Made available by Hasselt University Library in https://documentserver.uhasselt.be

Development and validation of a survey for well-being and interaction assessment by occupants in office buildings with adaptive facades Peer-reviewed author version

Atti, S.; Garat, S. & COOLS, Mario (2019) Development and validation of a survey for well-being and interaction assessment by occupants in office buildings with adaptive facades. In: BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENT, 157, p. 268-276.

DOI: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.04.054 Handle: http://hdl.handle.net/1942/29546

1 Development and validation of a survey for well-being and interaction 2 assessment by occupants in office buildings with adaptive facades

- 3 S. Attia¹, S. Garat ^{1,2}, M. Cools ^{3, 4, 5}
- 4 ¹Sustainable Buildings Design Lab, Dept. UEE, Applied Sciences, Université de Liège, Belgium
- ² EPF Graduate School of Engineering, Sceaux, France
- ³ Local Environment Management & Analysis (LEMA), Dept. UEE, Applied Sciences, Université de Liège, Belgium
- ⁴ KULeuven Campus Brussels, Department of Informatics, Simulation and Modeling, Warmoesberg 26,
 BE-1000 Brussels, Belgium
- ⁵ Hasselt University, Faculty of Business Economics, Agoralaan Gebouw D, BE-3590 Diepenbeek,
 Belgium

12

13 Abstract: Assessing well-being and occupants satisfaction is a growing concern in façade design practice, as 14 increasing recognition of the value of well-being of occupants in office buildings. The objective of this study 15 was to develop a validated survey for evaluating the indoor environmental quality in office buildings with 16 adaptive facades to provide feedback to designers and operators and inform the building community at alarge. A 17 total of 70 employees completed an initial survey containing 14 questions grouped into six domains (OCAFAS-18 14). Factor analysis of the responses was performed resulting into a final survey grouped into three domains and 19 containing 15 questions (general feeling, thermal comfort and acoustic comfort) (OCAFAS-15). Statistical 20 analysis indicated that the OCAFAS-15 had good validity, reliability, and internal consistency. The survery 21 succeeded to benchmark well-being, satisfaction and interaction changes of employees in an open-space office 22 with dynamic louvers. The results indicates that the OCAFAS-15 provides a basis for dialoguebetween 23 occupants and façade engineers regarding the user interaction, façade control adaptation and in particular in 24 tracking of changes of indoor environmental quality, evaluating response of facades to occupants' requirements, 25 and guiding the operation of adaptive facades. A validated well-being and occupant interaction survey could be 26 particularly useful in benchmarking building with adaptive facades and recognizing and managing occupants' 27 dissatisfaction in buildings with dynamic facades.

28

Keywords: dynamic facades, user interaction, questionnaire, occupant satisfaction, thermal comfort, acoustic
 comfort

31

Abbreviation: AC, Acoustic Comfort; CFA, confirmatory factor analysis; DBO, Design, Build and Operate
 ;EFA, exploratory factor analysis; G, General; IEQ, indoor environmental quality; ICC, intra-class correlation;
 OCAFAS, occupant-centered adaptive façades assessment survey; POE, post-occupancy evaluations; TC,
 thermal comfort;

36 37

1. Introduction

Occupants' well-being and occupants' interaction assessments are considered to be the most important design goals in facades engineering [1, 2] and are now common place in building with adaptive facades [3]. An adaptive façade is a facade which can change his transports properties for all kinds of energies (radiative, thermal...) either as a passive reaction to changing environment conditions or as an active switch controlled by a

building control assistant. The purpose of adaptive facades is creating maximum comfort for occupant with 42 43 minimum energy consumption. However, there are very few pre and post-occupancy survey tools that can help façade designer and operator to understand occupants' experiences, perceptions and levels of satisfaction, in 44 45 buildings with adaptive facades. There is often a gap between the automated/responsive behavior of these 46 facades and the requirements of occupants', which creates discomfort, both visually and thermally [4]. Only in 47 the past five years has occupant-centered adaptive façades assessment been extensively studied and measured as 48 part of the scope of EU COST Action TU1403 "adaptive facades network", under whose auspices the present 49 study was carried out [5]. The initiated COST Action TU1403 "adaptive facades network" aims to pool together 50 the knowledge, technologies and research from across European countries and beyond [6]. One of the main 51 objectives of this Action is assess and evaluate different adaptive facades technologies from an occupant-52 centered approach and create good-quality survey tools to benchmark and compare the indoor environment in 53 office buildings with adaptive facades

54 Historically, most well-being and satisfaction surveys have been developed with a focus on the indoor 55 environment [2]. Because thermal comfort, visual comfort, acoustic comfort and air quality are the strongest 56 discriminators of well-being and satisfaction of occupants in buildings [7, 8]. For example, the UK BUS 57 occupant survey allows benchmarking office buildings against an existing database of case studies [11]. Other 58 standard-setting bodies such as the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers 59 (ASHRAE) developed a Performance Measurement Protocols for Commercial Buildings [9]. The Center of 60 Built Environment (CBE) developed a Building Performance Evaluation (BPE) toolkit with an occupant 61 satisfaction survey with a score card report generation tool [29]. This was emphasized by emergence of post-62 occupancy evaluations (POE) in 1990s as an approach to address the sick building syndrome and occupants' 63 complaints in working environment [11]. A literature review published by Attia et al. (2018) [1], indicates that 64 the evolution of post-occupancy evaluation resulted in creating two procedural approaches or methodologies 65 namely: (1) Subjective or Qualitative Methods: a) Occupants Surveys, b) Interviews, and c) Walkthroughs and 66 (2) Physical Quantitative Methods: a) IEQ in situ measurements and b) energy and water audits and monitoring 67 [10-18]. However, most of these surveys are developed by researchers and are not validated or are developed by 68 third-party survey providers which make them not accessible for design teams, owners and buildings managers 69 and more importantly they do cater for buildings with static facades.

70 Although POE methodologies in buildings with static facades can be used in building with adaptive facades, 71 the creation of novel occupant-based behavioral and opinion survey that cater for adaptive facades and address 72 the interaction of users is becoming a growing concern [3, 19]. There is a consensus that occupants' well-being 73 and occupants' interaction in buildings with adaptive facades should be more intensively investigated [1]. Next 74 to IEQ parameters, these can include needs satisfaction, facade control, façade feedback, control adaptation, user 75 appropriation and the learning ability of the façade control system [4]. Using this inclusive definition of 76 occupant-centered well-being makes it harder to measure occupant interaction and engagement in buildings with 77 static facades. The usual method for constructing a valid occupant-centered adaptive facades assessment survey 78 (OCAFAS) is to identify different domains that independently contribute to well-being and occupants 79 interaction assessment for individuals in open-office spaces with adaptive facades [1]. The domain concept 80 allows the topic of well-being and occupants interaction in building with adaptive facades to be separated into

different parts that mirror its multifactorial nature. Then survey designers can group various assessment items,
which are intrinsic to the topic of well-being and occupants interaction within each domain [27].

83 In architectural and engineering firms, well-being and occupants satisfaction is a growing concern as 84 increased awareness of employees owns health and well-being is becoming a global trend [20-22]. In response 85 to increasing recognition of the value of the assessment of well-being and occupants interaction in buildings 86 with adaptive facades in practice, previous efforts have been made to develop assessment studies of well-being 87 and occupants interaction in building with adaptive facades. One of the earliest studies is the study of Vine [23] 88 who investigated interaction between occupants and a dynamic venetian blind in an experimental setting. Clear 89 et al. [24] investigate the responses of 38 subjects to electrochromic windows in an experimental setting. 90 Similarly, did Lee et al. [25] assess an electrochromic window control system in a fully monitored test-bed. The 91 measurements took place during 328 meetings in 6-months without indicating the nature of questions that were 92 used. Among the previous studied we consider the work of Bakker et al. (2014) the most significant. In their 93 study, they assessed the user satisfaction and interaction with automated dynamic facades in an experimental 94 facility with 26 test subjects [3]. Also, the work of Karlsen et al. (2015) is relevant because they assessed the 95 occupant satisfaction with two blind control strategies in an experimental facility with 40 test subjects [19]. 96 Exceptionally, the study of Stevens (2001) is the only found study that investigated the correlation between 97 occupant satisfaction and their ability to overrule automated façade control in real buildings [26]. However, 98 most those studies were mostly performed in experimental settings and did not focus on creating generic surveys 99 or POE methodologies catering for occupants in building with adaptive facades [1]. They focused on the 100 technical trial assessments of specific adaptive façade technologies in relation to occupant's satisfaction and 101 interaction. Previous studies did not enable occupants and operators in real buildings with adaptive facades to 102 track changes in well-being, evaluate response to façade control and guide the operation decisions.

103 Thus, in order to bridge this gap and improve the quality of evaluation of interactions between occupants 104 and their working environments in buildings with adaptive facade, we need to know the requirements and 105 troubles of the occupants. This is why we propose an occupant-based behavioral and opinion survey, the 106 analysis of the answers to which will allow us to identify the main problems in order to attenuate or eliminate 107 them. The aim is the creation of a validated survey that could be used in POE and also would enable facades 108 designers (architects and engineers) and operators (facility managers) to design and manage adaptive facades.

109 The purpose of this study was to create and evaluate the validity of an occupant-centered, multi domain 110 occupant well-being related survey appropriate for baseline benchmarking and ongoing evaluation of occupants' 111 satisfaction in experimental and real building settings. By including physical and non-physical assessment 112 domains, the survey was designed to accurately reflect the occupants' well-being and interaction in buildings 113 with adaptive facades.

2. Materials and methods

114

For this study we developed a study conceptual framework that summarizes and visualizes our research methodology. Similar to the work of Lavan (2013) [27], Lesley Wiseman Orr et al. (2004) [28] and Zagreus et al. (2004) [29], our research methodology combines mixed methods of research involving quantitative (e.g., case studies) and qualitative (statistical factor analysis) and quantitative (extensive usability testing) research. As shown in Figure 1, our conceptual study framework is based on three axes that will be described in

the following sections.



121

122 Figure 1, Study conceptual framework

123 From an epistemological point of view our study is not experimental and not empirical. By experimental we 124 mean measuring user's interaction and satisfaction in laboratory or test cell conditions. By empirical we mean 125 measuring the influence of the adaptive façade operation and design on user satisfaction, interaction or indoor 126 environmental quality. However, our study is a modelling study. We are not here focused on the nature of reality 127 (satisfaction, interaction and indoor environmental quality), rather we are focused on how we can know it. Also 128 due to the sensitivity of the building owner to release any negative information that can be used by occupants in 129 any future struggle, we hardly succeeded to convince the owner to allow us to benefit from the building 130 occupants to create the survey and not assess the building. In order to manage to do this study, we had three 131 previous failing case studies were the owner allowed us to do such study. Therefore, we found it more important to build and create a valid and open-access survey first, as a start, before using it on a large scale in different 132 133 case studies with the same adaptive facade technology.

134 2.1 Survey development and testing

135 2.1.1 Domain identification

The domain identification for the survey was based on a literature review and framework for adaptive facades evaluation developed by the first author to assess the well-being and interaction in buildings with adaptive facades [1, 2]. Based on a novel object-based façade characterization and classification framework we identified six domains as shown in Table 1. The survey was developed based on questionnaire responses by occupants. Their input was used to validate the six domains empirically thought to be related to an adaptive facades

- 141 performance with external movable shading, namely, views, thermal comfort, visual comfort, acoustic comfort,
- 142 façade control adaptation and user interaction.
- 143 Table 1, Domains and assessment items in the occupant-centered adaptive façades assessment survey144 (OCAFAS-17).

Domain of adaptive	Item number and description
façades assessment	
Personal Data	Gender, Age, Working Years, Closeness to window,
	Closeness to wall, Orientation, Floor, Location, Control
	Options, Computer/Paper work
General Feeling	(1) General satisfaction
	(2) Source of Disturbance
View	(3) Satisfaction with view
	(4) View importance
Visual Comfort	(5) Glare disturbance
	(6) Illuminance level I
	(7) Illuminance level II
Thermal Comfort	(8) Thermal preference
	(9) Temperature perception
	(10) Thermal comfort satisfaction
Adaptation Control	(11)Learning ability of control system (intelligence)
	(12)Control adaptation
	(13) Control disturbance
User Interaction	(14)Control importance
	(15) Satisfaction with feedback
	(16) Satisfaction with control and interaction
Acoustic Comfort	(17) Noise disturbance I (Movable shading)

145 2.1.2 Survey development

The alpha and beta version of the OCAFAS-14 was developed by the author to assess the satisfaction and 146 147 interaction of occupants with adaptive facades in office working environments. The identification of the survey 148 domains resulted in creating a survey with six domains empirically thought to be related to occupants' well-149 being in office buildings with adaptive facades. Each domain contained some related items that were scored on a 150 5-level Likert scale. Two general questions were added (personal data and general satisfaction, followed by an 151 occupant-centered adaptive façades assessment. The general feeling was scored on a 5-point numeric rating 152 scale from very poor to excellent. Based on informal responses during the survey testing (see next Section), the 153 survey domains and items were considered suitable for inclusion in an initial, 14-item occupant-centered 154 adaptive façades assessment survey (OCAFAS) (OCAFAS-17; Appendix A) after minor modifications. Since

employees occupants who reviewed the survey prior to testing considered the question on 'general feeling' to be valuable, it was held in the final survey. Based on the rule-of-thumb used in factor analysis that at least five times as many respondents should be used as the number of items in the questionnaire the target sample size was estimated [30, 31]. The target minimum sample size for survey was calculated to be 70 to cover the 14 questions.

160 Occupants who were employees in an office building with an adaptive façade were asked to participate in 161 the survey. The building is a nearly zero energy building located in Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium (Lat: 162 50.6770°N, Long: 4.6233° E), with unique glass façade, comprising thermal isolated glass sunshades printed 163 with white silk screen. The external façade is fully covered with double glazing system in combination with 164 movable sunshades printed with white silk screen. An external louvers system respond dynamically and 165 automatically to the angle of the sun which improves the control over energy consumption, solar radiation and 166 glare with the ability to admit natural light into the building while affording a view over the surrounding 167 countryside [32]. The main characteristics of the buildings are reported in the work of Samyn and De Coninck 168 (2014) [33]. The criteria for the selection of the case study building required it to have an adaptive façade with 169 multiple and identical working settings regarding, South orientation, occupant's number, function and furniture. 170 The building is built in 2014 and is equipped with HVAC system and was designed to have fixed, non-operable 171 windows. The external louvers are automated centrally for shading and occupant have access to internal roller 172 blinds. As shown in Figure 2, employees working in the South-East Section of Floor 1 and 2 (above ground) 173 were selected. Figure 3 provides an overview of the façade with the automated louvers opened.





175 Figure 2, Floor plans of the study location and AGC Glass Building, Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium [33]



Figure 3 (left), overview of the façade with the automated louvers opened; Figure 3 (right) Exterior – Windows
Double-skin façade combining glass louvres made of extra-clear glass (outside skin) with super-insulating
glazing and white spandrel double glazing (inside skin); Architect: Philippe SAMYN and PARTNERS sprl,
architects and engineers – BEAI sa, Photographer: Jean-Michel Byl, Courtesy Notice: AGC Glass Building - ©
Project : Philippe SAMYN and PARTNERS sprl, architects and engineers – BEAI sa [33]

183 Respondents were requested to provide data for their workstation's position, gender, age, and floor location.
184 The A4 double-page paper survey was structured into domains and their associated items (see Appendix A). The
185 paper format allowed the responders to go review or change their responses. 11 days after completing the initial
186 survey, responders were invited to complete the survey a second time. The two responses were analyzed to test
187 and retest reliability between surveys. Responses of the OCAFAS-14 were analyzed to determine which survey
188 components were relevant and should be reserved or adapted.

189 **2.1.2.1** Survey testing

A pilot study was carried out thanks to the feedback of the building manager. This allowed us to properly define the main lines of evaluation for questionnaires. The main result of this pilot study is the expansion of the initial three main axes (Comfort perception, Adaptation control and User interaction) into six new axes: View, Thermal comfort, Visual comfort, Adaptation control, User interaction and Acoustic Comfort. After these multiple steps, the following initial survey (see Appendix A) was printed in paper version.

195 2.2 Survey Launching

196 The survey was carried out twice at two-week intervals: on the 23/11/2018 and 04/12/2018. Participants were 197 who participated in the study were kept anonymous. The survey was conducted in accordance with the ethical 198 standards in the Declaration of Helsinki and the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). 199 The study took place on the first and second floor of a two open-space offices located in the South-East of the 200 AGC Glass Building. The questionnaires were distributed twice in the autumn of 2018 at 14:00. Respondents 201 required 12 minutes in average to fill in the survey. Recorded temperatures were conventional for the season. 202 The climatic conditions in Louvain-La-Neuve over these 2 days were essentially the same: clear sky with solar 203 radiation and ambient temperature around 5°C. This 2-week interval was considered short enough for subjects to 204 make an assessment under identical conditions and long enough for them not to remember exactly their answers. 205 Thanks to two-week intervals, it was possible to compare the answers of test-retest reliability. Indeed, since 206 surveys might be subjective and can be influenced by factors such as mood, we repeated the survey twice. By distributing the survey twice, the risk of dependence on these factors is reduced. In total, 70 employeesresponded to both survey rounds.

209 2.3 Factor Analysis

Factorial statistical analysis was done using SPSS AMOS software, to identify links, redundancies, similarities 210 211 between questions and between questions and their categories [34]. Once the answers were collected, an Excel 212 table was created including all the answers. In order to be able to do a better factor analysis, it was necessary to 213 transform all questions into Likert-type questions (scale evaluating a parameter on a scale of 1 to 5). Indeed, the 214 comparison of Likert questions is much stronger in terms of meaning than the comparison of several binary 215 answers having no defined link between them. In order for SPSS AMOS program to work properly, we removed 216 the surveys that were not answered twice from the answers database. A question with more than 5% missing 217 answers indicates that it is not comprehensible enough and must be changed or deleted. Then, we investigated 218 three major indicators namely the item retention within domains, validity and reliability.

219 2.3.1 Domains identification

220 To identify the different domains inherent in the questionnaires, two procedures were followed. First, from a 221 theoretical point of view, the different subdomains that were found in literature and proposed in the framework 222 of Attia et al. (2018) were tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) [2]. The correlation between two 223 questions of the same domain was analyzed using the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and the exploratory 224 factor analysis (EFA). The CFA was used to test whether our domain classification presented in initial survey 225 version in Appendix A is consistent with the occupants' understanding of the nature of well-being and 226 interaction in buildings with adaptive facades. The objective of confirmatory factor analysis is to test whether 227 the data fit our seven hypothesized classification framework. This hypothesized framework is based on theory 228 and/or previous analytic research [2].

229 Secondly, an exploratory factor analysis was carried out to reveal the different domains and their relevance. 230 The EFA is a statistical method used to uncover the underlying structure of a relatively large set 231 of variables. EFA is a technique within factor analysis whose overarching goal is to identify the underlying 232 relationships between measured variables. It is commonly used by researchers when developing a domain 233 (a domain is a collection of questions used to measure a particular research item) and serves to identify a set 234 of latent constructs underlying a series of measured variables. The domain relevance was calculated by an 235 Eigenvalue >1.0. The Eigenvalue feature prominently in the analysis of linear transformations [35]. To help 236 determine which questions should be retained to enhance the domain structure, the quality and strength of 237 relationship among questions was used

238 2.3.2 Item retention within domains

239 Standardized regression weights, were calculated to define the correlations of the different items to each of the

240 different domains. To proof a correlation the standardized regression weight should be at least 0.5 and higher to

be moderator or significant between an item and a domain.

242 Then, the correlation between two questions of the same domain was analyzed using the Pearson correlation 243 coefficient. The percentage of the correlation variation was used as a guide to reinforce the importance of the 244 selected domains. Questions were assembled into specific domains based on factor loadings ≥ 0.4 . Correlations 245 between an item and another item of 0.3–0.8 were considered adequate to assemble questions within a domain 246 [36]. A correlation of less than 0.3 means that the questions are not similar enough to be grouped in the same 247 domain, a correlation of more than 0.8 means that the questions are too similar and should be merged into a 248 single question. This analysis led us to delete several questions, which were not sufficiently correlated with the 249 other questions in the field. A pattern of extreme low or high scoring would indicate the questions might not be 250 sensitive enough to detect nuances in the well-being and interaction of occupants in buildings with adaptive 251 facades. The pattern was used to test for discriminant (known-groups) validity.

252 **2.3.3** Validity

The OCAFAS-14 items and domains were analyzed for discriminant validity through correlating to the wellbeing and interaction of occupants items (Appendix A). The discriminant validity tests whether domains that are not supposed to be related are actually unrelated. A correlation of 0.4–0.7 indicated good divergent validity. Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the correlation among the domains, in comparison to the individual items correlations.

258 2.3.4 Reliability

Internal consistency was examined to degree to which OCAFAS-14 questions, within each domain, measured the domains concept. A Cronbach-alpha score >0.6 indicated good internal consistency of the questions measuring a domain concept. The reliability was calculated by comparing the test and retest answers. The 11 days period was considered long enough that a responder would remember his or her first response. In the same, the 11 days period was short enough so that changes in the occupants' indoor environment status occurred.

3. Results

265 **3.1 Survey responses**

A total of 70 individuals completed both surveys for the test and retest analysis. Surveys with missing responses

were excluded. A total of 140 valid survey responses were received and provided complete personal data during

the survey personal data for the respondents in the study is presented in Table 2.

269 Table 2, Demographics of survey responders that provided informati	ion.
--	------

Gender (n =	70)	Location		Age		Workin	g place*			
Male	Female	Within 4 m from facade	Within 8 m from facade	Average	in survey location	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*

44 (63%)	26 (37%)	26 (38%)	44 (62%)	43 years	4 years	11	21	0	15	23
						15%	30%	0%	21%	33%

270 *(see Appendix A)

In asking questions about the overall well-being and satisfaction with the adaptive façade and their working environment, a majority of responders indicated their dissatisfaction with the façade (Question 11) as shown in Figure 4. Figure 5 provides an insight regarding this unexpected dissatisfaction. 82% of responders reported glare as the main reason for dissatisfaction followed by the lack of control (66%) and lack of view (51%). During the testing period of the survey, we amended Question 11 with a multiple choice question and an open question to make sure our survey will cover all well-being and satisfaction domains. Figure 5 provides a valuable insight to measure the reasons of dissatisfaction and their order of magnitude.



279 Figure 4, the breakdown of responses regarding the general satisfaction of occupants.

280

278







3.2. Domains identification

284 To identify the different domains inherent in the questionnaires, two procedures were followed. First, from a

285 theoretical point of view, the different subdomains that were found in literature and proposed in the framework

286 of Attia et al. (2018) were tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) [2]. The results of this CFA showed

287 that the seven domains identified in Table 1, based on the literature review and framework developed by Attia et

288 al. (2018) could not be discriminated based on the results presented in Table 3 [2].

289 Secondly, an exploratory factor analysis was carried out to reveal the different domains that could be 290 discriminated. Based on the principal component analysis only three domains out of seven domains have been 291 retained using the Eigenvalue criterion. Table 3 displays the Eigenvalues from this principal component analysis 292 underlining the 3-factor solution. Note that this three factor solution explains 64% of the variation present in the 293 different items that were measured. Only the Thermal Comfort (TC) and Acoustic Comfort (AC) were 294 discriminated under two groups. The other items belong to a General (G) domain. See Appendix A.

	Eigenvalue	Difference	Proportion	Cumulative
Q1	5.830	3.708	0.416	0.416
Q2	2.122	1.106	0.151	0.568
Q3	1.015	0.145	0.072	0.640
Q4	0.869	0.131	0.062	0.702
Q5	0.738	0.071	`0.052	0.755
Q6	0.667	0.110	0.047	0.803
Q7	0.556	0.105	0.039	0.842
Q8	0.451	0.062	0.032	0.875
Q9	0.389	0.046	0.027	0.902
Q10	0.342	0.052	0.024	0.927
Q11	0.289	0.012	0.020	0.948
Q12	0.276	0.026	0.019	0.967
Q13	0.250	0.050	0.017	0.985
Q14	0.199		0.014	1.000

295 Table 3, Eigenvalues of the Correlation Matrix: Total = 14 Average = 1

296

297 3.3 Item retention within domains

298 The standardized regression weights results indicate that most of items show a strong relationship between the 299 individual items and the latent dimension factors or domain (see Table 4). This confirms the validity of the new 300 domains structure (G, TC and AC) and the strong correlation between each domain and the investigated items. 301 See Appendix A.

302 Table 4, Standardized Regression Weights: (Group number 1 - Default model)

Items		Domains	Correlation
Q9	\leftarrow	TC	,716
Q8	\leftarrow	TC	,832
Q7	\leftarrow	TC	,637
Q1	\leftarrow	G	,724

Items		Domains	Correlation
Q3	\leftarrow	G	,597
Q2	\leftarrow	G	,721
Q4	\leftarrow	G	,828
Q5	\leftarrow	G	,761
Q6	\leftarrow	G	,754
Q12	\leftarrow	G	,788
Q13	\leftarrow	G	,560
Q10	\leftarrow	G	,584
Q11	←	G	,660
Q14	n/a	AC	-

The correlation between the ten items (questions) of the General (G) domain was analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. As presented in Table 5, all items had a factor loadings ≥ 0.3 . Item-to-item correlations of 0.3–0.8 were considered sufficient to group the ten items indicated in Table 5 within the General domain (G). This proofs correlations sufficient to group items according to the domain. See Appendix A.

308	Table 5, Pearson	Correlation	Coefficients o	of General	Domain (Questions
-----	------------------	-------------	----------------	------------	----------	-----------

Pearso	Pearson Correlation Coefficients, General Domain, N = 140, Prob > r under H0: Rho=0												
	Q1	Q3	Q2	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13			
Q1	1.000	0.493	0.679	0.6320	0.504	0.553	0.406	0.445	0.517	0.369			
Q3		1.000	0.498	0.527	0.411	0.530	0.408	0.317	0.362	0.287			
Q2			1.000	0.600	0.520	0.585	0.441	0.365	0.510	0.396			
Q4				1.000	0.585	0.571	0.555	0.611	0.641	0.453			
Q5					1.000	0.652	0.396	0.489	0.665	0.425			
Q6						1.000	0.324	0.405	0.577	0.452			
Q10							1.000	0.430	0.416	0.386			
Q11								1.000	0.644	0.288			
Q12									1.000	0.505			
Q13										1.000			

309

The correlation between the three items (questions) of the Thermal Comfort (TC) domain was analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. As presented in Table 6, all items had a factor loadings ≥ 0.45 . Itemto-item correlations of 0.3–0.8 were considered sufficient to group the three items indicated in Table 6 within the Thermal Comfort (TC) domain. This proofs correlations sufficient to group items according to the domain. See Appendix A.

315

316

317

318

319	Table 6,	Pearson	Correlation	Coefficients	of Thermal	Comfort	Domain	Questions
-----	----------	---------	-------------	--------------	------------	---------	--------	-----------

Pearson Correlation Coefficients	, Thermal Co	mfort N =	= 140
	Q18	Q19	Q20
Q18	1.000	0.523	0.459
Q19		1.000	0.599
Q20			1.000

321 4.4. Validity

Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the correlation among the latent dimensions (see Table 7), in
 comparison to the individual correlations (correlations Tables 5-6). From this table one could see that the
 correlation between the different dimensions are weak (correlation between TC, and AC, and TC and G), and
 only moderate between G and AC. See Appendix A.

326 Table 7, Correlations between Thermal Comfort and Acoustic Perception and Thermal Comfort and General327 Domain

Don	nain Co	Estimate	
TC	\leftrightarrow	AC	,346
TC	\leftrightarrow	G	,123
G	\leftrightarrow	AC	,547

328

329 **4.5. Reliability**

For reliability and internal consistency we calculated the Cronbach alpha's of the three domains. A high Cronbach alpha is indicating a large shared variance, indicating good internal consistency. The Cronbach-alpha score for Thermal Comfort (TC) domain was 0.770, indicating a good repeatability of survey scores submitted for the same occupant. Also, the Cronbach-alpha score for the General (G) domain was 0.904, indicating a very good repeatability of survey scores submitted for the same occupant. See Appendix A.

335 4.6. Final Survey OCAFAS-15

Based on factor analysis the original OCAFAS-14 (Appendix A) items were consolidated into 15 items organized into three domains, namely, general feeling (10 items), thermal comfort (3 items) and acoustic comfort (2 items) [37]. The final OCAFAS-15 (Appendix B) retained all question related to the interaction with the façade and it's and control adaptation. Item-to-domain correlation for OCAFAS-15 demonstrated significant correlation of all items within their respective domains. Factor analysis of the three-domain survey demonstrated the created survey is valid and can assess the well-being and interaction of occupants in buildings with adaptive facades.

343

344

345 4. Discussion:

346 5.1 Summary of main findings

347 Guided by the factorial analysis, the original six domains, OCAFAS-17 survey was reduced to a smaller three-348 domain, 15 item survey, OCAFAS-15. The analysis showed that: (1) the structure of the different domains 349 (General Feeling, View, Visual Comfort, Adaptation Control and User Interaction) was perceived by the 350 respondents as one domain. (2) Thermal Comfort was perceived as a distinguished domain. (3) Acoustic 351 Perception Comfort was perceived as a distinguished domain. (4) The Acoustic Comfort domain needed to be 352 amended to include at least two items (questions). (5) Study results indicate that the OCAFAS-15 has good 353 validity, reliability, high internal consistency to assess the well-being and interaction of occupants in buildings 354 with adaptive facades. The correlations are sufficient to group the 15 items under three major domains. See final 355 survey in Appendix B.

356 5.2 Strength and Limitations

357 We created a new survey and validated it with a sample of N-140 responses in a real office building with an 358 adaptive facade. No previous study, explored this terrain and until this moment there is no single survey for 359 adaptive facades that is open-access and validated through N=140 responses. Our work is part of the activities of 360 COST Action TU1403, European Solar Shading Organization and ISO Committee 52022-5 activities. Experts in 361 those organizations explicitly identified the need to create surveys that are validated and that can be used to 362 assess users' satisfaction and interaction in buildings with adaptive facades [1-2]. The findings of the past 363 Annex 66, and ongoing Annex 79 efforts confirm that in automated buildings, occupants remain one of the 364 greatest influences of building energy use [38-39]. For instance, Hong and Lin (2013) showed that occupant 365 behavior at the office scale could increase energy use by 80% or reduce it by 50% from standard assumptions 366 [40]. There is an increasing global expectation for comfort and user satisfaction, which necessitated a new look 367 at how occupants are incorporated into building design and operation. In this context, our paper presents one of 368 the rare case studies where researchers get access to a building with an adaptive façade and inquire about users' 369 interaction and satisfaction. For this research, we consulted a statistics scientist and linguistic expert to create a 370 new survey that we consider as a good start. We know that our survey is not perfect but it should be seen as 371 novel contribution that future researcher should build upon and turn it from a generic survey to more technology 372 and context specific survey.

373 The proposed approach has been implemented among participants of an office building with an external 374 dynamic shading system made of movable louvres. In order to use the questionnaire, all occupants of a building 375 had an equal chance of participating in the survey for our select (random) sample. Thus, in the context of this 376 research, we focused on occupants of office buildings with an adaptive façade in French Speaking Belgium, that 377 do paper and computer office work. 31% of the participants were females and 69% were males with a total 378 average age of 43 years. The 140 response of occupants working in office spaces with automated and movable 379 shading, suggest that OCAFAS-15 is useful for post-occupancy evaluations. We believe that the new survey 380 could be particularly useful for occupants to encourage discussion of occupant satisfaction and productivity in 381 relation to user interaction, façade adaptation control and comfort perception [1-3]. The OCAFAS-15 is a short 382 survey with an average response time of 12 minutes that can assess the well-being and interaction of occupants

in buildings with adaptive facades. The survey benefits from its brevity and ease of completion. The OCAFAS15 survey includes multiple domains and emphasizes the relation with external facades parameters for the wellbeing and interaction of occupants. In this respect, it differs from surveys that focus on mainly on indoor
environmental parameters such as thermal and visual comfort [11, 26 and 41]. It should be noted that parameters
directly discernable by the real building occupants have been reported to be more likely to have greater
reliability compared to experimental test-based studies [3].

389 The ultimate goal of well-being and occupants interaction assessment is to focus on well-being as the first 390 consideration in designing adaptive facades [2]. In this respect, a well-being and occupants interaction survey 391 has a potential role in influencing design decisions and assessing control strategies for automated movable 392 shading particularly when the goals is to inform designers during design or operators during operation. Other 393 benefits of a well-being and occupants interaction questionnaire are to raise awareness among adaptive façades 394 designers and operators of factors that influence well-being of occupants, monitor change in satisfaction over 395 time, improve compliance, increase the occupant's sense of interaction in the facades' operation, and improve 396 the practice's relationship with solar shading designers, contractors and operators. To illustrate, 82% (115/140) 397 of occupants investigated in this study stated that they dissatisfied with the interaction with the movable shading 398 system and that the survey made them feel more involved in articulating their concerns.

399 Ensuring a good quality survey with different domain and scales is not an easy task. It requires a way of 400 asking and wording the questions and many years of experience to make a survey mature. When surveys include 401 multiple domains, it gets more complicated because each domain and its correlations with other items need to be 402 validated. We recognize that there is an entire field in social sciences and even third-party survey providers that 403 is devoted to survey and scale development-psychometrics [42]. We recognize that the 140 responses from two 404 tests provided by 70 respondents are little. In the same time, it might be difficult for facade engineers to 405 understand the reasons of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the presented case study. However, in this study we did not seek to assess this specific case study. We aimed to create a tool that can be used to enable a dialog 406 407 between occupants and facade engineers. Adaptive facades with automated movable shading are a niche type of 408 buildings and we believe are the first study to investigate users in such buildings with a sample of 70 409 respondents [3]. Also, we believe this work will allow to benchmark working environments with adaptive 410 facades and to be able in the future to create a database of case studies [32, 43 and 44]. In the recent years, 411 several certified green buildings were designed following an integrative design process where Design, Build and 412 Operate (DBO) contracts are performance driven. Thus, our survey can be used as a tool for post-occupancy 413 evaluation and it can provide feedback to integrative design teams. Our aim in this study is not to establish that 414 dialogue between building designers and operators. This is not our responsibility. However, our aim is to 415 provide a tool that can be used to enable this dialogue within green certified and DOB contracted project 416 including the case of our case study [45].

417 Needless to say, we only chose one time interval during the autumn on the 23rd of November and 4th of 418 December from 14:00 to 15:00. We should ideally have tested our survey three times daily by selecting 419 representative days at least in four seasons of the year. However, we could not have a full access to repeat our 420 survey. We hardly got access to this building after several trials with building owners of adaptive facades. We 421 did our best to push the limits and get a good representative sample of occupants who can help us to shape a

- 422 generic survey that can be developed in the future. But we had the advantage to have all respondents in the same
- 423 building in a space with the same orientation and interior setting. Another limitation is that we focused mainly
- 424 on surveys responses and did not include any measurement in the study. In fact, we did not want to provide an
- 425 assessment of the current building, we rather wanted to create a new survey that can be used easily by
- 426 professionals and researchers in buildings with automated dynamic facades. Also, the for the Acoustic Comfort
- 427 domain we included in the running survey only one single question. However, the occupants indicated the
- 428 importance to include at least two questions related to noise disturbance.

429 4.3 Future Work

430 In summary, this study presents a novel survey with good validity to be used to assess occupants' well-being 431 and interaction in buildings with automated dynamic facades. Future research should test our survey in a wider 432 context with a larger sample of respondents with respect to different orientations, climates, view types and time 433 of the year. More work is also needed to test the three suggested domains and in particular the General Feeling 434 domain. We expected that visual comfort would lead to the creation of an independent domain, however, the 435 factor analysis proofed we were wrong. Surprisingly, acoustic comfort emerged as an important domain that was 436 undermined in our initial classification. Future research should, extend the Acoustic Comfort domain and add 437 more items and measure their validity and relevance. We believe that the same questionnaire can be adopted for 438 other type of commercial buildings with similar functional uses and similar dynamic shading technology. 439 Further research and adoption of the same framework would be excellent avenues for further research for further 440 validating and generalizability of the proposed survey for chromogenic, solar active and insulative facades.

441 It is clear that occupants' well-being and interaction surveys in buildings with automated dynamic facades 442 can take various forms and still be useful instruments. However, we have currently very few of them. Therefore, 443 researcher should create more surveys for the evaluation of experience and self-reported health and well-being 444 of building occupants. We believe that a statistically, valid and reliable instrument for evaluating the satisfaction 445 and well-being of occupants in building with automated and dynamic facades provided an excellent opportunity 446 for considering what is most important to the occupant and to convey to facade designers and facade operators 447 that the occupant well-being and satisfaction is their primary consideration. Finally, we encourage researcher to 448 develop more specific surveys that cover the different technologies of adaptive facades from an occupant-449 centered approach. Future surveys should address electrochromic facades and solar active facades and not only 450 automated dynamic facades.

451 5. Conclusion

452 Study results indicate that the OCAFAS-15 has good validity in assessing well-being and interaction of 453 occupants in buildings with adaptive facades. The OCAFAS-15 is a reliable and consistent survey that is brief 454 and easy to complete (generally, 12 min or less). A statistically valid and reliable survey for evaluating 455 occupants' satisfaction provides façade designers and operators with a useful tool for considering what is most 456 important to the occupant. The survey can guide facades design decisions, and convey to the operators and 457 building owners that the occupants' well-being and interaction in buildings with adaptive facades is the facades 458 community' primary consideration.

	-	n
4	5	ч

460 6. Acknowledgements

461 The authors express their thanks to all survey respondents. This research was partially funded by the European 462 Cooperation in Science and Technology Action TU 1403. The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge 463 COST Action TU1403 "Adaptive Facades Network" for providing excellent research networking. The authors 464 would like acknowledge the support of Working Group 3 members. to 465 Also, we would like to acknowledge the Sustainable Building Design Lab for the survey development and the 466 valuable support during the experiments and the analysis of data.

467 Appendix A – The initial survey questions can be found in the following link: <u>http://tinyurl.com/y6rw6avh</u>

468 Appendix B

- 469 The Occupant-Centered Adaptive Façades Assessment Survey (OCAFAS-15) can be found in Table 8 and in
 470 the following publication: Attia S., 2019, Occupant-Centered Adaptive Façades Assessment Survey (OCAFAS-
- 471 15), Liege University, Belgium, available at: https://orbi.uliege.be/handle/2268/232980, accessed 15.02.2019
- 472
- 473
- 474
- 475
- 476
- 477
- 478
- 479
- 480
- 481
- -
- 482
- 483
- 484
- 485
- 486
- 487

Occupant-Centered Adaptive Façades Assessment Survey (OCAFAS-15)

Part A: Personal data

A1: Gender	Man	Woman			
A2: Age					
A3: How long have you been working here?					
A4: Are you near a window (within 4 m)?	YES	NO			
A5: Are you near an exterior wall (within 4 m)?	YES	NO			
A6: What best describes the area of building	North	East	South	West	Core
where your space is located?	Don't know				
A7: On which floor of the building is your space located?	1rst	2nd	3rd	Other :	
A8: In which place do you spend most of your time?	1	2	3	4	5
	Windows blinds or shades	Room AC unit	Portable heater	Permanent heater	Door to interior space
A9: Which of the following do you personally adjust or control in your space?	Door to exterior space	Adjustable air vent in wall or ceiling	Ceiling fan	Ajustable floor/air vent (diffuser)	Portable fan
	Thermostat	Operable window	None of these	Other :	
A10: Do you work mostly on computer or paper?	Computer	Paper	Both		

Part 1: General feeling	1=not at all				5=Extremely Good
Q1: Are you satisfied with the facade?	1	2	3	4	5
Q2: How satisfied are you with the current view to outside?	1	2	3	4	5
Q3: How important is it for you to have a clear view of the outside?	1	2	3	4	5
Q4: How often are you disturbed by glare (direct sunlight, bright sky, or bright walls)	1	2	3	4	5
Q5: How do you judge the current illuminance level on the work plane?	1	2	3	4	5
Q6: How comfortable is the current illuminance level on the work plane?	1	2	3	4	5
Q7 : Do you think the facade management system adapt enough to meet your needs?	1	2	3	4	5

Q8: Does the change of brightness and view due to the movement of the facade disturb you?	1	2	3	4	5
Part 1: General feeling	1=not at all				5=Extremely Good
Q9: Are you satisfied with the interaction you have with the facade?	1	2	3	4	5
Q10: Are you satisfied with the dashboard (feedback screens) functionality?	1	2	3	4	5
Do you have any other comments regarding your general feeling?					

Part 2: Thermal comfort	1=not at all				5=Extremely Good
Q11: How do you rate you're immediate thermal sensation:	Cold	Slightly cool	Neutral	Slightly warm	Hot
Q12: How do you perceive this temperature	1	2	3	4	5
Q13: Are you satisfied with the temperature in general?	1	2	3	4	5
Do you have any other comments regarding thermal comfort?					

Part 3: Acoustic comfort	1=not at all				5=Extremely Good
Q14: The noise associated with the movement of facade disturb you:	1	2	3	4	5
Q15: The noise associated with working in an open office disturb you:					

Do you have any other comments regarding the survey in general?	
489	
490	
491	
492	
493	
494	
495	
496	
497	
498	
499 References	

- 500 [1] Attia, S., Luna Navarro, A., Juaristi, M., Monge-Barrio, A., Gosztonyi, S., Al-Doughmi, Z.. (2018a) Post-Occupancy
- 501 Evaluation for Adaptive Façades, Journal of Facade Design and Engineering, [S.l.], v. 6, n. 3, p. 1-9, sep. 2018. ISSN 2213-502 3038. DOI 10.7480/jfde.2018.3.2464
- 503 [2] Attia, S., Bilir, S., Safy, T., Struck, C., Loonen, R., Goia, F. (2018b) Current Trends and Future Challenges in the
- 504 Performance Assessment of Adaptive Facade Systems, Energy and Buildings, Volume 179, 15 November 2018, Pages 165-505 182, ISSN 0378-7788.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.09.017
- 506 [3] Bakker, L. G., Hoes-van Oeffelen, E. C. M., Loonen, R. C. G. M., & Hensen, J. L. M. (2014). User satisfaction and
- 507 interaction with automated dynamic facades: A pilot study. Building and Environment, 78, 44-52.
- 508 [4] Attia, S., Bilir, S., Safy, T., Garat, S., (2019) Adaptive Facades Performance Assessment: Interviews with Facade
- 509 Experts, SBD Lab, Liege University, Belgium, 2019 ISBN: 9782930909097. Retrieved from:
- 510 https://orbi.ulg.ac.be/handle/2268/213736.
- 511 [5] COST Action TU 1403, available from: http://tu1403.eu/?page_id=1816, accessed 14.02.2019
- 512 [6] Luible, A., (2015) COST Action TU1403 - adaptive facades network, in: Advanced Building Skins Economic Forum, , pp. 1226-1233 513
- [7] Altomonte, S., Schiavon, S., Kent, M. G., & Brager, G. (2019). Indoor environmental quality and occupant satisfaction in 514 515 green-certified buildings. Building Research & Information, 47(3), 255-274.
- 516 [8] Pastore, L., & Andersen, M. (2019). Building energy certification versus user satisfaction with the indoor environment:
- 517 Findings from a multi-site post-occupancy evaluation (POE) in Switzerland. Building and Environment, 150, 60-74.
- 518 [9] ASHRAE (2010). Performance measurement protocols for commercial buildings. American Society of Heating
- 519 Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers. Inc., Atlanta.
- 520 [10] Preiser, W. (2005). Building Performance Assessment—From POE to BPE, A Personal Perspective, Architectural 521 Science Review. 48 (2005) 201-204. doi:10.3763/asre.2005.4826.
- 522 [11] Leaman, A., & Bordass, B. (2001). Assessing building performance in use 4: The Probe occupant surveys and their 523 implications, Building Research Information 29, 129-143. doi:10.1080/09613210010008045.
- 524 [12] Bordass, B., & Leaman, A. (2005). Making feedback and post-occupancy evaluation routine 1: A portfolio of feedback
- 525 techniques. Building Research & Information, 33(4), 347-352.
- 526 [13] Meir, I. A., Garb, Y., Jiao, D., & Cicelsky, A. (2009). Post-occupancy evaluation: An inevitable step toward 527 sustainability. Advances in building energy research, 3(1), 189-219.
- 528 [14] Pati, D., & Pati, S. (2013). Methodological issues in conducting post-occupancy evaluations to support design decisions, 529 Health Environments Research and Design Journal. 6, 157–163. doi:10.1177/193758671300600312.
- 530 [15] Preiser, W. (1995). Post-occupancy evaluation: how to make buildings work better, Facilities. 13 (1995) 19–28.
- 531 [16] Kim, J., de Dear, R., Candido, C., Zhang, H., & Arens, E. (2013). Gender differences in office occupant perception of 532 indoor environmental quality (IEQ), Building and Environment 70, 245-256. doi:10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.08.022.
- 533 [17] Galatioto, A., Leone, L., Milone, D., Pitruzzella, S., & Franzitta, V. (2013). Indoor Environmental Quality Survey: A
- 534 Brief Comparison between Different Post Occupancy Evaluation Methods, Advanced Material Research. 864–867, 1148–
- 535 1152. doi:10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMR.864-867.1148.
- 536 [18] Li, P., Froese, T. M., & Brager, G. (2018). Post-occupancy evaluation: State-of-the-art analysis and state-of-the-practice 537 review. Building and Environment, 133: 187-202.
- 538 [19] Karlsen, L., Heiselberg, P., Bryn, I. (2015). Occupant satisfaction with two blind control strategies: Slats closed and 539 slats in cut-off position. Solar Energy, 115, 166-179.
- 540 [20] Attia, S., (2018c) Net Zero Energy Buildings (NZEB): Concepts, frameworks and roadmap for project analysis and 541 implementation, Elsevier, ISBN: 978-0128124611, doi:10.1016/c2016-0-03166-2.
- 542 [21] IWBI, (2019) WELL: The WELL Building Standard v2, Delos Living LCC, New York.
- 543 [22] ESSO, (2017) solar shading for low energy and healthy buildings, European Solar-Shading Organization, Zaventem, 544 Belgium, available from: http://www.es-so.com/images/downloads/Downloads%20publications/ES-
- 545 SO_Technical_GuideBook_BD_Final.pdf, accessed: 14.02.2018
- 546 [23] Vine E, Lee ES, Clear R, DiBartolomeo D, Selkowitz S. Office worker response toan automated Venetian blind and 547 electric lighting system: a pilot study. Energy Build 1998;28:205e18.
- 548 [24] Clear RD, Inkarojrit V, Lee ES. Subject responses to electrochromic windows Energy Build 2006;38:758e79.
- 549 [25] Lee ES, Claybaugh ES, LaFrance M. End user impacts of automated electrochromic windows in a pilot retrofit 550 application. Energy Build 2012;47:267e 84.
- 551 [26] Stevens S. Intelligent facades: occupant control and satisfaction. Int J Sustain Energy 2001;21:147e60.
- 552 [27] Lavan, R. P. (2013). Development and validation of a survey for quality of life assessment by owners of healthy 553 dogs. The Veterinary Journal, 197(3), 578-582.
- 554 [28] Wiseman-Orr, M. L., Nolan, A. M., Reid, J., & Scott, E. M. (2004). Development of a questionnaire to measure the 555 effects of chronic pain on health-related quality of life in dogs. American journal of veterinary research, 65(8), 1077-1084.
- 556 [29] Zagreus, L., Huizenga, C., & Arens, E. (2004). A web-based POE tool for measuring indoor environmental quality.
- 557 [30] Gorsuch, R.L., 1983. Factor Analysis, Second Ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ, USA, pp. 332.
- 558 [31] Hatcher, L., 1994. A Step-by-Step Approach to using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation 559 Modeling. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA, pp. 73.
- 560 [32] Attia, S. and Bashandy, H. (2016) Evaluation of Adaptive Facades: The Case Study of AGC Headquarter in
- 561 Belgium. Challenging Glass 5 - Conference on Architectural and Structural Applications of Glass, Belis, Bos & Louter (Eds.), Ghent University, Belgium, ISBN 978-90-825-2680-6. 562
- 563 [33] Samyn and De Coninck, (2014), AGC Glass Building, Lannoo Publisher, Tielt, Belgium. ISBN 978-2-87386-884-0 564 [34] Amos, I. S. (2012). IBM SPSS Amos. IBM Software Business Analytics, YTD03114-U, 1-8.
- 565 [35] Marcus, Marvin, and Henryk Minc. Introduction to linear algebra. Courier Corporation, 1988.
- 566 [36] Fayers, P.M., Machin, D., 2007. Quality of Life, Second Ed. John Wiley and Sons, West Sussex, England, pp. 118.

- 567 [37] Attia S., 2019, Occupant-Centered Adaptive Façades Assessment Survey (OCAFAS-15), Liege University, Belgium, 568 available at: https://orbi.uliege.be/handle/2268/232980, accessed 15.02.2019
- 569 [38] Yan, D., Hong, T., Dong, B., Mahdavi, A., D'Oca, S., Gaetani, I., & Feng, X. (2017). IEA EBC Annex 66: Definition 570 and simulation of occupant behavior in buildings. Energy and Buildings, 156, 258-270.
- 571 [39] Wagner, A, Obrien, L, (2018) Occupant behaviour-centric building design and operation EBD Annex 79, Proposal, 572 International Energy Agency
- 573 [40] Hong, T. and H.-W. Lin (2013). Occupant behavior: impact on energy use of private offices, Ernest Orlando Lawrence 574 Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA (US).
- 575 [41] ASHRAE, (2017) Thermal Environmental Conditions for Human Occupancy, in, American Society of Heating,
- 576 Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta, USA. 577
- 578 [42] Loder, A. (2019) Why should I use a third-party survey provider for my WELL project?, Available from :
- 579 https://www.wellcertified.com/en/articles/why-should-i-use-third-party-survey-provider-my-well-project, accessed 580 18.02.2019
- 581 [43] Bilir, S., & Attia, S. (2018). Performance Evaluation of Adaptive Facades: A case study with electrochromic glazing.
- 582 In A., Luible & S., Gosztonyi (Eds.), Adaptive Facades (pp. 315-324). Luzern, Switzerland: Lucerne University of Applied 583 Sciences and Arts.
- 584 [44] Attia, S. (2017) Evaluation of adaptive facades: The case study of Al Bahr Towers in the UAE, Shaping Qatar's
- 585 Sustainable Built Environment, Hamad Bin Khalifa University Press, Volume 2, Issue 6, P1-13. [45] Lee, E., L. Fernandes,
- 586 B. Coffey, A. McNeil, R. Clear, T. Webster, F. Bauman, D. Dickerhoff, D. Heinzerling and T. Hoyt (2013). "A Post-
- Occupancy Monitored Evaluation of the Dimmable Lighting, Automated Shading, and Underfloor Air Distribution System 587
- 588 in The New York Times Building."
- 589