural practice; acquire comprehensive experience in basic practice areas; explore specialized areas of practice; develop professional judgment; continue your formal education in architecture; and refine your career goals.⁶⁶

It is in the structured internship that architects learn the specifics of practice. Architects often begin their careers by correcting drawings of other architects in their firms.

Because educational programs for architects have so much information to relate, they cannot cover the realities of daily practice and that information comes through structured internships.

National Examination

Both interior design and architecture have certifying examinations: The National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ) for interior design, and the Architectural Registration Examination (ARE) for architecture.⁶⁷

The NCIDQ examination is divided into six performance domains that “characterize the work of interior design: programming, schematic design, design

development, contract documents, contract administration and professional practices.”⁶⁸

The two-day NCIDQ examination consists of two comprehensive multiple-choice sections and a practicum section. It is oriented toward testing an interior designer’s knowledge and ability to solve health, safety and welfare issues in an interior environment (NCIDQ, 2008).

The standards for sitting for the three-part NCIDQ examination depend on jurisdictional requirements, however, often one must graduate from a four-year university (CIDA accredited or not) and must work in the field for two years preferably under a licensed individual before sitting for the examination.

The ARE includes nine divisions, six of which are multiple-choice questions and three that are graphic divisions. The six multiple-choice divisions are: Pre-Design, General Structures, Lateral Forces, Mechanical & Electrical Systems, Building Design/Materials & Methods, and Construction Documents & Services. The three graphic divisions are: Site Planning, Building Planning, and Building Technology.

Again the similar terminology does not allow one to differentiate interior design from architecture.

Design Theories

I have stated in this dissertation that what makes interior design different from architecture is the theory of design on which it is based. I argue that since the turn of the 20th Century the driving impetus for architecture is the theory of aesthetics. The search for the perfect form, the simplification of the built environment into its most essential composites – its form, reflect the importance of this theory. In addition, architecture’s position was that every aspect of the built environment is its to shape and control – as a

macro-environment encompassing everything. On the other hand, interior design has a different overriding theory. I suggest that it is the theory of behavior. For interior design it is the micro-environment where the concern is for each individual in the space to function at a safe yet efficient level. In addition, the design of the space allows for individual expression of the client’s image through aesthetics.

In order to test this premise a Google search was implemented which revealed the following statistics.⁶⁹ The key points of the table below are that a search for the theory of aesthetics for architecture netted 1,450,000 hits. 7 of the first 20 hits were books written with aesthetics and architecture in the title, 6 were articles. Because 7 of the first 20 hits were books using the word aesthetics and architecture in the title, this overwhelmingly demonstrates how important aesthetics is to architecture. On the other hand, when examining the theory of behavior for interior design there were 1,350,000 hits of which 15 of the first 20 were syllabi or course descriptions for interior design programs. The other five hits were articles about behavior and interior design. This demonstrates the importance of theory of behavior in interior design education.

Table 1: Comparison of Google Searches about Theory

Search Parameters	Total Number of Hits	Syllabi	Articles & Books	Books with Arch. & Aesthetics in name
<u>Architecture</u>				
Architecture Theory of Aesthetics	1,450,000	0/20	6/20 Articles only	7/20
Architecture Theory of Behavior	351,000	3/20	5/20	
Architecture Theory of Behavior Excluding cognitive, systems, & biological	85,300	7/20	5/20	

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

<u>Interior Design</u>				
Interior Design Theory of Aesthetics	451,000	8/20	11/20	
Interior Design Theory of Behavior	1,340,000	15/20	5/20	
Interior Design Theory of Behavior Excluding cognitive, systems, & biological	60,900	14/20	6/20	

This discussion will document how the theory of behavior is realized in the practice of interior design through the selection of materials. Wall covering as defined by code, for the safety of the public in commercial environments as a Class A fire rating. Beyond that, there it is so much more to material selections than just choosing something for its aesthetic value.

While the wall covering selection for hotels, hospitals, and nursing homes all require material selections defined by building codes, the clients' needs for these spaces differ greatly in each of these environments. Research conducted since the 1970s demonstrated the psychological impact of the selections affect the welfare of the occupants. Interior designers will consciously alter the environment significantly in each of these temporary living situations.⁷⁰ In addition, the client requires the wall covering to be durable, easy to maintain, and stain resistant. From that point onward, the behavior/psychological component of the selection of interior materials will vary greatly.

Hotels offer their end users escape from the real world, a haven for the traveler, or a place to celebrate the big events in life. The interior selections need to establish an image and unifying concept for that facility that encourages escape, fun, and relaxation,

while allowing interchangeability from one room to another. In addition, the interior is part of a package that makes people want spend money to return to that hotel, repeatedly.

On the other hand, hospitals require the material selections to aid in the healing of patients by, among other things, reducing stress.⁷¹ Material selections can help reduce the stress for the patient, but also for the staff. This can help the staff to survive long hours on their feet, and still deal with periodic life and death situations.

The material selections for nursing homes must portray a home-like environment, and increase cognitive, aural, and visual abilities in residents.⁷² The interiors for Alzheimer facilities especially need to increase cognitive abilities yet supply a secure environment without looking like a prison (Guyatt, 2004). There is a fine balance among the need of aesthetics, function, and psychological impact, in addition to meeting the strictures of building codes.

Conclusion

The continued comparison of interior design to architecture demonstrated the problems that interior design experienced when it is trying to explain to the legislature how it is different from architecture. When comparing the descriptive verbiage of the accreditation of the educational programs, structured internships, and national examinations there are only small differences detected, because both professions use the same terminology and deal with similar client issues. While the terminology used to describe the profession is similar, there is a differentiation of expertise and viewpoint. I believe that the theory of behavior causes interior design to focus on the micro-environment. More quantitative research is necessary to test this premise

Chapter 3 – A History of Professionalization of Interior Design

This chapter outlines the components that have advanced interior design toward professionalization using the theory of professions established in Section 2-2. As a reminder the components that many professions take in moving toward professionalization are: (1) the formalization of education forming a body of knowledge; (2) the formation of professional organizations; (3) the development of an examination to test the body of knowledge; and (4) governmental regulation. The following establishes the history of interior design in relation to the process of professionalization.

Formalization of Education

As discussed in the history of interior design Section 2-3, formal education for interior decorators began in the 1920s, when women began attending land grant universities across the United States. Remember, it was not until the 1950s when interior decoration started becoming interior design. Interior design educators generally accept as common knowledge that programs began in universities in three different departments, art, architecture, and home economics. While the curricula for these different programs looked the same, with a mixture of studio and lecture classes, the foci of each curriculum was different. Interior design programs housed in art departments developed the two-dimensional and three-dimensional creativity of the designer. Programs housed in architecture departments stressed the architectural nature of the interior and aesthetics. Programs housed in home economic departments, especially at land grant universities, emphasized matters of behavior, function, and document preparation.

Many programs began in home economic departments. The programs expanded, in number and the variety of classes offered throughout the 1920s and 1930s. For

example, during this period the courses in the Home Economics Department at Virginia Polytechnic Institute (later Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University) doubled and then doubled again after World War II (Virginia Polytechnic Institute - Historical Data Book, 34). In 1921 the interior design program offered nine classes; in 1925 twenty-five classes; and by 1961 fifty-seven classes.⁷³ By 2007, the classes forming a unique body of knowledge for interior design at most universities included:

- History of art, architecture, and decorative arts
- Design, drawing, two and three dimensional studios
- Commercial and residential design studios emphasizing specialized design problems, space planning, and creativity
- Computer Aided Design (CAD), Sketch-up, Vis, Photo-shop, and other graphic presentation computer programs
- Methods & materials for interior design
- Construction documents and building systems, including building codes and American with Disabilities Act of 1992, ANSI and ASTM testing protocols
- Lighting & Mechanical Systems
- Professional practices
- Human behavior and psychology

As university programs developed, there were efforts to share information and standardize education. In 1962, the Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC)⁷⁴ formed to give educators a forum to exchange research and to “alleviate isolation of the educators from the profession.”⁷⁵ In 1970, Foundation for Interior Design Education (FIDER),

began to standardize the education through accreditation of the diverse interior design programs around the country.⁷⁶

Accreditation of university programs helped to make interior design education uniform, regardless of the department in which programs were located. At the same time, educators established and began to document the body of knowledge by increasing research and scholarly endeavors, and passed that knowledge on to their students. In 1975, the newly founded *Journal for Interior Design Education and Research (JIDER)*, now called the *Journal of Interior Design (JID)*, provided the conduit for dissemination of research to educators, the interior design community and the public at large.⁷⁷

Formation of Organizations

As education for interior design developed, professional organizations also developed. According to Gueft, soon after the turn of the 20th Century, the first interior design associations formed. These included the Society of Interior Decorators (only for men) and the Decorators Club (only for women) in New York City; the Women's Decorators' Association in Chicago; the Interior Decorators' Club of Philadelphia; and the British Institute of Interior Decorators in Great Britain (Gueft, 1980).

The American associations coalesced in 1931 into the 342-member American Institute of Interior Decorators (AIID). They held their first meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan in an attempt to counteract the first stages of the Great Depression. Their headquarters was in Chicago until 1933 when they moved to New York City. In 1936, the organization changed its name to the American Institute of Decorators (AID). On its twentieth anniversary in 1951, AID had 1,200 members from across the nation. The organization consisted mostly of residentially oriented interior decorators (Gueft, 1980).

Conflict within the Profession

As the theory of professions reminded us, as new professions form there are conflicts within the profession. An example was when college-educated practitioners supplant field-trained practitioners. Interior design faced these conflicts. The expansion of interior design education after World War II produced many new practitioners with a formal education, which led to a different way of thinking. These designers caused dissension in the professional organizations, whose leadership often were field trained practitioners. In AID, the newer members objected to: (1) the vetting process to approve new membership; (2) the single-slate election process to run the professional organization; and (3) the use of the name decorator versus designer. They also objected to the retail based mark-up system for the selling of products used by many decorators, rather than a more professional fee based system used by architects. Many of these new members worked in the newly developing field of commercial design. These conflicts came to a head in 1957 when the New York Chapter of AID rejected the national election results for the new board. Some of the disgruntled AID members left to form the National Society of Interior Designers (NSID) in 1958 (Gueft, 1980).

The name change of that new organization from interior decorator to interior designer was indicative of the movement toward professionalization of the field. It marked a change in scope of practice, from the focus on the decoration of homes and to a lesser degree businesses by someone trained on the job, to the design of commercial as well as home environments by a university-educated professional. In 1961, AID succumbed to the pressure and changed its name to American Institute of Designers (AID). By 1975, AID and NSID realized that they had more in common than differences

and that they would be stronger together than separate. They joined to form the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID).⁷⁸

By the late 1970s, the newly consolidated yet residentially oriented American Society of Interior Designers did not meet the needs of a number of professionals who still had a different orientation and the conflict within the field continued. Over the next fifteen years, differing priorities of practitioners divided the organization into seven different associations. The different interior design organizations included: Institute of Business Designers (IBD); International Society of Interior Designers (ISID); Council of Federal Interior Designers (CFID); Interior Designers of Canada (IDC); and Institute of Store Planners (ISP). Educators also have their own organization, the Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC).

At that time, there were other subsidiary organizations whose members did not have the 4-year education nor passage of the NCIDQ examination required for professional membership in the organizations listed above. They practiced on the periphery of the profession. While what they did was basically interior decoration for the home, they called themselves interior designers and worked in retail stores or showrooms. Their organizations were: the National Home Furnishing League (NHFL), which became the International Furnishing and Design Association (IFDA), Interior Design Society (IDS) and National Kitchen and Bath Association (NKBA).

The conflicts among these mainstream design organizations included: (1) the different outlooks of field trained and university educated practitioners; (2) the residential orientation of long-term members and the commercial orientation of newer members, and; (3) the reasons for meetings (social versus educational oriented meetings). In

addition, the conduct of interior design business practices was under attack. More established designers used the retail model, where furnishings were sold at a marked-up price and design is given away free. The newer generation of designers used a more consultant professional model, with monthly billing of fees for design services and the products supplied by others at a negotiated price (Guelf, 1980).

In 1990, a movement began to consolidate the seven main-stream interior design organizations of ASID, IBD, ISID, IDEC, CFID, IDC, and ISP into one organization. The discussions called “Unified Voice” (ASID History, 1990) attempted to merge seven into one professional organization. The reasons for unification were similar to those of 1975 when AID and NSID consolidated to form ASID. Promoters of unification felt that the organizations had more in common than differences and that they would be stronger together, especially when the groups considered the recent efforts for licensing in the 1980s.

In 1994, ASID (the largest organization) withdrew from the negotiations. Their stated reason for withdrawing was they felt retention of their highly marketed and recognized name was critical.⁷⁹ ASID had 30,000 members all of the other organizations together had only 10,000 combined members. In 1995, three of the other organizations in the Unified Voice discussions, IBD, ISID, and CFID, joined to form the International Interior Design Association (IIDA).⁸⁰ The other groups continued as independent organizations. In 2000, ASID and IIDA held discussions about their shared professional goals.⁸¹ As of 2007, many local chapters of ASID and IIDA held joint meetings and training sessions for continuing education (CE).

Development of Examination

As the profession continued to develop through strengthened university programs around the country, the members of the profession began to recognize a need for the development of a professional examination to test the body of knowledge. In the 1960s, AID wrote an examination for the profession (Gueft 9 & ASID History 1968). A few years later NSID developed a separate examination. By 1972, AID, NSID and IDEC joined an effort to establish a single nationwide examination to establish a minimum level of competence for practitioners. Their work resulted in the formation of the National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ) whose members wrote and monitored the nationwide bi-annual two-day examination. The NCIDQ established a minimum standard for interior design knowledge.⁸² As of 2007, all jurisdictions with licensing or certification use the NCIDQ as the qualifying examination for licensure. In addition, ASID and IIDA use the NCIDQ qualification as the requirement for professional membership. The accreditation of educational programs and an examination established minimal credentials for interior design marked the culmination of years of preparation by the profession of interior design for the final stages of professionalization, the effort toward licensure.

Governmental Regulation

In 1963, NSID began the effort for licensure when it formed a committee to organize to work toward licensure. In 1968, the introduction of licensure bills in California, New York, and Texas initiated a more widespread effort (ASID History, 2004). No enabling legislation passed until 1973 when Puerto Rico passed the first

legislation for interior designers, which was a practice act and restricted the practice of interior design on the island.⁸³

In 1980, the Society hosted a well-attended press conference in New York City to announce a national campaign to support state-by-state registration of interior designers (ASID History, 1980). Interior design had expanded rapidly from the 1950s through the 1970s. By 1985, an estimated 200,000 interior designers were practicing in the United States (ASID White Paper, 1). In 1985, a group of interior designers from Alabama presented their successful bid for licensure at the National Board Meetings for ASID. This presentation influenced chapter leaders around the country to work on licensure.⁸⁴ Within a year, ASID National joined with the Institute of Business Designers (IBD) to call for individual chapters to form separate legislative organizations to focus on licensure in their respective jurisdictions.⁸⁵

The Role of Jurisdictional Organizations

Because licensure was a state issue, each ASID and/or IBD chapter worked on licensure at a state or a jurisdictional level. Consequently, ASID recommended their chapters form a separate legislative organization in each jurisdiction. There were three reasons for this new legislative organization: (1) The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 did not permit 501(c) (3) non-profit status for professional organizations to solicit funds for legislative efforts. (ASID and IBD were both non-profit 501 (c) (3) corporations). (2) Some jurisdictions had overlapping organizational chapters such as ASID's Southern Ohio and Kentucky chapter. (3) A new organization could bridge the membership of the multiple interior design organizations and bring in non-affiliated interior designers to work toward a common goal -- legislation (Collins, 2005).

The Role of National Organizations

In 1985, ASID, IBD, and the other professional organizations formed the National Legislative Council for Interior Design (NLCID) as a clearing-house for legislative information. Its offices were at ASID National Headquarters in Washington, D.C. NLCID prepared a guidebook to help the various state coalitions to obtain legislation. It was called the *NLCID Opposition Guidebook*, which later became *A Call to Action*.⁸⁶

Legislative Process

Because each state had its own licensing advocacy group, it took a few years for legislative groups to organize, raise funds, and write legislation. As some of these legislative organizations approached their legislators, interior designers found a three-pronged opposition. The opposition consisted of dissenting interior design practitioners, architects, and the “less government” movement within the legislatures.

Opposition to Licensure

In the beginning of the efforts toward licensure, there were a few designers with training and some educators who did not understand the need for licensure and opposed these efforts. Some of these interior design practitioners continued to oppose the efforts. Most of these practitioners who opposed did not meet the requirements for licensure or practiced on the periphery of the profession such as people who worked at retail stores. There were also untrained practitioners that wanted to use the term interior designer to validate their untrained position. Members from IDS and NHFL often worked for a retail store that belonged to the Retail Merchants Association (RMA). RMA opposition was well organized and well funded and they were the primary spokespeople of these subsidiary groups in committee hearings.⁸⁷

Over the years, other groups that opposed licensure included allied design organizations such as the National Kitchen and Bath Association (NKBA) whose position swung from opposition to support and then back to opposition between 1985 and 2000. Their position changed depending on their perception of whether the benefits of licensing outweighed exclusion of some of their members because of their lack of design training. The retail focus of their membership continued to separate them from the mainstream of the interior design profession.

The basis for the American Institute of Architects' (AIA) opposition to legislation for interior design was its perception that interior design was usurping the interior portion of architecture and that a building's interior could not be a separate entity from the exterior.⁸⁸ The AIA was well-organized, well funded, and most of the time opposed interior design licensure.

The less government movement became an important factor in the late 1980s in some jurisdictions. The less government movement touted less tax because of less regulation; consequently, an even more streamlined government. The legislature and governors often opposed legislation on a policy basis because it would add to the cost of government. Deanna Waldron, Director of ASID's Government and Public Affairs, stated interior design's position that regulation costs could be covered by the registration fees and violation fines. She related that it is hard to document because "all that money goes into a fund of the general treasury." The Board gets an "appropriation that is the same amount every year" even factoring for inflation and "regardless of how much money" the registration and fines raise. She continued many times coalitions would tell

her, “Well there’s no way that they’re going to let us have a [separate] board because it’s going to cost money” (Waldron, 2005).

Actually, the operations of state government cost much more than was generally understood by the interior design coalitions. There are many facets in state government that new regulation will affect. A few examples of these costs that the coalitions understand are: (1) new personnel to manage the processes of regulation; (2) printing and mailing expenses; and (3) the establishment of a new regulatory board. However, additional costs of enforcement may not be considered by interior designers such as new inspectors, adjudicators, judges and an increase in the number of hearings room.⁸⁹

There are many hidden costs to regulation. For example, the cost of development and maintenance of a website can cost a jurisdiction up to \$1,000,000.00 a year. This price is shocking to many designers who pay as little as \$1,500.00 for the development of a website for their company and maintain it as a part of daily practice. The reason the governmental sites cost more is that these websites must be interactive. For example, many websites require a place for designers to register, for the public to check on the license of a prospective designer, and even have a place to file a complaint. This very complicated set of parameters that made worse with the antiquated IT systems that cannot be updated because of budget constraints. The sites must also always be in working order, which requires an IT staff working 24 hours a day seven days a week. Therefore, the reticence of fiscally conservative governors and legislators about new licensure of a profession is genuine. In fact, when Gov. Voinovich vetoed interior design legislation in Ohio on July 31, 1992, his veto statement included:

After carefully reviewing Senate Bill 75, it does not appear to me

that it addresses a significant health and safety issue. ... Rather, it would appear that the registration requirements ... follow the traditional model of professional licensing standards which often have anti-competitive effects and ultimately, lead to increased cost to consumers. ... Senate Bill 75 furthers an already bad precedent of continuing to expand the well over 400 separate Boards and Commissions in Ohio. ... I am committed, with the help of the attorney general, to do something about the burgeoning number of these independent Boards & Commissions. This [is a] significant public policy issue.⁹⁰

On the other hand, fiscal responsibility was not the only parameter for passage of the legislation. Remember, Guice reported in 1993 the only variable predictor of legislature's action was the number of lawyers in the legislature, not the fiscal attitude of the legislative body (Guice, 1993).

Support of Licensure

Groups supporting the licensure of interior designers varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Quite often interior design legislative committees formed coalitions with other complementary organizations for the mutual support legislative efforts when those efforts were not detrimental to the organization's goals. For example in Virginia, the Fire Fighters testified in favor of licensing for interior design because they understood the value of having a trained profession selecting materials that can add to the fire load and give off toxic fumes.⁹¹ Some of these support groups were: homebuilders association,

design/build people, landscape architects, mechanical contractors, electrical contractors, and others.⁹²

Throughout the late 1980s, conflict ebbed and flowed among the interior design community, the retail associations, the architectural community, and the political factions devoted to less government. In 1989, an agreement signed by the AIA, ASID, IBD and ISID defined situations in which the AIA would not oppose licensing for interior designers. This Letter of Agreement, commonly called the Joint Accord, has eight main points:

- Title registration.
- Requirements for registration to include (1) a four-year minimum professional degree, accredited by the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) or the equivalent; (2) National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ) testing or the equivalent; and (3) a monitored internship, to be developed.
- No grandfathering without strict and equivalent education, training and testing criteria.
- Joint regulatory boards, where feasible.
- A clear definition of interior designer to be developed and agreed upon by the respective parties at the state level.
- Voluntary continuing education.
- Licensed architects can continue to perform interior design services and use the title, interior designer.

- Where states customarily provide sealing privileges for professions under title registration, a set of definitional conditions will apply. In addition, the parties pledge not to be associated with the development, consideration or introduction of any form of interior design practice registration.⁹³

Before the Joint Accord only six jurisdictions had licencing-- Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C. Within five years after the signing of the Joint Accord, twelve additional jurisdictions achieved licensing in -- Arkansas, California, Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. In 1999, ASID withdrew from the Accord when it hampered the licensing process in the jurisdictions that did not have licensing (ASID History, 1999). ASID National stated that the AIA was using the Joint Accord to stop legislatures from passing laws that did not use the exact wording of the Accord.⁹⁴ Since that time, an additional five jurisdictions passed licensing in -- Colorado, Kentucky, New Jersey, Wisconsin and Oklahoma.⁹⁵

An example of how the use of the exact wording of the Accord became a problem was in Michigan in the negotiations between the Coalition for Interior Design Registration (CIDR) and the AIA, in 1994.⁹⁶ The Joint Accord provided that students must receive a four-year degree from a FIDER (or equivalent) accredited program. In Michigan, there are fourteen universities with interior design programs, twelve of which were state sponsored. In 1994, four of these state sponsored schools were FIDER

accredited. The state legislature would not allow wording in any bill that disenfranchised students graduating from the ten state university programs without FIDER accreditation. AIA Michigan insisted the use of the exact wording from the Joint Accord, which impeded the legislative process for over six years.

Changes in Building Codes

The impetus for licensing increased with the 1981 modification of the BOCA Building Codes and other building codes in the United States, which captured remodeling and renovation for architects and engineers. (This topic is discussed in detail in Section 4-3). Before this time, interior designers could prepare documents for permits in the remodeling of commercial and residential spaces. The change in the building codes required the seal of an architect or professional engineer on all documents for submittal for permit, thus affecting the independent practice of interior design. As the 1980s progressed, enforcement of the change in the building code meant that interior designers could no longer prepare documentation related to renovations to submit to building official offices for permit.

With this new stance it became necessary to protect independent practice and became a restraint of trade issue (*A Call to Action!*, 1995). This issue also rallied many independent interior designers to work toward licensing. Even designers in jurisdictions with licensure the interior designers had to be on guard for any bill, an effort toward deregulation, or other form of restraint of trade that could curtail practice.

Conclusion

This section demonstrates that the professionalization of interior design is no different than any other profession. It shows that interior design has completed many of the components of professionalization described by Freidson and Abbott. It has

developed professional organizations, educational programs, an examination and a body of knowledge. As predicted by Freidson and Abbott the conflicts within the profession have caused the professionalization process to falter from time to time. Freidson and Abbott indicate the early stages of gaining acceptance within and without the field is part of the process. Professionalization of interior design is still in its beginning phases. I believe that interior design established a new market of remodeling existing spaces and that with the down turn in the economy in the late 1970s architecture tried to capture this new market for them. It during the conflict inherent in working on licensure that interior design became a profession by 2000.

Chapter 4 – State of the Profession

Section 1 – Position of Interior Design Professional Organizations on Licensure

This section begins the new data collected through interviews with the leadership of the professional organizations of interior design and others active in the process of licensure on the national level. Most of the interviews took place in 2005 or 2006. It documents their opinions of the change that have happened to interior design over the years as background to further understand the conflicts discussed in Chapter 4. The chapter continues with the AIA's position represented by one interview, documents written by the AIA National and the AIA leadership in each of the three jurisdictions. In addition, there are sections on how gender and changes in building codes affected the process of licensing for interior designers. The last section in this chapter examines how interior design can endanger and/or enrich the public as justification for licensure.

The interviews in this section were of the executive directors of most of interior design's professional organizations. The choice to interview the executive directors was to give a longer and more comprehensive view of the profession. The interviews include: Michael Alin of ASID; Jeff Kenney of NCIDQ; and Kayem Dunn and Holly Mattson of FIDER.⁹⁷ In addition, interview with the Directors of Government and Public Affairs for ASID documented their expertise in working with coalitions during the licensing efforts. They were Deanna Waldron (1998- Present) and Stacey D'Aquila Hatfield (1995-1998). In addition, Eric Weidegreen was the only president interviewed. His interview took place when he was president of IDEC 2006-2007. He discussed the role of the educator and the educational process. Terri Maurer, FASID, spoke of her experience as ASID National President from 2001-2002⁹⁸ in this section of the dissertation. Her experiences

with the Ohio coalition are covered in Section 5-3. Each of the interviewees was asked the same set of questions, and their responses were recorded then transcribed.

Establishment of the Profession

The interview of Michael Alin⁹⁹, the Executive Director of ASID, took place at ASID Headquarters in Washington D.C. on November 22, 2005. He stated that about thirty years ago, interior decoration reached a turning point moving toward becoming the profession of interior design. The process included establishing FIDER in 1970 to accredit education; NCIDQ in 1973 as the qualifying exam; and finally in 1975 when AID and NSID joined to form ASID. He stated that ASID realized “what [the] profession could be.” As time progressed interior design developed a strong definition of the profession while its members worked toward licensure.

Stacy D’Aquila Hatfield’s¹⁰⁰ interview took place by telephone on December 8, 2005. Hatfield was the Governmental Affairs Coordinator for ASID from 1995-1998. When interviewed, she worked for the Nevada Board of Architecture, Interior Design and Residential Design, for four years. She reiterated Alin’s point by stating “The profession has grown and matured.” According to Hatfield, future practitioners now understand that they need to be qualified professionals. Consequently, they know [that] they need a 4-year degree, to pass the NCIDQ, and to complete some kind of internship program. She continued that there is so much to learn and know, it’s not just a matter of waking up one day and saying “Oh, I have a knack for colors. I’m going to be an interior designer.” She concluded that she does not know if licensing spurred those changes, or if it is just the market and technology demanding these skills.

The interview with Eric Weidegreen, the 2006-2007 President of IDEC, took place during the IDEC regional conference on October 27, 2006 in Greensboro, North Carolina.¹⁰¹ He is an architect by training, but has been teaching interior design full time since 1989 and so has a “rare view of what has been going on” (Weidegreen, 2006). Weidegreen said that interior design has constantly changed over the last thirty years. Echoing Abbott from the theory of professions he stated, “Any profession that is valid is in a dynamic situation.” He continued that IDEC is constantly trying to redefine their goals by asking how can IDEC best help their membership (the educators), to adapt to a profession that is changing? He said that he chose to teach interior design rather than architecture because he saw interior design has “the ability to define [itself], really for the first time... right now.” He concluded it is easier said than done, but that NCIDQ and FIDER have been responsive to these needs to define interior design. Architecture on the other hand is “working off of a much older core.” He stated that architecture is currently trying to re-define what it is, what its mission and what architects should be doing. In Weidegreen’s opinion, as an architect who teaches in interior design, architecture does not have as much flexibility in establishing a new direction as interior design does because of the weight of its long history.

Establishment of an Advanced Education

Terri Maurer’s FASID interview took place at The Fairfield Inn in Columbus, Ohio on July 13, 2005.¹⁰² Maurer was ASID Ohio North Chapter President before she was the ASID National President, from 2001-2002.¹⁰³ At the time of her interview she was very active with the Ohio coalition for licensing as director. In her interview, she

agreed with Weidegreen the curriculum in the schools change to keep up with how the profession has grown.

Weidegreen gave an example of how interior design education is responding to the issue of sustainability. Interior design educators have “embraced not just sustainability, but Cradle-to-Cradle as a paradigm within design education.” He is proud of that stance and that FIDER has taken “to not be reactive to what’s going on in the profession, but proactive.” His excitement showed when he said that every time IDEC does something proactively about education it is reflected in the profession within a maximum of four years as students graduate having “embraced that philosophy.” He stressed that educators need to constantly examine and refine education parameters, “because we create practitioners, as educators. It is a power and a responsibility.”

The Body of Knowledge

Weidegreen reiterated Abbott’s position, described in the theory of professions Section 2-2, that one of the components of professions is the establishment of a unique body of knowledge. He discussed the document by Martin and Guerin that was “defining the body of knowledge” of interior design and was funded initially by Ontario’s licensing coalition ARIDO. Martin and Guerin’s work defines six parameters of interior design, which was discussed in the Introduction. Weidegreen stated that they concluded that the main difference between architecture and interior design is the “human factor.”¹⁰⁴ He admitted, “Now as an architect, I would have a little bit of qualms about that statement,” but the “depth of interior design’s dependence on issues of human factors certainly outweighs what architecture does.”

He stated that there is debate within IDEC about *The Body of Knowledge* document. Weidegreen thinks discussion and vetting of the document is necessary because it can have a big impact on the profession. He warned that it is “not cast in stone,” but it needs to be “constantly evaluated.” That means the elimination of some elements and the adding of others on a continual basis. Weidegreen stated how FIDER is the gold standard for interior design accreditation.

Accreditation of Education

On August 10, 2005, Kayem Dunn, Executive Director of FIDER and Holly Mattson, Deputy Executive Director and Director of Accreditation, were interviewed in the FIDER offices in Grand Rapids, Michigan.¹⁰⁵ Dunn began the interview by explaining what FIDER is and how it is structured. “FIDER is the accrediting agency for interior design education.” It is the only accreditation group for interior design, and focuses strictly on interior design. They serve the United States, Canada, and any institution that has a campus beyond the borders. Dunn continued, “Our mission is to provide the foundation for future excellence in the interior design profession by setting standards for educational programs and then accrediting programs that use those standards.” She concluded, “Our vision is that every interior designer is a FIDER accredited program graduate.”

She discussed the organization of FIDER as an independent, not-for-profit organization. While financial support comes from the various professional organizations, FIDER is “obligated to maintain independence.” FIDER’s structure is a board of directors and an accreditation commission. For the Board of Directors, members are drawn from interior design professional organizations. The accreditation commission

consists of six people; five of whom come from the ranks of interior design, and one who represents the public. That group has the final responsibility for making accrediting decisions.

When Alin, ASID's Executive Director, talked about FIDER he stated, "FIDER is unique, in that it is process-specific accreditation" rather than a more general accreditation of schools of arts and design. Dunn also discussed the differences in accreditation standards for different professions. The NAAB standards tend to be broader, more general statements such as demonstration of the knowledge of building service systems or building integration systems, whereas, FIDER uses very specific and detailed requirements to articulate its expectations. For example demonstrating a knowledge of electrical plans by showing appropriate data/voice/communication locations. Alin continued, "There is, I think, a fairly significant difference."¹⁰⁶

Dunn outlined the process that interior design programs go through to become accredited. They must apply, meet eligibility requirements, do a self-study, and prepare an extensive report. The three-day site visit team consists of two educators from other universities and a practicing professional. Dunn stated, "We were among the early adopters of this outcome-based evaluation system," which went into effect in the late 1980s. FIDER is concerned about whether the students graduate with demonstrated knowledge and skills required to enter the profession.

These peer evaluators compare standards established by FIDER to the program's self-study, student work, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. They write a report about the program, which goes through a lengthy review

process by a separate independent body of peers for accreditation. Dunn continued that this process is typical for the boards for all accrediting organizations.

Dunn discussed how standards change over time. “We do extensive consultations with the communities of interest to ensure that our standards are relevant for the profession.” Mostly, FIDER reflects changes in practice and the rate of change is increasing. For example, in 2004-2005, FIDER increased the requirements for student knowledge on sustainability.

Weidegreen discussed his university’s experience with a FIDER visit as a good experience. He felt that the visiting team had “the stringency and the fairness” that he appreciated. They asked fair questions which were always in relation to the rigor of that program. From his position at as IDEC President, he has seen many programs with a wide range of design education. “FIDER creates minimal standards and a uniformity that is critical. We can’t be a profession if we can’t count on the knowledge [of] our practitioners.” This rigor continues with the professional examination.

Formation of the Examination

Jeff Kenney was interviewed during Neocon at the Merchandise Mart in Chicago on June 12, 2005.¹⁰⁷ He began the interview by explaining his position as Executive Director of NCIDQ. He is responsible for the management of the organization and reports to an elected eight-person Board of Directors, which hires the Executive Director. He leads the staff in executing the Board’s policies, planning, and “everything that is appropriate for the organization.” He talked about his background. He is a registered architect, a member of AIA, and “was exam director at NCARB for 10 years.” Before NCIDQ hired him, he worked for a few years as an outside consultant to help write the

NCIDQ examination. Eventually, the Board of NCIDQ offered him his current position. He felt that the position was a good fit with his expertise and that he “could help the organization move forward.”

As background to the organization, Kenney stated he believed the first NCIDQ examination was in October 1974. NCIDQ started as an independent examination body, which was unique for that time-period. He commented that most other examinations of professions came into being in the last forty years “had a credentialing examination for membership within the society.” The AIA is an example of this. He continued that many of those professions did not separate the credentialing body as independent organization until the last ten years. “People in interior design during those early days realized that for credibility” an independent body for verifying the profession was critical.

Kenney said, “The most important thing that we do is the examination.” NCIDQ is continually strengthening the exam to be “the best possible exam.” It makes sure that it meets all standards for the field of psychometrics of testing. The exam must be valid, reliable, and defensible to be a credible professional licensing exam. He continued, “Validity derives from a study we do of the profession every five years, called a Practice Analysis.” In order to do this, “We have to find out what is competent practice [by] survey[ing] the profession.” They change the examination to reflect the changes in the profession to make sure the examination measures competency in interior design as practiced in the field.

Maurer also mentioned how the examination has changed over the years. The “standards have gone up and the test has changed dramatically.” NCIDQ responded to practitioners wanting “different specialties” reflected in the examination because the

expertise was different in hospitality, health care or even residential design. She continued, “Gone are the questions on period furniture. There’s nothing in the test that in some way doesn’t relate to health, safety, and welfare” of the public.

In addition, Kenney said that the development of the exam is by volunteer interior designers from across the U.S. and Canada. These “incredibly dedicated volunteers” write test questions and practicum problems, and jury the exam. In addition, they use Capital as their testing consultant company, which provides the professional testing expertise to guide the process.

Kenney stated that most professions require formal education and varified experience before a practitioner can sit for an examination. This is because professional examinations test the ability of someone to practice in a competent manner. Education alone is not enough, but two years of practice broaden and deepen learning from schools. He continued, that NCIDQ, NCARB, or any professional examination group has a process that each applicant needs to complete to sit for the examination. “Usually [they] don’t let people do things out of order, even though people can gain knowledge in all kinds of ways.”

Kenney described some of the outreach NCIDQ does in addition to preparing and giving the exam. “We have seven or eight major categories of things that we’re working on. A major one is communications and marketing. There are many audiences NCIDQ could try to communicate with — everything to the general public, interior designers, architects, builders, and building code officials on how NCIDQ protects the health, safety, and welfare of the public.” He stated that it is a hard message to get across to so many diverse groups. The NCIDQ Board decided that its current focus should be on

students, defining what NCIDQ does for them. The students need the information the most and they are easily identifiable, quantifiable, and “a message can be tailored to inform them about the need to become qualified.”

Weidegreen, the educator, has seen a change in the attitude in the students and young professionals about taking the exam. He has seen it go from taking the exam as “is a good thing to do,” to “that should be the goal of the graduate of any program.” He continued that the stronger the firm a designer works with, the more it becomes a requirement to be licensed. He admitted, “Of course, stronger firms will also pay for the process.”

Deanna Waldron was the current Director of Government and Public Affairs at ASID when interviewed on November 21, 2005 at ASID Headquarters.¹⁰⁸ She stated, “ASID has very strict, governmental policies with regard to legislation. We will not support legislation that does not specify the NCIDQ as the only exam.” The NCIDQ tests the knowledge-base in relation to the health, safety, and welfare of the public for all facets of the practice of interior design. There are two other examinations, which only cover a part of the practice. These examinations have been put forward as being equal to the NCIDQ examination. They are the Council for Qualification of Residential Interior Designers (CQRID), which tests knowledge of residential interior design and was written by the Interior Design Society (IDS). The other exam used by the National Kitchen and Bath Association (NKBA) tests residential kitchen and bath design. Waldron explained that both organizations wanted their exam judged as equal to the NCIDQ. In California Dr. Norman Hertz, who was the retired head of the testing review board in the state of

California, did a study reviewing the three examinations for the California Council for Interior Design Certification (CCIDC).¹⁰⁹ The following is a summary of the results:

AN EVALUATION OF THE TESTS USED BY CCIDC
IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Performed by Dr. Norman Hertz

- No tests have been reviewed or approved by the State of California neither in the legislative branch nor in the Department of Consumer Affairs. CCIDC would have to request this review from the State.
- The CQRID does not meet Section 139 of the Business and Professions Code. Does not have a valid basis from a job analysis. A specialty test developed for a trade group.
- The tests administered by NKBA do not meet Section 139 of the Business and Professions Code. CCIDC would need to prove that 57% of all Interior Designers' work is restricted to Kitchen and Bath. A specialty test developed for a trade group.
- The NCIDQ meets the examination validation and psychometric standards set by Section 139.

Waldron said that Hertz determined that the CQRID examination was not a valid examination because it was based on a job analysis was done in 1990 or 1991 and is therefore too old. She said that the “analysis should be updated every five to seven years.” In addition, CQRID only consulted IDS members as their data pool; therefore,

the people surveyed were not representative of the entire profession of interior design. She reiterated the Hertz study, which said the NKBA exam is a very good exam “for what they test.” It is not a valid test for registering interior designers, because residential kitchen and bath is a small portion of the work interior designers do. Waldron said that in addition, Hertz’s study stated that the NCIDQ examination “meets the examination validation and psychometric standards set by Section 139” of California law. In contrast to the ASID position, Waldron said that Illinois and Arkansas have unofficial tiered registration, where there are two examinations -- one for interior designers, using the NCIDQ, and one for residential interior designers using CQRID.

Legislative Process

Waldron discussed her job at ASID. The Government and Public Affairs department team handles the day-to-day support of legislative coalitions. They review legislation and make suggestions. She stated, “sometimes those suggestions are contingent on our (ASID’s) support.” Her job specifically consists of budgeting and all the administrative work for the department. Since the legislation is on a state or jurisdictional basis, none of the national interviewees discussed the legislative process except Waldron, who summarized the national statistics for registration in 2005. “We have twenty-four [jurisdictions] with either title or practice acts.” She stated that Colorado has “an exemption in their architecture statute for interior designers who have met certain qualifications, to submit certain types of work” to building officials for permits.

Opposition to Legislation

When asked about the opposition that interior design faced when attempting legislation, Waldron said the most active opposition was the “AIA, [interior] designers that would not meet the criteria of law,” and retail groups such as IDS. She also said that NKBA opposed, but she reiterated that they were against practice acts more than title legislation. Alin discussed another large challenge in jurisdictions that had licensing for interior designers was deregulation pressures from budget shortfalls of governmental bodies.

Waldron expanded on the opposition of interior designers to licensing by saying that they were designers who “are not eligible to sit for the NCIDQ, are afraid to take the NCIDQ, or simply don’t want to take the NCIDQ.” Also, the Interior Design Society (IDS), which she believed started as a subsidiary of the National Home Furnishings Association (NHFA), opposed and still opposes legislation in many jurisdictions.

She said that the National Kitchen and Bath Association (NKBA) changed positions over the years; in fact, in the mid-1990s the NKBA made their members take the NCIDQ before taking the NKBA examination to become certified kitchen and bath designers. By early 2000, the NKBA National took “a very aggressive stance that their exams should be considered equal to the NCIDQ for the purposes of licensure.” Waldron concluded, “ASID has no problem with specialty certification, so long as the interior designer has passed the NCIDQ first.”

Alin stated that AIA’s opposition went through many phases, beginning with total opposition to interior design registration in the 1970s and 1980s. In the beginning “they would try to say that there was no profession of interior design, [which] backfired on

them [and] alienated legislators in the process.” He stated that from 1989 to 1999, ASID, IBD, ISID and the AIA had an agreement called the Joint Accord. Under the accord, the AIA would not oppose legislation if it fit within the parameters of the Joint Accord. He continued that even with the Joint Accord, over the years individual architects testified in many jurisdictions in opposition to interior design licensure, but that there were also many individual architects who testified in favor of it. In 1999, when ASID pulled out of the Joint Accord, the AIA went back to total opposition of any legislation, especially practice legislation. Bob Boynton, FAIA, in his interview stated that after ASID pulled out of the Joint Accord the AIA members felt that ASID went back on their word, that interior design would never go after practice legislation, every time practice legislation was introduced in various jurisdictions.¹¹⁰

Maurer, who was president of the state-wide coalition in Ohio when interviewed in 2005, stated that the architects in Ohio would like interior design to require the most stringent qualifications in their legislation. They discount the transformation their legislation has made over the last “sixty-five years they have had a law on the books.” She continued, “They want us to have only FIDER accredited five-year programs.” She continued, “interestingly enough” they did not want to include CEU’s (Continuing Education Units), as part of the legislation “because if they grandfather in, they will have to take them.” The interviews continue with a question about who supported legislation.

Support of Legislation

Waldron confirmed that ASID and IIDA’s local chapters are the active participants in working on licensing for interior designers in each jurisdiction. Most of the chapters of these professional organizations form coalitions, which bring together

affiliated and unaffiliated interior designers to work together on this process. She reiterated, “We encourage our chapters to work through a coalition instead of doing their own chapter legislative activities for a number of reasons.” (1) They are able to collaborate more easily with other design organizations and non-affiliated designers; (2) The coalitions can raise money and spend money differently if they are not a 501 (c) (3) corporation. In addition, there are limitations as to the amount of dues ASID chapters can allocate for legislation. The base amount that chapters can spend is in direct relation to what the national organization spends, which means a 6% cap in their budget for direct lobbying. “If they spend more than that, then they have to pay taxes on it.” (3) With a separate coalition, they can raise money separately to pay for lobbyist.¹¹¹

Waldron said that before she started at ASID, there was another separate organization that helped coalitions with lobbying efforts, called the National Council for Legislation in Interior Design (NCLID), and helped coalitions with wording of legislation, strategies, and sharing information that worked in other jurisdictions. That organization disbanded in the mid-1990s. ASID National hired the employees of NCLID and moved the group under their auspices. They changed the name to Government and Public Affairs and they continued to work with coalitions.

Dunn and Mattson stressed how FIDER supported coalitions by supplying them with standards and any documents required to help them and the legislators to understand the profession. Dunn said that FIDER was “responsive to groups that are advocating for licensing to help them understand that there are standards for education and that there is a quality assurance process” with accreditation. Dunn continued to say that there was a real lack of understanding among legislators of how complex the demands are for the

interior design profession. Mattson added that FIDER helps coalitions by explaining to legislators how FIDER accredits interior design and the quality of that tool. Kenney also discussed how NCIDQ responds to coalitions and to legislatures in the effort to procure licensing.

Licensing

Maurer discussed the need to have more uniformity in legislation around the country. She said, “We are half-way there with about half the states with legislation on the books.” In an effort to make legislation more uniform, ASID and NCIDQ have written model language for legislation.

Hatfield’s experience in her position on Nevada’s regulatory board has been positive. She explained that their organization of their Joint Board includes architects, interior designers, and a profession called “residential design.” They are not residential interior designers. They are actually the only state that regulates residential design, which she explained is “basically architects for homes.” Residential designers design the entire structure, do the grading, placement of the walls, everything for the home.

Hatfield said that “Registered Interior Designer” is the title the interior designers use, but it is practice legislation. There is an exemption section for each of the three professions they regulate. The law states that, “if whatever you’re doing is regulated by some type of code or regulation, then you have to be licensed.” She stated that in Nevada filing for a building permit does not require a license so a non-licensed residential interior designer can file for a building permit. A designer needs to be licensed if they work on projects that have code driven selections, such as flame resistant wallcovering or carpet. Hatfield reiterated, “it is codes...” If the project is dealing with building codes, the

designer needs to be licensed. She continued, “Once they practice in the commercial arena, licensing is required because the selection of commercial materials is code driven, even doing basic decoration using rated materials.”

Hatfield concluded that the law is working well. Although there was some conflict to begin with, now there is no conflict between the interior designers and the architects. “They work really well together.” As of May 25, 2005, there were 103 registered interior designers, 2,755 licensed architects, and 132 residential designers.

Enforcement of Licensure

Hatfield continued discussing enforcement issues by stating that their Board has not sued anyone, “since I’ve been here.” They do go after people who are practicing illegally, but she admitted that cease-and-desist agreements solve most cases before they get to prosecution. She stated that they do have a number of people who have practiced interior design without a license. She mentioned that disciplinary actions are on their website. Go to their website at nsbaidrd.state.nv.us to see disciplinary actions. “Go under publications and forms.”

Enforcement of licensing laws comes in many forms. Waldron mentioned a problem that there has been a decline in architects registering. She said that the AIA explanation for this is that most firms pay for registration; in order to cut costs, they only register one architect per jurisdiction to seal the drawings. “As long as there is a registered architect to sign off on everything, firms cut down on the amount of licenses they pay.” Boynton also mentioned this phenomenon in his interview. He said that he believes in “good firms,” supervision by one registered architect protects the health, safety and welfare of the public and they are legally liable for the work they seal. He

warned, this is something that needs monitoring because the cutbacks in licensed individuals may negatively affect licensing in the future, especially with governmental bodies looking at ways to reduce costs. A discussion of enforcement of licensing laws is included in the case studies about the individual jurisdictions.

Perception of the Public

When asked about the perception of the public about interior design, Kenney stated that the profession has to educate the public about how interior design has changed. He said, “I actually think that if you can educate the public in general to what interior designers do, the rest will fall” into place. He thinks the challenge is to get the public to “understand what your worth is by creating safe, functional, aesthetically pleasing spaces.” In addition, there are “so many good examples of how good design affects human behavior,” and interior designers need to communicate that better.

When asked about the changes in the public perception, Weidegreen discussed the television shows that have become popular in the last few years, such as *Trading Spaces*. He said he has seen an increase in the number of students applying for interior design programs. “We have 18-year olds deciding in droves to come into interior design. Years ago, we had to defend our programs with the administration” of our universities for the low number of students. Now the programs are all full.

Maurer had a negative view of the television shows commenting that the emphasis on decorating a room in twenty-four hours does not demonstrate the complexity of interior design. Maurer stated, when she was ASID President; she received a call from the *Wall Street Journal* home section about *Trading Spaces*, asking her what she thought about it. She related what she said, “I’m glad you asked because I don’t watch it all that

often and I had seen it [when a] girl was redoing somebody's family room and decided it would be a good idea to glue straw on the walls." She continued that this show in particular decorated with a substance that could negatively affect the users of the space who have allergies, and said that good interior design "cannot be done in 24 hours." Maurer lamented that the interchangeable use of the term interior decorator and interior designer on these shows and in the press further confuses the public in understanding how interior design is more than picking the color and pattern of a wallcovering for someone's home. Although she only does commercial work, Maurer still believes that the public does not understand what interior design is. "I still get clients who introduce [me to] their office as 'our decorator'."

Perception of Interior Design

When asked about the perception of the interior design community, Alin, the Executive Director of ASID, stated, "the whole issue of protecting the right to practice and looking at the skills needed to be a professional are dramatically different than they were." He continued by describing the goals of ASID as a society. "We have to educate our members" about the things that they need to know. This includes ergonomics and technology, both how technology relates to practice in tracking projects, but also how the clients use them. He continued, "What is the impact of the technology in a hospital or having a conference room in a corporate office" with teleconferencing?

Alin continued, saying that the profession has come a long way in jurisdictions where legislation is pending. There is no longer a question as to the validity of the education or examination for interior design. The challenge of the passage of licensing is that many interior designers fail to register. "They don't understand that licensing is a

continuing process” and that what happens with individual interior designers signing up for title registration affects the ability to achieve practice legislation later.

Maurer is concerned that some time in the future there are going to be educated commercial designers doing only large contract projects who are licensed. “The biggest problem I see is, kids now are coming out [of school] so prepared, they don’t want to do residential design.” She worries that the uneducated, unqualified interior designers are doing residential interior design, without the need for licensing. She continued, “Residential may have to rise at its own rate.” Alin is concerned because ASID membership includes a predominance of residential interior designers. He thinks that ASID must merge what designers need as professionals with what the profession needs to keep the design community working together for licensing, whether they practice residential or commercial interior design.

Below is a review of other topics discussed as part of these interviews, including building codes, compensation (professional fees verses selling product), structured internship programs, and continuing education.

Other Issues

Building Codes

Kenney discussed the redundancies of overlapping checks and balances that are designed to protect the public in the built environment. “The redundancies of architect, structural engineer, electrical engineer, and interior designer” build in a safety factor in each of their design calculations, which overlap and protect the public. Waldron also talked about the complexity of the building codes. “As building codes become more and more uniform they [also] become more complex. You’re going to need people on the

team that specialize in certain parts of the code.” She continued that one person could no longer know everything about codes because “the international code comes in volumes.” She continued that they keep writing more, and they are updated every three to six years. This means that each area of expertise in the built environment must have proven qualifications to protect the public welfare.

Kenney reiterated that the building codes alone could not protect the public because “construction is too complex.” The building inspectors check the drawings and the projects as they are under construction as the final check and balance. He continued, “I find it really interesting that there are also the checks and balances in other professions.” He gave the example of surgeons who have twelve years of education in order to become a surgeon, but they cannot do surgery without hospital privileges. That is the last check to make sure they are qualified and competent. Well actually, he admitted, the last check is insurance companies. “For all professions, insurers won’t insure bad practitioners.”

Compensation

Alin went on to discuss how compensation for interior design is changing. As interior design moves toward professionalization, it is becoming a fee-based rather than a product-based compensation system. He said, “Charging a fee for service does not mean you can not supply product.” At some point in the project when you get into the construction phase, some designers move from a fee for service situation into supplying custom products, especially in hospitality design where custom design sets a project apart. He concluded that designers need to treat their work as a “professional charging fees for service or no one else will respect them as a professional.”

Structured Internships

Kenney discussed the structured internship program called the Interior Design Experience Program (IDEP), which is based on a specific number of contact hours and diverse content areas of practice dealing with health, safety and welfare issues. He said NCIDQ did research on these programs, and that IDEP is based on architecture's Intern Development Program (IDP). He continued that, especially in programs coupled with architecture, the students show a lot of interest in participating in IDEP. On the other hand, NCIDQ needs to work on brand awareness for their program so that students feel that they must participate in it as part of their training. He stated, "I always explain to students that it's a curriculum for continuing learning—just like you would not go into an undergraduate degree program with no idea of what courses to take." He continued that there is a curriculum for a reason -- that you build knowledge on top of other knowledge. "IDEP is the structure of the curriculum to continue learning" with monitored field experience.

Two of the items that NCIDQ is continuing to work on in relation to the IDEP program are requiring a mentoring professional to work with the new graduates who work for large architectural firms and small interior design firms. This will help designers who may lack the ability to get a broad range of interior design experience because of their place of employment and for designers who cannot find employment. They have various concepts to be able to expand the training in those situations, such as "remote supervision" by someone at a different firm to give guidance. Also, group projects might allow designers from different firms, whose on the job experience is limited, to work on a realistic yet artificial project to gain experience that enhances their

education.¹¹²

Continuing Education

Alin said it was part of ASID's job to "help members protect the right to practice," and continuing education is part of that commitment. In 1978, ASID with the other professional organizations, established the Interior Design Continuing Education Council (IDCEC) to review and accredit continuing education for interior designers. There was major push to develop education programs and in 2005, there were over a thousand programs. He continued, saying it is important that practitioners recognize that even when they passed the NCIDQ, that it tests minimum competency and they must take continuing education to stay current. Continuing education helps members keep up with changes in the profession and provides opportunities for them to interact with one another.

Conclusion

This section is important to this dissertation because it demonstrates a conscious and continuing effort on the part of the professional organizations of interior design to elevate the profession. ASID, IIDA, but also NCIDQ and FIDER continue to refine the standards of accreditation to meet the criteria of practice and to define it in relation to protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. In these interviews, one can see the conflicts within the profession, how it is struggling to justify its professionalization and the ambivalence of the public about interior decoration verses interior design. This ambivalence affects how legislatures view licensure for interior design.

While interior design has worked hard over the years to fulfill all of the components of professionalization, it seemed to be checking items off a list, until it came

to the conflicts inherent with licensure. This may be because the strengths that make interior designers good at their profession are the very things that caused trouble when working on licensing. The ability to listen and incorporate varying opinions into their designs hampers negotiations. Interior design not only negotiated with the AIA, but allowed the AIA, their direct competition for remodeling work, to define the profession in the Joint Accord. In response to the conflict, it has taken over twenty-five years for interior designers to begin to assert its unique qualities, strengths, and establish how it was different from architecture.

This history demonstrates the struggles interior design went through in the transformation of interior decoration into interior design. While these themes are outlined here, the reverberations will be seen in the case studies. (1) Interior design has problems justifying the need for licensure because the public does not understand the changes the profession under gone since 1950. (2) The field continues to struggle to define itself as an independent profession. (3) The field is struggling with an inferiority complex as seen by the divisions within the field and with other professions. (4) Interior design has problems differentiating its work from that of architecture. (4) Commercial interior designers struggle to justify the health, safety and welfare issues of residential interior design. As late as 1995, these divisions separated the once unified professional organization into smaller special interest organizations, which has weakened the profession considerably. (5) The lack of participation of interior designers in the process of licensure negatively affects the efforts for licensure. (6) The low number of registrants negatively affects more stringent future legislation and supports the pressures of deregulation because of budget concerns in state governments.

Chapter 4 – State of the Profession

Section 2 – Position of American Institute of Architects on Interior Design Licensure

The interview with Robert Boynton, FAIA, establishes the position of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) on licensing for interior designers. Their position is included here because the AIA has been the most consistent opposition to interior design licensure. Also interior designers have negotiated with the AIA at a national level with the Joint Accord and in almost every jurisdiction to establish a definition for interior design to their detriment. It is important to understand the AIA's position before we see this how it has affected the efforts toward licensure as discussed in Chapter 4.

As noted in the introduction, the author attempted to obtain interviews with two architects active in the process of licensing for interior design in Washington, D.C. and Ohio, but was unable to do so. The following represents the AIA of Virginia's viewpoint and because Boynton was also active on a national level his views reflect AIA National's position. The interview with Robert A. Boynton, FAIA¹¹³ took place on July 21, 2005 in Squires Student Center on the campus of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.¹¹⁴ Virginia has four AIA chapters that hold local meetings, and a Commonwealth-wide organization. Boynton was president, in 1978, of one of the four chapters of the AIA in Virginia. He then became the president of the state society in 1987.

Boynton discussed in the interview, he was not actually involved in the negotiation process in any jurisdiction. He was privy to the views of the AIA National at the time when this activity was happening because, "What is more important is that I was the second chair of the Government Affairs Committee [for the AIA National], in 1976 to

early in the 1980s.” This was the time when licensing for interior designers began to be discussed. Boynton’s qualifications included the fact that he was a registered lobbyist for the AIA and for another group known as the Virginia Association of Professions during that period.

Boynton stated that the AIA National’s position has “been all over the landscape” when it came to registration for interior designers. He explained that architecture preferred to use the term registration because it differentiated any legislation passed from the more restrictive licensing. Licensure is the most common form of regulation for architects in most jurisdictions. For architects the term “licensing” connotes both practice and title protection.

He implied that the AIA national position opposed licensing interior designers before the letter of agreement was reached among the AIA, ASID, IBD, and ISID in 1989, known as the “Joint Accord.” He provided a history of the negotiations that led to the Joint Accord agreement. Meetings took place among the AIA, National Council of Architectural Review Boards (NCARB) and the interior design organizations of ASID, IBD, and ISID in 1988. At these meetings, representatives discussed how the various groups could come to an understanding about the proposed legislative efforts for the licensing, certification, or registration (different terms are preferred by the different organizations) of interior designers around the United States. In 1989, these meetings resulted in the Joint Accord among the AIA, ASID, IBD and ISID. As a reminder, the eight points of the Joint Accord’s were:

- Title registration.
- Requirements for registration to include (1) a four-year minimum professional degree, accredited by the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER) or the equivalent; (2) National Council for Interior Design Qualification (NCIDQ) testing or the equivalent; and (3) a monitored internship, to be developed.
- No grandfathering without strict and equivalent education, training and testing criteria.
- Joint regulatory boards, where feasible.
- A clear definition of interior designer to be developed and agreed upon by the respective parties at the state level.
- Voluntary continuing education.
- Licensed architects can continue to perform interior design services and use the title, interior designer.
- Where states customarily provide sealing privileges for professions under title registration, a set of definitional conditions will apply. In addition, the parties pledge not to be associated with the development, consideration or introduction of any form of interior design practice registration.¹¹⁵ (Letter of Agreement, 1)

Boynton stated, “NCARB was also involved in those negotiations” but did not sign the letter of agreement. NCARB’s representatives stated that the reason for the architects to participate in the Joint Accord was for interior design to agree never to try for practice licensure, for the sealing of drawings, or for the ability to apply for building

permits. This is why the AIA signed the Joint Accord. If interior design legislation included all eight points, the AIA would not oppose the legislation.

Virginia Legislative Efforts

When asked about his recollection of what happened in Virginia in relation to licensing, Boynton provided a description of the events from the AIA viewpoint. He was personally involved with the AIA of Virginia in the late 1980s during the negotiations, but was not part of the negotiating team. He recalled that interior designers initially sought licensure¹¹⁶ with their own board, but were not able to move forward with their legislation. Boynton described the legislative activity of interior designers that took place after the signing of the Joint Accord. It was at that time he recalled that the interior designers changed their position to accept a joint board with the architects and certification or title legislation. These actions brought them in line with the Joint Accord. He reiterated that while the AIA of Virginia did not support interior designers for certification, the AIA did not oppose it because it was in accordance with the Joint Accord. Boynton also noted that interior designers in Virginia had wise lobbying advice and significant funding to pay for the lobbyists, allowing them to get to the right legislators who support licensure.

Opposition to Certification

When asked about the other opposition, Boynton could not recall all the specifics, but stated his belief that the engineers and the building officials opposed the legislation. For instance, “In Richmond, they [the building officials] would in many cases receive interior design documentation and they would require . . . an architectural seal” for approval and would reject the drawings that did not have an architectural seal. “The

building code states that it has to be sealed by a design professional to put walls up... for more than just furniture, finishes, and even systems furniture.”¹¹⁷

Boynton mentioned that in the early 1990s as part of the governmental reduction movement, Governor George Allen set up a blue ribbon task force to study the “government holistically and made recommendations to serve the public better and with less interference.” He reported that the task force said, “That there was no compelling reason for the interior designers or some other organizations, for that matter, to be registered.” Boynton concluded with the comment, “There are as many governments putting interior designers [certification] on as are taking them off.”¹¹⁸ According to Boynton, this was because “there are some occupations that need to be regulated and some not,” implying that interior design was one of those occupations that did not need regulation.

Boynton also provided information about more recent events. Although he had left the APELSLAID¹¹⁹ Board in 2003, he was aware that in 2004 interior designers asked the Board for the ability to seal drawings. From his standpoint, he believed interior designers could seal their drawings “with anything they like,” but that there was no provision in the handbook followed by building officials that allowed interior designers to use that seal on their drawings so that they could be submitted to building officials.

Boynton stated that during the 2004 meeting with the full APELSLAID Board someone asked “what about the Joint Accord” and its provisions not to seal drawings. The designers explained that ASID withdrew from the Joint Accord in 1999. Boynton expressed the AIA’s belief “that they were betrayed by the interior design organization’s withdrawing from the Accord.” From his standpoint, the interior design organizations

had broken their word to the AIA by attempting any legislation that is a practice act, adds sealing privileges, or enables designers to pull building permits. Because the Joint Accord specifically excluded interior designers from ever going after those provisions, Boynton stated, “The current [AIA] national position is that they are against interior design licensing.”¹²⁰

Enforcement of Laws

Boynton also discussed the enforcement of the laws and regulations. He began by stating that in his opinion, “Virginia do[es] not enforce things well.” Although they had hearings, discussions, and debates, the board has difficulty coming to a consensus toward enforcement because of the varied composition of the board. The APELSLAID Board, Boynton explained, consists of “five disciplines, three [of] which are licensed and they each have three representatives on the board,” which are architecture, professional engineering and land surveying. The two professions that are certified are landscape architecture and interior design. They have two representatives on the board. According to Boynton, this has led to “unusual tensions” and interesting coalitions, which sometimes make enforcement difficult.

Boynton noted that a few years ago some of the members of the board tried to split the board into one for surveyors, engineers, and landscape architects and a separate board for architecture and interior design. According to Boynton, the tensions among the various professions made that difficult. His final remark on this topic was that, “Architects and engineers don’t think there is a need for interior design [to be certified] and [we] just ignore them.”

The interview moved on to how architecture and engineers differentiate their scope of work. Boynton stated “Regulation[s] say [that one profession can] only do work [of another related profession] that is incidental” to the profession. “Architects do not do very much engineering at all.” Maybe they do “a little bit of structure for wood framing for residential, never anything of any kind for mechanical or electrical [engineering].” In the last few years, “Engineers have backed away from design-build.” Boynton admitted that there was conflict between the professions, but it has worked itself out over the years. “Architects will hire engineers. We can not design a large building and protect the life and safety of occupants of the building, [without] engineers to do [the] structure.”

When asked about whether the AIA does training for the building officials, he responded by recognizing that the AIA used to do training for building officials years ago because many AIA members “felt that the building officials were being derelict in their duty” to enforce the building codes. While those architects felt the “need to advise [building officials] about what [they thought] their responsibilities [were],” Boynton indicated that in recent years the AIA has moved away from carrying out that responsibility.¹²¹

As documented in the professionalization Section 2-2, the establishing of education, experience, and nationwide examinations was part of the qualification process for professions. Boynton discussed how education, experience, and examination were a three-legged stool for documenting qualifications for any profession. “The three legged stool is NCARB terminology. A three legged stool doesn’t rock.” But, Boynton added, “it can slip. I was the one who [wanted] four legs,” the fourth leg being “equivalency.” Boynton reiterated the importance of the three legs, “I wrote the architectural

examination for years. The problem with all examinations [is] if you are a good exam-taker, know the system of examination, and you are bright you can pass the examination without knowing the [information subject to] examination.” This explains the need for education and experience to confirm a person’s knowledge.

Then he spoke of the building codes as the “final redundancy.” He commented on the effectiveness of code officials in many locations because they are not sophisticated enough to make sure the building is built to code, especially in large, complex structures. Instead, sometimes the code officials rely on the seal of the architect to know that the building meets code, rather than on independent inspection by the official.

When asked how the professions have changed during this time-period, Boynton stated that during the debate on this topic at the APELSLAID Board he took the position that interior designers should not sell product. Rather than talking about interior design, he described what happened with landscape architecture. “When the landscape architects became certified, which is way back in the 1980s, they had the same problems that the interior designers have when they became certified.” He pointed out, “landscape architects had been working for nurseries” selling plants. Boynton noted that once they became certified, “They had to stop selling plants.” and that “It took them a while, but the profession changed.” When the APELSLAID Board recently had a hearing about an interior designer who was getting a fee and commission on furniture, Boynton stated that the Board ruled against her because the Board felt the only compensation acceptable for registered professionals was a fee for service.

With regard to fees, Boynton’s opinion was that architects are so driven to design that they may often give away their service. According to Boynton, architects “have let

their practices get away from them.” An example he used is traditionally architects charge a fixed fee for their services, which included the interior of the building they are designing.

As an example of this phenomenon, he spoke about the way the Commonwealth of Virginia negotiates the bid for State projects. The State apparently uses a standard fee for a standard type of building, setting the architect’s fee at 6% of the cost of the building. But, now that standard fee does not include furnishings and interiors. Because Boynton pointed out, that since half of a building’s design is considered engineering, 3% of the fee goes to the engineers. Since other consultants get other portions of the fee. The “architect is lucky to end up with thirty-five percent of the 6% fee.” He concluded at that rate they “were lucky to break even. The interior designer [who made 3% on the interior] made more money than the architect.” Now, the interior fee can be billed separate from that of the architecture. By incorporating interior design services in their firms, they can charge a 6% fee for buildings and an additional 3% for the interior.

He concluded these thoughts by stating that architects never design a building without thinking about the interior. It was not until the late 1980s that architects finally began charging for the interior as a separate entity when they realized they had been giving it away for free. In his opinion, architects have always been interior designers.

Public Perception

When asked about the changes in the public’s perception of interior design, Boynton responded by discussing how the perception of interior design has changed on the AELSAID Board since certification. The Board members can now distinguish between interior decorators and interior designers. His opinion was that interior

decorators have lost respect on the Board because they are not knowledgeable, but he stated that “the true interior designer” brings a lot to the table. For example, in Boynton’s opinion, “Certified Interior Designer” (CID) has helped architects and the facilities’ managers differentiate qualified interior designers. But, he concluded that, “It hasn’t helped with the public perception.” Boynton continued, “I respect interior designers more only because they have clearly defined themselves [as] different from decorators. When I first started in architecture there were no interior designers.” He admitted, “at least we didn’t know of them. We hired interior decorators [to work on] the houses of our wealthy” clients.” This has changed over his career.

Other Concerns

Boynton further stated he believed that certification of designers is burdensome to the public. From his point of view, it offers only the status and competitive edge that comes with a title act without benefiting the public by protecting them with practice legislation. He also commented on the additional expenditures by NCARB to go around to [AIA Chapters] in all the states to help them understand the difference between registration and certification.

He also noted an additional problem that architects and other registered professionals face. For example, changing status on the governmental level can also cause problems. He used the example of the recent Virginia legislative changes of “certified landscape architect” to “landscape architect.” While the purpose of the change was ostensibly to lessen the public’s confusion, the result was the necessity to re-grandparent the profession, allowing for a second time non-qualified practitioners to become certified.

Enforcement

Boynton also discussed other issues about enforcement, such as how the computer has changed the production of drawings. “In good firms, there is always an architect in control” of the production of documents even though some of the details are copied from online manufacturers catalogues. He admitted that with a “bad architect, you can’t protect the public from [bad] supervision.” But he believed that it is realistic to assume that someone in a particular office is endeavoring to supervise all work. For example, in Boynton’s firm an architect may be licensed in another state and seal the drawings for that state, but there is always “one architect in control of the drawings,” whether that architect seals the drawings or not.

Technology

Boynton further noted that many architects are concerned that technology is damaging architecture. Currently, “There are reports that 250,000 positions in architecture are going out of the country. Plans are sent overnight to India and come back the next morning.” This allows both large and small “firms [to] do more and more work.” Contrary to these concerns in Boynton’s opinion “technology is going to be the salvation of architecture. [because] you still need a person” to do the design. The “next new technology is going to bring [design] more and more into our control because of the 3-D programs.” According to Boynton, this will allow architects to visualize the results and the control of projects will come back to the architect. On the other hand, Boynton expressed the concern that the “synergy of the office [will] not happen when using drafts-people overseas.” He referred to the Bauer Report on education in architecture, which stated that, the “studio was the best possible way to teach anything.” Boynton firmly

believes that the best way for an architect to learn is to have another person to discuss the design with him. “People don’t design in isolation.” Interactions with another human being “make us more creative.”

Research

On the positive side, he noted that research into building systems and other technology gives new ways for architects to inform their clients. For example, Boynton noted that he could tell a client that a glass shed roof will make people feel better and work more efficiently, but before that was only the architect talking. According to Boynton, now “there are scientists, who have done research supported by the AIA, who can prove more glass will help improve the students’ mood and retention of information.”

Documents

In addition to Boynton’s interview, there were documents on file at ASID National about the AIA’s position on the changes in the building codes, and the interpretation and enforcement of the codes. The following excerpts are from a newsletter written in 1993 from President Lipaj of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects¹²² to registered architects in Ohio. It defines the new enforcement at the local level. He stated the goal was “preventing unlicensed people from authoring construction documents used to obtain building permits.” The Ohio Section 4-3 of this dissertation will document the resulting curtailment of interior designer practice. Lipaj’s message continued with Practice Requirements... “It is illegal for anyone other than an architect to either provide or to offer to provide architectural services. Violators face the possibility of injunctive action or criminal prosecution.” Lipaj reiterated that architects could not place their seals on drawings produced by other professionals by saying, “When an

architect chooses to participate in such an arrangement, the architect may be jeopardizing his or her license as well. It is unlawful for an architect to seal documents not prepared by the architect or under the direct supervision of the architect.”

Although architects in Ohio did not have, a “seal law” until 1995, architectural firms had “Certificates of Authorization.” The Certificate of Authorization was the registration of an architectural business with the state and only companies with that authorization could submit documents to building officials. The newsletter stated, “All organizations providing architectural services are required under Ohio law to procure for this Board a Certificate of Authorization to provide architectural services.” It continued, “An architect cannot contract to render architectural services to an unlicensed entity who, in turn, provides the architect’s services to another.” The newsletter continued, “The unauthorized organization providing the services of the architect to another may be enjoined by the courts to prohibit such activities and the architect may face disciplinary action through the Board.”

The newsletter continued to define what an architect could and could not do:

Plan Stamping – An architect who sells his seal is in violation of Ohio law and may lose his or her license for such an offense.

Plan stamping encourages the creation of organizations, which are providing a wide range of architectural services. When a building department requires a seal, these people simply find someone with a seal who is willing to stamp the documents for a fee. Such activity undermines the entire premise of licensure and is an offense to every ethical architect as well as a hazard to the public health,

safety and welfare. The Board considers that all documents required to be submitted to a building department for obtaining a building permit, depending upon the nature of the documents, must be sealed by an architect or a professional engineer who has prepared the documents or under whose direct supervision they have been prepared.

Conclusion

Bob Boynton, FAIA, stated the AIA's position on registration and certification for interior designs. He clearly delineated the AIA's position as reflected in the Joint Accord and the two AIA white papers on interior design registration. There are major inconsistencies to their position.

Boynton stated that architecture has always done the interior of buildings. Between the 1950s to the 1980, this is correct in that he is talking about the main floor lobby of the building, circulation spaces such as elevators, elevator lobbies, restrooms and egress stairwells. They also did some client spaces in these buildings. He is not talking about the acres of undeveloped space left on the subsequent floors of these multi-storied buildings constructed all over the United States.

The AIA has said that interior design does not affect the health safety and welfare of the public because it is only decoration and furniture arrangement. On the other hand, the AIA said that interior designers need to be supervised by architects to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public because the architect is the "sole arbiter of the built environment."¹²³ These are contradictory statements. When Boynton spoke about grand-parenting allowing unqualified people to use the title of interior designer weakens

the profession. Architecture also faced that same problem years ago, so why not have the strongest form of licensure at the beginning a practice act.

The Joint Accord stated that interior design will only go after title registration, but Boynton stated that title registration does not protect the public. The AIA would like to reserve sealing privileges and the ability to pull building permits for architects and engineers. Since a seal was required by code for submittal to building departments, capturing sealing provisions means that only architects' and engineers' documents can be submitted for approval. Before 1981, the building official would decide if a remodeling was to code and react appropriately, soon after the changes to the codes, the AIA trained building officials as to their duties in accepting drawing only with architectural seals. The extensive re-stating of the rules for sealing and submittal of drawings written by the AIA president in Ohio emphasizes that these were new enforcement procedures changed enforcement before the legislation for the seal bill came into affect. In Section 5-3 about Ohio's case study, Volz stated that the Ohio Board of Architecture was doing "enforcement by administrative rule" (Volz, 2005).

On the other hand, individual architects, including Boynton, were beginning to understand the value interior design brings to the built environment. He discussed the changes in his perception of interior designers, by noting, "The true interior designer has a lot to bring to the table for an architect; they don't just pick colors." In general, there seems to be a growing acknowledgement that an interior designer adds value to architectural projects because architect firms are hiring interior designers as part of their design teams.

Chapter 4 – State of the Professions

Section 3 – Gender Issues

As interior design moved toward the final component of professionalization, licensing. An important factor in the process is the gender of the profession's practitioners, which was and is predominantly female, and the role that gender plays in the profession. As much as society would like to discount the role that gender has on professions, feminist theory shows us when a profession is dominated by one gender that understanding the gender in the profession is critical to understanding that profession. In addition, the role that gender plays in this discussion is important because the main opposition to licensure for interior design was architecture. The conflicts discussed in the results chapter take on a new dimension when one understands that the membership of the AIA was 80% male as of 2004.¹²⁴

While there should be additional research done on this topic, this section discusses gender in relation to the conflicts inherent in the licensing process. In 2004, 30,000 members of ASID made it the largest professional organization for interior design. The membership was 80% female. (ASID, *Facts and Figures*, 2004) Gender and identity are important to this discussion because they affect how interior design defines and identifies itself, which affects how it interacts within its own profession, with other professions and the legislature. The following is a discussion about how gender has reverberated through interior design, and the role of gender in the built environment.

As stated in the AIA Position Section 3-4 of this dissertation, interior design used architecture to gauge its efforts toward professionalization and licensing, but this comparison was a double-edged sword. Lucinda Kaukas Havenhand, in her article “A

View from the Margin: Interior Design,”¹²⁵ stated that when interior design uses architecture as a model for its legitimacy, it “inadvertently supports the system that ensures its supplemental position.” She continued:

...interior design strategies for legitimacy have contributed to this marginalization, and prevent it from understanding and establishing a distinct, non-supplemental identity. In efforts made to define, establish, and recognize the field of interior design, little mention has been made of the issue of gender. ... The gender implications attached to interior design, which in turn are largely responsible for its inherent assignments of inferiority, have been treated like “the crazy aunt in the attic” and have been purposely overlooked. By ignoring this important aspect of its perceived identity, interior design has not been able to acquire the proper self-consciousness needed to solve its identity problem. As its recent history demonstrates, efforts to control its own identification by creating definitions, bodies of knowledge, and professional rules and organization, do little to counteract interior design’s perceived inferiority to architecture. The link between interior design and the feminine has to be acknowledged.

Another edge of the sword of using architecture as the roadmap of professionalization was the ingrained cultural bias of a male-dominated profession attempting to “control” a female-dominated profession. Goodwin of Virginia related a story that echoed stories told by many of the interviews in this study. She described the

first meeting she attended where interior designers attempted to find common ground with architects.¹²⁶ The meeting took place in 1980 in Baltimore. It consisted of architects, interior designers, dealers, and other interested persons from Virginia, Washington, D.C., and Maryland. According to Goodwin, “There was a lot of discussion about what an interior designer should be allowed to do.” Such as, where was the limit when interior design crosses over into architecture? The group discussed which kinds of walls interior designers should be able to detail to file for building permits and which ones they should not be able to do. The argument bounced between architects, who stated interior designers could not do wall details because walls “actually impact fire safety” and interior designers saying that they should be able to do walls “because it is typical tenant work.” Finally, one architect raised his hand and said, “You don’t get it. You shouldn’t be able to do any walls.”

Goodwin continued that, while this would be a broad generalization that did not apply to all architects, her conclusion was that architects believed they should have jurisdiction over interior designers and “for that matter, landscape architects.” She finished her story with the statement that architects believe they are the “only group that is responsible to the state and to the public for the health, safety [and] welfare of the public. That doesn’t make engineers very happy either.” Her conclusion was that the architects would like interior designers to be “a subset of architecture.” This belief was reiterated in almost every interview with interior designers for this dissertation.

When Steve Vogel, President of the AIA MI chapter stated clearly at an ASID meeting in Detroit, Michigan, that architects are the “soul arbiters of the built environment” in that only they know the building codes and work for the health, safety,

and welfare of the public, he was only reaffirming the AIA's national position (Vogel, 1993).¹²⁷ The feelings of inadequacy exacerbated conflicts within and among various interior design organizations that will be documented in the case studies in Chapter 5.

Rather than looking at a femininity as being a detriment to the profession, this dissertation posits that the feminine traits of interior design are part of what made it a unique profession and gives it attributes that enhance the built environment.

Havenhand's is the only article found about the feminine perspective in interior design. After Havenhand's quotation above, one hesitates to return to articles about the feminine perspective in architecture, but the feminine viewpoint in the built environment is essential for this analysis. For example, Lucy Lippard discussed the differences in the outlook of male and female architects in her article, "Centers and Fragments: Women's Spaces:"¹²⁸

Traditionally inside represents the female, and outside the male.

Attention has already been drawn to the male concern with façade and monument, the female concern with function and environment; the male concern with permanence and structural imposition, the female concern with adaptability and psychological needs.

The discussion of this distinction of place is in other literature from Veblen's 1850s treatise *The Theory of the Leisure Class* mentioned in Section 2-3. When examining why interior design is 80% female, this cultural difference may make it understandable that women might gravitate toward interior design as a profession.

Anne Vytacil also discussed women's strengths in her article about females in the educational environment of the architectural studio, in "The Studio Experience: Different

for Women Students.” She stated a female’s “sensitivity to existing context, combined with an understanding of user-needs and a willingness to accept and incorporate varying opinions, can contribute substantially to the successful execution of a contemporary architecture project.¹²⁹ She continued that the appreciation of these assets were limited in the competitive environment of the architectural studio in universities.

These feminine traits were part of the assets that interior design brings to clients and the built environment. The feminine traits were concerned with the interior of spaces, and with the existing context, function, and adaptability of environments. As Vytacil said in her article, females understand user psychological needs and have a willingness to incorporate varying opinions into their designs. In addition, I have come to believe the gender predominance in interior design has internalized a female viewpoint and even embedded it in education and training.

As interior design education developed during the 1950s through the 1970s, many of these programs were located in Home Economics departments. In the 1970s, Home Economics became Family and Consumer Sciences to reflect the scientific nature of the fields it incorporated (Guerin Interview, 2006). But, because of its location in Home Economics during the 1950s interior design included the study of the theory of behavior based on sociological and psychological models. This theory, on which interior design was based, reinforces the female concerns of function and adaptability, as discussed by Lippard and Vytacil. The theory that other interior design programs used when located in architecture and art departments was often the theory of aesthetics. These diverse theory philosophies were shared at Interior Design Educators Council meetings, and when the faculty published their research in the *Journal for Interior Design Education and*

Research. This blended and unified the theories on which the profession is based.¹³⁰ In 1970, the development of FIDER accreditation standardized interior design education and incorporated the model where behavioral theory and function are just as important as aesthetics. This meant for interior design that each practitioner, no matter what his or her gender, viewed the profession through the lens of training, which may be considered intrinsically gender specific.

These concerns for “adaptability and psychological needs” were strengths that helped to make interior designers integral contributors to the team working in the built environment. The need for a deeper examination of this topic will help understand the road-blocks to men becoming interior designers.

The interviews in this dissertation reveal a belief of interior designers that the AIA would like to control interior design, or as Goodwin said “To tuck it back under the umbrella of architecture” (Goodwin, 2005). At the outset, that stark statistic, of architecture being 80% male and interior design being 80% female, demonstrated a dichotomy between the professions. Because the AIA has been the main opponent to interior design legislation; that position could be simplified into a “them versus us” scenario, or the older male dominated profession holding down the newer female dominated profession. It was more complex than that. For example, Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman pointed out in their article “Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for ‘The Woman’s Voice’”¹³¹ They define domination of one sex over another in these terms:

It reflects nascent empirical theory insofar as it presupposes that the silencing of women is systematic, shows up in regular,

patterned ways, and that there are discoverable causes of this widespread observable phenomenon; the demand reflects nascent political theory insofar as it presupposes that the silencing of women reveals a systematic pattern of power and authority; and it reflects nascent moral theory insofar as it presupposes that the silencing is unjust and that there are particular ways of remedying this injustice (Lugones & Spelman, 1983, 18-19).

There was a pattern of domination between architecture and interior design, but one cannot forget that the theory of professions posits that any established profession will strongly defend its territory from what they consider the encroachment of another profession. A conclusion cannot be defined as to whether this phenomenon is part of the professionalization process, or is exemplary of male domination. It is probably both.

Jeff Kenney, NCIDQ's Executive Director in his interview said that interior design has come a long way in defining itself in the last twenty-five years. Professionals working on licensing had a quandary; in order to justify the reason for licensing they demonstrated their professional skills by using document packages similar to those of architecture, which included, floor plans, reflected ceiling plans, and millwork details. Sometimes this approach has failed when legislators thought, "this looks like architecture." This emphasizes Havenhand's assertion that by using the older profession's framework of professionalization, interior designers often was not able to differentiate themselves from architecture to the legislators. It was an uphill battle to describe the profession from this supplemental position. Quite often architecture had been able to simplify the discussion in legislative hearings to "interior design is not

architecture and therefore does not protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. It does not need licensing.” By allowing, the definition of interior design to be simplified to “what they are not” (Lugones & Spelman 22), interior design continued in this subsidiary position to architecture.

In addition, in the late 1980s, interior design negotiated its very definition with the AIA, in the form of the Joint Accord. Although this was done with very good intentions, very few professions would allow their main competition a say in defining its legislative agenda.

Conclusion

My research on gender in interior design has revealed (1) The feminine viewpoint gives the interior designer strengths and a unique viewpoint and position in the built environment. This is re-enforced by (A) the theory of behavior on which the profession is based; (B) the unique body of knowledge embedded in the education because of its theory; (C) the concern for the end users’ function and safety; and (D) the ability to incorporate diverse viewpoints into existing contexts in an aesthetically pleasing whole. (2) On the other hand, using architecture as their gauge for professionalization put the profession of interior design in a subservient position to architecture. This has been exacerbated by the overwhelming gender differences between the professions. (3) Interior design’s ability in incorporating the diverse viewpoints, which is an asset for clients, is detrimental when negotiating with other professions.

As Havenhand stated, interior design needs to continue to work on defining itself as an independent profession and accept its feminization. I believe it is important for interior design to embrace its past because it helps differentiate it from other professions.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

I believe that interior design and architecture will benefit from a better mix of genders in each profession. Because of this, there should be considerably more research into gender and the profession of interior design.

The next section discusses the changes to the Building Officials & Code Administrators (BOCA) building code since its inception in 1919.

Chapter 4 – State of the Professions

Section 4 – Building Codes

The development of building codes was to protect the health and safety of the public. This section documents the changes to the building codes to show how these alterations changed the direction of the licensing efforts for interior design. Originally, the profession was concerned about stopping the untrained practitioners from doing interior design and for elevating the prestige of the profession. Once the building codes changed, it became an effort to protect the right to practice as an independent interior designer. It was the changes in 1981 that affected the ability of interior designers to practice independently and increased the impetus for interior designers to go after licensure in jurisdictions all over the United States.

History of Building Codes

This section examines the history and impetus for the change to building codes. The codes arose from two areas of concern: (1) protecting the public from fires and other calamities; (2) protecting specific vulnerable populations from unscrupulous people in the built environment, such as landlords, builders, and developers. The commercial codes set the minimum standards for public spaces and the residential code set minimum standards for housing.

Before 2000, there were three different codes used throughout the United States. They were the Uniform Building Code (UBC), Southern Building Code Congress (SBC) and the code developed by Building Officials & Code Administrators (BOCA). Although in 1981 there were three building codes in effect in the United States, this

section documents the changes in Building Officials & Code Administrators (BOCA). The other codes reflect these modifications.

History of Building Codes

The implementation of building codes protects the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Above all, disasters stand out as the primary impetus for changes in the codes. The great fires, hurricanes and earthquakes have animated the culture to impose building controls to protect the public. This section will examine fire in relation to building codes, because fires are most often affected adversely by the interior selections.

Throughout the centuries, fire has been a concern especially in overcrowded cities with open flames for heat and light in wooden structures. “In 1648, Governor Peter Stuyvesant of New Amsterdam (New York City) was the first in the New World to appoint fire inspectors with the authority to impose fines for fire code violations.”¹³² This was the beginning of establishing a standard for public safety in the New World.

Over the decades the technology for fire fighting changed from bucket brigades to horse propelled pumps with hoses, to self-propelled steam engines that eventually tapped into the city water supply through fireplugs. The new machinery was not well accepted by firefighters until “in Cincinnati, Ohio the public forced a steam engine on the firefighters” (History of Fire Fighting, 2005, 1). Fire safety codes continued to develop after the Great Chicago Fire and the burning of San Francisco after the 1904 earthquake. New building techniques in cities resulted in flame resistant structures that cut down the building-to-building transmission of fires.

As taller buildings were built, the safety needs changed. In 1911, the fire at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory in New York City demonstrated the problem. One hundred

and forty five people (mostly young women) perished in the fire with minimal damage to the structure. The fire was on the eighth, ninth, and tenth floors and the water pumps, ladders, and hoses could not reach those floors. Many people jumped or were pushed to their deaths from the ninth floor because the doors to the stairwells were locked. In addition, the horror intensified when due to the height of the fall, the jumpers fell through the nets the firemen held for them. The public was appalled that a fire in a modern fire-proof building could kill so many.¹³³

Insurance companies quite often led the effort for building code and fire resistance in the built environment.¹³⁴ The fire protection at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory was gravity fed, from a roof storage tank, and stand pipe with a hose and buckets of water on each floor, which did little to provide a means to douse the burning contents. Although sprinklers were developed in 1895, they did not become part of the building code until much later. With each new disaster the building code changed. With the collapse of New York City's World Trade Towers in 2001, new building codes will be adopted to decrease the possibility of such a collapse.

At times, the changes to the code were designed to meet needs perceived by firefighters. In 2005 in an online article, Vincent Dunn, Deputy Chief FDNY (retired) stated that the building codes no longer protect the firefighters adequately. His argument is that the client-driven issues of more lease space on every floor has compromised the safety and the ability of fire fighters to extinguish fires. In addition, ganging stairwells compromises egress because the access to them is often close together. The load for those stairwells is for the egress of only a few floors, not for the egress of the whole building. The current sprayed on fire protection of structural steel is inadequate to

protect the steel structural members, resulting in collapse and injury to firefighters.

According to Dunn, all of these changes have affected the safety of the firefighter in high-rise buildings.

Residential building codes were developed to protect people from living in squalor in rental buildings. The writing of residential building codes required minimum standards for housing by establishing standards. Some of the standards were (1) the number of unrelated people who could occupy a “home” to avoid overcrowding; (2) minimum amount of space necessary for occupation; (3) two means of egress from every sleeping area; (4) minimum standard needed for plumbing and electrical; and (5) requiring kitchens with appliances and running water.

At other times, building codes addressed the specific needs of a vulnerable group of people. For example, in 1990, Congress adopted the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This addition to the code stipulates that everyone, no matter his/her ability, must be treated equally in the new construction of public spaces. In addition, universal design has been developing since the 1980s encompass the needs of everyone using a space.

Creating the building code was not sufficient. What is also important was enforcement, and, in particular, uniform enforcement. A well trained code official and enforcement arm of government is very important for making sure the code is followed.¹³⁵

As a result, over the years the code and its adoption in the jurisdictions created checks and balances. The buildings designed by qualified registered designers such as architects, professional engineers, landscape architects and now interior designers. Their redundant expertise confirm and validate each others work. The building are designed to

a code that sets the parameters of safe buildings. The code officials and building inspectors confirm the building. All of these regulations and codes set in place a web of checks and balances and redundancies that protects the public in the built environment.

Up until 2000 there were three building codes used in the United States. “Building Officials Code Administrators International (BOCA) were used on the East Coast and throughout the Midwest of the United States, while the codes from the Southern Building Code Congress International (SBCCI) were used in the Southeast, and the codes published by the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO) covered the West Coast.”¹³⁶ In 2000, the three codes were combined into the International Building Code 2000 (IBC) which was revised in 2003. The development of the International Residential Code (IRC) happened at the same time.

The codes are constantly being refined to deal with the information learned from each new disaster. New building techniques are tested in a laboratory, and then included in the code, only to be revised with the new information gleaned from each new fire or other disaster investigation. This is an ongoing process, which protects the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Tracking the changes in the BOCA Building Codes

This study includes a comparison of the first chapter of the BOCA building codes for commercial construction from 1965 to 1999. BOCA was used by many jurisdictions and municipalities across the United States, but was especially prevalent in the East and Midwest. Since 1978, the BOCA building code has been revised every three years, but there were extensive revisions to the code in 1978, 1981 and 1993. This comparison begins with the 1965 BOCA Building code, which stated the following:

When Permit is Required. – It shall be unlawful to construct, enlarge, alter, remove or demolish, or change the occupancy of a building from one use group to another requiring greater strength, exit or sanitary provisions; or to change to a prohibited use; or install or alter any equipment for which provisions is made or the installation of which is regulated by the Basic Code, without first filing an application with the building official in writing and obtaining the required permit therefore; except that ordinary repairs as defined in section 102 which do not involve any violation of the Basic Code shall be exempt from the provision. (BOCA 1965, 8)

It can be seen that it is unlawful to do modify a structure without filing for and obtaining the required permit. The next section defines who can file for permits.

By Whom Application is Made. – Application for a permit shall be made by the owner or lessee of the building or structure, or agent of either, or by the licensed engineer or architect employed in connection with the proposed work. If the application is made by a person other than the owner in fee, it shall be accompanied by a duly verified affidavit of the owner or the qualified person making the application that the proposed work is authorized by the owner in fee and that the applicant is authorized to make such applications. The full names and addresses of the owner, lessee, applicant, and the responsible officers, if the owner or lessee is a corporate body, shall be stated in the application (BOCA 1965, 113.1)

In BOCA 1981, there were changes to the repairs and maintenance section, which then provided that only an architect or professional engineer shall design work of:

Cutting away of any wall, partition or portion thereof, the removal or cutting of any structural beam or bearing support, or the removal or change of any required means of egress or rearrangement of parts of a structure affecting the exit requirements; nor shall ordinary repairs include addition to, alteration of, replacement or relocation of any standpipe, water supply, sewer, drainage, drain leader, gas, soil, waste, vent or similar piping, electric wiring or mechanical or other work affecting the public health or general safety”

(BOCA 1981, 113.3)

This change in code and the enforcement of these provisions by building officials effectively made it impossible for interior designers to submit drawings for permits.

The BOCA 1993 language changed from naming the specific profession permitted to file documents to the more generic term “registered design professional.” Provisions also state that the drawings need to be sealed in accordance with the registration laws in the jurisdiction.¹³⁷ The professional architectural and engineering services section emphasized that all construction documents required for a building permit shall be prepared by a registered design professional with sealing provisions.

(BOCA 1993) It should be noted, that if an interior designers were licensed in the state, he/she would be a registered design professional. This change stemmed from a joint effort by the interior design professional organizations. At that time, jurisdictions that had licensing for interior designers, whether a title or practice act, had the ability to

submit documents to building officials once again. This was a big step forward for interior design because it left the decision to issue a permit to the discretion of the building official on the qualifications of the documents submitted.

There were few changes to the BOCA code in 1996 and 1999. Many of the provisions from the BOCA code 1999 have been included in the new International Building Code (IBC) 2000. Because this study is about the period before 2000, the IBC was not examined.

Conclusion

Over the years, there have been many changes and refinements to the building codes dealing with commercial construction. This section finds that in 1981, changes to the repair and maintenance section limited the designer who could prepare and submit documents for permit to only architect and professional engineers. With the enforcement of that provision over the next few years, it effectively made the independent practice of interior design for projects requiring a building permit impossible unless that jurisdiction has licensure. I think that this change was a major impetus for interior designers to attempt to achieve licensing, and changed the direction of the argument to restraint of trade issues.

Conclusion of Chapter 4

It should be noted that while interior design has taken steps to become a profession since changing its name in the 1950s, it was the downturn in the economy in the 1970s that affected its right to practice. Deflation from the over-spending on the Viet Nam war and the oil embargo of 1973 put the United States economy into a prolonged recession. This downturn curtailed new construction, which affected architects who

looked for new sources of revenue (Boynton, 2005). The architects viewed the still-burgeoning fields of interior design and commercial development as usurping the traditional purview of architecture, which included the interior as part of their building package. Conflicts between the professions developed.

The changes to the BOCA building code captured those markets for architecture and professional engineering. The AIA even trained building officials to their duty of enforcement by requiring only the seals of architects and professional engineers on submittals (Boynton, 2005).

This new threat to interior design changed the reasons for licensure. In the beginning, the goal of licensure was an effort to stop the untrained practitioners from doing interior design. Licensure would incidentally increase the prestige of the burgeoning profession. It soon became restraint of trade issue and a fight for interior designs very existence as an independent profession.

I believe that the checks and balances built into the implementation of building code, registration of professionals, and construction process give the built environment an extra measure of protection for the public. Because so many of the decisions that interior design make affect the products that people use on a daily basis and could harm occupants of the space interior design must be included as part of the professional team.

The following chapter will chart this process of attempting to achieve licensure in the three jurisdictions with three levels of licensure.

Chapter 4 – State of the Profession

Section 5 – Justification for Licensure

This section examines the transformation of interior design by examining the changes in residential and commercial design from 1950s through 1970s. There will be a special focus on the changes in office design because 70% of all commercial interior design projects involve office design (ASID White Paper, 1987). These examples will demonstrate the complexity of the issues that interior designers deal with to understand how the unregulated practice of interior design does harm to the public and therefore the profession needs licensure.

As was established in the history of interior design Section 2-4, there was explosive growth in the practice of interior design since World War II. “That prosperity fostered the largest building boom in American history – one that was to last twenty years” (Tate and Smith, 1986, 421). This growth had two aspects; (1) expansion of commercial spaces in existing multi-storied buildings and (2) the expansion of suburbia. The expansion of commercial interior design included the design of offices, retail stores, health-care, hospitality, institutional, and educational facilities (Tate and Smith, 1986).

In order to demonstrate the changes in commercial interior design, I choose office design to show how interior design has expanded from just interior decoration. Office design is used as an example of changes that overtook all commercial environments.

Tate and Smith said, “It was in the 1950s that interior designers – rather than office managers, as had previously been the case – became involved in office interiors in skyscrapers” (Tate and Smith, 1986, 422, & 432). In office design the systems approach of Modernism in architecture led to custom designed furniture and movable partitions in

the 1960s. These were mostly designed by architect. In 1970 Herman Miller, Inc. invented and manufactured the first systems furniture (Tate and Smith, 1986). Interior designers became the experts in designing this new kind of office.

As outlined in Section 2-3, the changes in office design began with the building of large open plan structures designed by architects and built all over the United States from the 1920s onward. The division of spaces into smaller leasable units in these open plan buildings needed someone trained in space planning. Architects were busy designing the structures so interior designers filled this gap in service and designed these new kinds of spaces. Often these demarcated offices had an open office area flanked by enclosed offices, conference rooms, staff lounges, coffee/copy stations, and storage areas.

Tate and Smith said of the 1950s through the 1960s, that this new planning approach required new skills of a step-by-step analysis of human function and activities. Thereby the new scientific discipline of “human factors” was established (Tate and Smith, 1986, 432 & 433). This put the design of commercial, institutional, and educational spaces on a considerably more scientific basis. Interior design, with its training based on the theory of behavior, expanded to fill this market demand. They gave clients spaces that functioned for the occupants and increased productivity (Tate and Smith, 1986).

As early as the 1950s, no longer could the term interior decorator suffice to describe what interior designers did. Decorating two-dimensional wall surfaces was still part of the package, but interior designers increasingly became involved with the three-dimensional design of the interior environment. For example, in the office design

discussed above, interior designers prepared building plans, furniture plans, built-in millwork, and other build-out details such as bulkheads and other interior amenities.

At the same time, the technical infrastructure of offices altered as new technology changed the office forever. Some of these technologies included the invention of copy machines in the 1950s, systems furniture in the 1970s, personal computers in the 1980s, and telecommunication technologies in 1990s. In addition, in the 1950s, the invention of suspended acoustical ceilings (Tate and Smith, 1986) meant that interior designers had to work with electrical engineers in reflected ceiling plans to put lighting in relation to systems furniture. The design had to be flexible as company needs changed. Interior designers concerns were for the function and aesthetics of the space rather than just foot-candle levels that interested the mechanical engineers. In the 1970s, electrical plans increased in complexity because of the new manufactured systems furniture that was hard-wired to the building. The burgeoning use of personal computers needed networking cables connecting each computer to a server. By the 1990s, interior designers consulted with telecommunication specialists for video conferencing and other amenities, which further increased the complexity of these plans. Interior designers worked with mechanical engineers about the location of the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) grills and sprinkler layouts (Tate and Smith, 1986).

In the 1950s through the 1970s, the developing profession responded by expanding and intensifying training based on the theory of behavioral sciences and stressing the micro-environments of how people occupy spaces. This training also added information on building codes, building systems, material and finish properties, mechanical and electrical information. By 1970, it had instituted accreditation of

university training (FIDER), and in 1973, a nationwide examination (NCIDQ) qualified practitioners in the developing profession. Over the years, the examination became increasingly rigorous and reflected the changes in the profession.

Because of these developments, it became important that the public be able to differentiate someone with training from an untrained person who had a flair for colors. Interior designers selected code-driven materials and did space plans where harm of the public became an issue. The development of the profession continued, but it was the efforts for licensing which made interior design develop and refined a definition of this evolving profession.

Since the 1970s, interior designer worked to define the profession, but it still took twenty minutes to explain why interior designers did so much more than select colors, how they protect the health, safety and welfare of the public, and at the same time how they differ from architects. In meetings with legislators, they would describe how the layout of systems furniture affected egress, acoustics, and ergonomic design. How the work-station and chair selection could affect people's health – from neck, back and shoulder problems to carpal tunnel injury. The concerns about health, safety, and welfare include these safety issues, but also include function, productivity, ethical and financial considerations. The concern of interior designers also involved how the selections of materials can modify behavior and affect the psychological welfare of end users as discussed earlier (Tate and Smith, 1986). In the 1990s, the public still could not differentiate between an interior designer and interior decorator and the press used the terms interchangeably. The invention of *HGTV* has only made the confusion worse.

They use unqualified people to decorate rooms reinforcing the stereotypical decorator, but calling them interior designers.

The changes to residential interior design were just as transformative. Levittown, New York was an example of this growth. “Levittown was the first truly mass-produced suburb and is widely regarded as the archetype for postwar suburbs throughout the country.”¹³⁸ Because main-stream architecture has turned its back on residential design, it was interior designers, who helped the owners personalize these tract homes and others like them all over North America. Interior designers filled this burgeoning need with full-service residential design that met the needs of the new occupants (Tate and Smith, 1986). Some of the impetus of change included the growth in the importance of Universal Design¹³⁹ in the 1970s and in aging-in-place¹⁴⁰ movement in the 1980. Security and safety issues of children spending considerable time at home alone had also come to the forefront with both parents working. The expansion of multi-family living, such as upscale condominium complexes in the 1980s and 1990s, also added multiple housing code issues. The training of interior designers to these issues became even more important as they strived to give their clients a unique yet safe environment.

Justification for Licensure

People are injured everyday at home and at work. There are many hazards in the interior environment. For example, national statistics show that there are 300,000 slip and fall injuries that happen each year in the work place which result in disabling injuries.¹⁴¹ These statistics come from for workman’s compensation information, but it can be assumed that as many or more injuries happen in the home. The statistics are daunting.

Second only to motor vehicle accidents; slips, trips and falls are the most frequent accidents leading to personal injury. According to the National Safety Council (NSC), the major cause of accidental deaths and injuries in America are slip-and-fall accidents.¹⁴²

The selection of interior finishes in both commercial and residential environment is important to minimized the risk of slips, trips and falls. Problems come from uneven flooring changes, inappropriate use of area rugs, as well as, slippery flooring surface, which cause injuries. Research on the nature of flooring surfaces such as Dr. Joan Dickinson's *The Effect of Selected Residential Carpeting on the Balance and Gait of Older Healthy Adults*¹⁴³ helps interior designer understand the consequences of their selections. There are other dangers inherent in the specifying of interior products, such as using glass table-tops, which are not tempered, causing injuries.¹⁴⁴

The teaching of this safety information in interior designer programs is required for accreditation. For example, in materials classes in university programs students learn building and ADA codes, ANSI, ASTM and other testing protocols, barrier free design and even indoor air quality information such as: materials that off gas, which can cause health problems. While sales representatives give the interior designers updated information, interior design continuing education programs supply information without a product bias and provide information about new research on these important topics.

It is one thing for a person to select finishes for their own residence, it is another when someone hires a design professional to make those selections. Interior designers sell their professional expertise to the public for a fee. Therefore it is vital for that public to be able to differentiate the qualified from the unqualified practitioners.

Jeff Kenney put it this way in his interview that the public demands more out of their environments, they use interior designers to meet those demands (Kenney, 2005). This goes far beyond the selection of a color or pattern for a wall covering or fabric. In addition, selections can be just as important in a residential setting where codes are not as much of a factor, but the psychological well-being of the family is.

Waldron said defining the credentials of professional interior designers who give clients this degree of expertise is critical (Waldron, 2005). The expertise of interior design is about how people function in a space to the optimum of their abilities (Maurer, 2005). Wiedegreen stated in his interview, “there’s a difference certainly between a decorator and an interior designer... that license is critical in that definition. That health, safety, and welfare aren’t just three words – it’s a philosophy and a stringency of who we are as a profession” (Wiedegreen, 2006).

Conclusion

This section demonstrates how the different aspects of interior design affect not only the safety through code driven selection of material, but also the health and welfare of people who occupy space in the public arena and private arena. In the complexity of today’s build environment, there are layers of checks and balances from the building code to the regulatory boards protect public from un-qualified practitioners, interior design needs to be part of the protections. These redundancies and checks and balances verify each aspect of the building before and during construction.

Chapter 5 – Case Studies

Section 1 – Washington, D.C.

This chapter is the main body of research for this dissertation. It documents interviews with people active in the process of licensure for interior design in three jurisdictions. The parameters of choice of jurisdictions were three fold. (1) They resulted with three different levels of licensure. (2) They were active in the process for a similar length time. (3) They were in close proximity to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. These stories will trace the conflicts and stressors on interior design in the efforts for licensure.

These three case studies synthesize the interviews of people active in the legislative efforts for interior design licensure. Each individual interview documented their personal perceptions of what happened in the process from the 1970s through 2007. As with all personal reflections, these accounts project the viewpoint of the participants, which may have been subject to revisionist thinking over time with hindsight. Therefore, three separate interviews were made when possible from each jurisdiction to confirm events. In addition, documents produced at the time the events happened and archived at ASID National were used to triangulate the interviews.

Washington, D.C.

To understand the process that led to licensing of interior designers in Washington, D.C., the author interviewed Vincent G. Carter,¹⁴⁵ NCIDQ, ASID, CID-Maryland (Certified Interior Designer State of Maryland) and Andrea Kelly, NCIDQ, ASID, CID-D.C. The Carter interview took place at Union Station in Washington, D.C.

on November 20, 2005.¹⁴⁶ Andrea Kelly's telephone interview was on December 1, 2005.¹⁴⁷

Carter discussed his role in achieving licensing for interior designers in the 1980s through 1997. He discussed the efforts for licensure from its inception through his term on the Interior Designer Registration Board for Washington, D.C. Carter was the first Chairperson of that Board. In 2005, when the interview took place Carter lived in Maryland and was a certified interior designer there.

Andrea Kelly, ASID became active with her appointment to the joint regulatory Board for Architecture and Interior Design in 2002. While she was not active in the process of achieving licensure, she discussed her expertise as a current (2005) member of the Board in Washington, D.C. She stated that attitudes on that board have changed during her tenure. She was a licensed interior designer who had been practicing in the District since 1985. Kelly's tenure on the Board was renewed in 2007.

Carter stated that many volunteers have worked toward licensing in D.C. Therefore, Carter and Kelly represent the active participants in the process. They have related their memories of events in which they participated without examining documents. The review of documents achieved at ASID National during the events validated their memories. The following is a synopsis of the interviews with Carter and Kelly. Three other interior designers who were very active in the process declined an interview.

Reasons for Participation in the Process

People become active in the political process for various reasons. Carter's reasons included the fact that he lived and worked in Washington, D.C. and felt it was

important for interior designers who resided and offered interior designs services in D.C. to participate in the process. He said that it is the location of the project, which determines whether an interior designer needs a license in Washington, D.C. Therefore, a designer does not have to live in D.C. to practice. Carter's resident status at that time was very important as a voter and tax payer in the District.

Kelly discussed her unique background: before moving into interior design, she had a degree in another field and worked with NBC broadcasting for years. In 1985, while she attended Mt. Vernon College, she worked at the Design Center. Eventually she started a practice, began to understand the profession, and she felt that she needed professional credentials. Kelly reiterated, "I could have been grandfathered" into licensing in Washington, D.C., but to practice in other states she needed "NCIDQ certification." She put her business on hold to go back to school. By 1993, she had a degree in interior design. Once she graduated, she started working in an architectural firm and passed the NCIDQ examination. In 2002, when she heard that the Board of Architects and Interior Designers needed new members, she volunteered.

Political Landscape

Carter described Washington, D.C.'s unique political organization. The District of Columbia is a city that is separate entity from any state. While it has no representation in the Congress of the United States, Congress has legislative oversight for final approval for all matters concerning the District. A spokesperson, who is appointed by the mayor, lobbies for Washington, D.C. in Congress to influence votes about the district, but D.C. itself has no direct representation. Because it is, a city government, legislation follows a different track than most state governments.

It has an elected a nine-person City Council and mayor. Legislation goes through a hearing process in committee to modify legislation. Once the committee approves the legislation, it moves to the council and is voted on. Then the bill goes to the United States Congress for approval and funding. Approval is usually a rubber stamp by the committee that oversees the District of Columbia and then the full house confirms the legislation and/or funding. When the Congress approves the bill, the mayor signs it and it is implemented. On occasion the mayor may veto bills.

Legislative Process

Because of Washington, D.C.'s unique position in the United States government, changes in the Federal and city administrations affect the business climate in the District. The ebb and flow of the economic changes with each new Federal administration present many business challenges in the District because of funding changes. In addition, each new city administration has the potential to implement different rules and regulations, which affect the business climate.

According to Carter, the process of working for licensure began in 1983 in response to those challenges. "Some interior designers in the area saw the need to become a recognized profession." In addition, he said that they wanted to stay a step ahead of the rest of the country – to be the leaders and impetus for licensing in the United States. In fact, the effort in D.C. started before ASID National established their legislative support group in 1985. Key members of the D.C. design community such as Penny Bonda, FASID, who became ASID National president soon after these events and influenced the national movement toward licensure.

Once interior designers in D.C. realized the need for recognition through registration, fifteen to twenty designers formed a coalition to begin to work toward registration. They hired an attorney who worked for NCIDQ and lived in Washington, D.C., to draft a bill. The coalition worked closely with the city council in preparing the draft. They especially received feedback from council members John Wilson and Charlene Drew Jarvis.

Because of the unique governmental organization of the city council, the coalition had to focus its efforts on the mayor and nine members of the council. The coalition worked hard to inform the council members about the issues. Carter admitted, “We were in fairly good political standing in the District,” because they participated in the political process, including donating to individual council members’ election campaigns. The coalition found that the number of people contributing to campaigns was important. “It demonstrated the breadth of the support, so it was better to have a list of 100 donors rather than two big contributors.”

The legislative process continued with the final draft of the bill. The committee overseeing regulatory boards began the formal review process. This review had to satisfy council members that the new law is necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public from harm, without being onerous. The review process gave any interested party time to become familiar with the bill, comment on the bill and participate in public hearings. Carter stated, “The review process varies depending on the severity of the legislation, from thirty to ninety days.” Carter said that he and other interior designers testified at the public hearing. They emphasized how interior designers could improve “the health, safety, and welfare of the public by being licensed.” The testimony gave the

council members concrete examples of how “interior designers touch lives in so many ways” in both residential and commercial design.

After the hearing, but during the review process, Carter related that Council member John Wilson changed their bill from a title act to a practice act. Wilson stated that a practice act was more comprehensive and truly protected the public. With the approval of the committee, the legislative process went very quickly. Council members considered the comments and recommendations. They approved the bill on the first vote. The Congressional review approved the bill and the mayor signed it into law. Within the first few years, one thousand one hundred interior designers became licensed.

Carter related that when the bill changed to a practice act there was a lot of consternation in the interior design community, “a lot of people did not want to push through a practice [act].” He said that they were concerned about the perceived strength of the opposition from the AIA; they felt it was difficult to achieve, because it would receive a lot of opposition, and would make the architects angry.

Opposition to Legislation

As with any proposal for new regulation, there are groups that oppose the efforts for licensure of interior designers. Carter singled out two main opponents – the AIA and interior design educators. In his opinion, the AIA opposition arose from a concern about the revenues generated by projects: “They feel that we were taking away their potential revenue and that we were not qualified to practice interior design.” Carter continued the architects believe they do interior design. If the architect could not design the interior, then at least they should be in charge to supervise the project.¹⁴⁸

In Carter's opinion, during the Joint Accord (1989 – 1999), "the AIA [was] trying to set up harder requirements for interior designers [to be licensed] than they have had [for themselves] in the past, or even now." For example, in some jurisdictions architects were grand-parented into their own registration with lesser qualifications than are currently required. As late as the 1970s there were architects "who did not even have a degree" in architecture, but could sit for the ARE exam. He reiterated that their requirements became more stringent over time. Carter believed that the AIA is trying to structure unreasonable interior design registration parameters.

On the other hand, he said the AIA wanted to require interior designers to have a degree from a FIDER (now, CIDA) accredited interior design program in order to register for licensure.¹⁴⁹ Carter continued that the AIA also wanted continuing education (CE) requirements for interior designers. Continuing education units for interior design are full day training sessions by independent experts, which are vetted and accredited by Interior Design Continuing Education Council (IDCEC). They have "proven specific benefits to the profession." He stated in some jurisdictions registration boards for architecture do not require architects to have continuing education. He also noted, the AIA gives credits for learning units (LU). A learning unit may be a "lunch and learn" where manufacturers present new products in an hour while they serve lunch in order for people to attend. These are not equal to day-long continuing education units, which are not allowed to be product oriented.

Carter said that over the years since their bill passed "the professional associations for interior design have tended to compromise¹⁵⁰ in the various jurisdictions to change the language to make it amenable to the AIA, more so than for ourselves." The interior

designers hoped that through negotiation and compromise that the AIA would not oppose their efforts.

Carter said that initially there was a lot of national level resistance to registration from educators in interior design. They opposed licensing, because in his opinion they “could not become licensed themselves.” Although the bill in Washington, D.C. had grand-parenting provisions, those provisions required the applicant to have practiced interior design full time for the three years prior to the enactment of the bill. These requirements excluded those educators who had never practiced interior design and/or those who feared taking and failing the NCIDQ examination. This resistance lessened over the years as educators began to understand how important licensure was to the future right to practice of their students.

Support for Legislation

Carter described the effort to achieve licensing in Washington, D.C. as a collaborative effort of volunteers from the different interior design organizations and the public. Because metropolitan Washington, D.C. covers two states and the district, the coalition included designers affiliated with ASID, IBD (now IIDA), and non-affiliated designers who lived and/or worked in Washington, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia. In addition, educators and students from colleges and universities in the area that had interior design programs helped with the coalition. He noted, Washington, D.C. comprised a transient population, so there were graduates of interior design programs from around the country who lived in the area and helped the coalition.

Carter said that ASID and IBD supported legislative efforts, as did students, educators, and many suppliers of products to interior design. Support came from the other

licensed professionals in the community. These included builders, mechanical contractors, HVAC contractors, and other allied professions. In October 1987, the coalitions and its allies achieved the first practice legislation for interior designers in the continental United States.

Implementation of the Legislation

Once the legislation passed, the mayor appointed five members to a Board of Regulation for Interior Design. The Board consisted of three interior designers, an educator, and a member of the public. After the appointment of Carter as chairperson of the first Board of Interior Design Regulation, work began to organize the new Board. It took a few months for the Board to draft rules and regulations, and to set up the process for the credentialing of applicants.

Carter said the coalition estimated that there were a minimum of two thousand interior designers in the metro area. He admitted that predicting the number of interior designers in the district was hard because it depended on how one defined interior design. Before the enactment of the law, there were architects, interior designers, interior decorators, and even “individuals, who called themselves interior designers” when they were not. Many of these practitioners applied for registration. People who did not have the qualification had one year grand-parenting to register.

Carter explained that grand-parenting allowed people who have not fulfilled all of the qualifications for registration to become licensed during a limited window of opportunity. Some of the strict criteria were waived for people who can prove they have required experience, but not the education or passage of the examination. Quite often legislators will require grand-parenting with legislation to avoid disenfranchising

individuals who have been practicing for years. Grand-parenting is important in a jurisdiction with a practice act because a person cannot do the work involved in the regulated profession unless they are licensed/regulated. Grand-parenting in Washington, D.C. required practicing interior design full time for three years prior to the enactment of legislation and gave them one year to apply.

Carter recounted that some designers were upset when they did not qualify for grand-parenting or missed the grand-parenting period. Because practice legislation does not allow a practitioner to do the things involved in the licensed profession; often the requirements for grand-parenting are less strict in practice jurisdictions. For example, Washington, D.C. had practice legislation, which had weaker qualifying standards than Virginia with title legislation. While this weaker qualifying standard initially allows less qualified people into the profession, once the initial grand-parenting period was over, it offers more protection to the public because only qualified individuals can actually practice the profession. As the older people retire, only practitioners with more stringent qualifications practice. As of the end of 2007 in the United States, there are six jurisdictions with practice acts and twenty with title registration.

In 1992, the Interior Design Board of Regulation came under attack during the budget crisis in D.C. The discussion is included in the Challenges to Legislation section below. Soon after, the Interior Design Board merged with the Board of Architects.

Kelly had been a member of the joint Board of Architecture and Interior Design since 2004. She discussed the selection process for the Board. Usually the professional organizations make nominations to the Mayor of the District of Columbia. The new combined board included “three architect members, three interior design members, and

one consumer member.” The mayor selected the board and the chairperson of the board from that group of nominations. Kelly said, “Our job is to approve licenses, continuing education (CE) courses, and preside at hearings.” The hearings are about infractions of a licensed individual because of a consumer complaint.

Challenges to Legislation

While having a practice act increased the level of recognition of the profession in Washington, D.C., interior designers faced many hurdles in the 1990s. There was a sharp reduction of the number of registered interior designers from 1994 to 1997. Carter described the reduction because of the budget crisis in the early 1990s. There were two events, which affected registration of all registered professions. (1) A 50% reduction in the staff of the regulatory boards led to the elimination of the enforcement staff.¹⁵¹ (2) A new professional assessment fee of \$250.00 was added to the \$50.00 annual renewal fee for each registered professional.¹⁵² For interior design in addition to the increasing fees there were the expenses of continuing education required by law. Carter stated, “As the cost mounted the numbers [of licensees] dwindled.” He continued, the professional fee confused many designers. Some let their licenses lapse because of the cost of the assessment, and others paid the new \$250.00 fee without actually renewing their licenses. As a consequence, interior design registrants dropped from 1,100 to 690 in three short years.¹⁵³ These events led to an impetus toward deregulation, which will be discussed in the Budget Crisis section below.

Enforcement

Although those financial pressures were great, the lack of enforcement of licensing laws was another pressure that may have led to people dropping their license or

not getting one in the first place. Both Carter and Kelly explained that the complexity of the enforcement process began with someone filing a complaint with the Board. The complaint initiated an investigation which, if found to be justified, led to a formal hearing, a finding, and an appropriate punishment. The cuts in the investigative branch by Mayor Kelly curtailed investigations and enforcement stopped.¹⁵⁴ In addition, Carter said, “It took such a long time to complete the investigations” that interior design projects were complete before the hearings and fines. On the other hand, the Compliance Division prosecuted unlicensed behavior. They also suffered a reduction in funding, which led to a lack of enforcement of unlicensed activity. So unlicensed practitioners were often not fined for unlicensed activity.

Carter explained that the fine of \$250.00 levied per infraction was not high enough to stop people from illegal practice. They “would pay the fine, pass the cost on to their client, and continue working.” The fine for someone accused of practicing without a license was regarded as an acceptable cost of doing business. The Board wanted to increase the fine to \$1,000.00. Carter said, “in order to make people listen you have to hurt them.” No increases took place while Carter was on the Board.

Kelly reiterated the need to increase fines. They have increased to \$500.00. The Board was working toward an increase to \$2,000.00 for the first offense, with the fine increasing with each additional infraction. Kelly hopes “they have to sit up and take notice.” The architects on the Board would also like this increase in fines.

Both Carter and Kelly noted a problem of unlicensed designers getting national attention in trade magazines. Kelly stated, “There are some well known celebrity designers [who] are in the shelter magazines.” They are unlicensed, “and yet they

continue to practice in the District. It infuriates the Board. “Our problem is the public is not willing to complain about these people, because they are enchanted with them.”

Carter stated, “The biggest culprits were large architectural firms from out-of-state who came into the District for the larger projects.” He related that the law allows registered architects to practice interior design without an interior design license. These well-publicized projects done by designers not licensed in Washington, D.C. decreased the impetus for licensing of interior designers in D.C.

Kelly said that improving enforcement of the licensing law is difficult because in Washington, D.C. the Board cannot initiate charges against unlicensed practice because the Board has jurisdiction only over those designers who are licensed. Enforcement is done by a separate entity.¹⁵⁵ The public must report someone practicing without a license, offering services without a license, or people using the title without a license. She has been told, if a Board member reported illegal practice it “might make us liable” to potential lawsuits for going after unlicensed activity.

Budget Crisis

Carter stated that cutting the number of staff in the regulation departments and adding fees had a positive affect on the cash flow of the regulatory part of the Washington, D.C. government Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA), but the budget crisis continued. Consequently, the Business Regulatory Reform Commission (BRRC), formed in 1997, examined all registered professions in an effort to streamline government.¹⁵⁶ They reviewed the cost of regulation versus the protection of the public. Interior design was one of the programs considered for elimination. In a fax from Carter to Kathi Bakin, the Governmental Affairs Director at ASID National, Carter

summarized a meeting with Linda Cropp, the chairperson of the reform commission, as follows: “Her rationale for proposing elimination [of the interior design board] was the need to reduce costs within the DCRA. This was prompted by “the low number of licensees, minimal number of hearings, and low number of complaints filed against Interior Designers.” In response, Carter “countered that of course there were few complaints, etc. recognizing the funding for the investigative unit was abolished during former Mayor Kelly’s term.”¹⁵⁷

As chairperson of the Board of Regulation for Interior Design, Carter was very active with the coalition to stop this deregulation. The coalition drafted four versions of letters for interior designers to use in defending and maintaining licensure. These letters allowed designers to choose the appropriate letter to fit their circumstances. They also could write their own letter, but include the pertinent information in the body of the text. “This was before the Internet. We flooded them (the City Council) with faxes and voice mails from the metro D.C. area and from people all over the country, such as California, Florida, Oregon, and even Canada.”

In paper work archived with ASID National, Carter reported about his testimony at the hearings. He questioned why there was no invitation for interior design to participate in the BRRC review process, even though there was an AIA person who was a member of BRRC.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, he was surprised that a number of professions under review were not consulted during the information gathering aspect of this review.¹⁵⁹

His testimony focused on protecting the public and the fact that the Interior Design Board could cover its own expenses “if allowed to raise fees.” Other designers testified on other points. The huge amount of work by the interior design community

thwarted the effort for deregulation . On October 9, 1997 Carter sent a fax to Kathy Bakin about the BRRC hearings just completed the day before. In it he states, “We were heard, and look forward to the next step, which will probably be a request to consider a joint board.”¹⁶⁰

After the hearings, when Mayor Barry did not renew Carter’s term of office, he stepped down as chairperson and member of the Board of Interior Design Regulation. The archival documents of the licensing process in Washington, D.C. at ASID National headquarters stopped with his departure from the Board. Soon after, the Board of Interior Design merged with the Board of Architecture.

Perception of the Public

Carter and Kelly both believe the profession has changed since regulation. The public recognized a level of professionalism that they did not before D.C.’s practice legislation. Carter feels, “We can easily educate the public by promoting who we are, using acronyms behind our name, putting [a] licensing number on [our] business card, just making the public aware the regulation exists and that we are a registrant.” He continued that a potential client interviewed him recently and asked, “Are you licensed, are you NCIDQ certified, are you a member of a professional organization? All the questions you want them to ask.”

In addition, Carter stressed the need for employers and vendors to require licensure for all employees and remind governmental bodies to request licensed individuals for projects. For example, typically when the government solicits business from interior designers the document will say, “NCIDQ preferred” as part of the qualification statement. That is another way to educate people. The interior design

community needs to remain vigilant and active in advancing the profession to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public from harm.

Perception of Interior Designers

When asked about changes in the perception of interior designers about their profession, Kelly discussed the changes that she has witnessed as a Board member. Now the process of professionalization has differentiated interior design members on the board. “There are two people on the board right now who are [NCIDQ] certificate holders. One who is not.” They have different viewpoints about enforcement of the regulation. “It dilutes our power [on the board] in many ways because we are not like minded.” The architects, on the other hand, are all NCARB and they have all passed the ARE, giving them an additional solidarity. In addition in the past, there has been a tendency to be on the board for prestige and what it does for your business, “rather than ensuring professional practice.”

Kelly stated that registration has changed “our perception about ourselves. My current position allows me to mentor the less experienced designers.” For a while, “we were running away from the decorator [image]... now we are comfortable” with both decoration and design, and we have “reconnected with” our past.

Perception of Other Professions

Kelly stated that there was animosity between the architects and interior designers on the board when she first joined. “In the beginning, it was like two meetings going on in the same room. At hearings, there was awkwardness at first.” Interior designers on the Board, such as Carter and Kelly, took their jobs seriously and demonstrated a level of professionalism that the architects had begun to respect. Bob Boynton, FAIA stated in

his interview that architects have begun to understand the competence of a well-trained interior designer and the value they bring to a project. Kelly stated that now the joint Board in D.C. has begun to work together on issues that affect both professions.

Personal Changes

Kelly said, “I have grown by being on the Board. Because I [entered] the Board [knowing] no history about it, I had to study the regulations, and I now know them by heart.” She believed the interior design part of the Board could not be window-dressing, “but protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.” In addition to studying the regulations, “the FIDER and NCIDQ [national] meetings helped me a lot.” They were a resource to learn about accrediting of educational programs and professional examinations. She understands how they interconnect with the professional organizations into the big picture. She felt that she owed it to the people she was representing to have a criteria to assess her decisions to know “my opinions were honorable, and informed, and not off-the-cuff.” Kelly stated once she understood the position of interior design, she began to understand the architect’s position.

Other Concerns

While licensing and enforcement involve a complicated process, much of the justification for registration and appropriation of funds comes from a record kept on infractions and other statistics. D.C. had hired a new program manager and administrator for the Board will help them have more statistical information to track of cases and Board decisions.

Kelly was concerned about liability in her activities as a member of the Board of Architecture and Interior Design. Board members are protected when they are acting

within their statutory powers, but Kelly reported intimidating telephone calls to her business and heard about calls to other board members. She explained, “They [threaten to] go after us individually.” She continued, “You do your civic duty, but you don’t want to lose everything you own.” Kelly stated that this threat of lawsuits against Board members is a problem so that the AIA has modified its enforcement for fear of lawsuits.” Kelly is concerned that this penchant for litigation compromised enforcement.¹⁶¹

In Kelly’s opinion, the enforcement arm for the District does not take the professions of architecture and interior design seriously, “because there have been no [recent] major events where buildings have collapsed and people died.” Between the two professions, “they take architecture more seriously.” As far as interior design goes, she laments, “they still think of us as decorators,” but enforcement is getting better. The public, clients, and other licensed professionals, are doing their part.

Impact of Legislation

Practice Act

Kelly discussed the importance of Washington, D.C.’s practice act, which includes title protection. This means, “No longer can an individual practice interior design or call themselves a designer [without a license].” Nor can someone licensed in another profession practice or call him or herself an interior designer. Carter reiterated, “That makes all the difference.” A practice act ideally stops unlicensed practitioners from doing the work. With a title act, only the title is regulated; anyone can do the work involved just use “another title, such as space planner.”

Carter and Kelly both believe a practice act is important. Carter stated, “The impact of the practice act has been major for interior design in D.C. It raised the level of

acceptance and level of authority.” Since the passage of the bill in D.C., it has increased the level of professionalism and the acceptance as a professional has increased. He stated that it has made people more aware of NCIDQ and FIDER (now, CIDA) because they are written as qualifications in the law, mentioned in the legislation, or discussed as an exception in legislation.

Enforcement issues aside, Kelly thinks that the practice act has changed interior design in the District. “Our product is better, more thoughtful, more universal, and [there are] less people showing up with bolts of fabric.” She continued, we are now “serious professionals that [clients] can count on to interpret building codes and ADA codes.” Clients respect “our judgment more.” In addition, Kelly believes the development of *The Body of Knowledge* document for interior design is critical to advancing the profession.

Carter explained further, a licensed individual must educate people when they use the “term interior decorator.” The public does not understand that an “interior decorator works from the structure in and applies finishes to surfaces.” On the other hand, “An interior designer works with the individual and designs from the inside out” in three dimensions. “There is the big difference between the two. You explain that difference to enough people and they begin to understand.”

Kelly stated regulation has forced us “to reconnect... with the consumer... and the commercial consumer is really seeing [the value of] that.” They realize designers make a difference to the quality of the overall project. “Every generation will get better. It does not mean that it is not difficult to practice, but our supporters really care...” With a laugh she continued, in some ways “I don’t think the public cares about a designer being licensed, until they want to sue.”

Kelly discussed her goals for her next term. The board needs to work on enforcement of the practice act and to “see more interior designers licensed. Our numbers are dropping.” But, she reiterated without enforcement there is no perceived value for being licensed. People who are not licensed need to be accountable and learn the value of being licensed, “Compliance and enforcement; they are the next big goals.”

The 2005 Board was still struggling for funding. “We are not alone struggling; boards [from around the country] were not funded.” She stated that communication with the people enforcing unlicensed activity was getting better. “They apprise us of what they are doing with people practicing without a license.” Once enforcement became more robust, Kelly would like to review the interior design act to make it more current. The process of revising the law included working with the board attorney to revise the language, then submitting the new language to the board in draft form for revisions. Eventually the revised language will go to City Council for approval. The practice act needed revisions to fit with the NCIDQ model code and to delete grand-parenting. This would make reciprocity with other jurisdictions easier. She commented that the architects are also reviewing their language, “but interior design is further along in the process.” She admitted, “The architects are looking at what we are doing to make sure that there is nothing untoward.”

Board Concerns

Kelly diverted the interview to discuss a concern the board had about the “number of architects not taking [the] ARE exam.” The discussion of this topic was also in Bob Boynton, Jeff Kenney, and Mark Courtney interviews. It was a concern of many of the practitioners interviewed. Because of the high costs of taking the ARE examination and

the high cost of maintaining a license, many large architectural firms had one licensed professional in each jurisdiction where the company practiced. That person reviewed and signed off on all of the drawings for his or her jurisdiction and accepted the liability for the firm for any mistakes in the drawings. Kelly explained that originally, this practice “was designed for apprentices,” but in some firms newly graduated architects were no longer encouraged to take the ARE examination. The concern of some firms was the cost of licensure. Other firms did not want to invest time and money needed for a new employee to become licensed only to have them leave soon after to start their own firm. Kelly continued that there could be architects working for twenty years who had not taken the exam. There was “nothing [illegal or], right or wrong [about this practice]; it was all about money” and firms do not want to pay for additional examinations and licenses with one person to supervise and seal drawings.

Mark Courtney, of the APELSLAID Board in Virginia, was concerned that the practice of unlicensed individuals working on projects circumvented the system designed to protect of the public. This system was built-in to the regulations and codes with redundancies of overlapping professional expertise and check and balances. Each licensed professional working on a project verifying each other’s work to protect the public into today’s complex built environment. This expertise was reinforced by building codes, code officials and inspectors reviewing the projects at every level of construction.

Kelly was concerned that the practice may soon become the “same with interior designers.” In addition, with the current budget crises in government, the reduced number of licensees could be used as an argument that regulation is no longer necessary. In addition, the Board was concerned about the “project management movement.” This

was where people supervise projects without the proper certification usurping billable supervisory duties from registered architects and interior designers.

Conclusion

Washington, D.C. had the first practice legislation for interior design in the continental United States. This examination of the process of achieving licensure demonstrates the following: A small legislative body makes it is easy to educate the council people about the profession of interior design and to donate to campaigns. A small concerted group of interior designers can have a large impact on a small group of legislators. The speed of legislation can be critical to its success. One key legislator can make a change to the legislation, such as the practice act, which benefits the profession. Practice legislation protects the public because it stops the untrained from practicing. Practice legislation starts with weaker credentialing, but becomes stronger as non-credentialed practitioners retire. Practice legislation leads to a respect for interior designs value by the public and other professions.

This jurisdiction demonstrates some of themes that will be revealed in other jurisdictions. As Abbott discussed in Section 2-2, opposition to licensure from within the profession is often from people who do not understand licensing. They fear they may not be able to be licensed, so oppose it. Opposition from other professions is fierce and multi-pronged. Once the battle for registration is over, the animosity between professions lessens. The joint concerns of the professions bridge the differences and may lead to an understanding of the other profession's value on both sides of the gap.

There is a misunderstanding by the interior design community about the real cost of licensure and the hidden costs behind regulation as outlined in Section 2-4. With the

efforts to reduce taxes and reduce the size of government deregulation of all professions will continue to be a real force. Coalitions need a better understanding of how governments work, not just the legislative process, but basic concepts as the balance of power of the administrative, judicial and legislative branches. In light of budget cuts and deregulation efforts, interior designers must become licensed and maintain that position. Finally, this jurisdiction demonstrates that interior design can be an integral part of the checks and balances of the built environment that protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

Chapter 5 – Case Studies

Section 2 – The Commonwealth of Virginia

On October 25, 2005, the interview with Barbara Goodwin, ASID, CID-Virginia (Certified Interior Designer in the Commonwealth of Virginia) took place at Gilley's Restaurant in Blacksburg, Virginia.¹⁶² Goodwin described her role in achieving a title act for Virginia in 1990. On September 10, 2006, Janet Kane, FASID, CID-Virginia was interviewed over the telephone from her retirement home in Florida.¹⁶³ Kane worked licensure from the 1970s through the early 1990s. On August 1, 2007 Ann W. Putney Manson¹⁶⁴ was interviewed with Barbara Goodwin at Goodwin's home near Richmond, Virginia. Manson was most active during the effort to resist deregulation in the 1990s. All three women related their memories of events in which they participated without examining documents. In fact, Kane commented "OK. You're making me drag up a lot of old information and I hope I am correct." Although these were just three of many volunteers who worked on the Committee for Certification of Virginia Interior Designers (CCVID), these designers played a role in the process of achieving licensure and continued to be active through many challenges to registration from the early 1970s through the year 2006. Once again, documents archived at ASID National were used to confirm information. The following is a synopsis of the interviews with Kane, Goodwin, and Manson.

Kane began the interview by discussing her involvement, which began somewhere between 1976 and 1978. Kane related that LT¹⁶⁵ and she initiated the first attempts at political activity in Virginia. Both Kane and LT were leaders of ASID in Virginia at that time.¹⁶⁶ Kane related, this was so early in the process that, "Of course,

we didn't have criteria to go on for licensing of interior designers." So they had to gather information about interior design because this effort was nine years before ASID National formed its legislative group. She continued, "We forged ahead, thought we were very well prepared, and we went before the Board of Trade." The results were not what she expected, "The whole thing was a farce. They thought we were all a bunch of decorators, and why in the world would we want to be licensed!?"¹⁶⁷ After this, they decided they needed to regroup and find out what some of the other chapters were doing about licensing.

With Kane and LT's background, they had not expected this response from the board. Kane discussed their backgrounds. LT was a highly qualified, commercial designer who was the head of the design group at one of the large national banks. The bank "had built [a] tower building and [she] had been responsible for the entire project." Kane continued she felt herself to be "just as well qualified" as LT. She remembered with intensity, "these people on this board practically laughed us right out of the room." She and her colleagues decided to "do this the proper way."

Reasons for Participating

The meeting in Baltimore in 1980 that Goodwin discussed in Section 3-5 was part of the process of trying to "do this in the proper way." Interior designers, architects, dealers and other interested parties got together to try to form a consensus about the scope of interior design work. Goodwin came away from that meeting with the "realization that architects really don't think we should be practicing [interior design], except under their jurisdiction." Until that time, she had thought interior designers were working on licensure to stop unqualified people from practicing.

Because of her lack of experience of working on licensure, the attitude of the architect in that Baltimore meeting really surprised Goodwin. She stated, “after all she worked for architectural firms for fourteen years.” In her experience, many architects wanted to work with interior designers. They knew “they need us; they like us, and they like the fact that we can bring in extra income.” Despite her experience, Goodwin related that, in the architects’ opinion, interior designers should work under their supervision. She continued, “I am saying this, not out of anger and bitterness, because I have worked for architects” who emphasized the value of having a design team including, “interior designers, architects, [and] engineers.” The meeting in Baltimore “broke me out of my [state of] naiveté.”

Political Landscape

Goodwin explained that Virginia has a part time legislature; the sessions are from January to the middle of February. In addition, every fourth year there is a shorter session and sometimes they have emergency sessions.

Legislative Process

Goodwin related that they formed the Committee for Certification of Virginia Interior Designers (CCVID) in the mid 1980s and held their first meeting in Richmond. They believed that there were about 2,000 to 2,500 interior designers practicing in Virginia. They hired Mark Rubin as their lobbyist. He “had gotten licensure for landscape architects” and that experience proved very helpful to the committee. CCVID believed that interior design was similar to landscape architecture in the issues that affected their efforts toward licensure. For example, early on landscape architecture had retail providers called nursery-men, who sold products and gave design away for free.

Interior design also had designers who sold product for retail prices and the design was free as part of the sale. Goodwin stated that CCVID asked the landscape architects if they could hire Rubin because they “didn’t want to step on any toes.” Rubin was an “attorney, a lobbyist, and Democrat and that is what we needed at the time. He was extremely helpful.” They worked with Rubin to draft legislation, get sponsors and schedule the timing of their bills. He also monitored the legislation of other groups. Goodwin said that “A couple of years ago, a new policy required that bills [be] in the hopper about two weeks ahead” of the session. She explained this new policy made it much easier to monitor other legislative efforts rather than watching for new bills every day of the session.

Both Goodwin and Kane stated a lobbyist could be very cost-prohibitive to coalitions with limited funds. Goodwin said they saved money on the lobbyist because he had other clients whose needs coincided with theirs. She continued that his connection with other clients helped in interior designers’ efforts. Rubin told the committee that he was already going to talk to legislators for another group and “it is just a matter of saying the right thing to the right people” while he was standing there.

Rubin helped CCVID draft legislation. Kane and Goodwin referred to a meeting in Rubin’s office. Kane’s excitement showed when she said, “I swear I felt like I was in Congress. It just sent chills up and down my spine, when we signed off on the bill.”

At the same time they were writing the legislation, they organized a grass roots lobbying effort. Because CCVID did not have money to donate to legislator’s campaigns, they needed a wide support base of interior designers. The lobbyist helped train them for grassroots lobbying. They learned how to do the telephone calls to ask for

support. They made a political contact list, Goodwin stated that there were only about twelve political contacts and “hardly any of them were clients.”

Kane explained that by 1987, ASID had formed the national legislative group and other jurisdictions had gotten far along with their licensing efforts. This allowed CCVID to put together more substantive documentation for hearings about the practice of interior design. She stated that they went to the first hearing “loaded for bear” and gave the committee a lot of information. In her opinion, the most effective testimony was the fire chief of Roanoke, Virginia, who cited different fire situations his firefighters¹⁶⁸ and he had experienced.¹⁶⁹ Also, effective was the testimony of a nurse who became an interior designer.¹⁷⁰ She spoke of different reasons for licensing, including accidents that would not have happened if a person with an understanding of code was doing the interior selections.

Goodwin described how easily hearings can be diverted and “kill a bill in committee.” She recounted a hearing in 1987 where a woman stood up and said this bill will disenfranchise many designers who have come to design through other careers. The woman gave the example of, “When I went to college in 1970, the only thing that a woman could do was be a teacher, major in Home Economics, or be a nurse.” Goodwin recounted that she thought to herself... the 1970s was a time of women’s liberation, young women burning their bras and young women moving away from traditional roles for women. The woman continued the testimony by saying that she would not want the committee to disenfranchise this group of untrained designers. That bill never left the committee and CCVID withdrew the legislation until the next session.

Goodwin explained how frustrating the process could be. She related, “It was the politics of it that was the lousy part. Luckily we had a good attorney [Rubin] who guided us.” Politics is “really who you know and what kind of impact they can make.” She declared that even in committees, “I bet you half of them have never read the bill.” When someone made an emotional plea like that woman did, the coalition could not counter that emotion in “the mitigating two minutes you had” for response. They did not have time to start from scratch and explain to the committee the reasons for the bill.

Manson discussed how hard hearings could be on the participants. At one hearing, Goodwin was not allowed to do more than answer yes or no to questions. “The legislator was so angry because Barbara would try and answer the question” more fully and he told her she “could say yes or no.” She bemoaned the fact that it seemed as if “people had already made up their mind[s]” about their vote. It was then that Goodwin realized that “we didn’t have any political power. And the other part was that we were so naïve we thought, this is the right thing to do, why would anybody have a problem with it?”

Goodwin recounted that their lobbyist would “do a head count” and they always pulled the bill if they thought it did not have the votes to pass. This happened in 1986 and 1988. She continued that she thought they skipped the next year because it was a shortened session, and brought the legislation back in 1990.

In 1990, there were three fires in nursing homes in Virginia. Goodwin stated, “Nobody wants a disaster, [but] if it happens, grab-a-hold of it.” These fires helped them explain why the certification of interior design was important to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. “Only one [of the buildings] was sprinkled and [none of] the trash cans, linens, and bedspreads were flame retardant.”

With the help of the Fire Protection Institute, CCVID made a video demonstrating difference between using fire resistant materials in interiors and not using them. It included a dramatic example of fire in a wastebasket in an interior with residential amenities, such as a chenille bedspread and flammable draperies. Then they did another demonstration with modacrylic bedspread and draperies, and a fire extinguishing wastebasket (that collapses on itself to extinguish fires) that interior designers would specify in nursing homes. These demonstrations were video taped to show legislators. They even had television coverage by “a couple of television stations.” This video demonstrated the importance of the interior finish selection for fire safety. Because of the disasters, the video and with support of the Fire Fighters Institute and individual fire fighters, the bill passed in 1990. Goodwin concluded that it would be a harder case to prove now with most facilities going non-smoking.

Kane, Goodwin and Manson reported that another key to their success was the support of MM. MM was “old time furniture dealer selling traditional furniture in downtown Richmond” who sold furniture to many politicians. Goodwin stated MM was active in important politically oriented groups like the Lions’ Club and the Retail Merchants’ Association, Because he had designers on his staff, he understood the issues involved with certification. According to Goodwin, he said, “You know [to support certification] I am going to alienate a couple of my designers because they are not qualified. But I am going to do it, because I think it is the right thing to do.” She continued, that he was extremely influential and he garnered the support of “the Retail Merchants Association (RMA)” for CCVID efforts. Goodwin stated that this was a unique situation because in most jurisdictions RMA has opposed all licensing efforts.

As part of the interview, the designers were asked about the Joint Accord in relation to their legislation. Manson stated, they used “almost exactly the wording of the Joint Accord in the statute.” Doing so helped ease passage of the bill because the AIA would not oppose the effort. In addition, it allowed for funding from ASID National to supplement the funds raised by CCVID membership dues and donations. They did make one change by adding “or equivalent” to the FIDER accreditation requirement in order to allow students who graduated from a non-FIDER accredited educational program into the credentialing process in order to become certified. They all believed that the success of the legislation in 1990 resulted from the effort by many people. Kane said ruefully, “Well, it took us a total of fifteen years to get licensing” because of the gap in time in between sessions and the “different battles.”

Opposition to Legislation

When discussing the opposition to interior design licensing, Kane said, “The architects and engineers gave us a lot of difficulty.” She stated that the architects believe that they are the original interior designers. The interviewer/author interjected her observation that in 1993 in Michigan, Steve Vogel, President of AIA Michigan, talked to the Michigan ASID meeting and said “architects were the sole arbiters of the built environment.”¹⁷¹ To which Kane replied, “Right. That was the main sentence [they use] and they must have passed that through all their chapters.” Goodwin also stated the main opposition was the AIA architects. She continued early on CCVID decided that, “We are not going to fight the architects [on] what they say is their territory.” She said that interior designers argued that there is some flex or overlap in territory. It helped that they had some examples of overlapping territory and the specialized expertise of interior

finishes. Before the Joint Accord, the architects opposed their efforts, CCVID had to be careful in the way they presented themselves to the legislature, “but we also had architects who supported us.” Manson stated that when CCVID came in line with the Joint Accord, the AIA did not oppose their efforts, but individual architects did.

Kane stated there was “all kinds of pulling back and forth” between the different groups. For example, the engineers did not present much opposition. The landscape architects were fighting to expand their own legislation. “They felt that there were certain issues [that] should not involve interior designers.” Goodwin noted that landscape architects had the same problem with lack of respect by the legislature. “The joke on the hill, when the landscape architects were trying to get licensed [was] ... It is ridiculous, who ever got hurt by a bail of hay?” The joke changes when interior design’s bills were moving, “No one ever got hurt by yellow.”

Support for Legislation

Kane stated the main support for licensure in Virginia came from ASID, from both the local chapters and the national organization. Kane and LT began their efforts before the establishment of the National Legislative Coalition for Interior Design (NLCID) in 1987. She commented, after the coalition formed financial aid from ASID National helped pay for their lobbyist and were very helpful during the deregulation battles. Goodwin stated, “ASID was very strong and very supportive” of licensing in Virginia. She said that ASID would give guidance such as, “No, no don’t listen to that, this is going to happen.” She spoke about how they would monitor all the bills in the legislature and let the committee know if there was something that threatened the Virginia licensing act, which “helped us a great deal.” All three women, who are active

ASID members, felt that the Institute of Business Designers (IBD) would do things when they were asked, but they were not intrinsically supportive in either funding or volunteers.

Goodwin and Manson said, “We had retail merchants in support of the bill, [led by] MM, who was head of the Retail Merchants Association.” Goodwin continued, that his support was instrumental in their getting certification. While landscape architects had concerns about the scope of the legislation, they did not oppose interior design certification.

Goodwin lamented that interior designers in Virginia were not good at garnering support from other organizations. They tried to learn how to make alliances with people who could help their progress. Manson recalled, “We tried really hard to get a couple of building inspectors to speak on our behalf,” and had couple of inspectors show up for one hearing, but they did not speak. Goodwin said some contractors and a couple engineers supported their efforts "because they had their own fights with the architects.”

Implementation of Legislation

Once the bill passed in the Commonwealth of Virginia, it still took a while to fully incorporate interior design into the existing Architect, Professional Engineer, Land Surveyor, and Landscape Architect (APELSLA) Board. It took a couple of years for their stationary to reflect the new name – the Architect, Professional Engineer, Land Surveyor, Landscape Architect and Interior Design (APELSLAID) Board. The process began with changes to the rules and regulations of the APELSLA Board. The Board prepared applications and mailed them to interior designers in Virginia. Manson, who was head of the coalition and on the Board of Regulation, stated, the “Board scrutinized

everything” in relation to documents submitted by interior designers before they became certified. The statute required graduation from a four year FIDER accredited college and passage of the NCIDQ with no provision for grand-parenting. Goodwin stated she had a designer working for her who did not have a four-year FIDER degree. She was ASID chapter president, NCIDQ certified, but did not have a four-year degree. Goodwin had to go “do battle” for this person saying, “She’s passed NCIDQ.” She already had to produce her credentials to sit for the examination. There were other designers accepted for certification who were comparable, “so let her be certified.” Manson added that there are always problems in establishing comparable credentials, but it was allowed because of the “equivalent clause” in the original law.

The documents filed with ASID National outlined the process of implementing the legislation in Virginia. In 1993, there needed to be clarification of the Rules and Regulations.¹⁷² The lack of grand-parenting, such as the case listed above, was causing problems for designers who had been practicing for years and did not want to take the NCIDQ exam, but wanted to be registered. In 1994, a bill was drafted and introduced in the Senate to add grand-parenting to the enabling legislation.¹⁷³ In addition, Vincent Carter talked about one interior designer who because of her political connections was able to re-open grand-parenting allowing her to become licensed.

Challenges to Legislation

As noted above, one of the challenges that interior design faced was resistance within the profession. Kane discussed how CCVID’s efforts to certify interior designers sometimes curtailed the support of the older practitioners who did not have the qualifications to become licensed. She also explained that because title acts do not

require people to be certified, there are designers who do not bother to become certified because they are “too busy,” and certification is not necessary to practice. They just call themselves interior designers rather than “Certified Interior Designer” and continue to practice. This sword cuts both ways, because if the coalition is going after a practice act the number of certified interior designers is important as part of the proof that a stricter statute is needed -- low numbers of certified interior designers means low need. Also as seen in Washington, D.C., a budget crisis can initiate examination of whether certification is necessary, and low numbers of registrants can hurt the profession.

Kane stated that she has fought for forty years for professionalism in interior design. She said that as far as she was concerned, a large percentage of designers will be licensed, and “the other percentage shouldn’t get it anyway. I know that’s kind of cruel, but there are too many bad designers out there who should not be practicing.” This was what certification and licensing did. It set minimal levels of competency for licensing.

Budget Crisis

None of the interior designers discussed the 1991 budget crisis during the interviews, but documents from ASID National revealed a budget crisis in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This budget crisis initiated a streamlining examination of the entire Commonwealth government in order to save taxpayers’ money. The Project Streamline Commission recommended deregulation of ten professions as one of the potential cost cutting measures. Interior design was one of the professions threatened.

In 1991, Milton K. Brown Jr., Director of the Department of Commerce, sent a letter to Goodwin, an APELSLAID Board member, discussing the possibility of deregulating interior design in Project Streamline. Brown mentioned four reasons for

regulation: (1) “The unregulated practice of the profession or occupation can harm or endanger the health, safety, and welfare (HSW) of the public;” (2) The practice has “inherent qualities particular to it that distinguishes it from ordinary work and labor;” (3). The profession requires “specialized skill or training;” and (4) “The public is not effectively protected by other means.”

Anne W. Putney (later, Manson) sent a memorandum to interior designers in the Commonwealth calling them to arms to fight deregulation of interior designers.¹⁷⁴ She outlined the need to raise money, get support from allied professions and interior designers. In addition, she encouraged everyone to re-establish contact his or her legislators.

In a memorandum to NLCID from Putney (Manson) she reported on Board of Commerce hearings she attended, “re: Deregulation of Interior Designers... When they got to the interior designers the atmosphere turned hostile.¹⁷⁵ The animosity was obvious as the Board related what they felt were instances of misinformation presented by interior designers in their testimony before the board.” Putney (Manson) continued that they claimed that some people who testified from other organizations in favor of interior designers use fictitious arguments to make the health, safety, and welfare (HSW) case. She reported that the Board of Commerce concluded, “...since they didn’t think it would do any harm, they would allow the law two years to prove itself.” By May of 1991, the deregulation crisis subsided temporarily.

In late 1994 and early 1995, another round of deregulation efforts began because of the continuing budget crisis in Virginia. This effort culminated in an October 5, 1994 memorandum from Vincent G. Carter, Director of Government and Public Affairs (for

ASID), to holders of CID (Certified Interior Designers) in Virginia.¹⁷⁶ One of the things the memorandum stated was that, “Gov. Allen’s Blue Ribbon Task Force has proposed elimination of state certification for Interior Designers.” He concluded by listing hearing locations and dates around the Commonwealth and other pertinent information.

When the hearings were held, various people testified in various locations. These testimonial letters were on file with ASID National. On October 13, 1994, architect JRW testified in support of certification for interior designers.¹⁷⁷ In his testimony he said, “I know that there are certain areas of the interior designer’s activity that overlaps my expertise, just as there are areas of the practice of engineers that overlap architecture.” He continued by saying that civil engineers’ work may overlap with that of landscape architects, but each has its distinct core of expertise and each identified as a unique profession and licensed or certified accordingly.

Carter sent a summary of testimony to the task force from the October 18, 1994 hearing he attended.¹⁷⁸ In the packet to ASID, he included copies of other information from the hearings. (1) United States General Services Administration – Requests for Submission with its preference for qualifications of interior design. (2) Letters that opposed the deregulation of interior design; (A) SBJ’s¹⁷⁹ written testimony opposing deregulation of interior design certification; and (B) CMS’s¹⁸⁰ testimony memorandum. Through the efforts of many people, deregulation for interior design was stopped, again.

Perception of the Public

Kane stated the public perception of interior design has changed since she began working on licensure in 1978. “The public in general is so much more conscious of design and what it should be.” Kane recounted that years ago a designer could tell a

clients they should have something and they would buy it. Sometimes this meant the client did not get what they needed. She recounted that this not so likely to happen now because clients are better informed... the public in general is “a lot more knowledgeable” about the profession. Kane said, “I really have to thank ASID for that because of their national advertising program pushing professionalism. It has made a big difference in the public understanding the knowledge-base of a professional interior designer.”

Goodwin and Manson differentiated the public from the end-user. They believe the end-user certainly sees a difference since certification. Companies such as insurance carriers hire interior designers to help move their offices and to select furniture that can make their employees more productive. In addition, they mentioned that governmental bodies are starting to include “certified interior designer preferred” on their bid documents.

Perception of Interior Designers

When asked if the perception of interior designers has changed, Goodwin stated, “I’d like to think that at least more schools are paying attention to becoming accredited.” Schools make sure that students know how critical it is to graduate with the proper credentials to be able to practice.

Manson stated that technology such as computers has given a “different slant to the way we work and what we do. It’s not just a matter of putting the pillow in the right place, although we have to do that too.” Computer aided design (CAD) gives designers a great opportunity to document their ideas, but as a tool, CAD does not solve the problems of visualizing in three dimensions nor the need to have drawings scaled correctly. Manson said, “a client needs to see something that is totally worked out.” She continued

by saying that the design needs to be conceptualized “in your head” before it can be drawn with CAD. Goodwin and Manson are concerned that technology has taken creativity away from design. Manson reiterated that she requests students to bring more than CAD drawings to job interviews, so that she could see how well they think and develop a design.

Goodwin stated because of the technology, “I think we’re attracting more technically savvy people. They see this as a challenging, contemporary field [as] opposed to the ones who make pillows and coordinate the curtains.” Manson agreed technology has made interior design “a little bit more interesting to upcoming professionals.” In Goodwin’s opinion, the home decorating television shows as seen on *HGTV* highlight the schism between the “decorating only side” of the television shows and the professional training certification requires.

Perception of Other Professions

In relation to the perception of other professions, Goodwin spoke of architects, “They want [to do] the big picture. The public counts on the architects to be custodian or keeper of the house.” The architects believe it is what the public is looking for... and “that is what they want to make sure they can do.” They want interior design to be what it is, but that interior designers must work for or be supervised by architects. She concluded with, “After all, architects hire other professionals such as engineers.”

Personal Growth

Kane discussed how the process of working on interior design certification has changed her. “Well, I think it has overall made me a lot more conscious of the fact that in Virginia, you have to be a licensed interior designer to be a true professional.” She

continued, it gives one more power and clout with clientele and even helps one gain clientele. “Most of my work was contract work and when you were vying for a project with competing design firms, if you could say, “All the designers in my office are licensed interior designers, [it] offered a lot more clout” than a firm whose only certified designer was the principal or owner.

Goodwin discussed her personal growth during this process as being a mixed blessing. On the good side, she thinks it reinforced her active association with different groups, and made her a broader person by emphasizing how important it is to network with other people and groups. On the negative side, she does not like the politics of it, especially dealing with the “good ole boy networks.”

Manson said, “It made me really aware of political connections and affiliations” and what they do for professionals in general.” She also stated it made her lose respect for the architects and engineers, “that they’re being so catty about this. I would much rather have a more user-friendly relationship with them.”

Goodwin summarized her involvement as follows, “It is because we’re fighting for survival.” Most of the time the jobs interior designers work on are not affected by the ability to pull building permits, therefore not reflected in daily tasks. She continued, “It’s the right to practice that’s in jeopardy.” Manson agreed. Goodwin continued, “Survival [and] right to practice. It is like the architects are trying to gobble interior design up.” Manson finished the thought with “They don’t want to do the work,” but they want oversight of what interior designers produce.

Other Concerns

Other issues in the interviews included the Joint Accord and the proposal to unify the professional organizations into one, called “Unified Voice.” Kane did not think that the Joint Accord made any difference to certification in Virginia. On the other hand, she was “absolutely crushed when the merger, between ASID and the other seven design associations” did not happen. She continued with passion, that the Virginia Chapter was very much in favor of going forward with the merger. She stated that the AIA is unified and strong. Interior design on the other hand is “putzing along with... well, now, two separate groups.” She has confidence that consolidation will come because of the challenges interior design still faces. “It’s still going to happen.”

Another idiosyncrasy that happened in Virginia occurred after the interior design legislation passed. The AIA hired Mark Rubin to be their lobbyist. Kane stated, “all of a sudden he was also working for the architects. Then it became just a terrible conflict of interest” and CCVID had to let him go.

In addition, Manson, who is a member of the building code official group in her area, related a story about a code official meeting she attended. It was a code official meeting, which had no architects in attendance. The AIA had apparently prepared and sent handouts to the meeting. The handouts stated, “Please consider only those plans by architects and professional engineers.” It included a questionnaire where each question reinforced the idea that only architects and engineers be allowed to submit drawings. Manson concluded, “It’s just unreal... unbelievable.”¹⁸¹

When asked about architects’ influence with building officials in Virginia, Manson spoke of a chart, which was adopted as an appendix to the Virginia Uniform

Statewide Building Code. It was prepared by the AIA to define “at what point do you need a licensed architect or engineer.” Goodwin stated it is a check list that the code officials “reference” when examining plans. Manson said that, “There are quite a few things on the list [that] is work that I do.”

Conclusion

The Commonwealth of Virginia passed a title legislation for interior design in 1990. There are important lessons learned in Virginia’s efforts toward licensure. Hiring a lobbyist with experience in a similar type of legislation can help a coalition. The lobbyist understands many of the issues, they know the legislators who may be sympathetic to those issues, and they can quicken the learning curve of the coalition because they have been through it before. The lobbyist can also facilitate becoming organized for lobbying and understanding who they should lobby. It can save money for the coalition because the lobbyist may give a discounted price because he/she is already informed and working on similar issues. Funding and raising money is a major concern of coalitions. They should not be surprised if the opposition hires a successful lobbyist away.

Interior designers adherence to the parameters of the Joint Accord led to the AIA not opposing their bill. Although in Section 4-3 Bob Boynton said that the AIA was caught off guard and so did not oppose the legislation. The help of MM with his political clout and ability to bring the Retail Merchant Association in line to not oppose certification was also very important. But, it was Goodwin’s belief that the nursing home fires were critical in passage of their bill. They were able to use the three tragedies to demonstrate in a dramatic way that having someone untrained doing interior design has

harm the public. CCIDV joined with an important support group of fire-fighters to not only testify for them, but to co-produce a video to demonstrate the difference training and knowledge can make in a fire situation. Because they were able to demonstrate the health, safety and welfare issue to the legislature the legislation passed quickly.

Interior design certification faced multiple waves of deregulation as in Virginia. The 1992 budget crisis reverberated through the regulation boards. I would be interested to know why in the Virginia hearings of the Board of Commerce someone thought interior design had mis-represented them in the hearing when the bill passed. Consequently in the future, when deregulation pressures re-emerge, the coalition needs to stress the fires and how injury could have been prevented. In addition, CCVID did not include grand-parenting as part of their bill and its addition to the legislation allowed people who practiced interior design previously a window of opportunity to become certified.

These interior designers clearly understand that they are fighting for the survival of their profession. Of the 2,000 designers they believe they have in the jurisdiction only a little over 500 have become certified. Coalitions need to do a better job informing their profession as to the importance of becoming and maintaining certification. The interviewees also stress the importance of unifying the profession organization.

Many times the interviewees stated that they were not good at and disliked the political process. I think this is because it is counter to the way they do their jobs. Hopefully, this dissertation will help them gain the confidence in their position in the built environment and provide a vocabulary to respond to negative comments by legislators and competing professions.

Chapter 5 – Case Studies

Section 3 – State of Ohio

Unlike the interior designers in Washington, D.C. and Virginia, designers in the state of Ohio have been unsuccessful in achieving licensing for over thirty years. In 1992, their legislation was successfully adopted in both houses of the legislature, only to have Governor Voinovich veto the bill. When these volunteers were interviewed in 2005, they continue their efforts on licensure by writing new legislation, negotiating with other interested parties, and lobbying the legislature for passage. The following interviews with three key interior designers describe their continuing efforts.

The interview with Gary Volz, ASID, IIDA, and NCIDQ certified, took place at his offices in Cincinnati, Ohio on July 12, 2005.¹⁸² When interviewed, he was a practicing interior designer in the state of Ohio whose firm shared office space and partnered with an architectural firm. He was active in trying to get licensing for interior designers in Ohio. He was the first director (president) of the Coalition for Interior Design Legislation in Ohio (CIDLO) from the mid-1986 until the Governor of Ohio vetoed the bill in 1992. Although retired from CIDLO in 1992, he continues to support it by paying for his employees' membership, testifying and writing letters whenever needed.

The interview with Gayle Kreutzfeld, FASID, a former director of CIDLO, took place at her home in Columbus, Ohio on July 13, 2005.¹⁸³ She discussed her role with CIDLO from its inception until 2003 when she resigned for health reasons. The interview with Terri Maurer, FASID took place at The Fairfield Inn in Columbus, Ohio on July 13, 2005.¹⁸⁴ Maurer, director of CIDLO at the time of the interview, confirmed

the information told by Volz and Kreutzfeld. In addition, Maurer was ASID Ohio North Chapter President and ASID National President from 2001-2002. In the interview, she discussed her role with CIDLO from its inception as one of the “first members of the coalition” until her interview in 2005 when she was director of CIDLO, once again.

Although there are many volunteers for CIDLO, the experiences and viewpoints of these three interior designers provide documentation of events in Ohio. This account includes Volz, Kreutzfeld, and Maurer’s recollections and personal perceptions of what happened in the process from 1980 through 2005. The following is a synopsis of their interviews.

Political Landscape

When asked about the political landscape, Maurer discussed her concerns about the future of the profession of interior design. She discussed this as a former national president of ASID. She stated her belief that the profession could disappear unless jurisdictions around the country require licensing. She discussed the lack of commitment by the rank-and-file interior designer. “I do not think they see our profession disappearing” without licensing. She continued that too few people join the coalition, to give the coalition financial support in its licensing efforts. Maurer expressed in her opinion, “getting enough money” to pay a lobbyist at “twenty-five to thirty-five thousand dollars a year or more” was daunting. Not only did the lack of funding affect the ability of the coalition to hire a good lobbyist, it also inhibited donations to political campaigns. She concedes, “You know, it’s the good ol’ boys’ pay to play network, and designers don’t have the kind of money architects do.” She concluded the thought, “We’re lucky if

we can pay our lobbyists.” She continued, unfortunately, a good lobbyist is the only way to make any headway in the political process.

Volz put it this way, “My position is, at this point in time, that the profession of interior design hasn’t put its whole-hearted support behind the legislative effort. I think a lot of people were saying well ‘this is a good thing,’ but some designer may say, ‘I do residential and it doesn’t really affect me that much.’” He continued, “I think that the situation of the potential restriction on independent practice has not been painful enough yet for enough people that they are willing to put their support behind it.”

Maurer stated that, in her view, the political landscape changed when she was ASID’s National President in 2001. She was concerned about the trend for many interior design programs being “pushed back under the umbrella of architecture.” She understands the value educating the profession together so they understand what each profession “brings to the table on a project.” She does not want interior design to be “a subset of architecture.” She worries that this may hurt interior design’s independence as a separate profession. Gary Volz is also concerned about the independence of interior design as a profession. He began his interview by discussing the legislative process.

Legislative Process

Volz outlined how the coalition formed. “In 1986, discussions began in earnest between the [leaders of] Ohio South [and] Ohio North chapters of ASID, and some interested parties from IBD (now, IIDA) about the need to have licensing for interior designers in the state of Ohio.” According to Volz, ASID began its efforts by polling its membership to gauge its chapters’ interest in licensing. ASID received a positive

response. In 1987, was organized with a charter and took the name “the Coalition for Interior Design Licensing in Ohio” (CIDLO).

Kreutzfeld stated that once the coalition formed, the leaders raised money, hired a lobbyist, and wrote legislation. Volz described the steps the coalition took to organize in more detail. Just like Virginia, the coalition secured the services of a lobbyist who had previously worked with landscape architects. Both Volz and Kreutzfeld said hiring a lobbyist who worked with landscape architecture was an advantage. Kreutzfeld said, “he had already been through the learning curve” and understood CIDLO’s situation. In addition, Volz stated the lobbyist’s experience helped them to craft the language of the legislation and accelerated CIDLO’s learning curve dramatically. Their lobbyist could explain the legislative process to them in relation to the licensing of a profession. The coalition met once a month to map out the strategy for pursuing interior design registration.

There was some debate within the coalition about title versus practice legislation. Volz said they were strongly advised by ASID and IBD National to go after “title legislation first.” ASID and IBD National advised them over time they could tighten the language to move it toward a practice act. Volz said, “By this time, Washington, D.C.’s practice act had already become law, so there was a precedent” for a practice act. Kreutzfeld confirmed that the first bill, introduced in 1990, was a practice act. Volz stated, “Our law, to be honest, was really geared toward commercial practice. Our whole justification for this was protection of the public. If the public is not at risk then you have a hard time placing a restriction for the activities of some group.”

Kreutzfeld explained the nuances of this early bill. In order “to show [minimum] competence [in] barrier free design and ADA requirements.” Designers who had taken an earlier NCIDQ or AID exam needed to take the codes section of the current NCIDQ examination Maurer stated CIDLO’s viewpoint about grand-parenting, “We would rather not grandfather (grand-parent) anybody that didn’t meet the criteria,” but that the legislature would not allow a “person who has been practicing for twenty years” to be disenfranchised. Their legislation had twenty-year grand-parenting.

Volz described the regulating board that interior design would fall under once the bill passed. “My recollection at the time, we wanted to establish our board within the already established Board of Building Standards in Ohio.” This would keep expenses down because the Board of Building Standards was the group that certified building examiners. The heart of the bill was the ability “to stamp and seal drawings for non-structural interior construction to be able to secure a building permit.” He stated, “the architects wanted interior design to share a board, because they felt they would have a greater degree of control” over interior design.

Volz said that there was also discussion within the coalition about the use of the term “certification” versus “registration.” He felt registration sent a clearer message to the public because “registration is governed by a governmental agency.” Consequently, the first bills captured the title “registered interior designer.” Volz speculated this was “probably when the architects really got their backs up.” Robert Boynton explained this concept in his interview where he said the AIA wanted “registered” to be used only with architecture practice legislation. Usually the terminology for each jurisdiction was defined in the jurisdiction by statute or in the constitution.

Kreutzfeld stated, in 1990 Representative Pat Teaberry introduced their bill in the legislature. Its placement was in the Labor and Commerce Committee of which Teaberry was co-chair. When it became clear the bill was “not going anywhere,” CIDLO withdrew the legislation.

By the 1991-92 session of the legislature, CIDLO was ready to introduce their legislation, again. Volz spoke about how much their lobbyist helped them to strategize how to place the bill. They could anticipate more resistance in the Republican Senate than in the more Democratic House because Democrats are generally more responsive to licensing efforts. Consequently, coalition trustees decided to place it in the Senate first. Volz expanded the information about the sponsor. “We had a trustee who had a strong relationship with a State Senator from Lima, Ohio.” The senator acted as the principal sponsor of the bill, and both he and his legislative staff were able to secure co-sponsors. This meant the bill was introduced with bi-partisan sponsorship. He said that with the assistance of their lobbyist and bill sponsors, they were able to place the bill into a committee “favorable” to their efforts.

Volz continued that their lobbyist, who was strongly associated with the Democratic Party, was able to maintain a neutral non-partisan position. The arguments he helped craft were logical: (1) “This is a good thing for the public of Ohio;” (2) “It does not hurt anybody;” (3) “Why would you not do it?” and (4) “As long as it can be financially self-supporting, what could be the problem?”

Volz described the process by which the bill went into committee, which held hearings where he and others testified. It passed out of committee with the recommendation of passage, went to a floor vote in the Senate “where it received a

sizeable majority” of the vote. He continued, “The president of the senate Senator Aronoff, who is from Cincinnati, was actually quite supportive.” He said that with Aronoff’s influence and a few other key people, “We were able to get it heard successfully” in the Senate.

Then, it went on to the House and the bill went through the same process there. Volz recounted, “When we passed both chambers, it came to a [final] floor vote. We were successful on the floor vote and it went to the governor for his signature.” The governor immediately said that he would veto their bill.

Volz recounted how “We initiated a full court press to get as many people as possible to send letters, make phone calls, [send] telegrams (this was before email), to the governor’s office urging him not to veto this bill.” Volz continued, “I even had clients sending him letters and making phone calls. These are important powerful Republicans from Cincinnati who donated heavily, but it really did not influence his decision.” Their efforts were to no avail, Governor Voinovich vetoed the bill in July 1992. The Governor’s statement said the veto had to do with the “finance and budget concerns.”

Volz went on to discuss the reasons for the veto. “I think there were a couple of things that were at play here. Some of this is of course my opinion, so I can’t necessarily substantiate it.” Governor Voinovich ran strongly in Ohio on the “principle of strong budgetary and spending controls.” He recounted that, he thought Voinovich felt that the profession of interior design in Ohio was not financially strong enough to support its own legislation. Therefore, the concern was the “state was going to have to fund the board and all administrative activities associated with the bill.” Volz stated, and Kreutzfeld corroborated his statements, that the coalition tried to change the governor’s mind. Volz

said that they did their best to convince the Governor that CIDLO had done “our due diligence” in determining the revenues for “by a minimum number of designers who would become registered.” In addition, the legislation was set up so that they would share a board and administrative staff, which was an attempt to by CIDLO to keep costs to a minimum. “We could financially make this thing viable, but the Governor remained un-convinced.”¹⁸⁵

Both Volz and Kreutzfeld noted another complication to this issue. Although neither stated that it affected the Governor’s decision, it demonstrates how complicated politics can be. The governor’s brother is an architect. He also has a niece who owned an interior design firm and was not supportive of the bill. Both Volz and Kreutzfeld stated that the interior designers on her staff lacked the qualification for licensing. Volz met with her to explain how the bill would not affect her employees, but to no avail. They both felt this might have influenced the governor’s decision to veto the bill.

Maurer spoke of the veto with surprise and chagrin, “I was traveling” at the ASID National Meetings as Ohio North’s Chapter President” when Voinovich vetoed it. “I had the distinction [to] announce that we were the first state to veto the bill.” Both Volz and Kreutzfeld said after the veto CIDLO attempted to identify Governor Voinovich’s objections so that they could address these concerns and reintroduce the legislation “on an accelerated path.” But, that did not happen.

After the Veto

Volz recounted that the political environment in Ohio has not changed since Governor Voinovich left office in 1999 and was replaced by Governor Bob Taft. “Essentially we went from one Republican Governor to another Republican Governor.”

Ohio still struggles with budgetary issues and, according to Volz, “until the interior design profession can strongly demonstrate the ability to support its own registration without any monetary assistance from the state... I don’t think [legislation] stands a prayer.” Volz outlined the expenses for registration: board compensation for meetings, printing, and mailing costs of applications, part-time administrative staff to process applications, and a central clearing-house or office. The administration of the NCIDQ examination is by NCIDQ directly, not by the jurisdiction. Volz lamented that interior design has a “considerably smaller population” than other professions; therefore, CIDLO attempted to share some of these expenses by joining with an existing regulatory board.

It should be noted that the cost of regulation of a profession goes beyond the limited parameters Volz outlined and, as noted in Washington, D.C. and Virginia, people find ways to practice without being licensed, thus avoiding the fees.

Kreutzfeld said that after the veto, CIDLO began re-examining everything. The word licensing, “had a bad connotation to some people.” CIDLO changed their name from the Coalition for Interior Design Licensing in Ohio to Coalition for Interior Design Legislation in Ohio.”

Budget Crisis

When Volz resigned as the Coalition leader in late 1992, Marci Zimmerman was elected the director of CIDLO. Kreutzfeld stated that it was during her term they changed their lobbyist for the first time. While their first lobbyist had been very helpful in the beginning of the legislative effort, it seemed as if he was not continuing to move their efforts forward.

Kreutzfeld said it took another crisis for CIDLO to decide hire another lobbyist. In the early 2000s, the government in Ohio was facing a major budgetary crisis and Governor Taft introduced a new tax on service businesses, including interior design. Architecture was not included in this service tax, “which we felt was not fair.” It was double taxation, which put architects at a greater advantage because they were not included. She continued, “This crisis came up very fast.” Within two weeks of hiring the new lobbying firm, the committee in charge of the new tax held a hearing. Kreutzfeld noted, Volz came from Cincinnati to Columbus to testify. Because the hearing lasted too late into the night he was not able to testify. The next day a local ASID member, “read Gary’s [Volz] statement.” Soon after the hearing, interior design was removed from the list of businesses included in this tax. As the years went by, other threats to the independent practice of interior design appeared. Discussion of these threats follows the legislation information below.

Opposition to Legislation

When asked about the opposition to this legislative effort, all of the interviewees felt that the opposition had not changed much since the beginning in 1987. Volz stated, “The main opposition really fell into two groups: the first group was the Retail Merchants Association,” whose members were primarily furniture dealers in the Ohio and the designers who worked for them; and the second group was the AIA. He continued by saying, with the Retail Merchants Association (RMA), “We were attempting to make a distinct separation between people who derive their compensation by retail sales from those who derive their compensation through professional fees.” The retail designers felt that they needed the use of the title of interior designer to establish

their credibility with consumers. “However, they were largely selling furniture.”

Typically, they also were members of the Interior Design Society (IDS). Their strength came from “their employers who for the most part were fairly large furniture retailers with a lot of money and [who] made substantial contributions to various candidates’ campaigns.”

Kreutzfeld stated her belief that one of the reasons for the veto “was the campaign [of] proprietary interior designers by the retail merchant association, IDS, and the National Home Furnishing League” (NHFL). She said the lack of NCIDQ qualified interior designers would put their firms at a disadvantage. The dissenters “got behind a letter writing campaign to defeat the bill.” Volz said, CIDLO attempted to defuse their argument by including language in the legislation to call themselves interior designers and sell furniture. Only registered interior designers could use the term “registered interior designer.” He continued, “Essentially the legislator saw our point and felt as though their opposition was groundless.” Volz continued, “Ultimately, they were not as large a source of opposition as we expected.”

Kreutzfeld said, in the beginning of this effort there were interior designers “who didn’t believe in licensing,” because in her opinion they “didn’t take the exam, never had taken it, and resisted legislation simply because they weren’t about to [take the exam] at midlife.”

Kreutzfeld also said that at one point the “Ohio Council Retail Merchants under the auspices of the National Home Furnishing group wanted tiered registration.” Tiered registration meant two different kinds of registration -- one for commercial interior designers and another, less stringent one, for residential designers. At that time, IDS was

developing CQRID examination as an alternate to the NCIDQ exam. ASID, IIDA and NCIDQ oppose tiered registration because it weakened registration and confused the public. In addition, they thought the CQRID was not equal to NCIDQ because it tested knowledge of residential interior design without including any health, safety, or code issues.

Maurer also said that the National Kitchen and Bath Association's (NKBA) opposition stemmed from their concern that they would lose business. Maurer commented that NKBA has the kitchen and bath "market cornered." Many of their members are "Mom and Pop cabinetry shops" whose designers have little or no interior design education. She continued that NKBA has its own proprietary examination, which they judged as equal to the NCIDQ. According to ASID, IIDA National, and the independent researcher Hertz, whose work was discussed in Section 4-1 (Hertz, 2007), it is not equivalent. "Our argument was once they got that license, what's to stop a licensed kitchen designer from doing a public space? It does not protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public."

Maurer commented on NKBA's tactic that they used in many jurisdictions. In that they waited until it looks like a bill is going to pass and then they "do a letter writing campaign and blow it out of the water." Maurer continued that "One time it worked for them;" the second time CIDLO member responded in the hearings, "Well this bill's been coming through here for two years. Where were you?" CIDLO response worked with the legislators who agreed they could have been part of the process.

The AIA, the second source of opposition, "was another story." Volz recounted that the AIA's opposition seemed to stem from a perceived threat to their members. They

were concerned that architects would no longer be able to practice interior design, even though there was specific language in the bill to exempt registered architects and engineers. They would not be able to “call themselves a registered interior designer unless they were.” He continued by saying that CIDLO had an exemption with a “really easy provision for them to become registered.” They hoped that the exemption “would defuse their opposition, but it didn’t.”

Volz mentioned another major issue with AIA Ohio. “Ohio interior designers had a seal provision in our bill.” CIDLO wanted to use a voluntary seal to reinforce the public’s recognition of the profession of interior design. Under pressure, the language changed to “the seal would be distinctly different from the seal of a registered architect.” Volz said that the AIA believed “once you have a seal or a stamp, it essentially establishes a level of restriction on who can and cannot provide the services... By virtue of the fact that we had a seal clause, [the bill] changed from a title to a practice law.” He continued, “They play games with words. They spent an inordinate amount of money fighting our bill.” Volz finished this thought by stating that the fight over the sealing privileges “foretold the future for us.”

In addition, he recounted that another “bone-of-contention” with the AIA was the grand-parenting clause. It allowed people who may not have an education or have not passed the NCIDQ to call themselves interior designers. “The architects probably would be happier if we had had no grandfathering (grand-parenting) at all... despite the [fact] they had a grandfathering clause in their own law.” The architect response was “that was then; this is now.” Volz said that the AIA felt there should be no grand-parenting in interior design registration. He continued, it was AIA’s opinion that “To be certified and

registered as a professional [who is] part of a project design team, you need to follow the strictest adherence of professional standards.”

Volz then began to discuss how CIDLO used the Joint Accord language in an attempt to secure more support from the architects. The result was instead that the architects used the Joint Accord and their interpretation of its language, to mount opposition. In Volz’s opinion, “This has characteristically been the case, so many times, not only in Ohio, but even in other states.” Years of frustration were apparent when he described the typical dialogue as follows:

AIA: “Oh no, the Joint Accord doesn’t say that; it says this.”

CIDLO: “Well, no, it doesn’t. Here is the language and this is what it says.”

AIA: “Well, that is not how we interpret it.”

Volz said that they had a very different interpretation of the language of the Joint Accord. He concluded, “In fact, as far as I am concerned, the Joint Accord had no effect [in Ohio]. If the Joint Accord [had] not been in existence, I think we [would] probably have achieved very much the same result.”

Volz recounted how he interacted with JH,¹⁸⁶ the main negotiator for the AIA, while Volz was director. They had a number of face-to-face meetings, phone conversations, and an exchange of letters. When they negotiated, “It was a case... when you felt as though you had made some substantive progress. Then all of a sudden... We had taken two steps forward and now we have just taken two steps back again. So we never made progress.” Volz said the only time they made progress with the AIA was when the bill cleared both chambers of the legislature in 1992, “I immediately received a phone call from the Executive Director of AIA Ohio who said, “Okay, it is pretty

obvious that your bill is going to pass. When can we sit down and talk?” They never met, when the veto happened there was no reason to talk. Volz concluded, “I think when it was vetoed they were absolutely thrilled. Ultimately, they got what they wanted, but they didn’t get it through their own efforts.” The governor did it for them by vetoing the legislation.

There were two other groups, who opposed licensure in Ohio. Maurer, who was the current director of CIDLO in 2005, said, “Recently, we’ve had engineers pop up and be opposed to the legislation. We’re not really sure why and we’re trying to find that out.” Volz stated also the “commercial contractors tended to side with the architects.” They were a group that worked on large construction projects, and were “extremely well funded.” In his opinion, they sided with the architects “because a good portion of their revenue was derived from project teams where they were associated with architects.”

Maurer, Volz, and Kreutzfeld discussed a new opposition strategy to CIDLO’s legislative effort. Kreutzfeld put it this way, “Sometime around 2000 to 2001, the architects, Council of the Retail Merchants, and Professional Engineering Society formed a coalition.” This Coalition agreed that legislation prepared by CIDLO had to meet each of the group’s concerns or they would oppose the bill. The problem with this coalition was that each member had different core requirements that were exclusive of the other organizations’ goals. For example, the architects wanted grand-parenting to be only for designers who graduated from a four-year FIDER accredited program and who had passed the NCIDQ. On the other hand, the Council of Retail Merchants wanted anyone using the title “interior designer” before the passage of the legislation to be grand-parented in to the regulated profession regardless of his or her education and lack of

successful passage of the examination. Those points are mutually exclusive, which rendered satisfying each organization impossible. CIDLO withdrew their legislative attempts and once again regrouped.

Kreutzfeld further noted that an engineering group in the last few years published an article ridiculing the need to regulate interior designers who “fluff pillows and pick out stripes versus plaids.” Maurer said this was the first time the engineers became active. This was surprising to the interior designers who “hire engineers, all the time.” At that point, “We just decided to stop. There’s no sense in going forward with” negotiations or legislation in this impossible climate.

Maurer talked about the new strategy CIDLO is implementing when dealing with the AIA. First she stated, “The architects have been in the game a long time; they know how to play the game, and they have a lot more money than we do.” In addition, “they’re willing to spend it to get what they want done.” Recently, after “years of delays” for “both major and minor” changes to the legislation, CIDLO stopped negotiating with the AIA. Maurer said, “It is like all of the sudden we didn’t jump when they said” jump. She continued, “But it is a whole different thing. As long as I’ve been in this coalition all we’ve done is crawl around kissing their feet trying to make them happy [so that they would] move out of the way... and it never worked.” In fact, “Now they’re worried about why we won’t talk to them.” She concluded, “Now we tell the legislators we met with them and we just can’t deal with them. You know, they’re irrational; they want to do this; they want to do that, and it’s just totally bizarre.”

Support of Legislation

CIDLO represents 2,000 to 2,500 interior designers in the state.¹⁸⁷ Volz and Kreutzfeld stated there was considerable support for legislation, but “it was [a] core group of people who were members of CIDLO that really got the job done.” All three designers discussed the supporters of legislation to include ASID North and South Chapters, IBD/IIDA members, non-affiliated interior designers, design educators, students, and even parents of students. Maurer presumed the parents who are paying tuition, worry about “their child’s ability to practice in the state when they get done.” Volz added, the “association of university interior designers (AUID) were strongly supportive.” Maurer and Kreutzfeld mentioned they also had support from the State Fire Marshal and fire fighter groups. Maurer said they had some architects testify for them. They were “from large firms” who have interior designers in staff. She recounted that currently, “we’re working to get in touch with a couple of the groups” of people with limited abilities for their support. In addition, Volz stated, “the landscape architects professed support. I don’t know that we saw any substantial support from them. But we at least made contact [since] we were using the same lobbyist.” He continued, “The home-builders really were not much of an issue one way or another.”

Volz recounted that they kept in touch with other adjoining jurisdictions such as Michigan and Indiana “with regard to their efforts, if there was precedent in any other state, we wanted to know about it.” They wanted to make sure, “since we had so many heavily populated cities that border other states, like Toledo and Cincinnati.” They did not want to create a situation that would disenfranchise designers in neighboring states.

Both Volz and Kreutzfeld stated interior design was overall supportive, but that

the rank-and-file interior designers sometimes were not as supportive as they could be. Volz said, it depended on “How many consider themselves [just] interior designers, versus how many people are committed to the profession. I think that is the real question.”

Challenges

Cease-and-Desist Orders

Ohio faced different challenges from the other jurisdictions studied in this dissertation because the governor vetoed the legislation for interior designers. Beginning in 1993, in documents filed with ASID, six interior design firms that received cease-and-desist orders from the Architectural Review Board for practicing architecture without a license. Volz stated prior to the cease-and-desist orders and then the seal law, “Anyone could submit drawings for a building permit.” He continued that it was up to the plans examiner to review drawings and determine if they required the seal of an architect or engineer. He said that before 1993, his firm on numerous occasions submitted drawings for non-structural interior construction renovations and secured building permits. The cease-and-desist orders began with a new interpretation of the licensing laws and the hiring Chad B. Holland, Investigator of the State of Ohio.

Maurer was one of the six interior designers who received a cease-and-desist order. She received hers in 2001. She related her experience when she received the letter during the year she was ASID National president. “I was sued for practicing architecture without a license.” She recalled the project as a building that had all the appropriate elevators, means of egress, and barrier free restrooms. She related, “I was [hired] to do interior design... all [the] non-structural work for the build-out” of the two story office.

Maurer continued, “Basically, we were their agent.” Her company did the space planning, including full height partitions, office furniture, and open plan systems. They also designed a private kitchenette and bathroom between the two owners’ executive offices. She described the documents her company had prepared as typical space planning for this type of project, a wall section of 2 x 4’s at 16” on center, drywall on both sides. Maurer’s firm hired an engineer to do the HVAC, mechanical, and electrical drawings that were necessary, and the engineer sealed those drawings. Maurer hand-carried the documents to the building department to file them.

Maurer related when she took the plans to the building official’s office. There were two forms to fill out. “You’re either turning in architectural drawings or electrical drawings. You have to fill out the appropriate form with name and address, how they contact you, maybe the project name.” She continued, “There are two check-off boxes on the form,” for those who are submitting the documents. One box was for architect or one for the owner. Her dilemma was obvious: she was neither an architect nor the owner. She checked neither box, and she stated, “I’m sure before I was out of the parking lot they were photo copying and faxing that [form] down to Columbus.” Soon after, “I got this cease-and-desist letter.” She recounted, “I, of course, like the fool I am, said, well what did we do that was architecture? If we crossed a boundary someplace, I want to know. So we don’t do it again.” There was no response to her question.

Maurer continued with her story. She hired a local attorney and, because she was ASID’s National president, she tapped the expertise of ASID National’s attorney for consultations. She related that the architectural board wanted her to sign a blanket boiler-plate letter that said she was practicing architecture without a license and she wouldn’t do

it again. Maurer responded, “I need to know what specifically I did in my drawings is architecture?” She stated, “I never was told what I did that was practicing architecture without a license.”

In the meantime, the lack of a building permit was holding up construction on the project. “The client had to hire an architect to redraw my drawings with his logo to put his stamp on them, which cost the client another \$4,500.00 that he didn’t have to spend.”

In order to put this case behind her, Maurer recounted, “I finally did sign something that said I agreed to disagree” with the accusation that I was practicing architecture. “Basically they put that in their newsletter that I had signed the typical cease-and-desist boiler-plate [stating] that I wouldn’t practice architecture without a license again.” She continued that “is on the Internet, if you call my name up under “Google,” you’ll get copies of the state newsletter.” She reiterated, to this day, “We have no idea what I did that was architecture, because they refuse to tell me,” and furthermore “they don’t have to.”

Another case she knew about involved a designer who worked for the University of Cincinnati, who also received a cease-and-desist.” In that case, “She had a long conference room, had a door at each end, and they put a wall down the middle to make two private offices.” The Board of Examiners sent her a letter to cease-and-desist from practicing architecture without a license. When Maurer talked to the attorney, he explained the Board of Examiners was concerned that the wall would change the HVAC system. She responded with, “That’s when I call in the mechanical engineer and we know to do that.”

In 1994, Volz sent a memorandum to Kathi Bakin of ASID National stating that the Board was using the Administrative Code in Ohio to change enforcement parameters of the architectural law “by defining any alteration to a building” as architecture.”¹⁸⁸ “It is clearly an attempt to legislate by Administrative Rule. We all know that is illegal.” The cease-and-desist orders began before the passage of the seal bill in Ohio.

Seal Legislation for Architecture

Most jurisdictions had seal provisions as part of their architect and professional engineering licensing laws, Ohio did not have sealing provisions. Seal provisions state that each professional must seal and sign their drawing before submittal to building departments. This means that the drawings were produced under their direct supervision of a licensed individual who accepted liability for what is in them. Over the years, this sealing provision has been re-enforced by the changes to the building code. See Section 4-4.

The motivation for the seal bill in Ohio is unknown, but in 1995 the architects wrote legislation to add sealing privileges to their law. According to Kreutzfeld, CIDLO was negotiating with the AIA. They told CIDLO that they wanted the seal bill to stop “design-build people” who did “residential buildings,” but also designed small commercial spaces in office and retail buildings. CIDLO “wanted to oppose [the seal bill] and the architects told us that if we did not fight them, then they would support our legislative process.” She stated that the CIDLO was told, “the design-build people were really the problem” for the architects because they did “direct architectural work.”

This information was reinforced by a memorandum written about a phone conversation between JF,¹⁸⁹ as director of CIDLO and D’Aquila. D’Aquila wrote, JF

reported on a meeting with the Ohio Design Task Force who sponsored the seal bill, and CIDLO saying “interior designers were told that if they are being harassed by the Board [of Examiners], let them know, and they will get the Board off of their backs.”¹⁹⁰ The memorandum continued, “They were not out to get the interior designers [with the seal bill]; they are targeting people who one day decide that they can draw plans for a building, etc.” The memorandum ended with, “JF said there is a case pending now, and they are trying this tactic to see if they are true to their word.” But, their word did not hold because cease-and-desist orders were served on Terri Maurer in 2001.

After the Seal Bill

This situation was exacerbated when the seal bill for Ohio passed in 1995.¹⁹¹ In the interview, Kreutzfeld explained once the seal bill passed everything changed, building departments in the state required a seal by an architect or engineer on plans before they would accept the documents for submittal. She continued, “Many designers who submit[ed] plans after that, for things certainly under the interior designer’s expertise, were accused of practicing architecture.” Volz said, since the passage of the seal law for architecture in 1995, interior designers were disenfranchised from “independent practice.”

Maurer summarized her experience, “That’s where the bitterness comes into it. It is just frustrating! We’re doing design as ethically as we can; we’re being open and honest with our clients.” In addition, “we’re working against all this other nonsense. And it just becomes a sad, sad game.”

Coping with the Seal Bill

With the passage of the seal bill and with no legal definition of interior design,

some of the largest and most successful interior design firms in Ohio had their work redefined as architecture. This work was routinely performed by interior designers before the seal law.

Maurer stated, “We’ve had designers run out of business in Ohio because they [could not] hire an architect to do their drawings.”¹⁹² Before the early 1990s, if an interior designer did modify interior partitioning in existing buildings they could hire the correct professional and file for building permits. In 1993, the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architecture changed the interpretation of the laws and some interior design firms “hired architects on their staff.”¹⁹³ Because the regulations say: (1) any business filing for a building permit needs to be an architectural or engineering firm; (2) in order to register as an architectural firm, 51% of the owners have to be registered architects, interior design firms had to give away 51% of their business to an architect or an engineer to continue to do business.”¹⁹⁴

In response, some of the larger independent interior design firms began to hire architects to be able to file for building permits for their projects, but that was not an adequate solution. In fact, Marci Zimmerman,¹⁹⁵ who was interviewed over the telephone on August 29, 2006, commented that her firm hired an architect on staff to seal their drawings. She left the business after a couple of years when it became clear that the business was no longer a viable concern when they gave away 51% of their firm to an architect in order to continue to do the work that they had done previously.

Volz put it this way, “We still have certain purview, that as interior designers, we believe that [our practice] is not restricted” by the passage of the seal law. He continued, they soon understood that “when you are making any kind of constructed alteration to the

interior of a building, that needs to respond to building code, [and] you are going to get a building permit, you are going to have the seal of an architect or engineer” on your drawings. He continued, that begs the question, “Are these projects happening without a permit, which is not professional, or are these projects happening with the participation of an architect and engineer at a higher cost to the consumer as result of the architects seal law?” In his opinion, there is no justification for the additional fee, extra time or that added level of administrative expense. In 2005, his company shared offices with an architectural firm that issues interior drawings on their title block under their architectural seal for building permits.

Perception of the Public

When asked about how the public perception of interior design has changed, Volz stated, “My personal opinion is that public perception has not changed in the last twenty years. That does not say that there are not people who have a greater understanding of what interior design brings to the table. There are.” He has more clients now than he had twenty years ago who understand “the value of interior design.” But, as to the public at large, he thinks interior design has “taken a step back with some of the reality television shows [such as, *Trading Spaces*]. To a large extent interior design has become trivialized by the shows.” He feels that until registration happens in Ohio, the public’s perception of interior design will not change.

Kreutzfeld stated that maybe the public is “more aware of” interior design as a profession, but, “hiring a certified interior designer” is not foremost in the public’s mind when it comes to a design project. It is “Who you know and what you know is the prime factor in choosing an interior designer.” Maurer stated, “Well, since we do not have any

[licensing] in Ohio, it's hard to say. But I think to some degree it is making a difference.” She continued, “I think in the states that [have] it, there's definitely a better perception of what designers do.”

Perception of Interior Design

When asked about how the perception of the profession has changed during this period, all three designers felt that there was a real lack of commitment by the rank-and-file interior designer for licensing. Volz stated it this way, “I don't see [registration] happening in Ohio in the next ten years. And the reason is because I don't see the population of interior designers, [who] would be affected by licensing, behind it.” We need to have “commitment to the profession [that] goes way beyond any source of income. Something you do because you can't see yourself doing anything else.” He concluded, “I do this because it is what I want to do and I can't imagine doing anything else. [To] some people it is truly a source of passion to the extent that they are willing to go to the mat.” Kreutzfeld put it this way: many designers “profess to being very busy, and when they are busy,” they do not care. She continued, “unless they face an obstacle, like the tax on their business” they do not care.

Personal Growth

Volz spoke about how the process has “made me more diligent about issues like professional liability. I want to make sure that I don't do anything to contribute to the AIA's argument that an interior designer created a larger hazard on a project.” In addition, “I now have a separate independent professional liability insurance policy, which I didn't have at the time when all of this licensure effort began. But he admitted

that getting insurance may have “happened because we are in an increasingly litigious environment in this country. And I want to protect my business and myself.”

When asked how working on licensing for interior designers has changed her, Kreutzfeld related that in the beginning she was “interested in seeing it pass just to give status to the profession and [differentiate] qualified people who practice.” Her viewpoint changed over time. She worked on licensing “because the state of Ohio says that I am not legal. They do not recognize interior design as a profession.” She continued it is only recently that “the United States government does [recognize the profession] under its own designation.” They list interior design specification as a recognized profession for immigration.

Maurer related that the process of attempting to get licensing in Ohio had “made me very bitter.” She went on to explain, “We like to think that we have grown up in a relatively enlightened women’s situation in this country.” She continued, “We grew up with the group that decided we could do everything. We could get jobs, families, careers, and educations.” She continued after working on licensure, “It’s like, you’re pushing this rock uphill and it’s a good ol’ boys’ club. It is so frustrating to not be able to get somebody to listen to what you have to say.”

In addition, her frustration was apparent when she related, “Those of us that have been in ASID abide by a code of ethics. And we’re dealing with politicians, who if anybody has picked up a newspaper in the last five years, left that word [ethics] out of their dictionary all together.” Maurer reiterated interior designers, whether working on a home or in business such as a hotel, hospital, or daycare center,” want to make those

places “safe and aesthetically pleasing.” They know the environment relates back to the “mental and physical” welfare for the end-user.

Kreutzfeld was optimistic when she spoke about the future of design. We need “to encourage them to take the Step [program]. If self certification through the NCIDQ is their only hope” they need to take the examination.¹⁹⁶ She continued, “I have seen so many designers who have made the effort and passed the NCIDQ, literally blossom; it gives them a confidence in themselves and their capabilities that they didn’t have before.” She continued that the “NCIDQ is only merely minimum competency;” it tests knowledge “that is pertinent” to the field.

Other Concerns

Volz stated, “I think, what needs to happen is for IIDA and ASID to finally say “let’s put aside the differences and come together with a common vision, [for] greater financial and membership strength.” He continued that, “NCIDQ, FIDER, and the professional societies could be the focus for that.” The problem is there are too many individual groups [with] specific focus to the exclusion of the others.” Without working together, “I would probably not be so aware of what my colleagues in Vancouver were suffering at the hands of some group that was trying to restrict their practice.”

Maurer said, interior design is “a different body of knowledge,” than architecture. Because most interior design programs include a number of building systems courses,” interior designers know “how to recognize a load-bearing wall” and “when you need to bring in a mechanical engineer [or] when you need to bring in an electrical engineer”. On the other hand, “none of their [architectural] programs require anything in interiors at all.” She continued, the AIA thinks, “they’re qualified to do anything we do,” but on the

other hand “we are not qualified to do what we have been trained to do” and have been doing for years. “How do you argue with that kind of logic?”

Volz reiterated Maurer’s comments by stating, “Architects would very much like to define the activities of interior design within the realm of the practice of architecture.” He continued, “that is clearly something that we have fought time and time again. But, by virtue of the fact that they have a seal law, it really is a moot point now” in Ohio.

On the other hand, Volz said, clearly “we have a problem with untrained people in our own profession” and regulation of the profession will help solve that problem over time. He countered from the governmental side of things, “ultimately if [the state] budget is what is driving this [inability to get legislation passed]... Okay, let’s get rid of interior design registration; get rid of architectural, and engineering registration” and let the market determine the qualifications of each profession.

One of the positive things Kreutzfeld sees is the profession changing the way interior designers charge for their time. Where they once sold product, more designers are now selling their time for a fee, “which makes them more professional.”

Kreutzfeld was concerned that the seal bill really exacerbated the divide between residential and commercial interior designers. “The seal bill exempted single dwelling homes and [two story] apartments units,” so residential interior designers can submit their own documents to the building department for building permits. She continued on the other hand, the commercial interior designer, who designs public spaces, could no longer get building permits without an architect re-drawing their documents to affix their seal in a legal manner. Maurer added, the re-drawing of documents costs the client considerably

more money for no reason. Volz stated that the seal bill, “basically disenfranchised” the independent practice of commercial interior design in Ohio.

Conclusion

Ohio demonstrates the negative effect that not having licensure has on the independent practice of interior design. While the process of attempting to get licensing had followed on a similar timeline to Washington, D.C. and Virginia, the veto of interior design legislation in 1992 set Ohio on a different path. As of 2007, the Ohio Legislature has failed to pass licensure for interior designers.

Ohio demonstrates how the lack of licensure can affect interior design’s right to practice. After the veto, the changes in enforcement of architectural rules and the passage of the seal bill changed the landscape for independent practice of commercial interior design in Ohio. Once prosperous independent interior design businesses closed and interior designers went to work for architectural firms to do what they once did in their independent interior design concerns. Others hired architects and gave away 51% of their business, which is not a viable long term solution to this problem.

The conflict between CIDLO, the AIA, and the other interior design organizations has allowed the opposition to split the profession of interior design into core units of interest. These tactics have weakened the overall efforts of licensing for interior design in the state of Ohio. Before 1999, the division between trained interior designers and the untrained was obscured by the seven separate interior design organizations. The legislators could not differentiate those professional organizations from the less qualified Interior Design Society (IDS). This confusion was used effectively by the coalition of AIA, engineers and IDS.

There were also some interesting revelations. The Joint Accord was used to negatively impact negotiations with the AIA. As we saw in the Section 4-4 and here, both the AIA and CIDLO feel that the other group does not negotiate in good faith and has considerably more money to use in legislation. The former should not be surprising, as Freidson and Abbott said that professional organizations promote and fiercely defend their perceived jurisdiction. The latter is always in the eye of the beholder. The fact that Maurer's question about what was it that she did that was architecture and was not answered is very intriguing. The new strategy of not negotiating with the AIA has elicited concern from the AIA about lack of interaction. It is notable that the interior designers interviewed were not optimistic about the future of interior design as an independent profession.

Conclusion of Chapter 4

When comparing what happened in the three jurisdictions examined, some findings are obvious. The higher the level of licensing, the more protection there is for the independent practice of interior design. The higher the level of licensure, the more respect there is for the licensed individual. In Ohio, where there is no licensure for interior design, once thriving interior design businesses have closed and other interior designers have partnered with or gone to work for architectural firms to continue to do the work that they had done independently in the past.

The opposition has done a good job of dividing interior design into its smallest parts, and interior designers have allowed this. Both Gary Volz and Terri Maurer said that residential interior design is separate from commercial design because it is hard to explain how the design of residential projects affects the health safety and welfare of the

public sufficiently to warrant governmental intervention. While they totally understand and can espouse the effects material selections and space planning have on the safety of the public in commercial design projects, they have a hard time reaching the same certitude in residential design. In addition, residential interior designers can pull building permits for most of its projects so are not as concerned about licensure to be able to practice. This division of interior design cuts the support base in half. Interior design needs to come together in understanding that interior design the psychological health of the family unit that lives in a home designed well or poorly.

The results sections also clearly demonstrate that the splitting of interior design into its smallest units makes it easy to conquer. These divisions of interior design cut the support for licensure in half and cut the number of licensed individuals, which affects interior design's ability to get future legislation and to resist deregulation efforts. It allows the opposition to alter their arguments to fit the weaknesses and divisions of interior design in each jurisdiction. The most blatant was in Ohio where the AIA formed a coalition with Interior Design Society. I believe residential interior design qualified by NCIDQ must be folded back into the health, safety, and welfare argument of the built environment.

The rank and file interior designers need to understand the necessity to become licensed. This is no longer an issue that can be put off for another day when they are not so busy. They need to understand that what they do is a profession that can harm or promote the health, safety, and welfare of the public and stand up for that by becoming licensed. For the foreseeable future, it may be the only way that interior design will not be taken over by architecture.

Some themes seen throughout this dissertation: the designers working on licensure do not understand the true cost of regulation to jurisdictions. While the commercial interior designers can easily justify the health, safety, and welfare needs of their commercial clients, they have more problem justifying licensing for residential interior design. This may allow interior design numbers already low in comparisons to other professions to be effectively cut in half.

The AIA has done a good job of halting progress of licensure in many jurisdictions and has worked for deregulation in other jurisdictions where licensing has been passed, such as Washington, D.C. and Virginia. Volz stated, “They play games with words.” Time and again, interviewees stated that, just when they thought they had moved forward, the situation would revert back where they started. Maurer in Ohio may have come up with the best strategy, which is to ignore the AIA and tell the legislators that it is impossible to work with them. This coincides with my suggestion that interior design establish its own separate identity from architecture. In no way can these experiences be considered unique. The stories conveyed through these interviews were repeated in each jurisdiction.

It must be understood that conflicts and struggles are part of the process for legislation. But the struggle has, in my opinion, made interior design into a profession. In addition, the field is making progress towards recognition. For example, on October 13, 1994, architect, JRW¹⁹⁷ testified in support of certification for interior designers in Ohio, said “I know that there are certain areas of the interior designer’s activity that overlaps my expertise, just as there are areas of the practice of engineers that overlap architecture.” He continued by saying that civil engineers’ work may overlap with that of

landscape architects, but each has its distinct core of expertise and each should be identified as a unique profession and licensed or certified accordingly.

Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This dissertation is the first extensive examination of interior design as a profession. It establishes the history of professionalization of interior design based on the theory of professions. While it began study as a historical case-study of licensure in three jurisdictions with three different levels of regulation, it soon expanded into a full examination of the profession and the process of professionalization. Specifically, it answers three questions: Is interior design a profession? If so, what forces transformed interior design into a profession? What makes interior design different from architecture?

I found that interior design as practiced in 2007 began in the 1950s. This dissertation documents the living history of the profession. Because it is such a new profession the literature review included a limited number of books and articles. Much of the historical documentation came from handouts from professional organizations and information gathered through interviews. The interviewees included the executive directors of professional organizations and participants in the licensing process in the three jurisdictions examined. This document used the lens of the theory of professions to analyze the information about the profession or the professionalization of interior design.

Definition of Interior Design

Interior design as practiced by 200,000 practitioners in the United States is an independent profession concerned with the interiors of buildings, applying the theory of behavior to design micro-environments for the end user that function at a safe and efficient level, while assuring the interiors are aesthetically pleasing.

Development of Interior Design

At the turn of the 20th Century, newly designed structures began to take over the center and periphery of most cities. These steel structures designed by architects offered large open plan spaces in the interior with acres of undeveloped space to be leased by new tenants at some future time. This new kind of leased space required someone trained in design to transform it into useable space for the new occupants. Architects were busy designing new buildings so interior designers filled this gap in service. Interior design expanded every aspect of its knowledge base to meet the needs of this new type of service and interior decoration transformed into interior design. The field expanded rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s in response to the new needs.

During the 1970s recession, the market for architecture vanished and architects turned their attention to this new market place. Architects said they always did the interior as part of the building and claimed it as their lost territory. They attempted to take control of this new market. Interior design came under attack because it had developed the remodeling market into a viable profession, which was separate from architecture.

Architecture and the Interior

There have always been some architects who designed the interior of buildings. Architects such as Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius and Frank Lloyd Wright did the interiors including the design of furniture, tableware and silverware. But by the 1970s the ordinary architect designed the interior of the public areas in the buildings they designed. These spaces included the lobby, elevator lobbies, egress stairwells and public

restrooms. For thirty years, most architects ignored the new and growing market of the tenant space in these new buildings.

Architects were not interested in remodeling the interiors of existing spaces until the recession of the mid 1970s. In the 1970s and 1980s, they attempted to take “back” their lost territory. They announced that the interior was a part of their building package and therefore their purview to design or supervise. My research supports my contention that because there were fewer buildings to design, architecture looked to remodeling the interior of existing spaces to supplement their business and found interior design had already captured that market.

My research also found that the 1981 changes to BOCA captured this remodeling market for architects and engineers. I found that representatives of the professions of architecture and engineering then trained the building officials to accept drawings with architects’ or engineers’ seals only, thus cutting off the profession of interior design from an activity it was trained to perform and had practiced since 1950.

It should be noted that architecture declares itself to be the sole arbiter of the built environment, thereby bringing interior design under the purview of architecture. Yet as the built environment has become more complex, architecture has split into smaller yet technical increments of knowledge. The master builder of Gothic cathedrals has divided into a team of professionals including the architect, contractor/builder, engineer, planner, surveyor, landscape architect and interior designer. All members of this team are complementary professions. The overlap of that expertise is the bedrock of the checks and balances built into the regulatory boards, which protect the public from harm.

Interior Design and Architecture -- a Comparison

In order to understand how interior design differs from architecture, this document compared the two professions by reviewing the accreditation, examination and internship programs. Initially it was difficult to differentiate the professions because both work with clients, use the same terminologies and produce similar documents of design, such as floor plans. I discovered what differentiates the two professions is the theoretical emphasis on which each is based. While these theories are not unique to each profession nor mutually exclusive, the theory of behavior predominates in the profession of interior design and the theory of aesthetics predominates in the profession of architecture.

Professionalization of Interior Design

By examining interior design through the lens of the theory of professions by Freidson and Abbott, I determined that interior design met most of the components of professionalization by 1980. However, insecurities within the profession and opposition from outside of the profession caused practitioners of interior design question their professional status. This was exacerbated by interior design using architecture as a guide to judge its own professional status. This put interior design in a position subservient to the older profession.

Gender

Gender is an important subtext to professionalization and professional status because of the predominance of females in interior design and males in architecture. This predominance has resulted in the internalization of feminine traits at the most basic level of the services interior design offers. In addition, gender affects how the profession of

interior design defines itself and how it deals with such conflicts as how the profession is regarded by state legislators.

Rather than looking at the feminine aspect of interior design as a detriment, I believe it is part of what makes interior design's viewpoint unique and valued in the built environment. The theoretical base for interior design – the sociological model of the theory of behavior -- arises from the many influential education programs developed in university home economics departments. While I do not espouse this viewpoint, I believe that it cannot be discounted that some aspects of this feminization may be internalization in the culturally assigned roles of the interior as the “private sphere and domestication,” or “the feminine” environment for females to design.

This feminization of interior design brings strengths to the profession, complementing and reinforcing the theory of behavior. According to Anne Vytlačil such feminine traits as a focus on working within the existing context, adaptability of environments and an emphasis on function, are integral to interior design. She also said females understand user psychological needs and have a willingness to incorporate varying opinions into their design. In my opinion, this is exactly what interior designers do and what distinguishes their services from main-stream architecture.

Building Code

I examined the Building Officials & Code Administrators (BOCA) building codes. When BOCA changed in 1981, it captured the remodeling of existing spaces for architects and professional engineers by excluding non-licensed practitioners from filing plans. This action made licensure for interior design mandatory in order to keep it an

independent profession. These changes imposed a restraint on the trade and threatened the interior designer's right to practice.

The building code is part of the government's complex regulations and codes that protect the public in the built environment. These regulations include checks and balances of professions with overlapping expertise. The redundancies of overlapping expertise can confirm and check the work of others in the design and building process. Other checks and balances include code officials and inspectors who assure that construction is performed to code. With the complexity of construction techniques and building codes, the exclusion of interior design through this regulation weakens the web of protection for the public.

Conflicts and Transformation

Abbott described the conflicts within and among professions that change and shape all professions into something that they were not before. I found that conflicts inherent in the professionalization process have been critical to making interior design into a profession. The conflicts made interior design refine its definition and closely examine its position in the built environment. Conflicts also helped it define how the profession affected the health, safety and welfare of the public. The conflicts that faced interior design have been from within the profession, from other professions and from governmental resistance to increasing the cost and size of government.

Conflicts within the Profession

Freidson and Abbott said a unified profession is stronger than organizations separated by petty distinctions. The conflicts within the profession have been and will be used to separate the profession into its smallest parts in the legislative process. The

insecurities within the interior design profession, as demonstrated by the seven professional organizations in the Unified Voice talks, have split the profession of interior design into smaller and smaller increments. The divisions include interior designers working for architectural firms and the variety of commercial interior design organizations such as retail, federal workers and business designer and residential designers.

These divisions have allowed the opposition to split the profession into its smallest parts. They have also allowed subsidiary professional organizations, such as Interior Design Society (IDS) and National Kitchen and Bath Association (NKBA), to have a larger voice in the legislative process because legislators cannot figure out whom is speaking for the qualified professional. This has weakened legislative efforts. The professional design organizations and individual designers need to unify, respect one another's expertise and have confidence each other's unique expertise.

In addition, my research shows that interior design must keep residential interior design within this regulation process, because poorly delivered residential interior design also affects the health, and welfare of the public. Issues such as universal design and aging in place will be more important as the population ages.

Michael Alin, the Executive Director of ASID, and other interviewees stated, once jurisdictions have adopted licensure, interior designers must become registered. The lack of practicing professional registrants is affecting future efforts to strengthen licensing from title acts to practice acts and to defend against de-regulation. Rank and file interior designers need to understand the necessity to be licensed and take the steps to become licensed in the jurisdictions in which they practice.

Conflict from Other Professions

It is my opinion, based on my research, that because of the newness of the profession and its need to quality itself as a profession, interior design used architecture as a comparison to its professionalization to its detriment. It placed interior designers at a subservient level to architects. The AIA used this inferior position to negotiate with interior design, reinforced the divisions within the profession and used those divisions to their advantage.

The main opposition to licensure has come from the AIA. Interior designers negotiated with the AIA on a national level with the Joint Accord and in every jurisdiction. In fact, interior design allowed the AIA to help define interior design legislation parameters in the Joint Accord. The Accord benefited architecture and in the end was detriment to interior design, because it permitted only title legislation. This resulted in the elimination of the stronger professional regulatory restrictions applicable to doctors, lawyers and architects that are found in licensing laws around the country. And, this led to the elimination of the power of interior designers to be recognized as professionals eligible to pull building permits, thus reinforcing the AIA position of pre-eminence.

In addition, one aspect that makes interior designers good in their profession, a willingness to compromise diverse viewpoints, has hurt their ability to negotiate with the AIA as equals. Interior design must find and hone the negotiating tools necessary to present a powerful and united front to legislators rather than deferring to the AIA. Otherwise, architecture can continue to promote its dismissive attitude toward interior design, demonstrated most poignantly in architecture's silence in response to Maurer's

attempt to obtain an explanation from architects about what it was she was doing that constituted “architecture.”

My research shows that title legislation clearly does not protect the public from unqualified practitioners. In fact, the AIA is aware that title legislation does not protect the public. Interior design needs to continue to work for practice legislation to protect the public from unqualified practitioners and to be part of the checks and balances discussed in the codes section.

Governmental Resistance

The most misunderstood aspect of opposition to licensure is the government’s resistance toward new regulations. First and foremost, interior design fails to recognize the prevailing unwillingness of governmental bodies to regulate. Because interior design hears the issue as primarily a function of cost of regulation, all of the interviewees have spent time analyzing costs of regulation, which they have not fully understood. They see only the surface costs of the legislation. These costs include such things as a new regulatory board, mailing expenses and an additional or shared employee. In actuality, new regulation requires enforcement which includes such expenses as additional inspectors, attorneys, judges and courtroom space for adjudication. There are other hidden expenses such as the creation and maintenance of costly interactive web sites. In a period where state and local governments are facing major budgetary concerns and have to choose between cutting school programs and repairing the crumbling roads, the additional cost for regulation is very hard to justify. This means that any group requesting new licensure must demonstrate that an unregulated profession can harm the public.

In addition, the continuing financial crises in governmental bodies will pressure governments to de-regulate. Many jurisdictions that have licensure face regularly scheduled sunset regulations, which mandate regular review and justification of professional regulation. Professional coalitions continually fight to keep the regulations they have.

Case Studies

Examination of three legislative effort case studies in Washington, D.C., Virginia and Ohio, found: licensure protects the profession from infringement on the right to practice. The stronger the legislation the more protection it gives the independent practitioner.

Case Study – Washington, D.C.

The interviews and documentation from Washington, D.C., demonstrated that the practice act was the best solution to protect the public and assure independent practice of interior design. After passage of the practice act, the initial jockeying for position between professions eventually ceased, and the animosities between professions decreased. There was an increase in respect between professions. The interviewees believed that the perception of interior design by the public and other professions has risen because of recognition the act has elicited. In addition, the act prevented untrained, inexperienced and untested people from practicing interior design.

With the budget cutbacks in Washington, D.C., however, interior design found that it was not done protecting the public and its professional independence. Only with vigilance was it successful in fighting off the threat of deregulation. Enforcement of licensing laws is also a problem when budgets are tight.

Case Study – Virginia

The interviews and documentation in Virginia demonstrated that a title act does not protect the public from untrained, inexperienced and untested practitioners of interior design. It merely prevents those people from calling themselves “certified interior designers.” These interviews and documentation also demonstrated that the adoption of the Joint Accord enabled interior design to gain the less satisfactory act without opposition from the AIA.

The Virginia case study also demonstrated that interior design should use specific events, such as the three nursing home fires, to prove to legislators the need for government to protect the public from unlicensed interior designers who might, for example, use dangerous materials in their work. There has been an increase in respect for interior design from both professional colleagues and the public with a title act.

With state budget cutbacks similar to those in Washington, D.C., Virginia also faced the threat of deregulation. While interior design in those two jurisdictions has been successful in fighting it off, vigilance over the legislative and administrative process is needed on a continual basis.

Case Study – Ohio

The interviews and documentation on Ohio demonstrated that, although the process for licensing was very similar to other jurisdictions, the unpredicted outcome of

the governor's drastically changed the climate for interior design. Because Ohio never attained interior design licensing legislation, interior designers in Ohio have had an uphill battle to continue to practice as independent practitioners. At least six interior design firms were sued for practicing architecture without a license. A number of dependent firms were forced out of business. And a number of formerly independent designers have partnered with or gone to work for architectural firms in order to continue to practice their profession. In addition, Ohio's seal law has effectively excluded interior designers from preparing documents for submittal to building officials.

Recommendations

From my research it has become clear that the lack of a legal definition of interior design is detrimental to the profession of interior design in the long term. Some of the problems include: without regulation there is no method for the public or other complementary professions to differentiate the designer with education and experience, and proven by an examination, from someone with no training. If a jurisdiction adopts a title act and then moves to a practice act, the profession must open the profession to grand-parenting thus letting the unqualified practitioners into the profession, for a second time. The new legislation would need to be written to minimized this circumstance.

Unification of the profession is necessary. A single professional organization assures a stronger financial organization. Legislators would understand whose voice represents qualified interior designers. It would consolidate finances. In addition, it would concentrate volunteers onto issues important to the profession as a whole, in turn increasing the impact of those volunteers.

Interior design must overcome its identity crisis and embrace its unique characteristics. In defining itself, interior design has used architecture as a guidepost. Even though decoration of spaces has been in existence since the time of cave painting, the profession of interior design, as it is now practiced, is a new and quickly transforming profession. The public, represented by legislators, finds it hard to understand something that has transformed in just fifty years.

Interior design must embrace its predominantly female orientation rather than allowing that orientation to complicate the issues. This cultural baggage includes all of the following: (1) The interior is not as important as the structure of the building. (2) The interior is a woman's place. (3) The interior is both transitory and personal, and therefore trivial. And (4) What does yellow have to do with health, safety and welfare? To the contrary, interior design knows that the interior is where the individual workers or residents perform safely and efficiently or face unknown hazards in their environment because of an untrained person designing it.

Professionalization

My research has convinced me that it was dealing with the conflicts inherent in the process of licensure transformed interior design into a profession. Because of interior design had to define itself, it had to formalize the education, accredit the educational programs, and establish a national qualification examination. Its professional organizations advanced the profession and began the push for licensing. The conflicts within the profession have helped it differentiate itself from decorating. The conflicts with architecture have helped it understand its unique body of knowledge and viewpoint.

In addition, my research has demonstrated that where interior designers are licensed they have gained respect and acceptance as fellow professionals and the public.

My initial thesis was that scholarship should address the justification for licensure for interior design. In the course of that research, I discovered the greater need for scholarship to understand the history of the professionalization of interior design, and then focused that scholarship through the lens of the process of licensure. My findings are now grounded in research and close examination. Interior design has progressed significantly, but it needs to accept itself for all of the strengths it brings to the built environment. The main body of this research was conducted from 2003 through 2006 and the profession faces new challenges and new opponents.

Interior design is not just a pretty face, but a profession with services that affect the health, safety and welfare of the public. To be a recognized profession, interior design needs the ability to stay independent from architecture. In the current political climate that independence comes only with licensure.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marilyn Corson Whitney, ASID, IDEC
December 3, 2008

Bibliography

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: an essay on the division of expert labor*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL
- Abercrombie, S. (1985, July). Leaders confer again. *Interior Design Magazine*, 56, 7, 181.
- Abercrombie, S. (1988, June). In the trenches. *Interior Design Magazine*, 59, 9, 180.
- Adams, E. (1988). Common good. *Architecture*, 88, 6, 118-122.
- AIA, ASID, IBD & ISID. (1989). Agreement of Support. Letter to Licensing Coalitions.
- AIA board votes to collaborate with interior designer, other allies. (1989). *AIArchitect*.
- AIA moves on Interior Design Licensing. (1989, February). *Progressive Architecture*, 177, 6, 25.
- American Society of Interior Designers. (2005). *History of ASID: 30 years of advancing the interior design profession*. Washington, D.C.
- American Society of Interior Designers. (2005). Washington, D.C..
- American Society of Interior Designers. *Fact and Figures*. (2004). Washington, D.C..
- American Society of Interior Designers. (1987). Licensing of interior designers an ASID white paper. NY.
- ASID, IIDA, NKBA and NCIDQ join forces to protect interior designers. (1999, October). *NCIDQ Letter*, 2.
- Legislation By State. <http://www.asid.org/legislation/state/> Retrieved on 11-29-08.
- ASID & IIDA Meet to Share Goals for Interior Design Industry (April 10, 2000). ASID Media Information Center. Washington, D.C..
- ASID National. (1999). ASID withdraws from unified voice talks letter to members.
- Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: the changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Bennett, B. (1996, September). Architects score wins for industry standards. *Detroit Free Press*. Detroit, MI.

- Berger, C. J. (1990, February). Law: getting and keeping a license. *Progressive Architecture*, 71, 2, 57.
- Blakesmore, B. (1997). *History of interior design and furniture*. NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bone, S. (1994, May). Legislation from Europe. *Architects Journal*, 199, 19, 38.
(1994). Building codes and life safety. *Building Renovation*, 5, 2, 47-48
- Brubaker, John S. and Rudy, Willis (1997). *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities*. Fourth Edition, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ.
- NPFA. (2005). History of the NFPA codes and standards-making system. <http://www.nfpa.org/assets/files/PDF/historyNFPAStandards.pdf>. Retrieved April 25, 2005.
- Building Officials Conference of America, Inc. (1965). Fourth Edition. Owl Printing Company, IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1970). Fifth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1975). Sixth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1978). Seventh Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1981). Eighth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1984). Ninth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1987). Tenth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1993). Twelfth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1996). Thirteenth Edition. IL.
- Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1999). Fourteenth Edition. IL.
- Brent, R. S. and Seidel, A. D. (1988). Commonalities and differences in graduate interior design programs: IDEC membership sample. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 14, 2, 29-36.
- Brent, R. S. and Seidel, A. D. (1990). A quantitative comparison of graduate programs in architecture and interior design. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 16, 1, 11-16.

- Building codes and life safety. (1994, Winter) *BR Building Renovation*, 1994.
- Code Consultants Inc. (1986). *Fire code summary - Architectural Woodwork Institute*. St. Louis, MO.
- Clothing, Textiles and Related Art. (1964). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA. 134-137.
- Collins, B.C. (February 25, 2005). Telephone interview by author
- Coplan, N. (1990, November). Discusses a recent case in which an interior designers challenges architectural licensing, Law: defining interior designer. *Progressive Architecture*, 71, 12, 41.
- Coplan, N. (1990, July). Discusses various definitions of interior designers for purpose of their licensing, Law: licensing interior designers. *Progressive Architecture*, 71, 7, 41.
- Dunn, V. (2005). Are architects, engineers and code-writing officials friends of the firefighter? <http://vincentdunn.com/dunn/a&e/buildings.htm>. Retrieved 11-29-2008
- Evans, G. W. (2003, December) The built environment and mental health. *Journal of Urban Health*, 80, 4, 9, 536-555.
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/332145g14675h745/> Retrieved August 13, 2007
- Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: theory, prophecy and policy*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Freiman, Z. (1990, September). Interior design. *Progressive Architecture*, 71, 9, 95.
- Gargaro, P. (1995, December 4) Survey finds building-safety concern. *Crain's Detroit Business*, 10.
- Greenstreet, R. (1988, November). Law: licensing precautions. *Progressive Architecture*, 69, 12, 53, 56, 58, 60.
- Gueft, O. (1980 & 1988). *ASID the past as prologue: the first 50 years. 1931-1981: an overview*. A reprint of the *ASID Annual Report* in the ASID National Meetings booklet in Grand Rapids, MI.
- Guice, J. H. (1993). The propensity of state legislatures to license interior designers. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 19, 2, 3-14.
- Hammatt, H. (2002, March) The quest for licensure: part I. *Landscape Architecture*, 92, 3, 54-56.

Hammatt, H. (2002, November). The quest for licensure: part II. *Landscape Architecture* 92, 11, 62, 64-65.

Hammatt, H. (2002, December). The quest for licensure: part III. *Landscape Architecture*, 92, 12, 54, 56-57.

Harwood, A. B. (1991). Comparing the standards in interior design and architecture to assess similarities and differences. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 7, 1, 5-18.

Hewlett, C. J. (1985). The future in interior design. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 11, xx, 10-12.

History of fire fighting. (2005). *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*, 6th ed.. Columbia University Press. <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1E1-firefigh.html>, Retrieved November 29, 2008.

History of IIDA. <http://www.iida.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=161>, Retrieved November 26, 2004

Home economics. (1921). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA. 115-116.

Home economics. (1958). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA. 216-221.

Home economics. (1962). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA. 128-133.

Home economics. (1921, 1958, 1960 & 1964). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA.

Hooray! AG opinion supports A/Es. (1995, September). *AIA Michigan – Bulletin* 1. Interior design registration laws. (2004, October 22)

International Building Code, Inc. (2003). First Edition. Chicago, IL.

IDEC Website <http://www.idec.org/> Retrieved October 22, 2005.

IIDA History. (2004, November 26)
<http://www.iida.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=161>

(1964, January). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Historical Data Book*, LOV LVII #3, 34.

JID Editors. (2004). www.journalofinteriordesign.org/ Retrieved November 29, 2008.

- Kostof, S., (1977). *The architect chapters in the history of the profession*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Kostof, S. (1985). *A history of architecture settings and rituals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Lahndt-Hearney, L. (1996). The role of professional registration in engineering academia. *IEEE, FIE 1996 Proceedings*, 1239-1242.
- Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: a sociological analysis*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Levrio, J. (1985, April 29). *An Assessment of the Interface of Specialized Accreditation and State Professional Licensure Policies and Procedures*. Paper presented at the meeting of Education Research Conference, University of Maryland.
- Licensing bill amended in Florida. (1989, July). *Interior Design Magazine*, 60, 7, 54.
- Licensing muddle in Arkansas. (1993, June). *Interior Design Magazine*, 6, 6, 35.
- Lugones, M. C., & Spelman, E. V. (1983). "Have we got a theory for you! Feminist theory, cultural imperialism and the demand for "the woman's voice" ". In Kolmar W. K., & Bartkowski, F. (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader*, Second edition. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Martin, C. and Guerin, D. (2006). The body of knowledge of interior design. Retrieved on 6-16-08 at <http://www.careersininteriordesign.com/idbok.pdf>
- Massey, A. (1990). *Interior design of the 20th century*. New York, NY: Themes & Hudson, Inc.
- McGinty, J. M. (1994, November/December). NCARB – Big Brother? *Texas Architect*, 44, 6, 22-23.
- McKellar, S. & Sparke, P. (2004). *Interior design and identity*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Acceptance of architectural and engineering plans. (2001, December 10). *Bureau of Construction Codes Technical Bulletin: Michigan Department of Consumer & Industry Services*, Lansing, MI.
- Mitgang, L. D. (1999, July). Overwhelmed by requirements, interns cheat on reports to NCARB. *Architectural Record*, 187, 7, 55 & 62.
- Mowat, J. (1987, March). Critique of AIA objections to interior design licensing as stated in the AIA white paper, Lansing, MI.

NCARB - trust us to never change. (1999, June). *Architecture*, 88, 6, 118-122.

NCIDQ Website. (2004). <http://www.ncidq.org/who/index.asp> Retrieved October 28, 2008.

New design professional newsletter addresses regulatory issues. (2000, June) *AIA Michigan Bulletin*, 5.

Nesmith, L. (1989, January). AIA, ASID & IBD sign accord on designer title registration. *Architecture: the AIA Journal*, 78, 1, 18 & 20.

Nesmith, L. (1988, December). Board to consider new policy on interior design licensing. *Architecture: the AIA Journal*, 77, 12, 40.

O'Sullivan, R. C. (1996, November). Interior designers and practice restrictions: is it worth the fight? *The Forbes Group*.

Pearslee, J. E., James, D. and Simmons, R. (1988). Litigation in interior design: examining United States appellate court cases in professional practice. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research* 25, 2, 16-31.

Pile, J (2005). *A History of Interior Design*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Hoboken, NJ.

Polites, N. (1993, July). Interior design forum: Arkansas enacts tiered licensing system: interior designers weigh consequences. *Interior Design Magazine*, 64, 7, 33-34.

Polites, Nicholas. (1993, August). Interior design forum: designer licensing trouble ahead? *Interior Design Magazine*, 64, 8, 41-42.

Procurement, interior designer certification: top issues list for '96 legislative sessions. (1995, December) *AIArchitect*, 11.

Professional standards. (2004). <http://www.accredit-id.org/profstandards.php>, Retrieved November 29, 2008.

Sapers, C. (2001). Interior design licensure update. *Direct Connection: National Council of Architecture Registration Boards*, 5.

Schneider, P. (2000). Perfect masters of their art: re-imagining expertise. *Journal of Architectural Education*. 53, 3, 141-145.

Shulman, K. (2003, July). Turf war: why do architectural organizations oppose interior design licensing? *Metropolis*, 22, 11, 98 & 101.

Skog, G. (1999, September). Bits and pieces. *AIA Michigan Bulletin*, 1.

Smith, A. (1988, June). Legislative efforts require negotiation. *AIA Michigan Bulletin*, 11-12.

Sonet, J. M. and Seigel, A. M. (1988, June). Don't step over the line. *Interior Design Magazine*, 59, 9, 96-100.

Stanton, M. J. (1999, November). On the issue of interior designers' registration. *AIArchitect*, 1.

State should raise architectural standards. (1995, December 2). *Detroit Free Press*, Editorial Page.

Tate, A. & Smith, C. J. (1986). *Interior design in the 20th century*. NY: Harper and Row, Publishing, Inc.

Tetlow, K. (1990, May). Qualifying performance. *Interiors*, 149, 10, 50.

Tetlow, K. (1990, December). Business tactics [interior design title registration]. *Interiors*, 150, 5, 39.

(1989) *Architectural Record*, 177, 2, 25.

Vogel, S. (1995, April). Where we are in government affairs. *AIA Michigan – Bulletin*, 1-2.

Vytlačil, A. (1989) "The studio experience." In Berkeley, E. P. (Ed.), *Architecture a place for women*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute.

What do building officials think of architects? (2000). *Direct Connection: National Council of Architecture Registration Boards*, 3, 1, 1.

Woods, M. N. (1999). *From Craft to Profession: The Practice of Architecture in Nineteenth Century America*. University of California Press, CA.

Worth the price of admission? (1994, April). *Progressive Architecture*, 61-65, 100,102

Young, A. (1995, Nov. 20) "Measure would expand who can act as architect." *Detroit Free Press*, sec. 2B

Appendix A
Interview Waivers

Virginia Polytechnic and State University

Informed Consent for Participants
In Research Projects Involving Human Subjects

Title of Project: Licensing for Interior Designers: Three Case Studies

Investigator: Marilyn Whitney

Advisor: Dr. Joseph Rees, Dr. Marilyn Casto and Terry Clements

I. Purpose of Research

The purpose of this study is to examine conflicts licensing exposed between the professions of interior design and architecture, and how this conflict shaped the self-perception of the profession of interior design. The study will delve into three jurisdictions with different levels of licensing and three levels of opposition to licensing. The interviews by Marilyn Whitney (the researcher) will ascertain how the process of licensing or not achieving licensing was performed in your jurisdiction. The assessment of these findings will uncover the similarities and differences in the process and in the outcome; and will track the changes in attitudes of the interviewee about the profession of interior design in these areas.

II. Procedures

The interviews will include three interior designers and one architect from the jurisdictions of Washington D.C., Virginia, and Ohio. They will also include key national legislative leaders. They will be the people who were instrumental in the legislative process and available for the researcher to interview. The interviews will take place in a place at a time agreed upon by both participants in a location where they are comfortable. The interviews will last about two to four hours for a total of about ten hours. Each interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed by the researcher or a transcription person paid for by the researcher. Because of the public nature of the effort to pass legislation the identity of interviewee will not be held confidential.

III. Risks

Participants will be asked to describe and discuss previous experiences with their legislative effort for interior designers in your jurisdiction. This could possibly cause feelings of discomfort. Researchers promise to take all possible measures to eliminate this minimal risk during the course of the study. Participants will have full freedom to stop the interview or withdraw from the study at any point. Each participant will have full access to his/her interview within the study as well as the opportunity to provide feedback to the researcher.

IV. Benefits

No promise or guarantees of benefits are offered from the research to any of the participants. Your participating in this study will possibly benefit from the opportunity of reflecting upon your personal experiences in the process, possibly judge your attitudes and relationships with the events that happened, and have the chance to evaluate your experience. In addition, your participation in this study may benefit other organizations attempting to have licensing by understanding the process better.

The researcher might benefit from the findings of this study by utilizing them to study the process of licensing and how it maybe facilitated in other jurisdictions.

V. Confidentiality and Anonymity

Because the importance of the information in the interview all information may be used by the researcher in her dissertation. The researcher will use the interviewees name and affiliation in the dissertation.

VI. Compensation

The participants will receive no compensation for their participation in this study.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

Participants will have full freedom to stop the interview or withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. Participants are free not to answer any interview questions that they choose. There may be situations where the investigator may determine that a participant should not continue to be involved in the study.

VIII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic and State University.

IRB Approval Date:

IRB Approval Expiration Date:

IX. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have the following responsibilities:

1. To participate in a one-on-one interview for two hours with additional interviews up to ten hours.
2. Provide feedback to the researcher as needed.

X. Subject Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

_____ Date _____
Subject Signature

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:

- _____
- Investigator(s) Telephone/E-mail:
Marilyn Whitney whitneym@vt.edu (540) 382-1228
 - Advisor Telephone/E-mail:
Dr. Marilyn Casto mcasto@vt.edu (540) 231-3687

Departmental Reviewer/ Department Head Telephone/e-mail:

Chair, IRB Telephone/e-mail:

Subjects must be given a complete copy (or duplicate original) of the signed Informed Consent.

Appendix B
Interview Questions

History

Name, Position, Address, telephone and email address.

What was your role in the efforts to have interior design legislation in your jurisdiction?

Please tell me about your experiences in trying to achieve licensing for interior designers.

Summation of History

1. Were the efforts successful?
2. Why?
3. Who was opposed to licensing for interior designers in your jurisdiction?
4. Do you know why they opposed the effort?
5. Who supported licensing for interior designers?
6. Do you know why they supported the effort?

Other questions will flow from the answers...

The Profession of Interior Design – Perceptions

What is your perception of the following questions:

1. Has the process of attempting to be licensed changed the profession of interior design?
2. How?
3. Has the public's perception of interior design changed in the last twenty years?
4. Do you think licensing has affected public perception?
5. How has this process changed you as a professional?

Appendix C

List of Appellations for Organizations

AIA	American Institute of Architects
AIID	American Institute of Interior Decorators
AID	Association for Interior Decorators (Later Association for Interior Designers)
ARE	Architectural Record Examination
ASID	American Society of Interior Designers
CIDA	Council for Interior Design Accreditation
CFID	Council of Federal Interior Designers
FIDER	Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research
IBD	Institute of Business Designers
IDEC	Interior Design Educators Council
IDEP	Interior Design Experience Program
IDP	Intern Development Program for Architecture
IDSA	Industrial Designers Society of America
IF	Industry Foundation allow firms and suppliers to be members of ASID
IDI	Interior Designer Institute of British Columbia
IDO	Interior Designers of Ontario
IDS	Interior Design Society
IIDA	International Interior Design Association
ISID	International Society of Interior Designers
ISP	Institute of Store Planners
NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Boards

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

NCIDQ	National Council for Interior Design Qualification
NCARB	National Council of Architectural Review Boards
NHFL	National Home Furnishings League
NLCID	National Legislative Coalition for Interior Design
NSID	National Society of Interior Designers

Appendix D

Historical Timeline of Interior Design in the United States

- 1800s Upholsterers began helping women decorate their homes.
Interior Decorators became the terminology used.
- 1904 Elsie De Wolfe opened her decorating shop in New York City. (Gueft, 6)
First interior design program at a university.
First organization of interior designers.
- 1932 The American Institute of Interior Decorators (AIID) had its first national meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan. There were 342 members to leave that meeting. Over the years their “Programs for membership included ongoing education and development of a code of ethics and practice guidelines. Outreach to public through such projects as show houses, outreach to students with scholarship and out reach to related professional through affiliated memberships were other continuing efforts.” (Gueft, 7)
- 1933 Move the AIID national offices from Chicago to New York City.
- 1936 The AIID became the American Institute of Decorators (AID). (Gueft, 7)
- 1951 Grand Rapids hosted the twentieth anniversary of AID, which then had 1,200 members.
- 1951 AID Southern California “campaigns to place licensing laws on the books-laws restricting the right to practice interior decoration/design to licensed individuals.” (Gueft, 8)
- 1957 A faction of AID broke off to form the National Society of Interior Designers (NSID) (Gueft, 8)
- 1960 NSID “develops a model bill, a practice act restricting the right to practice interior design to licensed interior designers, and sought to have it passed in a number of states.” (Gueft, 8)

AID worked with psychologist, testing experts, scholars and educators to establish an examination to qualify interior designers. Candidates for membership needed to take the exam to qualify for admission. NSID also developed an examination a little later. (Gueft, 8)
- 1961 AID changed its name to Americans Institute of Designers (Gueft, 8)

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- 1962 Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC) was founded. (Gueft, 8)
- 1970 Foundation for Interior Design Education and Research (FIDER) established standardize accreditation of interior design educational programs. AID, NSID and IDEC worked together to establish this organization. (Gueft, 8) As of 2006 the name changed to Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).
- 1972 National Council for Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ) established an examination to test minimal levels of competency for interior designers. The exam combined the examinations from AID and NSID into a single examination. (Gueft, 8) (<http://www.ncidq.org/who.htm>)
- 1973 Puerto Rico is the first jurisdiction to have licensing and the first practice act in the United States.
- 1975 AID & NSID joined to form the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID). (Gueft, 9) (<http://www.asid.org/>)
- 1982 Alabama is the first state to have a title act for interior designers.
- 1984 Memorandum dated May 22, 1984 from Barbara Ebstein, National Title Registration Chairman to chapter presidents. Questionnaire about their chapter efforts toward registration.
- 1985 Commercial interior designers in ASID formed a separate organization that better catered to their needs. The new organization was the Institute for Business Designers (IBD).
- 1985 ASID recommends that designers form legislative organizations and work toward regulation of interior design in their jurisdiction.
- 1986 The federal government passes a bill, which gives Washington, D.C. a practice act for interior designers.
- 1988 Unified Voice meets to attempt to join all interior designers into one professional organization. The groups in the discussion are: ASID (30,000), IDB (10,000 with overlapping members of ASID), IDEC, ISID, IDS, CFID, and ISP.
- ASID National Headquarters moves to Washington, D.C..
- 1989 The “Joint Accord” is an agreement between the national organizations of AIA, ASID, ISID and IBD that outlines the parameters for support for licensing for interior designers by the AIA.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- 1990 Virginia passes a certification act for interior designers.
- 1994 ASID withdraws from Unified Voice talks
- IBD, ISID, ISP, and CFID merge to form International Interior Design Association (IIDA).
- 1999 Joint Accord rescinded by ASID and IIDA.
- 2000 Talks about joint concerns between ASID and IIDA.

Appendix E

Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline of Washington, D.C.

This timeline was established by documents filed at ASID National Headquarters by the participants. In no way can it be considered a full picture of unfolding events. The research done for this chapter included interviews with the participants in the process of getting licensing as interior designers, interior designers, and architects.

Establishment of Licensing

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| April 23, 1984 | Carolyn Pulsifer ¹⁹⁸ letter from ASID Washington Metropolitan Chapter President to Ed Grips ASID National Exec. Dir.
Polled chapter
Written bill by Kornblut
Gone to NCIDQ for review
Gone to ASID/Sonet for review
Bill based on architects' registration model for easier understanding as accepted by the council.
Defines interior design
Title restriction |
| June 3, 1985 | Bill 6-2511 introduced (Cited in Bill Summary from J. Ray, June 24, 1986) |
| March 11, 1986 | Public roundtable (Cited in Bill Summary from J. Ray, June 24, 1986) |
| June 24, 1986 | Committee discussion and "mark up" changes bill to practice act (Cited in Bill Summary from J. Ray, June 24, 1986) |
| July 7, 1986 | Martha P. Cathcart ¹⁹⁹ letter from secretary of Washington, D.C. Metro Chapter of ASID to Jean Richmond.
Copy of bill attached.
Proposed title act written three years ago (1983) submitted a year ago (1987)
Changed to a practice act
Chairman of Consumer & Regulatory Committee
"To be "in line" with other licensing acts that require licensing board to be established."
Interior Designers not thrilled
"...invites vehement opposition from AIA"
Done without warning during "mark up" version
Passed committee to full city council
Attached to this memorandum and bill summary. |

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- June 24, 1986 John Ray Report, Chairman Committee on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs²⁰⁰, Council for the District of Columbia
“Report about Bill 6-2511 the “Interior Designers Licensing Act of 1986”
Report on bill 6-2511
Purpose
Bill history
June 3, 1985, bill Introduced
March 11, 1986, Public roundtable
June 24, 1986, Committee discussion
“mark up”
Issue and background
Describes Health, Safety, & Welfare
Alabama, Connecticut, & Louisiana have licensing
Summary of testimony
Section by section analysis
Definitions
Board Terms
Duties of board & mayor
NCIDQ or exam developed by D.C.
Practice act
Exemptions: consultants, officers, employees of D.C., landscape architects, city planners, architects, engineers, interior designers working under the supervision of a licensed interior designer, and interior decorators dealing with aesthetics only.
Grandfathering for one year with three years experience.
Continuing Education Units (CEU) may be required by mayor.
Yearly renewal (fees of \$80.00).
Action of Committee – Approved.
- September 11, 1986 J. A. Wilson, Council for the District of Columbia,²⁰¹
memorandum introduction of friendly amendments to bill 6-2511, “Interior Designers Licensing Act of 1986”
Amendment clarifying the architecture exemption so architects can advertise interior design services without being licensed interior designers.
- September 16, 1986 J. A. Wilson, Council for the District of Columbia,²⁰²
memorandum clarification and re-circulation of

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

amendments to Bill 6-2511, “Interior Designers Licensing Act of 1986.”

Re-clarification of amendment for the architecture exemption.

- September 30, 1986 Memorandum from Martha Cathcart to ASID & IBD members.²⁰³
Action on practice act bill on October 7, 1986.
Historic vote, first practice act in country.
Copy of final bill attached, dated June 24, 1986.
- October 1, 1987 Memorandum from Martha Cathcart to Jim Mezrano,²⁰⁴
National Title Registration Committee, Licensing updates.
February – Practice act becomes law.
May – Mayor appoints interior design licensing board.
June – Board getting organized.
Working with Maryland, testifying in Virginia, and “attended several fundraisers for supportive city council members.”
Goals – “Fight any efforts by the local AIA to have our law revised.” Lobby for and testify for the right to be exempted from architects revisions to their licensing act, “which could be interpreted as infringement on our right to practice.”
- July 15, 1988 Date sent to ASID National – District of Columbia Register²⁰⁵ City of Washington, D.C., Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Chapter 8 Interior Designers.
Terms Expires Oct. 31.
Licensure by examination – NCIDQ.
Waiver of exam for practitioners before 2/24/87
Proof of Practicing for 3 years immediately prior to passage (min. 1,500 hours).
Professional organization, or employer, or 2 clients, and attorney, CPA review business records and records prove meet minimum requirements.
Scope of practice
Continuing education
Five hours contact time required for renewal of license.
Sixty day late grace period with late fee

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

Disciplinary actions

Reprimand
Probation
Limitations on license
Course of remediation
Retraining
Re-examination

- February 14, 1989 Martha Cathcart, Chairperson of the Board of Interior Designers, letter about notice of intent for adoption of proposed rules for interior designers,²⁰⁶ published in February 10, 1989 D.C. Register.²⁰⁷ Rules attached.
- No date Application for licensing in Washington D.C.²⁰⁸ Instructions, requirements, NCIDQ certification. Verification form, and application for D.C. License
- 1990 Anna Lisa Lane (No Date). Grandfather clause runs out on interior designers licensing law.²⁰⁹ *Washington Business Journal*. Washington D.C.
“Fine for practicing interior design without a license is \$200.00.”
- November 27, 1992 Vincent Carter, Acting Chairperson of District of Columbia Board of Interior Designers²¹⁰ memorandum to licensed interior designers, subject: signing and sealing of drawings and plans.
Stamp and seal samples.
Changes to the District of Columbia Construction Codes page 12-13 and 12-14.
“Plans for non-structural alterations and repairs of a building, including the layout of interior spaces, which do not adversely affect any structural member or any part of structure having a required fire resistance rating, or the public safety, health or welfare, and which do not involve the practice of engineering as defined by the D.C. Professional Engineers Registration Act, shall be deemed to comply with this section when such plans are prepared, signed and sealed by an interior designer licensed and registered in the District of Columbia in accordance with the D.C. Interior Designer Licensure Act of 1986.”²¹¹

Threats to Licensing

Washington, D.C.’s budget crunch.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- June 29, 1992 D.C./AIA Memorandum to Post or Circulate.²¹²
New \$250.00 non-regulatory head tax for licensed individuals in addition to the \$80.00 license renewal. AIA needs to lobby against this fee.
“Furthermore interior designers -- who are not also subject to the District’s professional licensure laws and who frequently complete with architects for commissions -- are among the many licensed business-persons not included on the list of those who must pay the additional fee. Clearly, this is discriminatory and anti-competitive.”
- May 1993 Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Finance and Revenue.²¹³
“e. Add acupuncturists, podiatrists, interior designers, chiropractors, and psychologists licensed by the District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affaires to the professionals subject to the \$250.00 annual professional license fee administered by the Department of Finance and Revenue.”
- Sept/Oct 1993 Designline ASID Washington Metropolitan Chapter
Newsletter²¹⁴ objecting to the way the fees were implemented.
- November 18, 1993 Letter Ted L. Pearson from Rita St. Clair Associates
office²¹⁵ objecting to the additional fee as “unreasonable increase in the non-regulatory license fee that is now required for the maintenance of the regulatory license in the District.”
- February 19, 1996 Electronic Mail from Vincent Carter to Stacey D’Aquila²¹⁶.
Cut backs in D.C. Government. “I am concerned that D.C. is going to cut regulatory boards. I think that the writing is on the wall with the fiscal crisis receiving as much press as it has been lately.”
- July 3, 1997 Vincent G. Carter to Kathi Bakin, Stacey D’Aquila and Jed Weiss.
Rumor confirmed that DCRA was going to do away with interior design licensing law. Low number of licensees, minimal number of hearings, and low number of complaints with need to reduce costs.
Of course there are few complaints, funding for investigative unit cut.

August 1997

Business Regulatory Reform Commission Submitted to the Mayor and members of the Council of the District of Columbia D.C. Law 10-212.²¹⁷

- Cut back in funding causing examination (12-13)
 - Self-certification
 - Self-inspection
 - Staffing concerns
 - Streamline code enforcement, permit processing
 - Pocket permits for licensed & registered plumbers electricians, and other contractors for non-structural interior renovations to single family homes and commercial jobs that do no exceed specified dollar amount.
 - Architect and Engineers with two or more years experience with two or more projects to issue “post-card” building permits residential renovations to single family homes and commercial jobs that do no exceed specified dollar amount.
- Enforcement issues (23)
 - “In addition to insufficient budgetary and staffing levels, there are a number of regulatory provisions which are inadequate to the task. For example, OCOM has authority to issue notices of civil infractions for some, but not all of the categories of unlicensed activities and license violations for which it is responsible for investigating and enforcing. A good example of OCOM’s inability to issue civil infractions to unlicensed home improvement firms.”
- Staffing issues (25)
 - Staff cut from 80 to 15 while work load more than doubled.
 - Technology needed to offset staff-cuts
- Recommendations for Change (36)
 - Adjust fees to cover costs
 - Pilot programs for self regulation
 - Automate licensing and regulatory processes
 - Provide appropriate staffing
 - Sunset legislation to periodical objective reviews of regulatory boards.
 - Computerize examination
 - Standardize nominations to boards.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- September 1977 Patton, D. J. and Brazil, H. memorandum: Will D.C. seize the opportunity to change?
- ”It is estimated that as many as 10,000 unlicensed businesses are currently operating in the District. They know with some certainty that they won’t get caught, and to the extent that they do, the level of fines and penalties are hopelessly insufficient and do not deter non-compliance. For those businesses which have stuck by the District in hard times and have played by the regulatory rules, we know they carry a heavier burden than they should.”²¹⁸
- September 26, 1997 Letter from Vincent G. Carter to Chairman Linda W. Cropp, Chair of the Committee of the Whole²¹⁹ Support 5% surcharge.
Disagree with repeal of Interior Design Licensing Act of 1986.
Limited number of complains because of lack of enforcement was cut and had not been reinstated.
When the \$250.00 additional professional licensing fee was implemented, the number of licensees dropped from 1100 in 1994 to 690 in 1997.
- September 26, 1997 Joyce Burke-Jones, National ASID President letter to Linda Cropp, don’t repeal licensure.²²⁰
- September 26, 1997 Linda Smith, National NCIDQ President letter to Linda Cropp, don’t repeal licensure.²²¹
- October 1, 1997 Letter from Vincent Carter to Linda Cropp and Harold Brazil. Discovery during DCRA Hearing of September 30, 1997.²²²
- Interior Design Board not apprised of being included in BRRC Report or this meeting
 - “For interior design it was simply the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) desire to eliminate their competition, namely interior designers.” “What better way for the AIA to eliminate their competition than to eliminate a practice act in the District of Columbia which requires

a license to practice interior design, making them the only game in town.” (2)

“The AIA attempted similar tactics in Florida and Virginia in recent years, but were unsuccessful. In both cases they were members of the commission recommending the sun-setting, elimination or rescindment of laws regulating the field of interior design (note their member on the BRRC). The AIA continues to be a major opponent to our efforts to obtain and/or maintain licensure and legal recognition of the interior design profession. Burying elimination language in other legislation is a common tactic of the AIA. This attempt by the AIA was the basis of my note to you this morning regarding Free Trade and Anti-Trust. I hope that the council considers the entire picture, including my statements above, before making its own recommendations.” (2)

“Last night’s hearing brought several issues to light, unfortunately most were negative, but none the less I am more informed than before the hearing and for that I thank you. It was really disappointing to hear each targeted board and commission state that they had not been contacted; to that list please add interior design.”

“Hopefully you are now aware of the limited research and contacts made by the BRRC in preparation of their report and/or recommendations.” (2)

October 1, 1997

Fax from Vincent Carter to ASID National Legislative Group and others. BRRC Hearing of Sept 10, 1997.²²³

- “The hidden agenda was made apparent last night when Council member Dixon and Mayor Barry thanked the AIA for their participation in the commission.”

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- Send faxes and letters supporting interior design, our practice act.

October 1, 1997 NCIDQ Legislative Alert from Todd Bostek to NCIDQ Certified interior designers to fight repeal of interior design licensing law.²²⁴

- Send faxes and letters supporting interior design practice act.

October 6, 1997 Letter from M. Kathie Dalrymple to Harold Brasil about the public hearings #5 Reduction of number of Board and Commissions.²²⁵ Support to retain interior design licensing.
“Interior designers work with spaces that greatly impact the safety, health and well-being of almost every person in the District of Columbia: schools, health care facilities, restaurants, offices, institutions, sports facilities and more. We are the advocates for the consumer. We help them understand what they need and who best can accomplish the work for them.”

October 7, 1997 Letter from Stephen Dunn, AIA to Council Member Brazil in support of retaining D.C. law 6-172.²²⁶
“For example: my firm recently completed a training facility for disabled individuals. It was essential that the interior designer on the team was knowledgeable as I on the various codes, such as ADA compliance, fire safety and egress issues, and on product safety. The interior designer made so many of the design decisions that determined the suitability and safety of the facility that I can’t imagine a jurisdiction such as the District of Columbia not wanting to provide its citizens with the protections offered by licensure.”
“One more important point: It has recently come to my attention that more and more of the Requests for Proposals that come to our office from the government and private industry are requiring a licensed interior designer as part of the project team. It seems to me that by retaining the Interior Design Licensure Act you are assuring those interior designers practicing in D.C. an opportunity to compete for these projects. Without it, they are out of the running. This doesn’t seem quite fair.”

October 8, 1997 Statement for the record by Kathi Bakin, Director, Governmental and Public Affairs, ASID for the

Committee of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs hearing for the District of Columbia on October 8, 1997.²²⁷

“The District of Columbia Register dated November 27, 1992, which contains construction code language adopted by the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Section 108.1 “Professional services required”, states:

Plans for non-structural alterations and repairs of a building, including the layout of interior spaces, which do not adversely affect... and part of the structure having a required fire resistance rating, or the public safety, health or welfare, and which do not involve the practice of engineering... shall be deemed to comply with this section when such plans are prepared, signed and sealed by an interior designer licensed and registered in the District of Columbia in accordance with the D.C. Interior Designer Licensure Act of 1986.

Practicing within the scope of the definition of “interior design” and the D.C. Construction Code language, interior designers often bid on project in competition with architects. These same services also are considered part of the scope of architecture. If they are regulated as part of architecture because they affect health, safety and welfare, and if these services are subject to construction codes and often require a permit, then it follows that when interior designers engage in these same services, they, too, affect the health, safety and welfare.”

October 8, 1997

Letter from Vincent Carter to Cropp and Brazil about self-supporting ID Board, Anti-trust and DCRA Enforcement.²²⁸

- If allowed the ID Board could be self-supporting.
- AIA activities could be construed as anti-trust violations.
- “Legislation is only as good as the enforcement allowed for under the law.”
- Do not repeal 6-172. “To do so would be a grave mistake on behalf of the health, safety and welfare of the public citizens of, visitors to, and those employed in, the District of Columbia.”

October 9, 1997

Memorandum from Vincent Carter to Council members about additional testimony on October 8, 1997 BRRC Hearing.²²⁹

“When the financial disclosures are made public I formally request that you include the type and nature of business of

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

each contributor, as there is a potential conflict of interest anti-trust violations related to the AIA and it's members on the BRRC.

The D.C. Board of Interior Designers can be self-supporting if allowed by the Council.”

- October 9, 1997 Fax from Vincent G. Carter to interior designers about BRRC hearing.²³⁰
“Thanks to all of you for your support. We were heard, and look forward to the next step, which will probably be a request to consider a joint board.”
- October 8, 1997 Vincent G. Carter to interior designers about vacancy – chair of the D.C. Board of ID.²³¹
“I can only laugh at the telephone call I received from the Mayor’s office today. It was regarding my tenure as the Chair of the Board. My term expired May 1997. What better way to shut up someone making the most of their position than to remove them from it? After serving ten years on the board I feel it is time for a change, to allow someone else the opportunity to make a difference. ... I prefer to recommend my successor.”
- October 16, 1997 Letter from Joyce Burke-Jones, National president of ASID to Harold Brazil.²³² Same letter was sent to Linda Cropp
Why was the boards affected by the hearings not notified individually of the hearings? Why were the professions “affected never asked by the BRRC to provide information about what they do and how this deregulation would affect eh profession or D.C. designers?”
- October 17, 1997 Fax from Susette Wilder to Linda Cropp. State of Florida has enacting licensing for interior designers.²³³ Same Fax sent to Harold Brazil.
- Universal design/barrier free environments
 - Environmentally friendly products
 - Ergonomically correct furnishings
 - “...impact of order, healthful air quality and beauty on our collective psyche.”
- “Interior designers should be treated the same way as the rest of the design/build industry, including architects and contractors.”

Appendix – F
Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline of Virginia

Establishment of Licensing

- CCVID was formed in 1982 (From news release dated April 20, 1990).
- April 18, 1984 W. Lee Joel II,²³⁴ ASID letter to Barbara Ebstein and Diana Gabriele about chapter efforts toward licensing. They are conducting research study, dialogue with other professions and seminars for interior designers. Attached is a survey sent to ASID chapters, 23 chapters replied. Survey asked what is currently happening about licensing in their jurisdictions.
- April 23, 1984 Diane Gabriel²³⁵ response to Joel's letter. Yes we would like to see the surveys.
- June 19, 1984 W. Lee Joel²³⁶ letter to Barbara Ebstein, ASID appraising her of what is happening in Virginia, about the results of their questionnaire, and with questions about licensing in other jurisdictions.
- June 19, 1984 W. Lee Joel²³⁷ letter to Terry Perry, IBD inviting IBD to participate in the Legislative Regulation Committee.
- June 25, 1984 Paula F. Winstead, ASID to Diane Gabriel at ASID Headquarters. Current definition of interior designer. "What I am looking for is information that the public sees us as a viable profession and supports the efforts of A.S.I.D. and the quality of the professionals which are associated with A.S.I.D."
- September 18, 1985 Sponsored by ASID & IBD. Handout about Open Discussion: pros & cons of certification of Virginia interior designers²³⁸. To inform interior designers about the issues of licensing.
- October 17, 1985 Sponsored by ASID & IBD. Agenda for meeting²³⁹ to open the discussion about getting certification for interior designers in Virginia.
- No date CCVID and You²⁴⁰, handout for meeting. Description of the process of certification.
- January 14, 1986 Attached to above. Guidelines for legal certification of Virginia interior designers.²⁴¹
- January 15, 1986 Morton Marks²⁴² letter to interior designers in Virginia with the January 14, 1986 guidelines for legal certification of Virginia interior designers attached.
- May 3, 1986 Janet Kane²⁴³ meeting notes from the Committee for Certification of Virginia Interior Designers (CCVID). About the establishment of CCVID (18 people were copied on this memorandum)

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- Billing of Mark Rubin
- Establishment of P.O. Box
- Establishment of a bank account
- Letterhead designed for group
- Dues assessment of \$50.00
- Plans for accessing members were set
 - Mailing lists & telephone trees
 - Company to do mail merge mailings
 - Drafts for “Letters of support”
 - Assessment (invoices for membership)
 - Petitions
- May 20, 1986 Scanning publications for HSW issues
- May 20, 1986 Draft for letter of support for registration of interior designers.²⁴⁴ There were a possible 254 ASID members to support the effort.
- May 20, 1986 Draft of letter requesting support and sample of invoice.²⁴⁵
- June 7, 1986 CCVID invitation to meeting²⁴⁶.
- October 24, 1986 W. Lee Joel Co-chair CCVID letter to Virginia Chapter Board of ASID²⁴⁷. CCVID separated from ASID Board to “a state side effort of all interior designers including IBD, the Washington Metropolitan ASID Chapter, the National Home Furnishings League and independent interior designers.”
 - “CCVID will meet with the Commonwealths Board of Commerce in early November.”
 - “Letters soliciting funds as well as letters of support written by clients, business and professional Associations addressed to the Board of Commerce are being mailed out to all Virginia interior designers. This is the next most important task...”
 - Includes draft of letters to designers, invoice, guidelines, and letters to Board of Commerce.
- These next six items are all stapled together in package:
- October 30, 1986 Letter from Stuart Shumate to Fredrick J. Napolitano, Chairman of the Board of Commerce²⁴⁸. Engineer in support of interior design certification in Virginia. “I believe that state certification of interior designers will provide consumers with a uniform and readily understandable means of selecting persons with the requisite education and experience. Selecting the wrong person for such as job could place lives and property in jeopardy.”
- April 18, 1986 Letter from Perry F. McLawhorn of Allied Fibers²⁴⁹ to Nr. Napolitano in support of licensing of interior designers. “Interior designers... act as a key link between suppliers with their product information and the consumer who is not

trained to fully utilize this data. Proper use of this data is essential for the safety, health and welfare of the final user of designed space.”

March 6, 1986

Letter from L. Thomas Coulter, R.A.²⁵⁰ to Ellen Procejus, ASID about support for title registration for interior designers. “I feel that it is imperative that interior designers be afforded some type of state registration to establish standards of qualification for the preparation of interior plans involving code items, exclusive of structural elements.”

No Dated

No author. Notes for meetings with legislators.

No Dated

No author. States with legal recognition. States with bill in works. Over 90 school accredited by FIDER, 3 in Virginia, 2 in process in Virginia.

No Date

No author, Joint Resolution “ requesting a study of the need to certify interior designers in the Commonwealth. The Department shall submit its findings and recommendations to the 1988 Session of the General Assembly.”

October 30, 1986

Second draft of bill.²⁵¹

Definitions

““Certified interior designer” shall mean a person who, by reason of his special knowledge in the identification, research and solutions of problems pertaining to the function and quality of the interior environment and the principles and methodology of interior design acquired by professional, education, practical experience, or both, is qualified to engage in the practiced of interior design, and whose competence has been attested by the Board through certification as an interior designers.”

Interior Designer: “The “practice of interior design” by a certified interior designer shall mean any service rendered wherein the principles and methodology of interior design are applied in connection with the identification, research and creative solution of problems pertaining to the function and quality of the interior environment. Such services, relative to interior spaces, shall include programming, design analysis, space planning and aesthetics, using specialized knowledge of interior construction, building systems and components, building codes, equipment, materials and furnishings as well as the preparation of drawings and documents relative to the design of interior spaces in order to enhance

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

and protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.”

Board of Interior Design – 5 members

4 with ability to become CID – 1 Public

5 year terms – 2 meetings a year or as often as needed – 3 members a quorum

Board will promulgate rules.

Issuance of certification

6 years combined experience and education

Sit for examination

Corporation and other business entities shall register with the board.

Prosecution of Violations “...shall be done by attorneys for the Commonwealth of the counties or cities in which it is claimed such violations occurred...”

Two waivers were attached about building officials... they are not legible

November 24, 1986

Letter from William F. Hartman, III²⁵² to Mr. Sumpter Priddy of the V.R.M.A. about opposition for certification of interior designers from the Southern Home Furnishings Association.

No Date

Southern Home Furnishings Association. Registration of the title “interior designer”²⁵³. Handout that lists ten reasons that interior designers do not need certification.

- Exploits profession, gain of small group
- Not limit practice of ID
- It does not police practice
- Provides loopholes to unqualified
- Adds costs to consumers, state, and confuses marketplace
 - Fosters competitive marketplace
 - “Certain group in the industry are willing to enfranchise the incompetent in order to aggrandize their own position.”
- Licensing done by state for health, safety, and welfare issues or who are entrusted with “great public responsibility”.
- On the other hand, title bills seek only to limit the use of the title to restrain trade.
- This bill does not protect the HSW of the public.
- There is “no evidence of abuse either limited or widespread, which would justify the introduction of such as bill”.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- “75% of all designer work is done in America is done by designers who work in retail home furnishings stores”.
- January 30/Feb. 19, 1987 General Assembly of Virginia – 1987 Session²⁵⁴. House Joint Resolution number 245 requesting the Board of Commerce to study the need for certifying interior designers.
- March 10, 1987 Laster G. Thompson, Jr. Deputy Director for Operations of the Department of Commerce²⁵⁵. Letter to Mark Rubin about interior design study with questions on the need to certify interior designers.
- March 19, 1987 Mark E. Rubin, lobbyist for Virginia Coalition for interior designers²⁵⁶. Letter to L.G. Thompson in response to above letter.
- No date Laster G. Thompson, Jr. cover letter from the Board of Commerce about Interior Designer Study Questionnaire attached²⁵⁷. Questionnaire attached, it reflects questions about practice involving health, safety and welfare issues.
- July 10, 1987 Frank A. Kearney Chairman of The Department of Fire Programs – Virginia Fire Services Board²⁵⁸. Letter to Thompson in support of interior design certification. “Because of the complex nature of fire and all that contributes to it the acts of interior designers have a profound affect on the safety of the public from a fire prevention perspective.”
- July 9, 1987 William H. Lloyd, Sr. President of the Virginia Fire Prevention Association, Inc. letter of support for certification of interior designers. “In most instances, interior finishes are not the material first ignited. After the fire has started and intensifies, the interior finish can become involved and contribute to the intensity and rapid spread of fire.”
- “It may appear that the answer to the interior finish issue is stringent building code enforcement. Such strict enforcement must be preceded by a detailed training program for code officials, but this is not the answer. Strict enforcement will not prevent the unnecessary cost to citizens when unacceptable interior furnishings are specified and installed prior to discerning their non compliance.”
- No date The Committee for the Certification of Virginia Interior Designers (CCVID). Update on certification process and plans for public hearings²⁵⁹.
- July 14, 1987 Janet E. Kane Co-chair of CCVID²⁶⁰ letter to L. Thompson summarizing the hearings about certification of interior designers.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

July 14, 1987	Janet E. Kane Co-chair of CCVID ²⁶¹ letter to L. Thompson summarizing research efforts at Virginia Tech.
October 22, 1987	Catherine M. Walker, Policy Analyst/Public Information Officer, Department of Commerce ²⁶² . Memorandum about the recommendations for no action on interior design certification because there are “There are no documented cases of harm to the public health, safety or welfare which can support the need for regulating the interior design profession.” “The public is offered a means of selecting a competent interior designer through the use of professional credentials granted by the national professional interior design associations.” “Potential for harm can exist in commercial and industrial building if proper flammability and toxicity levels are not maintained.” “It is premature to judge the effectiveness of the District of Columbia’s practice act and the title acts enacted by three states provide little enforcement.”
April 20, 1988	Barbara Goodwin and Bill Joel memorandum to regroup for the next effort. ²⁶³
October 16, 1989	Barbara Goodwin ²⁶⁴ of CCVID letter to Paul D. Mauch, Battalion Chief about scheduling an example of flame spread with three different kinds of materials.
No date	Handout including copies of fire stories in Virginia newspapers. ²⁶⁵
No date	Sample interior design problems. ²⁶⁶
No date	Synopses of the NFPA report for CCVID. ²⁶⁷
No date	Virginia Interior Designer Demonstrate Preventative Measures. ²⁶⁸
January 12, 1989	1989 Session - House Bill No. 1683. ²⁶⁹ This bill would have adding certified interior designer to the Regulatory Board of architect, professional engineer, land surveyor, or landscape architect. This bill defines interior design, establishes the requirements of a regulatory board, the Board shall hold two examinations a year, and have meetings at least twice a year to do the business of the Board. This bill is a title act which restricts the use of the title certified interior designer, but does not restrict the practice of interior design. The Board will promulgate regulations for the execution of this law.
No date	CCVID announcement withdrawal of bill #1683. In addition, outlines what they have done, what they plan to do in next year, and that they need support of designers.
February 13, 1990	W. Lee Joel ²⁷⁰ letter to Jean Richmond, Director of ASID Governmental Affairs about the passage of House Bill #645.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

February 6, 1990 Board of Commerce reversed its decision of its study and withdrew opposition. (After two nursing home fires in Virginia and demonstration tape of fire in three interior environments helped to change people's minds)

February 10, 1990 General Law Committee vote bill out of committee

February 13, 1990 Bill passes house.

Projected senate committee February 21 and then the full senate.

April 4, 1990

House Bill No. 645.²⁷¹ Amendment I the nature of a substitute. "Code of Virginia amended Chapter 4 or Title 54.1 an article numbered 2, consisting of the sections numbered 54.1-412 through 54.1-415." (1) Adds interior designers to the Regulatory Board of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors, Landscape Architects and Interior Designers. Added phrases: "Certified interior designer" means a design professional who meets the criteria of education, experience, and testing in the rendering of interior design services established by the Board through certification as an interior designer." (2) "Interior design" by a certified interior designer means any service rendered wherein the principles and methodology of interior design are applied in connection with the identification, research, and creative solution of problems pertaining to the function and quality of the interior environment. Such services relative to interior spaces shall include the preparation of documents of non-load-bearing interior construction, furnishings, fixtures, and equipment in order to enhance and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public." (3) In addition, The Regulatory Board will be increased from 11 to 13 members two of whom will be certified interior designers. This amendment shall in no way restrict other professions of this section or state employees from rendering these services, but they cannot hold themselves out as "certified interior designers". The Board will offer two NCIDQ or equivalent exams a year. Graduates from four year FIDER accredited program or equivalent program and two years monitored experience. One year of grand-parenting five years experience decisions by Board. Reciprocity from licensed individuals from other jurisdictions where qualifications are equal.

No date

Key Points Virginia Interior Design Certification Law.²⁷²
States the key point of the new law.

April 20, 1990

ASID News Release²⁷³ - Virginia Becomes Eighth Jurisdiction in Nation to Pass Interior Design Title Act.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

May 31, 1990	Shari Winer of ASID ²⁷⁴ to Robert John Dean ASID National President about the compliance with the National Accord. Includes problems with legislation and suggestions of things to change if bill is used as the model bill on a national level.
No date	Licensing/Government Affairs ²⁷⁵ , Assumed to be the National AIA Newsletter? Touting the first passage of a bill “follow the guidelines of the December 1989 agreement”.
<hr/>	
January 18, 1991	Milton K. Brown Jr., Director of the Department of Commerce, letter to Barbara Goodwin about deregulating interior design. Brown reiterates the four reasons for regulation by the state and lists ten professions to be changed to consolidate by “Project Streamline”.
February 28, 1991	Anne W. Putney ²⁷⁶ memorandum to organize to fight deregulation of interior designers by raising money, get support, and reform bonds with legislators.
May 1991	Mark Shaw Lindsey writes On the Pedestal, an Editorial in the VA AIA Newsletter ²⁷⁷ outlines AIA position on ASID attempts to change to the BOCA Building Code as “a blatant and direct violation of the Letter of Agreement...”. Encourages architects to support budget cutting efforts in Virginia which includes the deregulate interior design. “There is another means to express your concern over this violation of the Letter of Agreement. On April 24 th the State Board of Commerce held a hearing to consider the deregulation on interior designers as part of a budget cutting process. (Title registration of interior designers was voted in by the legislature over the Commerce Department’s objections).” ... “Over the years, we have witnessed the gradual erosion of our profession to better organized, yet sometimes less qualified parties. They compete with us for work and fees. During this tough economic period, isn’t it time to question the judgment in allowing last year’s liberal and ineffective Virginia interior design bill to pass? Now, some will say that our new objections to title registration will violate the Agreement. I ask, who chose to ignore it first?” “Opinions expressed by the membership are not necessarily those of the editor, the JRC or the Virginia Society”
May 22, 1991	CCVID Update ²⁷⁸ , May 20, 1991 the “Board of Commerce recommended that since regulation of Interior Designers offers no harm to the public” regulation will continue for two years with a review by the Board of Commerce after two years.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- May 23, 1991 Kathi Bakin, State Government Affairs,²⁷⁹ memorandum to Jean Richmond about Virginia Board of Commerce Hearing re Deregulation of Interior Designers. Anne Putney reported about the hearing. “When they got to the interior designers the atmosphere turned hostile. The animosity was obvious as the board related what they felt were instances of misinformation presented by interior designers in their testimony before the Board. They claimed that those from other organizations who testified in favor of interior designers use fictitious arguments to make the HSW case. The said since they didn’t think it would do any harm, they would allow the law two years to prove itself.”
- January 28, 1992 Legislative Financial Aid Task Force,²⁸⁰ letter to Anne Putney about \$2,000.00 award for funding for their efforts.
- November 18, 1992 Kathi Bakin, State Government Affairs for ASID,²⁸¹ to Ms. Slayton of Department of Commerce. Grand-parenting people whose degree is pre FIDER.
- December 7, 1992 Willie Fobbs, III, Assistant Director Board of APELSLA,²⁸² letter to Kathi Bakin about grand-parenting in Virginia stating that the “Unfortunately, the enabling statutes do not clearly establish a “grand-parenting” clause for certification. Instead, the statute allows for a “Waiver of the Certification Examination” if certain other criteria are met. One of these is that the applicant hold a professional degree.” They are reviewing non FIDER programs.
- December 15, 1992 Susan Donn²⁸³ letter to Kathi Bakin. She received her certification as an interior designer in Virginia.
- January 8, 1993 Legislative Financial Aid Task Force²⁸⁴ \$2,500.00 award.
- April 1993 Clarification to Rules and Regulations Part VII, 7.1²⁸⁵ for the Commonwealth of Virginia.
- January 12, 1994 Senate Bill 29²⁸⁶ an attempt to change the grand-parenting to ten years practice, degree from 4-year college prior to 1971, is certified in another state or D.C., applied for waiver of examination within one year of effective date.
- January 25, 1994 Senate Bill 29²⁸⁷ an attempt to change the grand-parenting to twenty years practice, degree from 4-year college prior to 1967, is certified in another state or D.C., applied for waiver of examination before January 25, 1994.
- May 25, 1994 Anne W. Putney²⁸⁸ memorandum to Gretchen Wyatt at ASID about legislative events in Virginia. Mark Rubin negotiated this compromise, which was enacted. “The primary alterations to the former law are as follows: the “waiver of examination” period was extended to July 1, 1995; a person who used the title of interior designer for at least ten years prior to the initial regulations of the Board,

- has a minimum four year degree and can demonstrate to the Board satisfactory evidence of their professional competence shall be entitled to secure a certificate without written examination, provided application is made on or before July 1, 1995.”
- August 1994 CVVID wrote Virginia History²⁸⁹ outlines above happenings and closes with lessons CCVID learned: Do your homework. Get to know your delegates and senators. Show them you support their efforts. Let them know what it is you do by inviting them to coalition and other events. Support them with contributions when you can. Meet them in their home offices. Build up a “reservoir of good will” because, you will need it to continue your efforts... original sponsors and supporters may not stick with your organization.
- October 5, 1994 Late 1994 – 1995 Deregulation efforts underway. Vincent G. Carter,²⁹⁰ Director of Government and Public Affairs (for ASID?) memorandum to holders of CID in Virginia. “Gov. Allen’s Blue Ribbon Task Force has proposed elimination of state certification for Interior Designers.” Lists meeting dates and pertinent information.
- October 13, 1994 James R. Washington²⁹¹, architect’s testimony in support of certification for interior designers. “I know that there are certain areas of the interior designers activity that overlaps my expertise, just as there are areas of the practice of engineers that overlap architecture. And civil engineers work may overlap that of landscape architects, but each has its distinct core of expertise and each should be identified as a unique profession and licensed or certified accordingly.”
- October 19, 1994 Vincent G. Carter²⁹² summary of testimony from the night before. Vincent will forward a package of GSA solicitation preferences to the task force. Other testimony forwarded.
- October 18, 1994 Sarah Boyer Jenkin’s²⁹³ testimony letter to Otis Brown, Chairman of the Blue Ribbon Task Force, Governor Allen’s Commission on Government Reform, to oppose deregulation of interior design certification.
- October 18, 1994 Carolin M. Schebish’s²⁹⁴ testimony memorandum to the Blue Ribbon task force to Streamline Government: re-certification of interior designers: opposition to recommendations 20C.
- March 30, 1995 Lou Horne²⁹⁵ to Rick Hodges Government Affaires Coordinator at ASID fax about the changes in conflict of interest.
- April 18, 1995 Rick Hodges²⁹⁶ letter to Lou Horne about Code of Ethics and conflict of interest language.

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- January 11, 1996 Mark N. Courtney, Assistant Director APELSLA Board,²⁹⁷ to Tom Banks at ASID National about a new category of membership “Retail Partners”.
- January 25, 1996 Thomas B. Banks, ASID Membership²⁹⁸ to Mark Courtney about “Retail Partners” membership will adhere to the same standards as other members.
- Fall 1996 Dimensions,²⁹⁹ Virginia Board for APELSLAID newsletter.
Certified Interior Designers who work for “Retail Partners” are subject to all aspects of the conflict of interest of the Boards rules and regulations.
- February 2, 1996 Legislative Financial Aid Task Force³⁰⁰ \$5,000.00 award for a study on the economic impact of interior designers on Virginia.
- March 28, 1996 Barbara Goodwin,³⁰¹ memorandum to Claude G. Cooper, Commissioner of Building Permits and Inspections City of Richmond, Virginia, about conversation “you have confirmed that Interior Designer’s plans are acceptable for submittal for a request for permit if there is no change in use, structural changes, or change to egress.”

Appendix – G

Archived Documents at ASID – Timeline of Ohio

- May 22, 1984 Memorandum and Questionnaire from Barbara Ebstein³⁰²
National Title Registration Chairman to Chapter Presidents
about efforts toward licensing in their states.
“During the past several months, several chapters have
contacted ASID to receive information or advice on
beginning a title registration effort in their states. Other
chapters are formulating and pursuing registration at this
time. Chapters showing interest include New York, New
Jersey, New England, Virginia, Florida, Georgia and
California. Also the Interior Designers of Ontario are
pursuing legislation after the introduction of a bill that
would have threatened their practice.”
Ohio South/Kentucky responded that there where no efforts
in their chapter “which encompasses parts of three states.”
- October 24, 1984 ASID Ohio North Board Meeting minutes³⁰³ presentation
on licensing made by Joyce Burke-Jones. Correction to the
minutes. “The legal firms has not been selected” and
“CIDLO is now an official corporation...”
- December 1987 Copy of the bill³⁰⁴ was reviewed by ASID National.
Establishes an InteriorDesign Board
Exempts, design assistants working under the supervision
of a licensed interior designer, furniture etc. sales person,
architects, engineers, drafts persons, and “any person using
the title interior decorator who does not provide advice
relating to health and safety issues.”
Title act, One year grand-parenting with six-years
combined education and experience, or NCIDQ, sealing of
documents required.
- September 30, 1987 Letter from Joyce Burk-Jones³⁰⁵ to Jim Mezrano ASID’s
National Title Registration Committee updating him on the
progress of their bill. CIDLO Corporation was organized,
trustees have “come to a consensus on the future Bill’s
salient features” and “an attorney has commenced writing
the Bill.” Introduction of bill, support of bill, and other
items will be implemented once ASID has approved the
wording of the bill. In addition, CIDLO is “supporting
Associated General Contractors (AGC) in stalling a “Seal”
bill 99, which attempted to delete current law which allows
non-architects to file plans with plan approval agencies.
Compromise language cannot be agreed upon, and we feel
the issue is under control at this time.”
- June 9, 1988 Letter from Robert Baughman³⁰⁶, AIA to ASID National
wanting an contact person from Ohio ASID for a group

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- called the Central Ohio Design Professional Association “is an organization of Ohio Architects, Engineers, Specification Writers and Interior Designers dedicated to the improved education and understanding of the Ohio and BOCA National Codes.”
- January 26, 1988 Letter from Gary Volz³⁰⁷ to Jean Richmond. CIDLO is going to hire a lobbyist “to promote our cause, but to oppose” a bill by the ASO (Architects Society of Ohio).
- April 1, 1989 Memorandum from Gary Volz,^{308[7]} Legislative Chairman to ASID Chapter 32 Board of Directors about funding for CIDLO. Highlights the differences to the Joint Accord practice act. Attached ID to existing Board of Building Standards the Board. Passage of NCIDQ and codes examination to be registered. Provisional license of three years to allow designers “who otherwise meet the requirements for licensure” with a window of opportunity to take the NCIDQ exam. Limited seal provisions. CEU credits required for renewal.
- July 31, 1989 Minutes of CIDLO meeting from Deborah A. Urton³⁰⁹ to CIDLO Board. Steps to take in next few months for passage of the bill. Draft copy of bills are ready #3781 and 3791. “Ohio Board of Building Standards is not interested in testing us on the Ohio Basic Building Code.” Sponsorship of bill still sought. “Long term planning regarding the roll and longevity of CIDLO needs to be addressed by the Coalition.” Bob McDavitt.
- No Date Announcement of General Meeting³¹⁰ to explain bills and rally support of interior design community.
- August 1989 Draft Bill³¹¹ with hand written corrections by at least two unknown persons. Practice and title act capturing interior designer. Proof of degree from a FIDER program and passage of the NCIDQ. For provisional acceptance of three years with proof of practice, then sit for NCIDQ examination. Sealing provisions. Separate Interior Design Board in the Department of Industrial Relations. Five members, 3 ID, 1 registered architect, one employee of Division of Factories and Buildings of the department. Funds from certification will help fund “building systems and materials information center.” Documents “shall be processed in the same manner” as a professional engineer, or architect for interior designers in sprinkled buildings.
- August 4, 1989 Carol R. Scinta,³¹² ASID Secretary Ohio South ASID meeting minutes. “Ohio Home Furnishings Association is concerned over the title aspect of the legislation.”... “The architects and engineers seem to be for the legislation. The

- August 7, 1989 bill is waiting to be introduced to the Legislature. Kay Craynon said the bill will in read the 19th of August.” Letter from Gary Volz³¹³ to Jean Richmond Reiterating the bills points and stating that the “principle opposition seems to be Ohio Home Furnishings Association. They don’t like restriction of the use of title “Interior Designer”. ... Interestingly enough, they don’t object to the practice restriction at all.”
- September 13, 1989 Memorandum from Shari Weiner,³¹⁴ Government Affairs Coordinator at ASID National to Gary Volz with suggestions to correct the draft bill. The main one being bills should be a title act to be in line with ASID policy and the Joint Accord. Missing is grandfather clause, code of ethics, CEU requirements for license renewal and they need to make some language changes to tighten meanings and avoid future problems.
- Sept/Oct 1989 Unknown newsletter article by William N. Wilcox,³¹⁵ Executive Director State Board of Examiners of Architects. Certification of authorization. “Perhaps one of the least understood aspect of the Ohio architectural practice act concerns the requirement that any organization providing architectural services must hold a Certificate of Authorization issued by the Board of Examiners of Architects. Enacted in 1983, this law requires that any corporation or partnership, which is providing, or offering to provide, architectural services must hold a Certification of Authorization. The requirement which are to be met by an organization applying for a Certificate of Authorization are relatively few and apply to organizations located in the state of Ohio as well as those located elsewhere. The requirements are as follows: 1. More than 50% of the persons holding shares in a corporation, or partners in a partnership, must be registered in Ohio to practice architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, surveying, or a combination thereof; 2. Those registered shareholders or partners must hold more than 50% of the shares of stock issued by the corporation or the interests in the partnership; 3. More than 50% of the members of the organization’s board of directors must be registered in Ohio to practice architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, surveying or a combination thereof; 4. If the corporation is providing architectural services, the firm must designate at least one registered architect (it may designate more than one if it chooses) as being in responsible charge of the firm’s architectural activities and decisions; 5. At least one of the

designated architects must be a member of the corporation's board of directors."

Exemptions corporations before Nov. 15, 1982. This law applies to engineering, landscape architecture, and surveying firms. "A certification of authorization must be obtained from the appropriate board for each discipline for which the firm intends to provide services." Simplifies former restrictions from 100% to 50% ownership

"It is important to note that the language of this law refers to "providing architectural services. This language was specifically and intentionally used to establish the distinction between the "rendering" of architectural services (which can only be done by architects) and the method by which those services are provided to clients. The business organization does not "practice" architecture, it becomes the conduit through which the architectural services are delivered to the client by the architect."

October 2, 1989

Letter from Gary Volz to Shari Weiner responding to her memorandum dated September 13, 1989.³¹⁶ State of Ohio no longer wants to pass title legislation. CIDLO agreed "along time ago in meetings with Architects Society of Ohio that we would only pursue very limited grandfathering. The "provisional license" idea was developed by the landscape architects in Ohio, and has proven track record which the architects and the legislature have accepted." CEU's will be addressed in a future amendment as more programs develop and are available in Ohio.

December 26,

Anonymous³¹⁷ notes from a telephone call with Gary Volz. Although CIDLO has been talking with AIA Ohio they "never received full agreement with local architects, but felt it was close enough to proceed." Architects they met with "could not speak fro AIA Board."... "Board turned down agreement." "ID wants to be part of Board of Building Standards. Architects want them to go on joint board of architects and landscape architects. Designers don't want to do this based upon treatment of landscapers by architects. Haven't allowed them to enact CEU requirements because architects don't want them."

March 13, 1990

Copy of the Bill 118th General Assembly Regular³¹⁸ Session 1989-1990. Sections 3781.220, 3781.221, 3781.222, & amend section 3791.041.

Definition of interior design. Establishes an Interior Design Registration and Regulation Advisory Committee in the Department of Industrial Relations. "The committee will serve the Board of Building Standards by advising them of

the standards to be employed in the selection, evaluation, registration and examination of interested candidates for registration.” Uses proof of degree in ID from FIDER accredited school and proof of NCIDQ passage as basis for registration. Stamp provisions (but no definition of who submitted to). Interior designer captured title. Exempts architects and engineers. Code of conduct. Three-year provisional status to take and pass NCIDQ.

Attached to same bill was a copy of the Senate Bill 376. There are a few changes of verbiage different but most of the provisions are the same.

March 26, 1990

Letter from Jean L. Richmond,³¹⁹ Director of Governmental Affairs ASID to Gary Volz. This letter reiterates comments made before about Ohio’s bills. The bill has been changed to a title act.

June 14,

Anonymous³²⁰ handwritten note assume by Jean Richmond at ASID National. Sen. Cupp is bill’s sponsor. There will be a separate board. ASO might support separate board. “No one has been able to contact Jack Hawk using Arch. Ex. Bd.” and “Juror in CIDLO awards program Bd. of Bldg. Std. very negative, was once on coalition side. Copies of Maryland, Tennessee, Virginia, and Illinois grandfathering verbiage was sent to Gary Volz.

September 5, 1990

Memorandum from Jean Richmond³²¹ to Ohio people about Draft Letter to Gerry Hammond, AIA

Aug. & Sept. 1990

Draft of Letter from Jean L. Richmond³²² to Gerry Hammond, AIA about Ohio’s compliance with the Agreement also known as the Joint Accord.

While no copy of the actual letter exists in the files...

“From our perspective, the legislation is generally in keeping with the Agreement.”... “Since the Agreement’s call for joint boards is not a definite requirement, we do not think their not having one provides ground for opposition to the bill.” There are precedents in Ohio and elsewhere.

“Gary did wonder why you have not been in touch with him, and has indicated that he is willing to speak with you, or whoever you suggest, about the legislation. He also indicated that CIDLO has been open to discussion with Ohio AIA throughout the process. However, he did express some frustration that, while they were able to reach some accord with those who came to meet with them, these individuals later reported that they had no authority.

Hopefully if there are to be more discussions, they will be with individuals who do have some say-so.” She closed with “I hope this helps get some dialogue going that will lead to a cooperative effort in Ohio.”

January 21, 1991

Gerald S. Hammond,³²³ FAIA memorandum to Interior Designer Liaison Group about Ohio Interior Design Legislation. Alter you to problems regarding the legislation (S. B. 376). “As currently drafted, the legislation does not comply with the national agreement in several important areas. “The inclusion of language relating to practice regulation. (As an example, Section 3781.59 (B) (1) refers to individuals “applying for registration or provisional registration **to provide interior design services.**” Furthermore, the legislation would apparently authorize registered interior designers to perform functions they are not currently allowed to perform under state law, e.g. Section 3791.041 (B) (3); this type of provision is regulation of practice and incompatible with title registration.)” (The second citation is about sprinkled buildings.)

Lack of internship requirements.

Provisions for sealing privileges for building permitting purposes.

Regulatory entity State Board of Building Standards.

“Discussions between the architects and interior designers in the state are continuing although there has been no effort yet on the part of the interior designers to bring the legislation into line with the national agreement. We are hopeful that your action, in communicating these serious concerns to the Ohio interior design coalition, will lead to resolution of these problems and enable an agreement to be reached.”

No date

Anonymous handwritten letter maybe written by Jean Richmond in response to Gerald Hammond’s memorandum, but may be letter not included in this file.

“Finally in writing”

“Recognized more points of disagreement – some positions not remotely acceptable.”

“Trustees voted to stay the course, but continue to work with ASO and Board.”

“Hopefully their position will become more flexible down the road trying not to let stumbling blocks get in our way.”

“CIDLO will respond within five days to Board letter.”

“Board – lack of fundamental knowledge about FIDER, NCIDQ, major issues with send a copy of bill.”

“Landscape architecture terminated relations with lobbyist wanted executive director/lobbyist.”

April 1, 1991

Anonymous³²⁴ handwritten note of a telephone conversation. Nothing since second hearing. “ASO is only opponent that hasn’t testified”

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- October 16, 1991 Letter from Fred Benadum³²⁵ to Ron Blank about Coalition for Equity in Interior Design Licensing. Letter describes banding retailers together to fight interior design licensing.
- No date Fact & Fiction – State Licensing of Interior Designers³²⁶ with application for membership. Sponsored by the National Home Furnishings Association and its design affiliate The Interior Design Society. Main Points: Helping customers with decorating may be restricted with licensing. NCIDQ is tests commercial design and is hard for residential designers to pass. Licensing may become a problem in the future when things progress to practice acts. “There is solid evidence that title bills will quickly be turned into practice bills. This means retail store staff members who are not licensed will not be allowed to counsel customers or in any way provide the normal services of a designers such as space planning and color coordination.”
- September 1991 CIDLO Membership Renewal Form.³²⁷ Highlights of Year Senate Bill #75 introduced by Sen. Cupp. Hearings and revisions followed. Revisions include the addition of 1.0 CEU credits per year, 20 years experience grandfathering, and separate interior design board.
- January 13, 1992 Anonymous handwritten notes of phone call with Gary Volz.³²⁸ About hearing. Opponent testimony 1/15/92. Proponent testimony 1/22/92. Fire Marshall’s support U. of Cincinnati support, Alumni Association of Kent State University. “Ohio so focused on Budget – looking at cutting school funds. Service tax killed in 1986.”
- January 21, 1992 Gary Volz³²⁹ rebuttal testimony faxed to Kathi Bakin. His response to other testimonies. State Board of Examiners of Architects - 1. “...the fact remains that the consumer often chooses to retain the specialized expertise and generally lower fee of a professional interior designer.” 2. “... it is apparent by their testimony that architects and engineers would like to capture these services within their exclusive prevue to their economic advantage.” 3. “... it is not hard to see why the State Board of Examiners of Architects would like to control not only the interior designers, but the \$120,000 - 150,000 which their registrations would generate annually.” This bill defines people with education, experience and testing from other unqualified individuals which helps the public choose the correct professional. Ohio Society of Professional Engineers – 2. “...Mr. Dailey states that conformance to building codes is the exclusive responsibility of the architects and engineers. Once again Mr. Regoli of the

- Board of Building Standards has articulated that this is not the case. Enforcement of building codes is the responsibility of the state and local building departments, and all construction is subject to their review as they deem necessary.” 4. ...” there is a clear exemption for registered architects and engineers is provided.” Ohio Board of Building Standard – 1. Reporting registered ID will save building officials time. Architect’s Society of Ohio - 1. Architects have conflicts over language of bill being practice when it is a title act. 2. CIDLO changed their definition of ID to what ASO suggested only to have them request a change again to definition that is “vague and lack a clear explanation of Interior Design activities.”
- January 27, 1992 Letter from Kathi Bakin,³³⁰ ASID National to Gary Volz with suggestion of changes to his rebuttal.
- March 16, 1992 David A. Collins³³¹ & David W. Field AIA Ohio Legislative Alert. “AIA Ohio withdraws opposition to revised interior design licensing bill.” “The revised Substitute SB 75 meets the objections raised by AIA Ohio during Senate Committee hearings. As introduced, the bill was a practice act with would have allowed registered interior designers to perform certain functions currently reserved to registered architects.” Changes include “non structural elements” specifically “excludes building mechanical and electrical systems except for specifications of fixtures and their location with interior spaces.” Separate board will be set up. Interior designers can stamp drawing, no mention of submitting for permit. Added, professional conduct and CEU. Also FIDER baccalaureate degree and grandfathering of 20 years. PAC thank you funds assessed for each architectural firm in state.
- April 24, 1992 Fax from Kathi Bakin,³³² ASID National to Gary Volz in North Carolina having “massive problems” with IDS.
- No date Letter from Patti Cardone³³³ to Interior designers in Ohio. Important Ohio Interior Design Licensing Update. Rallies the interior designers to support the process by making phone calls and sending letters.
- May 14, 1992 Letter from Kathi Bakin,³³⁴ ASID National to Gary Volz with NHFA board of directors. People to contact to check support and or opposition in Ohio.
- May 19, 1992 Letter from Faye Laverty,³³⁵ Executive Director of Coalition for Equity in Interior Designer Licensing. “I would appreciate your thought on how we can work together.”

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- May 22, 1992 Fax from Gary Volz³³⁶ to Kathi Bakin, ASID National with attached letter from Faye Lavery dated May 19, 1992.
- No date As Passed by Senate Bill #75³³⁷ 119th Assembly Regular Session 1991-1992. Adds “Certified Interior Designer, Reciprocity, and “full disclose of the compete method of compensation being received for providing interior design services.” And “a registered interior designer’s contract document shall contain a statement that this document is not an architectural or engineering drawing, specification, or design and is not to be used for the construction of any load-bearing columns, load-bearing framing, or load-bearing walls, or structures for submission to a municipal, township, or county building department of to the chief of the division of workshops and factories for approval of a building permit or license, unless otherwise required or permitted by statute, rule, ordinance, or resolution. As used in this section. “contract document” means all documents, plans and drawings required to complete a proposed design project.” 10 hours CEU per year at a FIDER accredited institution or the Board of Regents or recognized and pre-approved by ID Registration Board.
Provisional certificate must take exam within three years - Grand-parenting no examination 20 years with no education. Six years with education.
- July 7, 1992 Letter from Kathi Bakin³³⁸ to Gov. Voinovich. Encouraging him to sign the bill.
- August 3, 1992 Letter from Gov. George Voinovich³³⁹ to Kathi Bakin with unsigned veto letter attached.
- July 31, 1992 Unsigned letter of veto by Gov. Voinovich³⁴⁰
“After careful review, it does not appear to me that it addresses a significant health and safety issue.”
Requirements “follow the traditional model of professional licensing standards which often have anti-competitive affects and ultimately, lead to increased cost to consumers.”
And “furthers an already bad precedent of continuing to expand the well over 400 separate Boards and Commissions in Ohio.” Which “I am committed, with the help of the attorney general, to do something about the burgeoning number of these independent Boards & Commissions.” ...“This significant public policy issue.”
- September 1, 1992 Email from Kathy Bakin³⁴¹ to Gary Volz about Crawford article attached.
- August 10, 1992 Article by Dan Crawford³⁴² in the Willoughby Ohio News Herald about veto. ““I think it’s a lighthearted veto,” said Jenny Camper, a Voinovich spokesperson. “I mean, what would it really do? An interior designer puts in a bad

couch – that’s about all that would apply. Added on wag: “What are they going to do? Haul some poor schnook before this board for mixing stripes and paisley?” One final note: Had Voinovich signed the bill, the annual cost to the taxpayers for facilities and five-person staff would have been at least \$100,000.”

Fall 1992

Article by Robert McDavitt³⁴³ Why was the licensing bill vetoed? In the ASID Perspective Newsletter Ohio North Fall of 1992. “How could the bill have spent 18 months in process and no one – not the bill’s Senate sponsor, the bill’s House sponsor, state agencies who endorsed the proposal, or legislators – know that the governor would veto the legislation? The answer is apathy – on the part of the governor’s executive staff and the professionals in this field. Many interior designers were upset when they read about the veto, but few had paid attention to the status of the bill. Fewer still worked on getting it passed.” Only two people from Ohio North participated in this effort. “Some architects, professional engineers, the Ohio State Board of Architect Examiners, IDS and its parent organization, and the National Home Furnishings Association are working to diminish the important of our work. These groups not only opposed the bill, they continued to use their monetary pull and membership size to keep interior design professionals unrecognized.”

At some point ASID, IBD, and the other professional organizations from NLCID as a clearing house for legislative information. It was housed at ASID National Headquarters.

January 3, 1994

Memorandum from Gretchen Wyatt³⁴⁴ of NLCID to Virginia Reinhold CIDLO Chair about the NCILD Opposition Guidebook.

August 24, 1993

Anonymous³⁴⁵ (assumed to be Gretchen Waytt because of date) record of telephone call with Gayle Kreutzfeld. CIDLO is continuing their effort. How to activate their membership? “One main concern is whether designers in Ohio actually will register themselves, if the law were to be passed.”

December 10, 1993

Letter from William N. Wilcox³⁴⁶ of the State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects to Dauner Contracting Corporation about enforcement of licensing laws. This letter was also sent to Jay Schuermann on March 29, 1993, Leslie Gordon (UofD) on August 23, 1994, and Mr. Hart (UofD) on September 29, 1994. The letter outlines a laundry list of possible violations and

interpretations of court cases, but never charges Dauner with a violation...

“The troublesome part of the law is section 4703.18 (B) which is often misinterpreted to allow anyone to practice architecture.” Using extensive quotations from three court cases and Attorney General opinions, “Another interesting case is State vs. Design Collective, Inc. in which the courts found the practice of architecture not only included final contract documents for the construction of a building, but also included preliminary and schematic design phases of a project.”

February 15, 1994

Letter from Chad B. Holland,³⁴⁷ Investigator from of the State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects to Jeffrey E. Dauner of Dauner Contracting Corp. A complaint has been filed that “you may have violated provisions of law relating to the practice of architecture. Specifically, it is alleged that you have designed and produced documents for the “Korchmar Case” office building in Cincinnati, Ohio in February of 1993. This appears to be in violation of the Ohio Revised Code sections.” The sections are then cited.

February 15, 1994

Letter from Chad B. Holland,³⁴⁸ Investigator from of the State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects to Jay Schuermann of Effective Office Environments. A complaint has been filed that “you may have violated provisions of law relating to the practice of architecture. Specifically, it is alleged that your company has designed and produced documents for renovation to the “Korchmar Case” office building in Cincinnati, Ohio in February of 1993. This appears to be in violation of the Ohio Revised Code sections.” The sections are then cited.

No date

State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects³⁴⁹ sent handout with “applicable laws pertaining to the practice of Architecture in this state” to Schuermann and Dauner Contracting Corp.

Spring 1993

Ohio Architect³⁵⁰ newsletter from the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects. President’s message 1993 “...bring about a greater awareness to the public of the legal requirements for engaging architects for building projects, to the registrants of the laws and rule governing their practices and their relationships to their clients, to the students and interns of their requirements for obtaining registration, education, internship and the examination. And to the legislature of the need for laws in Ohio preventing unlicensed people from authoring construction documents used to obtain building permits.”

Practice Requirements

... “It is illegal for anyone other than an architect to either provide or to offer to provide architectural services. Violators face the possibility of injunctive action or criminal prosecution. When an architect chooses to participate in such an arrangement, the architect may be jeopardizing his or her license as well.” ... “It is unlawful of an architect to seal documents not prepared by the architect or under the direct supervision of the architect.” “Certificates of Authorization – All organizations providing architectural services are required under Ohio law to procure for this Board a Certificate of Authorization to provide architectural services.” ... “An architect cannot contract to render architectural services to an unlicensed entity who, in turn, provides the architect’s services to another.” ... “The unauthorized organization providing the services of the architect to another may be enjoined by the courts to prohibit such activities and the architect may face disciplinary action through the Board.

“Plan Stamping – An architect who sells his seal is in violation of Ohio law and may lose his or her license for such an offense. Plan stamping encourages the creation of organizations, which are providing a wide range of architectural services. When a building department requires a seal, these people simply find someone with a seal who is willing to stamp the documents for a fee. Such activity undermines the entire premise of licensure and is an offense to every ethical architect as well as a hazard to the public health, safety and welfare. The Board considers that all documents required to be submitted to a building department for obtaining a building permit, depending upon the nature of the documents, must be sealed by an architect or a professional engineer who has prepared the documents or under whose direct supervision they have been prepared.”

September 27, 1993

William Jackson³⁵¹ article in Business First of Columbus. Article is about lawsuit against a building designer for practicing architecture without a license. “Still, says the state, what he does when he designs residential and small commercial buildings is architecture, and it is illegal to do that in Ohio without a five or six-year college degree, a three-year internship and passing a four-day exam.” “In 1990 the law changed, however requiring a college degree and broadening the definition of architecture to include Long’s work.”

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- November 15, 1993 Letter to the Editor from William Wilcox³⁵² in the Business First Journal in response to William Jackson's column. "The law makes no differentiation between architectural practice involving residential, small commercial or other structures. The fact that Mr. Long calls himself a "designer" does not alter the fact that is practicing architecture and that he is not licensed to do."
- April 20, 1994 Letter from Gary Volz to Kathi Bakin³⁵³ about an "incident involving a local professional interior designer who free-lanced for a local furniture dealer and general contractor on an office remodeling project. In the interest of doing the right thing professional, they applied for a building permit and are now threatened with fines and litigation by the Board of Examiners of Architects of Ohio for unlawful practice or architecture."
"It is obvious that the introduction of a "Seal law" in Ohio is imminent."
- July 18, 1994 Letter from Gary Volz to Kathi Bakin about updates of Ohio HB 783.³⁵⁴ It is by the Home Builders Association "They don't want to be required to hire architects to design residential buildings." Also attached a CIDLO newsletter.
- August 23, 1994 Letter from Chad B. Holland,³⁵⁵ Investigator from of the State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects to Leslie Gordon of University of Dayton.
A complaint has been filed that "you may have violated provisions of law relating to the practice of architecture. Specifically, it is alleged that you have designed and produced documents for renovation to the "Kettering Labs" office February of 1994. This appears to be in violation of the Ohio Revised Code sections." The sections are then cited.
- No date Copy of the Bill 120th Ohio General Assembly Regular³⁵⁶ Session 1993-1994. House bill #783.
- September 21, 1994 Letter from John E. Hart,³⁵⁷ University council to Chad B. Holland about investigation against Leslie Gordon. Asking for more information.
- February 23, 1994 Building/Zoning Application for City of Dayton, Ohio.³⁵⁸
- October 31, 1994 Memorandum from Gretchen Wyatt,³⁵⁹ State Governmental Affairs ASID to Susan Mottice and Virginia Weinhold about competitiveness/restraint of trade after the cease and desist orders in Ohio. Two designers so far have received cease and desist orders by the "Ohio Board of Architects".
- October 1994 Jim Wright³⁶⁰ OHBA bill to clarify residential designing Builder Update Newsletter. Bill 783 attempts to amend 4703.18 as follows:

“Section 4703.01 to 4703.19 of the revised code shall not prevent persons other than architects from preparing plans, drawings, specifications, or data, from filing application for building permits, or from obtaining such permits for a building or structure that is used primarily for agricultural purposes or that is three stories or less in height that does not contain an elevator and that is used primarily for residential purposes, provided the plans, drawings, specification, and data for such buildings or structures are signed by the authors with their true appellation as engineer, contractor, carpenter, or other appellation. But without the use of any form of the title, architect. Nor shall it prevent such persons from designing such buildings or structure and supervising the construction thereof for their own use.”

“The current architectural licensing law was enacted in 1931, and in regard to 4703.18 (above) has not been revised since. Nor to the best of my knowledge, has there been any case law specifically addressing this statute in regard to single family residential plans. For sixty three years residential designers and builders have prepared plans for homes and submitted them for permit without any problems from the Board of Examiners of Architects. The local building departments, plan examiners, and building inspectors, have over seen the public health and safety issues involved exceptionally well.

Clearly something has happened in the last several years to cause the board and its executive director of almost twenty years to reinterpret 4703.28 in this aggressive manner. Apparently “in a time when the architectural profession is being beaten to a pulp – losing jobs, losing money and losing influence on the built environment” (Progressive Architecture April '94) this is a matter of jobs and economics and has little to do with health and public safety. I have been informed that builders have been called with a request to attend a meeting with the executive director of the Board and an assistant attorney general, and then threatened with prosecution unless they sign a settlement agreement promising that only architects will draw their plans in the future. Those builders that currently have stock plans on file have been told that they may not submit them for permit without an architect's seal or they will be considered guilty of practicing architecture without a license. This is in direct conflict with Ohio law that allows anyone to apply for a building permit. Ohio does not have a “seal” law.

“The Board also has sent letters to the building departments around the state (this quoted from one sent to Hamilton County) informing them that the law has been “incorrectly interpreted as allowing person other than architects to practice architecture.” In closing the letter, William N. Wilcox, executive director of the Board writes, “Obviously it is of great help to us when building officials around the state report instances of possible violations to us. We hope this cooperative spirit will continue and expand. It is very much appreciated.”

One of the many reasons that I feel the Board has taken an overboard approach in their current interpretation can be found in most of the case law I’ve read. For instance in defining “architects” in *McGill v. Carlos* 1947 the court found: “An architect is a person whose occupation includes the preparation of plans, sketches, and the complete details for the erection, enlargement, or alteration of a building or other structure for the use of the contractor or builder when expert knowledge and skill are required in such preparation.” (left out of this quotation... “, and that such laws apply to persons engaging in single isolated architectural transactions as well as persons attempting to practice architecture as a business or profession.”)

Obviously, designing a home does not require the same “expert knowledge and skill” as does the design of a public structure or a high rise office tower. The materials used, and the codes involved, are so completely different that a person working on the commercial side would have some difficulty adjusting to residential and our method of practice and construction (to be good or bad in their opinion). In addition, virtually anyone can design a home. Many of my clients come to me with sketches of the floor plans they want and anyone ... software package that will help them put together a set of drawings. I’m not saying that anyone can design a home well, but most people understand the basics of how it goes together.

Needless to say, as a residential designer, I’m not going to fold up my business and walk away. I’ve invested too much time and money in it. If I have to, I’ll find a partner or reach some other arrangement that satisfies the state, but I’m not leaving the business! Builders can however count on their cost for a house plan to soon be based on the fee schedule suggested by the AIA (American Institute of Architects). On their estimate forms they can add a line item right under real estate commission, for the same seven (7) to ten (10) percent fee. This will significantly expand

the number of jobs for architects, but will negatively impact the affordability of a home for thousands of Ohioans.

Please don't misunderstand, there are many, many excellent architects in the state, practicing both in the residential and commercial realms and this is not an issue between architects and builders. The problem originates from the State Board of Examiners of Architects and this is strictly a jobs and economics issue!

This aggressive position of the Board also affects the large builders in the state who have architects on staff. Many of these companies offer architectural services so that the customers are able to personalize their plans, and are considered "design-build" firms. In addition, many of these architects do not seal each construction set because they do not want the personal liability. House Bill 783 would allow "design-build".

November 10, 1994

Letter from Chad B. Holland to James E. Butkiewicz about cease and desist order.³⁶¹ "First, the state of Ohio does not recognize, regulate, or grant licensure for "interior designers"." Secondly, the Board of Examiners of Architects for the State of Ohio does not recognize agreements or statutes made between outside organizations such as the AIA, ASID or NCIDQ."

November 11, 1994

Memorandum from Gretchen Wyatt³⁶² to Terri Maurer about sending documents about survey, restraint of trade, and other issues.

Results of survey:

"Those who will pursue voluntary interior designer registration (86% of respondents agree). Those who feel Registered Interior Designers will gain recognition by peers (76% agree). Those who anticipate improved working relationships with other professionals (82% agree). Those who feel Professional Registration will advance their careers (63% agree). Those who feel Professional Registration will confirm their competency (88% agree). Employers who anticipate cost savings from fewer mistakes by Registered Interior Designers (26% agree). Employers who anticipate reduced insurance premiums for Profession Registration (26% agree).

November 21, 1994

Letter from James E. Butkiewicz³⁶³ to Robert Angle, ASID Legal Counsel about the cease and desist order his office received. "It is apparent that the attitude taken by the State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects (SBEA), Mr. Holland and his associates as stated in the attached letters dated November 9, 1994, clearly positions them

about all other organizations, associations, societies and any agreements between the same.

Therefore, as I have previously stated, as a NATIONAL DIRECTOR of ASID, I am greatly concerned about the future practice of professional interior design and the existence of ASID in the state of Ohio.

Although this action by the SBEA is directed, in my case, at my private right to practice, as a national director, I represent the entire ASID membership and the Society as a national board member.”

November 4, 1994

Letter from Gary Volz³⁶⁴ to Jim Butkiewicz about cease and desist order. “Yours is the third case in 1994 (at least as far as we know). I suspect that there will be more before year’s end.” Get in touch with legislators before the election. “We [CIDLO] plan to initiate some action in early 1995 to challenge their Administrative Code with the Ohio Joint Commission on Administrative Rule. Ideally, we would like to request a public hearing on our complaints.”

Summer 1994

Robert E. Martin³⁶⁵ President’s message in Ohio Architect Newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects.

“Historically, the Board of Examiners of Architects has been hampered in the enforcement of the Architect’s Law because of the lack of a full-time investigator working for the Board. In 1989, the Board was appropriated funding for a full-time investigator and since that time the Board has reviewed up to 75 matters a year. The cases mostly consist of the unauthorized practice of architecture, plan stamping or a combination of both.

The investigator visits building department throughout the state reviewing applications and documents submitted for building permit approval. If a project is submitted without being authored by an architect, the person preparing the documents will be requested to meet with the Board staff to resolve the matter. In the case of unlicensed practice, the person preparing the documents is offered the opportunity to enter into a settlement agreement whereby they agree to comply with the law and, essentially, cease and desist in the further practice of architecture.”

“The Board will generally offer to not seek prosecution or injunction in return for which the respondent will agree to cease and desist in the practice of architecture or holding themselves out to practice architecture in the future.

Agreements have also required closing of offices, removal of telephones, non-admission to the examination and other penalties of rather alleged violations. The Board has had

remarkable success with this program which, in many instances, has been a superb educational tool.”

“If you know that the Ohio Architectural Practice Act makes no exceptions for the practice of architecture to permit unlicensed persons to design any building type, including single family residences, except for their own use.”

- September 29, 1994 Letter from Chad R. Holland³⁶⁶ to John E. Hart attorney for University of Dayton about Leslie Gordon. “I realize that Leslie Gordon is an employee of the University of Dayton, and the project in question is owned and operated by the University of Dayton. However, the Board’s main objective is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The Board feels that by continuing to let Leslie Gordon design and prepare documents for alterations, additions and other projects without direct supervision of a registered design professional, the public’s safety could be compromised.”
- October 3, 1994 Letter from Gary Volz³⁶⁷ to Kathi Bakin about Leslie Gordon. “... nowhere do they quote the Ohio Revised Code nor the Ohio Basic Building Code regarding what specific activities define the practice of architecture. That’s because the ORC definition does not accomplish what they want. Their Administrative Code does by defining “any alteration to a building” as architecture. This is clearly and attempt to legislate by Administrative Rule. We all know that is illegal.”
- March 3, 1995 Anonymous (email) message³⁶⁸ to D. Werne and K. Bakin about a telephone call with Jennifer Fenderbosch about CIDLO’s plans. ...” to turn the anti-regulation argument on its head and say “IDs are victims of over-regulation by the architect’s board.” That would at least take us out of the defensive mode.”
- April 24, 1995 Fax from Gary Volz³⁶⁹ to Kathi Bakin about “Seal Bill” for architects. “As predicted – the introduction of a “Seal Bill” in Ohio with the apparent support of consulting engineers, AIA, Associated General Contractors, and Home Builders Association. I predict a swift passage. Probably by September. We could be in real trouble!”
- May 16, 1995 Anonymous³⁷⁰ letter to Jennifer (assumed Fenderbosch) with draft of bill attached. 1. Major points No ID definition in Ohio when “our profession requires a vast amount of knowledge and does affect the health and safety of Ohio citizens.” 2. Business is being lost therefore tax dollars. No quality control. “...3. registration will not keep anyone out of the business; and 4. without being too critical, explain

- that he lack of definition had prompted the Architects to attempt to put many of our profession out of business and a definition is needed.”
- May 16, 1995 Anonymous³⁷¹ Rough Draft of Interior Designer’s Bill. Includes: FIDER degree, NCIDQ passage, independent board, reciprocity for equal qualifications, stamp (without specifying its use), CEU, and 20 year grand-parenting to pass NCIDQ test within three years.
- May 18, 1995 Memorandum from Jennifer Fenderbosch³⁷² to Kathy Bakin outlines meeting with Mr. Lyles of the Ohio Department of Commerce. Concerned about Ohio losing business to outside firms because of lack benchmark qualifications.
Make statutory act as strong as possible, “This way no future administration could sneak a rule change by the industry.”
- June 6, 1995 Memorandum from Jennifer Fenderbosch³⁷³ to Kathi Bakin with changes to the Architects Seal Bill attached. All documents “submitted for approval”... “bear the seal of architect” or engineer registered in Ohio. Exemptions industrial, residential 1, 2, 3 family unit or “where no plans or specifications are required for approval.”
- June 7, 1995 Memorandum from Stacy D’Aquila³⁷⁴ to Jennifer Fenderbosch, try to get architects to add interior design to exempted things like decorating and installing interior products.
- June 19, 1995 E-mail from Stacey D’Aquila³⁷⁵ to Kathi Bakin and D. Werne about architects seal bill. Documents phone call with Jennifer Fenderbosch’s meeting with Bob Ray, AIA. “Interior design will not amend 231. In exchange, they (HB231 Task Force) will testify and write in support of ID regulatory bill. After the ID’s have a definition, they will be able to go in and amend 231 so that they can submit drawings for approval.”
- June 20, 1995 Gary Volz’s testimony.³⁷⁶ “For many years, interior designers have submitted their drawings and documents for building permits on project like those I’ve described. The language in H.B. 231 appears to prevent our continuing to do that by requiring the seal of a registered architect or engineer on drawings submitted for a building permit. We would like to know now Interior Designers will still retain their independent access to the permit process? The important issue here is not who can physically apply for the permit, but how the bill may restrict who can “author” the drawings and documents.”

A History of the Professionalization of Interior Design

- June 22, 1995 Letter from Gary Volz³⁷⁷ to Kathi Bakin about testimony for HB 231. “The response of the committee was one of surprise that we had not been consulted previously. We were asked why we didn’t testify in the House. The answer was that testimony finished before we learned of the bill’s existence.”
- June 22, 1995 Testimony from Jennifer Fenderbosch³⁷⁸ to H.B. 231. Includes fiscal impact of interior designers not being registered could be about \$9,500.
- August 8, 1995 Email from Stacy D’Aquila³⁷⁹ to Kathi Bakin about a phone conversation with Jennifer Fenderbosch about bill pending. “In a meeting with members of the Ohio Design Task Force (those who sponsored the seal bill). Interior designers were told that if they are being harassed by the Board, let them know and they will get the Board off of their backs. They were not out to get the IDs, they are targeting people who one day decide that they can draw plans for a building, etc. Jennifer said there is a case pending now and they are trying this tactic to see if they are true to their word.”
- December 5, 1995 Anonymous³⁸⁰ Rough Draft of Interior Designer’s Bill. Includes: FIDER degree, NCIDQ passage, independent board, reciprocity for equal qualifications, stamp with provision for filing, CEU, and 10 year grand-parenting to pass for barrier free part of NCIDQ test within two years.

¹ It should be noted that interior designers have undertaken similar efforts in Canada as well, but those efforts cannot be covered in the scope of this dissertation.

² The term jurisdiction encompasses both states and other governmental organizations such as Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico. While not included in the case studies, the first jurisdiction with a practice act was Puerto Rico in 1974.

³ As of late 2007, Ohio still had no licensing.

⁴ Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

⁵ NCIDQ. NCIDQ definition of interior design.

<http://www.ncidq.org/who/definition.htm>. Retrieved November 29, 2008.

⁶ Gueft, O. (1980). *ASID the past as prologue: the first 50 years. 1931-1981: an overview*. p. 6-7. A reprint of the *ASID Annual Report* in the ASID National Meetings booklet in Grand Rapids, MI in November of 1988.

⁷ Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1981). Eighth Edition. IL.

⁸ American Society of Interior Designers. (1987). Licensing of interior designers an ASID white paper. New York, NY: ASID.

⁹ Tate, A. & Smith, C. R. (1986). *Interior design in the 20th Century*. Pp. 227-231. NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

¹⁰ American Society of Interior Designers. (2005). *History of ASID: 30 Years of Advancing the Interior Design Profession*. Washington, D.C..

¹¹ Vytlačil, A. (1989) The studio experience. In Berkeley, E. P. (Ed.), *Architecture a place for women*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute.

¹² Boynton, R. (July 21, 2005). Interview with author.

¹³ Carter, V. G. (November 20, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁴ In order to do first-person interviews and keep the costs of this research as low as possible, jurisdictions were chosen within driving distance of Blacksburg, Virginia. The choice of locations in no way lessens the relevance of the findings.

¹⁵ I believe that the lack of this interview does not harm this dissertation because in the other jurisdictions the third interview only confirmed the first two interviews.

¹⁶ My background is reflected in this work in ways that cannot be documented by citations from particular publications, but rather from knowledge gained through thirteen years of professional experience in licensing efforts in Michigan.

¹⁷ Van Woerkom, M., Nijhof, W.J., & Nieuwenhuis, L.F.M. Critical reflective working behavior: a survey research. *Journal of European industrial training*.

<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/viewContentItem.do;jsessionid=EC8CEA42A14C3D02690C5682CF9AAC38?contentType=Article&hdAction=lnkpdf&contentId=83710>

7. Retrieved on July 3, 2007

¹⁸ McKellar, S. & Sparke, P. (2004). *Interior design and identity*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

¹⁹ Martin, C. and Guerin, D. (2006). The body of knowledge of interior design.

<http://www.careersininteriordesign.com/idbok.pdf>. Retrieved on 11-29-08.

²⁰ Praz, M. (1982). *Interior design from Neolithic to Art Nouveau*. New York, NY: Themes & Hudson, Inc.

²¹ Pile, J (2005). *A history of interior design*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- ²² Whiten, S. (1963). *Elements of interior design and decoration*. New York, NY: J.B. Lippincotte Co.
- ²³ Blakemore, B. (1997). *History of interior design and furniture*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- ²⁴ Harwood, A. B. (1991). Comparing the standards in interior design and architecture to assess similarities and differences. *Interior Design Educators Council, Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 7, 1, 5-18.
- ²⁵ Guice, J.G. (1993). The propensity of state legislatures to license interior designers. *Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*, 19, 2, 3-14.
- ²⁶ Pearslee, J. E., James, D., and Simmons, R. (1988). Litigation in interior design: Examining United States Appellate Court cases in professional practice. *Journal of Interior Design Education and Research*. 12, 2, 16-31.
- ²⁷ Freidson, E. (1994). *Professionalism reborn: theory, prophecy and policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- ²⁸ Larson, M. S. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- ²⁹ Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- ³⁰ Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: The changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- ³¹ There are instances of governments initiating action in the form of licensing professions, for example the licensing of physicians. There are also instances of government action as instigated by other entities, such as the introduction and changes to building codes by pressure of insurance company with the life safety issue exposed by a disaster. An example was the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire in 1919. (See the building codes chapter).
- ³² Rees, J. (July 20, 2004). Interview with author.
- ³³ Brubaker, J. S. and Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities*. (3rd Ed.), New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- ³⁴ It is tenuous to try to define professions as people who do not work with their hands. One needs to think about surgeons, pianists, and military leadership to know that definition is fallible.
- ³⁵ In the 1950s, Association for Interior Decorators (AID) split into AID and National Society of Interior Designers (NSID). They merged in 1975 to form the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID). In 1985, Institute of Business Designers (IBD) split from ASID to form another association, which then broke into smaller organization by specialties. By 1995, seven interior design organizations contemplated merging in the Unified Voice discussions, in which five organizations unified to become the International Interior Design Association (IIDA).
- ³⁶ American Society of Interior Designers. (1887). Licensing of interior designers an ASID white paper. New York, NY.
- ³⁷ McKellar & P. Sparkes, (Eds.) (2004). *Interior design and identity*, (P. 49). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

-
- ³⁸ Casto, M. (February 1, 2006). Early interior designers and the semantics of a profession. Symposium presentation at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- ³⁹ Guyatt, M. (2004). A semblance of home: mental asylum interiors 1880 – 1914. In S. McKellar & P. Sparkes, (Eds.) *Interior design and identity*, (P. 49). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- ⁴⁰ Small house movement.
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/suburbs/index.htm>. Retrieved on May 29, 2007.
- ⁴¹ Parr, A. E. (Winter 1970). Heating, lighting, plumbing & human relations. *Landscape*, 19, 1, 28-29.
- ⁴² Veblen, T. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class: An economic study of institutions*. NY: Viking Press.
- ⁴³ Sanders, J. (Spring 2002). “Curtain wars.” *Harvard Design Magazine*,
<http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/research/publications/hdm/back/16sanders.html>. Retrieved on November 29, 2008.
- ⁴⁴ Alin, M. (November 20, 2006). Interview with author. In the 1950s fifty percent of the profession were men and fifty percent were women.
- ⁴⁵ (1964, January). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Historical Data Book*, LOV LVII #3, 34.
- ⁴⁶ Guerin, D. (March 9, 2007). Interview with author.
- ⁴⁷ AAFCS Website. <http://www.aafcs.org/about/history.html>. Retrieved on June 5, 2007.
- ⁴⁸ Manson, A.P. (Personal communication, August 2, 1006). Interview with author.
- ⁴⁹ Vytlacil, A. (1989) “The studio experience.” In Berkeley, E. P. (Ed.), *Architecture a place for women*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute.
- ⁵⁰ Kostof, S., (1977). *The architect: Chapters in the history of the profession*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- ⁵¹ Woods, M. N. ((1999). *From craft to profession: the practice of architecture in nineteenth-century America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- ⁵² History of NCARB. <http://www.ncarb.org/forms/history.pdf>. Retrieved April 11, 2005.
- ⁵³ Draper, J. (1977). The ecole des beaux-arts and the architectural profession in the United States: the case of John Galen Howard. In Kostof, S. (Ed.) *The architect chapters in the history of the profession* (pp. 209-210) New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- ⁵⁴ See architectural timeline in the United States in appendix.
- ⁵⁵ Toker, F. (1985, March). Gothic architecture by remote control: an illustrated building contract of 1340. *The art bulletin*. 67, 1, 67-95. Retrieved on 4-6-2007
<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0004-3079%28198503%2967%3A1%3C67%3AGABRCA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-3&size=LARGE>
- ⁵⁶ Schneider, P. (2000). Perfect masters of their art: re-imagining expertise. *Journal of architectural education*, 53, 3, 141-145
- ⁵⁷ Engineering the Industrial Revolution. Retrieved on April 7, 2007 at <http://www.creatingtechnology.org/history.htm#2>

⁵⁸ In 2005, Virginia Tech has ten programs in its engineering department. Retrieved December 1, 2005 from <http://www.eng.vt.edu/main/index.php>

⁵⁹ In 2005, Virginia Tech has seven programs in its architecture department. Retrieved December 1, 2005 from <http://www.caus.vt.edu/>

⁶⁰ Gross, J. A. (2002, Spring). President's Message from Eastern Pennsylvania AIA chapter. Retrieved on April 7, 2007 from http://www.aiaeasternpa.org/news/presidents_message_sp02.html

⁶¹ Because this comparison is examining the CIDA standards as of 2006, the name CIDA will be used rather than the older name FIDER.

⁶² Weaver, C. (March 10, 2008). Interview with author.

⁶³ For brevity some of the points have been summarized by a number of criteria in that standard.

⁶⁴ NAAB: Accreditation, 2004 Conditions and 2006 Procedures retrieved on March 3, 2008 at http://www.naab.org/accreditations/2004_Conditions_2.aspx

⁶⁵ IDEP Program retrieved on March 6, 2008 at <http://www.ncidq.org/idep/idepintro.htm>

⁶⁶ IDP Information retrieved on March 6, 2008 at <http://www.ncarb.org/idp/index.html>

⁶⁷ ARE Facts retrieved on March 6, 2008 at <http://www.ncarb.org/are/FAQs.html>

⁶⁸ NCIDQ Exam retrieved on March 6, 2008 at <http://www.ncidq.org/exam/examinfo.htm>

⁶⁹ Google Search. (July 1, 2008). Search by author of: architecture theory of aesthetics, architecture theory behavior, architecture theory of behavior minus the words cognitive, systems and biological, interior design theory of aesthetics, interior design theory behavior, and interior design theory of behavior minus the words cognitive, systems and biological. Please note: the theory of behavior excluding the words cognitive, systems and biological, is an attempt to removed the physical sciences from the search.

⁷⁰ Evans, G. W. (2003). "The built environment and mental health." *Journal of Urban Health*, 80, 4, 536-555 Retrieved on August 13, 2007 at <http://www.springerlink.com/content/332145g14675h745/>

⁷¹ Ulrich R. S., (1991). "Effects of interior design on wellness: theory and recent scientific research." *Journal of Health Care Interior Design*. 1991;3:97-109. Retrieved on July 3, 2007 at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/entrez?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=10123973&dopt=Citation

⁷² Brawley, E. C. (1997). *Designing for Alzheimer's disease: strategies for creating better care environments*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons. Retrieved on July 3, 2007 from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=cq0MnaLEDXsC&oi=fnd&pg=RA1-PR9&dq=%22Health+Care+%22+in+%22Interior+design%22+&ots=7XvBNXcToj&sig=WrfEbqM8qDnD2zly-R5Mti1NybU#PPP1,M1>

⁷³ Home economics. (1921, 1958, 1960 & 1964). *Virginia Polytechnic Institute Catalogue*, Blacksburg, VA.

⁷⁴ IDEC Website. Retrieved October 22, 2005 from <http://www.idec.org/>

⁷⁵ Gueft, O. (1980). "ASID the past as prologue: the first 50 years. 1931-1981: an overview." Pp 8. A reprint of the *ASID Annual Report* in the ASID National Meetings booklet in Grand Rapids, MI in November of 1988.

-
- ⁷⁶ *FIDER Website*. Professional standards. Retrieved October 22, 2004 from <http://www.fider.org/accreditation.htm>
- ⁷⁷ *JID Website*. Retrieved November 17, 2004 from http://www.ejid.org/jid_page.cfm?pageID=1
- ⁷⁸ American Society of Interior Designers. (2005). "History of ASID: thirty years of advancing the interior design profession." Washington, D.C..
- ⁷⁹ ASID National. (1999). "ASID withdraws from unified voice talks letter to members."
- ⁸⁰ *IIDA Website*. "History of IIDA." Retrieved November 26, 2004 <http://www.iida.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=161>
- ⁸¹ "ASID & IIDA meet to share goals for interior design industry" (April 10, 2000). *ASID Media Information Center*. Washington, D.C..
- ⁸² *NCIDQ Website*. Retrieved October 22, 2004 from <http://www.ncidq.org/who.htm>
- ⁸³ *ASID Website*. Licensing fact sheet. Retrieved October 22, 2004 from <http://www.aisd.org/ASID2/pubs/factsheet/.pdf>
- ⁸⁴ Collins, B.C. (February 25, 2005). Telephone Interview with author. One of the leaders who attended the ASID meeting.
- ⁸⁵ The use of the term jurisdiction is because Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C. are not states, and they were among the first to have licensing laws for interior designers.
- ⁸⁶ ASID. (1999). *A call to action! Grassroots legislative training manual*. Washington, D.C.: ASID.
- ⁸⁷ Waldron, D. (November 21, 2005). Interview with author.
- ⁸⁸ Shulman, K. (2003). "Turf war: architectural organization oppose interiors design licensing?" *Metropolis*, 22, 11, 98 & 101.
- ⁸⁹ Faulhaber, C. B., Deputy Treasurer, State of Michigan 2003-2006. (October 10, 2006). Interview with author.
- ⁹⁰ Voinovich, G. V. (personal communication, July 31, 1992) Unsigned letter of veto.
- ⁹¹ Goodwin, B. . (October 25, 2004). Interview with author.
- ⁹² Volz, G., (July 12, 2005). Interview with author. Gary Volz mentioned in his interview a coalition between the AIA and IDS formed an alliance that if interior design could meet each group's requirement they would support the legislation.
- ⁹³ AIA, ASID, IBD, and ISID. (1989). "Agreement of Support." *Letter to Licensing Coalitions*. Also known as the Joint Accord.
- ⁹⁴ American Society of Interior Designers. (2005). *History of ASID: 30 years of advancing the interior design profession*. Washington, D.C..
- ⁹⁵ *ASID Fact Sheet*. Retrieved January 19, 2006 from http://www.asid.org/NR/rdonlyres/F9DEE009-189D-405C-8CE1-707234E6A0CB/281/factsheet_of_interior_design_laws.pdf
- ⁹⁶ Experience of author.
- ⁹⁷ In 2006, FIDER changed its name to the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA); because most of these interviews were completed before 2006, FIDER is used as the designation for this organization in this section.
- ⁹⁸ The part of the interview having to do with her activities for CIDLO is included in the Ohio section.
- ⁹⁹ Alin, M. (November 22, 2005). Interview with author.
- ¹⁰⁰ Hatfield, S. D. (December 8, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁰¹ Weidegreen, E. (October 27, 2006). Interview with author.

¹⁰² Maurer, T. (July 13, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁰³ The part of the interview having to do with her activities for CIDLO is included in the Ohio section of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁴ See discussion in Section 2-5 regarding interior design theory based on human behavior.

¹⁰⁵ Dunn, K. and Mattson, H. (August 10, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁰⁶ See Section 2-5 for a comparison on criteria for accreditation of CIDA (FIDER) and NAAB.

¹⁰⁷ Kenney, J.F. (June 12, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁰⁸ Waldron, D.L. (November 21, 2005). Interview with author.

¹⁰⁹ Hertz, N., (2007). "An evaluation of the tests used by CCIDC in the state of California," on file at ASID's headquarters.

¹¹⁰ Boynton, R.A. (July 21, 2005). Interview with author.

¹¹¹ Readers should seek independent legal advice on these matters because regulations vary per jurisdiction.

¹¹²

¹¹³ Although many people volunteered on this effort, these are Robert A. Boynton's personal perceptions and recollections of what happened in the process. Triangulation from other sources has attempted to confirm dates and activities. As with all personal reflections, this account projects the viewpoint of the participant.

¹¹⁴ Boynton, R. A. (July 21, 2005). Interview with author.

¹¹⁵ AIA, ASID, IBD, and ISID. (1989). "Agreement of Support." *Letter to Licensing Coalitions*.

¹¹⁶ By this, Boynton means a practice act.

¹¹⁷ This is why the changes to the building code in 1981 are important, because the changes to the code and the tightening of enforcement made independent practice of interior design difficult in non-licensed jurisdictions.

¹¹⁸ ASID does not report any jurisdictions losing licensing, although there have been threats of it because of budget crises of jurisdictional and state governments.

¹¹⁹ APELSLAID Board is the Architect, Engineer, Land Surveyor, Landscape Architect, and Interior Design Board in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

¹²⁰ The following reiterates Boynton statement. Mark Shaw Lindsey wrote an editorial in the May 1991 AIA Newsletter in Virginia. In the "On the Pedestal" column he wrote a response to the ASID attempt to change the BOCA Building Code as "a blatant and direct violation of the Letter of Agreement (also known as the Joint Accord)..." He encouraged architects to support budget-cutting efforts in Virginia, which included the deregulation of interior design. "There is another means to express your concern over this violation of the Letter of Agreement." He continued, "On April 24, the State Board of Commerce held a hearing to consider the deregulation of interior designers as part of a budget cutting process. (Title registration of interior designers was voted in by the legislature over the Commerce Department's objections)." ... Lindsey continued to outline some of the challenges that architects have been faced with, "Over the years, we have witnessed the gradual erosion of our profession to better organized, yet sometimes less qualified parties. They compete with us for work and fees." He questioned the legislature's intent

in passing the certification law. “During this tough economic period, isn’t it time to question the judgment in allowing last year’s liberal and ineffective Virginia Interior Design bill to pass?” He finished by, “Now, some will say that our new objections to title registration will violate the Agreement. I ask, who chose to ignore it first?” The editorial is followed a disclaimer of “Opinions expressed by the membership are not necessarily those of the editor, the JRC or the Virginia Society.”

¹²¹ Often professionals will train governmental officials in aspects of their job as part of their professional duties.

¹²² Lipaj J. F. (1993, Spring). “President’s message and practice requirements.” *Ohio Architect, newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects*.

¹²³ Vogel, S. (March 15, 1993). Lecture at ASID Meeting Wayne County Building.

¹²⁴ American Institute of Architects. (2005, December). Summary and review 2005 demographic diversity audit report.

http://www.aia.org/SiteObjects/files/Div_Demographic_survey_2005.pdf. Retrieved on November 29, 2008.

¹²⁵ Havenhand, L. K. (Autumn 2004) “A view from the margin: interior design.”

Massachusetts Institute of Technology design issues, 20,4,32-42.

¹²⁶ Goodwin, B. (October 25, 2004). Interview with author.

¹²⁷ The AIA’s view in their Interior Design Task Force reports “Elements of building design that affect public, health, safety, and welfare, and that are within the scope of architectural practice, require the training and experience found only in that required for licensing as an architect.” (AIA Task Force 6) On the other hand, they say the opposite of an interior designer; a page later states “It was not apparent, however, that the knowledge and skills utilized by interior designers are of a unique nature. A majority of architects possess similar abilities and, more importantly, perform the same tasks.” (AIA Task Force 7)

¹²⁸ Lippard, L. R. (1977). *Centers and fragments: women’s spaces*. S. Torre (ed.) *Women in architecture: a historic and contemporary perspective*. NY: Whitney Library of Design.

¹²⁹ Vytlačil, A. (1989) “The studio experience.” In Berkeley, E. P. (Ed.), *Architecture a place for women*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institute.

¹³⁰ See Section 2-5 for this documentation.

¹³¹ Lugones, M. C., & Spelman, E. V. (1983). Have we got a theory for you! Feminist theory, cultural imperialism and the demand for ‘the woman’s voice. In Kolmar W. K., & Bartkowski, F. (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader*, Second edition. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

¹³² History of fire fighting. (2005). *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*, 6th ed.. Columbia University Press. <http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1E1-firefigh.html>. Retrieved on November 29, 2008.

¹³³ (1994). Building codes and life safety. *Building Renovation*, 5, 2, 47-48

¹³⁴ Dunn, V. (2005). “Are architects, engineers and code-writing officials friends of the firefighter?” <http://vincentdunn.com/dunn/a&e/buildings.htm>. Retrieved on November 29, 2008.

¹³⁵ Cook, K. (April 11, 2005). Interview with author

¹³⁶ “History of building codes.”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Building_Code. Retrieved on January 10, 2008.

¹³⁷ Building Officials & Code Administrators International, Inc. (1981). Eighth Edition. IL.

¹³⁸ *Levittown History*. <http://www.levittownhistoricalsociety.org/history.htm>. Retrieved on November 28, 2008.

¹³⁹ “Universal Design.” <http://www.universaldesign.com/>. Retrieved on August 14, 2007.

¹⁴⁰ *National Aging-in-Place Council*. Retrieved on August 14, 2007 at <http://www.naipc.org/ResourceDirectory/InteriorDesignHomeRemodeling/tabid/92/Default.aspx>.

¹⁴¹ Slip and fall injury statistics.

<http://www.safetytoday.com/safetyresource/slipfall.aspx>. Retrieved on September 6, 2008.

¹⁴² St. Luke’s Iowa Health. Prevention of slip, trip, falls and injury.

<http://www.stlukes.org/body.cfm?id=273>. Retrieved on September 6, 2008.

¹⁴³ Dickinson, J.I. (May 1999). The effect of selected residential carpeting on the balance and gait of older healthy adults. <http://eab.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/33/2/279>. Retrieved on November 29, 2008.

¹⁴⁴ Consumers Council. (9-15-2000). Choice #287.

<http://www2.consumer.org.hk/p287/p287e.htm>. Retrieved on September 6, 2008.

¹⁴⁵ Although many people volunteered in this effort, this chapter includes Vincent G. Carter and Andrea Kelly’s personal perceptions and recollections of what happened in the process. Triangulation from other sources has attempted to confirm dates and activities. As with all personal reflections, this account projects the viewpoint of the participants.

¹⁴⁶ Carter, V. G. (November 20, 2005). Interview with author

¹⁴⁷ Kelly, A. (December 1, 2005.) Interview with author

¹⁴⁸ Carter continued to explain: “Architect and interior design opposition is more about money than turf, because the turf overlaps. With the economy [in late 2005], there is a big boom in D.C. and architects are involved in that... Ten years ago or so there was a lot of renovation work, not much new construction. Whole buildings were gutted and completely renovated. Because there was no structure involved, architects didn’t have to be involved [in the projects]. Those [projects] were done by interior designers on their own. The architects were really affected, then. So, they became more militant when the economy was down.”

¹⁴⁹ Author’s note: the more restrictive the terms of the regulation the fewer people who qualify for a license. Many legislatures will not allow licensing to restrict current practitioners, because that action could be through restraint of trade. Title acts can have tighter requirements for licensure because they only restrict the use of the title. Practice acts actually restrict the unlicensed from practicing the profession; therefore, qualification standards and grand-parenting of practitioners becomes a larger issue with practice acts.

¹⁵⁰ Author’s note; the practice legislation for Washington, D.C. was signed into law in 1986. In 1989 the letter of agreement between AIA, ASID, ISID and IBD, also known as

the Joint Accord was signed. It established a framework under which the AIA would not oppose interior design title legislation.

¹⁵¹ Government of the District of Columbia. (August 1997). Business Regulatory Reform Commission Report, p 35.

¹⁵² Wilkoff, W. L. (Sept/Oct 1993) *Designline*, \$250 professional license fee? 6, 1.

¹⁵³ Carter, V. (personal communication, September 26, 1997) letter to Linda W. Cropp

¹⁵⁴ Carter, V. (personal communication, July 3, 1997) fax to Kathi Bakin

¹⁵⁵ The balance of powers of government in the United States mandates this separation of power of the different branches of government: administrative (the Board administers), judicial (enforcement and prosecution), and legislative (make the laws).

¹⁵⁶ Government of the District of Columbia. (August 1997). Business Regulatory Reform Commission Report.

¹⁵⁷ Carter, V. (personal communication, July 3, 1996) E-mail to Kathi Bakin, Stacey D'Aquila and Jed Weiss

¹⁵⁸ Author's note: The BRRC may have considered the AIA person the representative of all professions in the built environment. The author does not know what level of notice was required for this quasi-governmental body.

¹⁵⁹ Carter, V. G. (personal communications, October 1, 1997) Fax to ASID National Legislative Group about BRRC Hearing

¹⁶⁰ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 9, 1997) Fax to Kathi Bakin about the hearings.

¹⁶¹ Author's note: Interior designers serving on a licensing board should make sure they have received board training from a qualified attorney so that they understand the protections from liability they enjoy while serving on a governmental board. The AIA is not a governmental entity and lacks governmental immunity.

¹⁶² Goodwin, B. (October 25, 2004). Interview with author

¹⁶³ Kane, J. (September 12, 2006). Interview with author

¹⁶⁴ Manson, A.P. & Goodwin, B. (August 1, 2006). Interview with author

¹⁶⁵ Initials are used because this person could not be contacted for approval of the use his/her name.

¹⁶⁶ Ms. Kane was president of ASID during 1976 through 1978, LT in the early 1980s and Kane again in 1986 through 1988.

¹⁶⁷ Author's note: the Greater Washington Board of Trade is a business organization providing advocacy, research and programs to the areas business community. The primary focus of most business coalitions is anti-governmental interference. So, their response to the presentation is not surprising.

¹⁶⁸ FAK, (personal communication, July 10, 1987) Letter to L. Thompson for support for interior designers certification from the Department of Fire Programs –Virginia Fire Services Board.

¹⁶⁹ Goodwin, B., (personal communication, October 16, 1989) Letter to Paul Mauch requesting a demonstration of flammability issues.

¹⁷⁰ CCVID (personal communication, no date) Virginia interior designers demonstrate preventative measures.

¹⁷¹ Kane, J. (September 12, 2006). Interview with author

¹⁷² Anonymous on file with ASID, (personal communication, April 1993) Clarification to rules and regulations part VII, 7.1.

¹⁷³ Code of Virginia (January 12, 1994). Draft of Senate Bill 29.

¹⁷⁴ Putney, A. W. (personal communication, February 28, 1991) Memorandum for the organization to fight deregulation of interior design.

¹⁷⁵ Bakin, K. (personal communication, May 23, 1991) Virginia board of commerce hearing re deregulation of interior designers.

¹⁷⁶ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 5, 1994) Memorandum Virginia may lose certification.

¹⁷⁷ Washington, J. R. (personal communication, October 13, 1994) Testimony at deregulation hearings.

¹⁷⁸ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 19, 1994) Memorandum about hearings the night before.

¹⁷⁹ SBJ. (personal communication, October 18, 1994) Testimony letter to Otis Brown.

¹⁸⁰ CMS. (personal communication, October 18, 1994) Testimony memorandum to Task Force.

¹⁸¹ Author's note: Professionals frequently instruct public officials about their duties as a public service.

¹⁸² Volz, G. (July 12, 2005). Interview with author

¹⁸³ Kreutzfeld, G. (July 13, 2005). Interview with author

¹⁸⁴ Maurer, T. (July 13, 2005). Interview with author

¹⁸⁵ Remember there are hidden cost of government that interior design coalitions do not understand.

¹⁸⁶ JH was contacted to be part of this dissertation and never responded. Therefore his initials are used to protect his identity.

¹⁸⁷ In response to the question of how they reached their estimate of numbers, Volz said: They counted the registry of members of professional societies, put a factor for people who were non-affiliated practicing interior designers. They used the phone book to find people who were not members of a professional organization plus estimated a number of college and university faculty who were also practicing professionals on a part time basis. "So that is how we arrived on that number."

¹⁸⁸ Volz, G. R. (personal communication, October 3, 1994) Letter to Kathi Bakin about Leslie Gordon.

¹⁸⁹ Initials are used for people who have not signed a release form and are referred to by interviewees.

¹⁹⁰ D'Aquila, S. (personal communication, August 8, 1995) E-mail about phone conversation with J. Fenderbosch.

¹⁹¹ Author's note: The Seal Bill may have been an attempt to clarify the new enforcement policy.

¹⁹² Lipaj J. F. (1993, Spring). President's message and practice requirements. Ohio Architect, newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects states the following. This is important because it demonstrates that the changes to the building code changed the enforcement of the laws in Ohio by capturing remodeling for only registered architects and engineers to do. If there was no difference in enforcement, he would not have to write this letter to AIA members.

“It is illegal for anyone other than an architect to either provide or to offer to provide architectural services. Violators face the possibility of injunctive action or criminal prosecution. When an architect chooses to participate in such an arrangement, the architect may be jeopardizing his or her license as well. It is unlawful of an architect to seal documents not prepared by the architect or under the direct supervision of the architect.”

¹⁹³ Lipaj J. F. (1993, Spring). President’s message and practice requirements.

“Ohio Architect, newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects. States - Certificates of Authorization – All organizations providing architectural services are required under Ohio law to procure for this Board a Certificate of Authorization to provide architectural services. An architect cannot contract to render architectural services to an unlicensed entity who, in turn, provides the architect’s services to another.”

“The unauthorized organization providing the services of the architect to another may be enjoined by the courts to prohibit such activities and the architect may face disciplinary action through the Board.”

¹⁹⁴ Wilcox, N. W. Newsletter Executive Director State Board of Examiners of Architects,

“These requirements are as follows: 1. More than 50% of the persons holding shares in a corporation, or partners in a partnership, must be registered in Ohio to practice architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, surveying, or a combination thereof; 2. Those registered shareholders or partners must hold more than 50% of the shares of stock issued by the corporation or the interests in the partnership; 3. More than 50% of the members of the organization’s board of directors must be registered in Ohio to practice architecture, engineering, landscape architecture, surveying or a combination thereof; 4. If the corporation is providing architectural services, the firm must designate at least one registered architect (it may designate more than one if it chooses) as being in responsible charge of the firm’s architectural activities and decisions; 5. At least one of the designated architects must be a member of the corporation’s board of directors.”

¹⁹⁵ Zimmerman, M. (personal communication, August 29, 2006). Interview with author.

¹⁹⁶ The Step Program is ASID’s organized study sessions for the NCIDQ examination.

¹⁹⁷ Washington, J. R. (personal communication, October 13, 1994) Testimony at deregulation hearings.

¹⁹⁸ Pulsifer, C. (personal communication, April 23, 1984) Letter to Ed Gips Exec. Dir. ASID.

¹⁹⁹ Cathcart, M. (personal communication, July 7, 1986). Letter to Jean Richmond ASID National.

²⁰⁰ Ray, J. (personal communication, June 24, 1986) Council of the District of Columbia, Memorandum to all council members. Bill 6-251, The “interior designers licensure act of 1986.”

²⁰¹ Wilson, J.A. (personal communication, September 11, 1986) Council of the District of Columbia, memorandum to all council members.

²⁰² Wilson, J.A. (personal communication, September 16, 1986) Council of the District of Columbia, memorandum to all council members.

²⁰³ Cathcart, M. (personal communication, September 30, 1986) Memorandum to Board.

²⁰⁴ Cathcart, M. (personal communication, October 1, 1987) Memorandum to Jim Mezrano, National Title Registration Committee.

²⁰⁵ (July 15, 1988). Notice of proposed rulemaking, Chapter 8 interior designers. District of Columbia Register, Washington D.C.: Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs for City of Washington D.C.

²⁰⁶ Cathcart, M. (personal communication, February 14, 1989) Letter to colleagues about adoption of rules Washington, D.C.: Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Occupational and Professional Licensing Administration, Board of Interior Designers.

²⁰⁷ (February 10, 1989). Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Notice of proposed rulemaking. *District of Columbia Register*, Washington D.C.

²⁰⁸ Application package from government of the District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Occupational and Professional Licensing Administration, Board of Interior Designers.

²⁰⁹ Lane, A. L., (1990). Grandfathering clause runs out on interior designer licensing law. *Washington Business Journal*, Washington D.C.

²¹⁰ Carter, V. (November 27, 1992). Notice to all District of Columbia licensed interior designers. Washington D.C.: Board of Interior Designers, Government of the District of Columbia, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, Occupational and Profession Licensing Administration

²¹¹ *District of Columbia Register*. (Friday November 27, 1992). Adoption of Building Codes. District of Columbia Construction Codes, 39, 48, 12-13, 12-14.

²¹² Moeller, G. M., American Institute of Architects (personal communication, June 29, 1992) Memorandum District of Columbia “Non-regulatory professional license” fee.

²¹³ (May 1993). Important notice. Government of the District of Columbia Department of Finance and Revenue.

²¹⁴ \$250 professional license fee? (September/October 1993). *Designline*, 6, 1.

²¹⁵ Pearson, T. L. (personal communication, November 18, 1993) Letter to the Occupational & Professional licensing Administration, Board of Interior Design, District of Columbia

²¹⁶ Carter, V. (personal communication, February 19, 1996) E-mail to Stacey D’Aquila

²¹⁷ Government of the District of Columbia. (August 1997). Business and Regulatory Reform Commission report, Submitted to the mayor and members of the Council of the District of Columbia, D.C. Law 10-212.

²¹⁸ Patton, D. J. and Brazil, H. (personal communication, September 1997) Will D.C. seize the opportunity to change?

²¹⁹ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, September 26, 1997) Letter to Linda Cropp.

²²⁰ Burke-Jones, J. (personal communication, September 12, 1997) Letter to Linda Cropp.

²²¹ Smith, L. (personal communication, September 12, 1997) Letter to Linda Cropp.

²²² Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 1, 1997) Letter to Linda Cropp and Harold Brazil about Discovery during BRRC Hearing September 30, 1997.

²²³ Carter, V. G. (personal communications, October 1, 1997) Fax to ASID National Legislative Group about BRRC Hearing

²²⁴ Bostek, T. (personal communication, October 1, 1997) to NCIDQ Certified Designers to fight repeal of licensing law.

- ²²⁵ Dalrymple, M. K., (personal communication, October 6, 1997) Letter to Harold Brazil about Reduction of the number of boards.
- ²²⁶ Dunn, S. C. (personal communication, October 7, 1997). Letter to Harold Brazil about support of retaining D.C. Law 6-172.
- ²²⁷ Bakin, K. (personal communication, October 8, 1997). Written statement for the Committee on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs hearing Council of the District of Columbia on October 8, 1997.
- ²²⁸ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 8, 1997) Testimony to Linda Cropp and Harold Brazil for hearing.
- ²²⁹ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 9, 1997) Memorandum to D. C. Council about additional testimony form October 8, 1997 BRRC hearings.
- ²³⁰ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 9, 1997) about BRRC public hearing of October 8, 1997.
- ²³¹ Carter, B. G. (personal communication, October 15, 1997) Memorandum about vacancy – chair of the D.C. Board of ID.
- ²³² Burke-Jones, J. (personal communication, October 16, 1997) Letter to Harold Brazil about lack of transparency in process before hearings.
- ²³³ Wilder, S. (personal communication, October 17, 1997) Fax to Linda Cropp about licensing in Florida.
- ²³⁴ Joel, W. L. (personal communications, April 18, 1984) Letter to ASID National.
- ²³⁵ Gabriel, D. (personal communication, April 23, 1984) Letter to W. Lee Joel.
- ²³⁶ Joel, W. L. (personal communication, June 19, 1984) Letter to Terry Perry, IBD.
- ²³⁷ Joel, W. L. (personal communication, June 19, 1984) Letter to Terry Perry, IBD.
- ²³⁸ American Society of Interior Designers (ASID) & Institute of Business Designers (IBD). (September 18, 1985). Open Discussion: Pros & Cons of Certification of Virginia Interior Designers. Virginia.
- ²³⁹ ASID & IBD. (October 17, 1985) Agenda of meeting with Pros & Cons attached. Virginia.
- ²⁴⁰ CCVID (undated). CCVID & You! Handout for meetings. Virginia
- ²⁴¹ Committee for Certification of Interior Designers in Virginia (CCVID). (January 14, 1986). Guidelines for legal certification of Virginia interior designers. Virginia.
- ²⁴² Marks, M. (personal communication, January 15, 1986) Letter to Virginia interior designers.
- ²⁴³ Kane, J. (personal communication, May 3, 1986) Meeting notes.
- ²⁴⁴ (personal communication, May 20, 1986) Draft of letter of support.
- ²⁴⁵ CCVID. (personal communication, May 20, 1986) Rough of letter requesting support and sample invoice.
- ²⁴⁶ CCVID (June 7, 1986) Invitation to meeting at Janet Kane's office.
- ²⁴⁷ Joel, W. L. (personal communication, October 14, 1986) CCVID Annual Report to ASID Board
- ²⁴⁸ Shumate, S. (personal communication, October 30, 1986) Letter to Fredrick J. Napolitano in support of certification for interior designers.
- ²⁴⁹ McLawhorn, P. (personal communication, April 18, 1986) Letter to Fredrick J. Napolitano in support of licensing for interior designers.

-
- ²⁵⁰ Coulter, L. T. (personal communication, March 6, 1986) Letter to Ellen Procejus about support for title registration for interior designers.
- ²⁵¹ Code of Virginia (October 30, 1986). Second draft of bill.
- ²⁵² Hartman, W. F., (personal communication, November 24, 1986) Letter to oppose certification of interior designers in Virginia.
- ²⁵³ Southern Home Furnishings Association, (personal communication, no date) Handout registration of the title “interior designer”.
- ²⁵⁴ General Assembly of Virginia, House Joint Resolution number 245 (1987 Session). Requesting the Board of Commerce to study the need for certifying interior designers.
- ²⁵⁵ Thompson, L. B. (personal communication, March 10, 1987) Letter with questions about the need to certify interior designers.
- ²⁵⁶ Rubin, M. E. (personal communication, March 19, 1987) Letter in response to L. Thompson’s questions.
- ²⁵⁷ Thompson, L. G., (personal communication, no date) Cover letter from Board of Commerce to selected study participants for interior designer study questionnaire.
- ²⁵⁸ Kearney, F. A. (personal communication, July 10, 1987) Letter to L. Thompson for support for interior designers certification from the Department of Fire Programs – Virginia Fire Services Board.
- ²⁵⁹ CCVID, (personal communication). Update on certification process and plans for public hearings,
- ²⁶⁰ Kane, J. E. (personal communication, July 14, 1987) Letter to L. Thompson summary of hearings about interior design certification.
- ²⁶¹ Kane, J. E. (personal communication, July 14, 1987) Letter to L. Thompson summary of research at Virginia Tech.
- ²⁶² Walker, C. M., (personal communication, October 22, 1987) Memorandum of denial of the need to certify interior designers in Virginia.
- ²⁶³ Goodwin, B & Joel, B. (personal communication, April 20, 1988) Regroup memorandum.
- ²⁶⁴ Goodwin, B., (personal communication, October 16, 1989) Letter to Paul Mauch requesting a demonstration of flammability issues.
- ²⁶⁵ CCVID (personal communication, no date) Hand out of compilation of un-cited articles from Virginia press.
- ²⁶⁶ CCVID (personal communication, no date) Sample interior design problems.
- ²⁶⁷ CCVID (personal communication, no date) Synopsis of the NFPA Report.
- ²⁶⁸ CCVID (personal communication, no date) Virginia interior designers demonstrate preventative measures.
- ²⁶⁹ Code of Virginia (January 24, 1989) House Bill No. 1683.
- ²⁷⁰ Joel, W. L. (personal communication, February 13, 1990) to Jean Richmond about passage of bill in House.
- ²⁷¹ Code of Virginia (April 4, 1990) Law enacted Amendment in the nature of a substitute.
- ²⁷² (personal communication, no date) Key points Virginia interior design certification law.
- ²⁷³ ASID National (personal communication, April 20, 2006) Virginia becomes eighth jurisdiction in nation to pass interior design registration.

- ²⁷⁴ Winer, S. (personal communication, Mary 31, 1990) Memorandum to R. J. Dean about compliance with National Accord.
- ²⁷⁵ (No date) Licensing/Government Affairs, Va. interior designer law sets national precedent.
- ²⁷⁶ Putney, A. W. (personal communication, February 28, 1991) Memorandum for the organization to fight deregulation of interior design.
- ²⁷⁷ VA AIA Newsletter (personal communication, May 1991) On the pedestal, an editorial.
- ²⁷⁸ CCVID (personal communication, Wednesday, Mary 22, 1991) What's CCVID?
- ²⁷⁹ Bakin, K. (personal communication, May 23, 1991) Virginia board of commerce hearing re deregulation of interior designers.
- ²⁸⁰ Legislative Financial Aid Task Force (personal communication, January 28, 1992) Letter about award of \$2,000.00.
- ²⁸¹ Bakin, K. (personal communication, November 18, 1992) Letter to Mary Slayton about grand-parenting in Virginia.
- ²⁸² Fobbs, W. (personal communication, December 7, 1992) Letter to Kathi Bakin about non FIDER accredited programs.
- ²⁸³ Donn, S. (personal Communication, December 15, 1992) Letter to confirm inclusion in certified interior designers in Virginia.
- ²⁸⁴ Legislative Financial Aid Task Force (personal communication, January 8, 1993) Letter about award of \$2,500.00.
- ²⁸⁵ (personal communication, April 1993) Clarification to rules and regulations part VII, 7.1.
- ²⁸⁶ Code of Virginia (January 12, 1994). Draft of Senate Bill 29.
- ²⁸⁷ Code of Virginia (January 25, 1994). Draft of Senate Bill 569.
- ²⁸⁸ Putney, A. W. (personal communication, May 25, 1994) memorandum about legislative events in Virginia.
- ²⁸⁹ CCVID (personal communication, August 1994) Virginia history.
- ²⁹⁰ Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 5, 1994) Memorandum Virginia may lose certification.
- ²⁹¹ Washington, J. R. (personal communication, October 13, 1994) testimony at deregulation hearings.
- ²⁹² Carter, V. G. (personal communication, October 19, 1994) memorandum about hearings the night before.
- ²⁹³ Jenkins, S. B. (personal communication, October 18, 1994) testimony letter to Otis Brown.
- ²⁹⁴ Schebish, C. M. (personal communication, October 18, 1994) testimony memorandum to Task Force.
- ²⁹⁵ Horne, L. (personal communication, March 30, 1995) fax to Rick Hodges about changes to conflict of interest in Virginia Code.
- ²⁹⁶ Hodges, R. (personal communication, April 18, 1995) to Lou Horne about ASID Code of Ethics verbiage attached.
- ²⁹⁷ Courtney, M. N. (personal communication , January 11, 1996) letter about new category retail partner and ethics concerns in relation to Virginias code.

-
- ²⁹⁸ Bank, T. B. (personal communication, January 25, 1996) letter in response. They will have the same ethical responsibilities as regular members.
- ²⁹⁹ Dimensions, Virginia Board for APELSLAID Newsletter (Fall 1996) 14-4.
- ³⁰⁰ Legislative Financial Aid Task Force (personal communication, February 2, 1996) Letter about award of \$5,000.00 to produce a study about economic impact of interior designers on Virginia.
- ³⁰¹ Goodwin, B. (personal communication, March 28, 1996) memorandum to Claude G. Cooper about interior design submittal of plans.
- ³⁰² Ebstein, B. (personal communication, May 22, 1984) Memorandum and questionnaire about licensing activity in their jurisdictions.
- ³⁰³ ASID Board Meeting Minutes, Ohio North. (personal communication, October 14, 1984).
- ³⁰⁴ Draft Bill 117th General Assembly Regular Session 1987-1988. Preliminary (personal communication, December 1987).
- ³⁰⁵ Burke-Jones, J. (personal communication, September 30, 1987) Letter to Jim Mezano of ASID National Title Registration Committee.
- ³⁰⁶ Baughman, R. N. (personal communication, June 9, 1988) Letter to ASID National.
- ³⁰⁷ Volz, G. (personal communication, January 26, 1988) Letter to Jean Richmond at ASID National.
- ³⁰⁸ Volz, G. (personal communication, April 1, 1989) Memorandum to ASID 32 Board of Directors.
- ³⁰⁹ Urton, D. A. (personal communication, July 31, 1989) Memorandum to CIDLO Board.
- ³¹⁰ (personal communication, no date) Announcement of meeting to explain bills.
- ³¹¹ Draft Bill 117th Assembly Regular Session 1987-1988 (personal communications, August 1989) Revised by at least two unknown individuals.
- ³¹² Scinta, C. R. (personal communication, August 4, 1989) Minutes of Ohio South ASID Board meeting.
- ³¹³ Volz, G. R. (personal communication, August 7, 1998) Letter to Jean Richmond.
- ³¹⁴ Weiner, S. (personal communication, September 13, 1989) Memorandum to Gary Volz and CIDLO Board.
- ³¹⁵ Wilcox, W. N. (personal communication, Sept/Oct 1989) Viewpoint: organizations providing architectural services. Unknown newsletter. Page 3.
- ³¹⁶ Volz, G. (personal communication, October 2, 1998) Letter to S. Weiner.
- ³¹⁷ Anonymous (personal communication, December 26, No Year) Hand written notes of a phone call from Gary Volz to a person from ASID national. The handwriting is the same as notes on the draft copy of the bill and another note signed with a S. It is assumed that this note was written by Sheri Weiner.
- ³¹⁸ Bill 118th General Assembly Regular Session 1989-1990. Sections 3781.220, 3781.221, 3781.222, & amend 3791.041 (personal communication, March 13, 1990).
- ³¹⁹ Richmond, J. L. (personal communication, March 25, 1990) Letter to Gary Volz about additional revisions needed to bill.
- ³²⁰ Anonymous (personal communication, June 14, no year) Handwritten note about telephone conversation and forwarded copies of grandparent verbiage.

-
- ³²¹ Richmond, J. (personal communication, September 5, 1990) Memorandum to CIDLO members with draft letter to Gerry Hammond.
- ³²² Richmond, J. L. (personal communication, September, 1990) Draft letter to Gerry Hammond.
- ³²³ Hammond, G. S. (personal communication, January 21, 1990) Memorandum to Interior Designer Group about Ohio Interior Design Legislation.
- ³²⁴ Anonymous (personal communication, April 1, 1991) Handwritten note about telephone conversation.
- ³²⁵ Benadum, F. (personal communication, October 16, 1991) Letter to Ron Blank about National Home Furnishing Association.
- ³²⁶ Coalition for Residential Interior Designers Licensing (personal communication, no date) Handout Fact and Fiction – State Licensing of Interior Designers with Application for membership.
- ³²⁷ CIDLO (personal communication, September 1991) Application for Membership Renewal.
- ³²⁸ Anonymous (personal communication, January 13, 1992) Documenting phone call with Volz.
- ³²⁹ Volz, G. R. (personal communication, January 24, 1992) Rebuttal testimony to opposition at hearings.
- ³³⁰ Bakin, K. (personal communication, January 27, 1992) Letter to Gary Volz about his rebuttal letter.
- ³³¹ Collins, D. S. & Field, D. W. (personal communication, March 16, 1992) AIA Ohio Legislative Alert.
- ³³² Bakin, K. (personal communication, March 24, 1992) Fax to Gary Volz about IDS opposition in NC.
- ³³³ Cardone, P. (personal communication, no date) Letter to interior designers in state of Ohio.
- ³³⁴ Bakin, K. (personal communication, May 14, 1992) Letter to Gary Volz about NHFA Board of Directors.
- ³³⁵ Laverty, F. L. (personal communication, May 19, 1992) Letter about Coalition for Equity in Interior Designer Licensing.
- ³³⁶ Volz G. (personal communication, May 22, 1992) Fax from Gary to Kathi Bakin with letter attached to Gary Volz from Faye Laverty.
- ³³⁷ Senate Bill #75, 118th Assembly Regular Session 1991-1992 (personal communications, no date).
- ³³⁸ Bakin, K. (personal communication, July 7, 1992) Letter encouraging Governor to sign bill.
- ³³⁹ Voinovich, G. V. (personal communication, August 3, 1992) Letter to Kathi Bakin with veto letter attached.
- ³⁴⁰ Voinovich, G. V. (personal communication, July 31, 1992) Unsigned letter of veto.
- ³⁴¹ Bakin, K. (personal communication, September 1, 1992) E-mail to Gary Volz about veto, article attached.
- ³⁴² Crawford, D. (1992, August 10). Fashion police can't be far behind. The News Herald Willoughby, Ohio.

- ³⁴³ McDavitt, R. (1992 Fall). Why was the licensing bill vetoed? ASID Perspective Newsletter Ohio North Chapter.
- ³⁴⁴ Wyatt, G. (personal communication, January 3, 1994) Memorandum to Virginia Reinhold about NLCID Opposition Guidebook.
- ³⁴⁵ Anonymous (personal communication, August 24, 1993) Record of telephone call (assumed to be Gretchen Wyatt) with Gayle Kreutzfeld about CIDLO continuing efforts.
- ³⁴⁶ Wilcox, W. N. (personal communication, December 10, 1993) Letter for Dauner Contracting Corp.
- ³⁴⁷ Holland, C. B. (personal communication, February 15, 1994) Letter to Jeffrey E. Dauner about a complaint filed.
- ³⁴⁸ Holland, C. B. (personal communication, February 15, 1994) Letter to Jay Schuermann about a complaint filed.
- ³⁴⁹ State of Ohio – State Board of Examiners of Architects (personal communication, no date) Applicable laws in Ohio.
- ³⁵⁰ Lipaj J. F. (1993, Spring). President's message and practice requirements. Ohio Architect, newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects.
- ³⁵¹ Jackson, W. (September 27, 1993). State tries to close door on building designer. Business First, P12.
- ³⁵² Wilcox, W. (November 15, 1993). State law protects public from wanna-be architects. Business First.
- ³⁵³ Volz, G. (personal communication, April 20, 1994) Letter to Kathy Bakin.
- ³⁵⁴ Volz, G. (personal communication, July 18, 1994) Letter to Kathy Bakin.
- ³⁵⁵ Holland, C. B. (personal communication, February 15, 1994) Letter to Jay Schuermann about a complaint filed.
- ³⁵⁶ Bill 120th General Assembly Regular Session 1993-1994 (personal communication, no date).
- ³⁵⁷ Hart, J. E. (personal communication, September 21, 1994) Letter to Chad Holland.
- ³⁵⁸ Gordon, L. (personal communication, February 23, 1994) Application for Building/Zoning City of Dayton, Ohio.
- ³⁵⁹ Wyatt, G. (personal communication, October 31, 1994) Memorandum to Susan Mottice and Virginia Weinhold.
- ³⁶⁰ Wright, J. (1994, October) OHBA bill to clarify residential designing. Builder Update, P21-22.
- ³⁶¹ Holland, C.B. (personal communication, November 10, 1994) Letter to Butkiewicz about cease and desist order.
- ³⁶² Wyatt, G. (personal communication, November 11, 1994) Memorandum to Terri Maurer.
- ³⁶³ Butkiewicz, J. E. (personal communication, November 21, 1994) Letter to Robert Angle about cease and desist order.
- ³⁶⁴ Volz, G. (personal communication, November 4, 1994) Letter to Jim Butkiewicz about cease and desist order.
- ³⁶⁵ Martin, R. E. (1994, Summer). President's message. Ohio Architect, newsletter of the Ohio Board of Examiners of Architects.
- ³⁶⁶ Holland, C. R. (personal communication, September 29, 1994) Letter to John E. Hart attorney for UofD about Leslie Gordon.

³⁶⁷ Volz, G. R. (personal communication, October 3, 1994) Letter to Kathi Bakin about Leslie Gordon.

³⁶⁸ Anonymous (personal communication, March 3, 1995) E-mail about telephone call with Jennifer Fenderbosch about CIDLO continuing efforts.

³⁶⁹ Volz, G. (Personal communication, April 24, 1995) Fax to Kathi Bakin about “Seal Bill.”

³⁷⁰ Anonymous (personal communication, May 16, 1995) Memorandum to Jennifer about draft copy of bill.

³⁷¹ Anonymous (personal communications, May 16, 1995) Rough draft of interior designer’s bill.

³⁷² Fenderbosch, J. (personal communication, May 18, 1995) Memorandum about meeting with Lyles.

³⁷³ Fenderbosch, J. (personal communication, June 6, 1995) Fax to Kathi Bakin with part of the architect seal bill attached.

³⁷⁴ D’Aquila, S. (personal communication, June 7, 1995) Memorandum to Jennifer Fenderbosch about architects seal bill.

³⁷⁵ D’Aquila, S. (personal communication, June 19, 1995) E-mail to Kathi Bakin about architects seal bill.

³⁷⁶ Volz, G. (personal communication, June 20, 1995) Testimony.

³⁷⁷ Volz, G. (personal communication, June 22, 1995) Letter to Kathi Bakin about testimony on bill 231.

³⁷⁸ Fenderbosch, J. (personal communication, June 22, 1995) Testimony to committee about bill 231.

³⁷⁹ D’Aquila, S. (personal communication, August 8, 1995) E-mail about phone conversation with J. Fenderbosch.

³⁸⁰ Anonymous (personal communications, December 5, 1995) Rough draft of interior designer’s bill.