The People, Place, and Space Reader

Edited by
Jen Jack Gieseking and
William Mangold, with **Cindi Katz**,
Setha Low and **Susan Saegert**

ROUTLEDGE

The People, Place, and Space Reader

Edited by
Jen Jack Gieseking and
William Mangold
with Cindi Katz,
Setha Low,
and Susan Saegert

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2014
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
The people, place, and space reader / edited by Jen Jack Gieseking, William Mangold; with Cindi Katz, Setha Low, and Susan Saegert.
pages cm
1. Social ecology. 2. Urban ecology (Sociology) 3. Human ecology. 4. Environmental psychology. 5. Public spaces. I. Gieseking, Jen Jack.
HM861.P46 2014
304.2--dc23
2013037743

ISBN13: 978-0-415-66496-7 (hbk)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-66497-4 (pbk)
ISBN13: 978-1-315-81685-2 (ebk)

Typeset in Goudy and Optima
by Saxon Graphics Ltd, Derby

MIX
Paper from responsible sources
FSC® C013056
FSC www.fsc.org

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

THE PEOPLE, PLACE, AND SPACE READER

The People, Place, and Space Reader brings together the writings of scholars, designers, and activists from a variety of fields to make sense of the makings and meanings of the world we inhabit. They help us to understand the relationships between people and the environment at all scales, and to consider the active roles individuals, groups, and social structures play in creating the environments in which people live, work, and play. These readings highlight the ways in which space and place are produced through large- and small-scale social, political, and economic practices, and offer new ways to think about how people engage the environment in multiple and diverse ways.

Providing an essential resource for students of urban studies, geography, sociology and many other areas, this book brings together important but, till now, widely dispersed writings across many inter-related disciplines. Introductions from the editors precede each section; introducing the texts, demonstrating their significance, and outlining the key issues surrounding the topic. A companion website, *PeoplePlaceSpace.org*, extends the work even further by providing an on-going series of additional reading lists that cover issues ranging from food security to foreclosure, psychiatric spaces to the environments of predator animals..

Jen Jack Gieseking is a cultural geographer and environmental psychologist and Postdoctoral Fellow in the Digital and Computational Studies Initiative at Bowdoin College.

William Mangold is a partner in a small design firm and Adjunct Professor in Interior Design at Pratt Institute.

Cindi Katz is Professor of Geography, Environmental Psychology, Women's Studies, and American Studies and Executive Officer of the Earth and Environmental Sciences Program at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York.

Setha Low is Professor of Environmental Psychology, Geography, Anthropoly, and Women's Studies, and Director of the Public Space Research Group at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York.

Susan Saegert is Professor of Environmental Psychology, founding director of the Center for the Study of Women and Society, and former director of the Center for Human Environments, all at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York.

For William H. Ittelson, Harold M. Proshansky, and Leanne G. Rivlin:
guiding lights in this journey through space and time

Editors' biographies

Jen Jack Gieseking is a cultural geographer and environmental psychologist and Postdoctoral Fellow in the Digital and Computational Studies Initiative at Bowdoin College. Her work is engaged in research on co-productions of space and identity in digital, imagined, and material environments, with a focus on sexual and gender identities. She pays special attention to how such productions support or inhibit social, spatial, and economic justice. She is currently working on her first book, *Queer New York: Constellating Lesbians' and Queer Women's Geographies of Justice in New York City, 1983–2008*. She holds a Ph.D. in environmental psychology and has held fellowships with the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; The Center for Place, Culture, and Politics; The Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies; and the Woodrow Wilson Women's Studies Dissertation Fellows Program.

William Mangold is a partner in a small design firm and Adjunct Professor in Interior Design at Pratt Institute. As a Ph.D. candidate in the Environmental Psychology program at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York, his research looks at social responsibility in design and utopian visions for transforming the social and spatial environment. Trained as an architect at the Rhode Island School of Design (RISD), he has worked on various buildings in New York City for the firm of Ivan Brice Architecture, including a number of restoration and adaptive reuse projects. Most recently he has taken on the design and renovation of an 1872 rowhouse where he lives with his family in Philadelphia.

Cindi Katz is Professor of Geography, Environmental Psychology, Women's Studies, and American Studies, and Executive Officer of the Earth and Environmental Sciences Program at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York. The recipient of fellowships from the National Science Foundation, the Association of University Women, the National Institute of Mental Health, the Center for the Critical Analysis of Contemporary Culture at Rutgers University, and the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University, she was the 2011–2012 Diane Middlebrook and Carl Djerassi Visiting Professor of Gender Studies at the University of Cambridge. Her 2004 book *Growing Up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children's Everyday Lives* received the Meridian Award for outstanding scholarly work in geography from the Association of American Geographers. Her other books include *Full Circles: Geographies of Gender over the Life Course* (with Janice Monk), and *Life's Work: Geographies of Social Reproduction* (with Sallie Marston and Katharyne Mitchell).

Setha Low is Professor of Environmental Psychology, Geography, Anthropology, and Women's Studies, and Director of the Public Space Research Group at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York. She received her Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley and has been awarded many honors and grants, including fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation, National Endowment for the Humanities, Hays-Fulbright Commission and Getty Center for ethnographic fieldwork in Latin America and the United

States. Recent books include: *Politics of Public Space* (with Neil Smith), *Rethinking Urban Parks: Public Space and Cultural Diversity* (with Suzanne Scheld and Dana Taplin), *Behind the Gates: Life, Security and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*, and *On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture*. She is currently researching the impact of private governance in New York City and Toronto condominiums with Randy Lippert funded by the Canadian Social Sciences Research Council, and writing a book entitled *Spatializing Culture: An Anthropological Theory of Space and Place*.

Susan Saegert is Professor of Environmental Psychology, founding director of the Center for the Study of Women and Society, and former director of the Center for Human Environments, all at The Graduate Center of The City University of New York. Her research includes studies of crowding; environmental stressors; housing and human development/well-being; and women and environments. She directs the Housing Environments Research Group, which works in partnership with community organizations and coalitions to improve distressed housing and neighborhoods. Her recent research concerns homeowners' experiences of the foreclosure crisis and policy implications; housing and health; and alternative housing policies to promote sustainable, inclusive, democratically governed communities. Her books include *From Abandonment to Hope: Community Households in Harlem* (with Jacqueline Leavitt), *Social Capital and Poor Communities* (with Mark Warren and J. Phillip Thomson), *Urban Health and Society: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Research and Practice* (with Susan Klitzman and Nicholas Freudenberg), and *The Community Development Reader, 1st and 2nd editions* (with James DeFilippis).

Acknowledgments

Preparing this book was a long and elaborate process that drew support and assistance from many different people. Foremost, we would like to thank the students, faculty, and staff at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY) for sustaining such a rich interdisciplinary environment that has deeply informed our work. Our work would not be as thorough without the support of Leanne Rivlin, David Chapin, Roger Hart, Michelle Fine, Susan Opotow, John Seley, David Harvey, Neil Smith, Ruthie Gilmore, and the incredible Judith Kubran.

Many colleagues were also instrumental in choices we have made in putting this together, including our friends and co-conspirators who form the environmental psychology program and the CUNY SpaceTime Research Collective. We extend a special thanks to those who gave us input on possible selections for this book, including Naomi Adiv, Christian M. Anderson, Jeff Broxmeyer, Isabel Cuervo, Kate Driscoll Derickson, Gregory T. Donovan, Jason A. Douglas, Martin J. Downing, Desiree Fields, Valerie Francisco, Bradley Gardner, Jesse Goldstein, Lystra Huggins, Amanda Huron, Aida Izadpanah, Elizabeth R. Johnson, Sara Koopman, Fiona Lee, Kimberly Libman, Matthew Mangold, Frank Muscara, Anupama Nallari, Diana Ojeda, Nicole Schaefer-McDaniel, Aga Skorupka, Collette Sosnowy, David Spataro, Lauren Tenney, Rachel Verni, and Marion Werner.

Jack: I am grateful to my colleagues in the SpaceTime Research Collective of the CUNY Graduate Center, and, most especially, those amazing individuals who make up the environmental psychology program. You helped form not only this book but also my own scholarship. I extend special appreciation to Linda Gieseking and Teddy Stephen for promoting this book and ceaselessly supporting me. I thank the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the German Chancellor Fellowship that gave me much of the time needed to plan and edit this volume.

William: My thanks to Pratt Institute and Moore College of Art and Design—places where I have been fortunate to teach and that have awarded grants to put this book together. The students and faculty at these schools have challenged me and informed my work, as have my friends and colleagues at the Graduate Center. More than anyone, it is my parents who got me started on the path of thinking deeply about the world in and around me, and it is my wife and children that continue to support and encourage me in this direction.

Jack and William: We would especially recognize Cindi, Setha, and Susan, our mentors, colleagues, and friends. Not only was their teaching the inspiration for this book, but their commitment to this project has helped see it through to the end as the kind of truly interdisciplinary and exciting text we desired to bring to life. We are also thankful to the editorial team at Routledge, Louise Fox, Nicole Solano, Fritz Brantley, and Siobhán Greaney, for their support of this book.

Cindi, Setha, and Susan: We would like to thank the students who have taken our courses, for pushing boundaries, asking astute questions, and consistently challenging our thinking.

Introduction

This book developed from conversations between Jen Jack Gieseking and William Mangold when they began teaching undergraduate courses drawing upon readings and discussions they had with Cindi Katz, Susan Saegert, and Setha Low during their time in the environmental psychology program at The Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). Jack and William were surprised that no text captured the cross-disciplinary and socially engaged work with which they had become familiar. Further discussion brought the editors of this book together in order to share the resources and scholarship that informs our interdisciplinary field.

There is no volume that draws as widely as the one you are now reading, and, as Susan describes below, it has been decades since the last reader on this material was compiled. In the time since the publication of these previous anthologies in the 1970s, Susan, Cindi, and Setha honed the core courses with the faculty of the environmental psychology program to present a dynamic and critical understanding of space and place. Through this effort certain topics such as home, urban experience, and public space remained significant, while other concepts emerged or challenged previously held ideas about nature or the way in which spaces are socially produced. As an outgrowth of that work, we feel that this book represents a fresh gathering of ideas and the beginning of a renewed conversation on these themes.

The People, Place, and Space Reader brings together the excerpted writings of scholars, designers, and activists from a variety of fields upon which we draw in our teaching and research to make sense of the makings and meanings of the world we inhabit. They help us to understand the relationships between people and the environment at all scales, and to consider the active roles individuals, groups, and social structures play in creating the environments in which people live, work, and play. These readings highlight the ways in which space and place are produced through large- and small-scale social, political, and economic practices, and offer new ways to think about how people engage the environment in multiple and diverse ways. *The People, Place, and Space Reader* provides a road-map for thinking about these concerns, offering guides for some familiar paths while charting new routes to recognizing and heralding differences in perception, experience, and practice that traverse disciplinary boundaries, period, and location. Emphasizing interdisciplinarity, this reader provides multiple entry points to join these conversations about what may seem to be quite disparate works and conceptual worlds.

WORKING DEFINITIONS: PEOPLE, PLACE, AND SPACE

Of the words in the title, *people* may seem least in need of definition. Yet many conceptions of the person sever the individual from the environment without recognizing the extent to which humans come into being and live inextricably connected to places, people, and their material and cultural histories and geographies. This book presents a conception of the person in which people live 'as much in process across and "through" skins as in processes "within skins"' (Dewey 2005 [1934]).

This way of understanding people as connected to each other and their environment allows for a reassessment of the meaning of place and space in planning and policy as well as in everyday life.

Space and place have multiple and sometimes meandering meanings attributed to them. Indeed, these terms are often deployed exactly because of the wide-ranging possibilities and variations they imply metaphorically and conceptually. Most generally, *place* is bounded and specific to a location, and is a materialization of social forms and practices as well as affective experience. *Space* tends to be understood as abstract, unlimited, universalizing, and continuous. The infinite, undefined quality of space makes us think of the cosmos, the ether of flows and travel, or the metaphorical space one needs to think. Places are often more grounded, serve as reference points in our lives, and have distinct qualities that give people a sense of belonging. The ways people, place, and space work together to form one another are complex, varied, and dynamic, and are the focus of this volume.

THE FIELD OF ENVIRONMENTAL SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE EDITORS OF THIS VOLUME

The field of environmental social science examines how people relate to, create, and define space and place; and how space and place relate to, shape, and define people and their experiences. This field of inquiry has gone by various names, including environmental psychology, psychogeography, environmental sociology, and environmental behavior and design. In the late 1960s, environmental psychology was formalized as an interdisciplinary field drawing primarily upon psychology, sociology, anthropology, geography, architecture, and urban planning (Bell et al. 2005; Pol 2006). As editors of *The People, Place, and Space Reader*, we come from several of these disciplines and were brought together through the environmental psychology program at the CUNY Graduate Center. Subsequently, as the volume and diversity of topics and approaches has steadily grown, the label *environmental psychology* has often seemed too narrow and has been replaced with the term *environmental social science*. In the sections below, each of the co-editors narrates the ways in which our disciplines have come together to inform and learn from environmental social science. Our education, research, and experiences offer a variety of ways to enter and make sense of this interdisciplinary field, while our different points of view allow us to challenge received ideas and build new understandings of people, place, and space.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY

Susan Saegert, psychologist

Environmental psychology remains a perpetual work in progress, developing in tension with a psychology that not only bounds people within their skin but also fractures them internally into separable processes like cognition and affect, physiology and phenomenology. The effort to offer an analysis of psychological processes embedded in environmental and social transactions extends back to the American Pragmatists, as well as to continental European Gestalt psychologists. J.J. Gibson is an important figure who connects these traditions throughout his work. We provide an excerpt from Gibson's last book, *Ecological Approaches to Visual Perception* (1979), in which he presents a conception of organisms (including people) as inherently and literally in touch with their surroundings. Keeping with the tradition of John Dewey and William James, organisms are not just registering information but creating it as they go about the activities necessary for life and for the pursuit of goals; Gibson succeeds in removing the psychological construct of a little person in the head who has to interpret perceptions and apprehensions by representing them to the person whose head is occupied. However, as a perception psychologist, Gibson leaves that head unsatisfyingly empty. Harry Heft's (2001) tour de force, *Ecological Psychology in Context*, connects Gibson to the legacy of William James who thought about thought plenty. He places Gibson in relationship to both the ecological psychology of Roger Barker (1968) and the lifespace psychology of Kurt Lewin (Lewin and Gold 1999; Heider 1959). He also attends to the ways in which humans make their environments and are made by the places and

objects we create (Lewin 1951). Heft's continuing productive line of inquiry and critique represents one of the most promising offspring of the work of the environmental psychologists of the 1970s. One of the living edges of this work is an attempt to connect the still individualistic psychologies of these authors to a richer understanding of embedded social beings engaged in collective as well as individual, and material as well as psychological and social projects.

Other strands of scholarship in psychology that significantly contribute to the making of a fully situated and robustly social environmental psychology may be found in social and community psychology. The practice of *participatory action research* (PAR) incorporates not only Kurt Lewin's pioneering work to develop that approach to research, knowledge, and social action but also Peirce's concept of *abduction* (Fine 2010), in which inquiry proceeds through simultaneous reasoning about and exploration of a problem. Community psychology has built an area of interdisciplinary research and practice dedicated to two aspects of the aspirations of early environmental psychology: (1) placing the creation of knowledge within real-world contexts; and (2) understanding individuals as transactionally engaged with communities and the broader society. Community psychology has found particularly fertile resonance with environmental psychology on topics such as place attachment (Manzo and Perkins 2006) and an action research approach to environmental sustainability (Schweizer-Ries and Perkins 2012).

Early environmental psychology began a path that continues to lead into engagement with contemporary concerns and continual re-understandings of our place in the world. In fact, *The People, Place, and Space Reader* is the third edited book of readings addressing these issues to be produced by the environmental psychology program of The CUNY Graduate Center. The first two readers, both by Harold M. Proshansky, William H. Ittelson, and Leanne G. Rivlin (1970, 1976), helped define the field, and their contributions still ripple through environmental psychology. Those two *Environmental Psychology* readers, as well as this volume, share the goal of increasing knowledge about the dynamic relationship between people and places while addressing issues of social and spatial inequalities. This work also aims to help develop theories adequate to the everyday experience of environments, as well as to aid in the creation of more just and more sustainable environments. Each of these books has engaged many different disciplinary perspectives on how people and places make each other.

The first reader, *Environmental Psychology: Man and his Physical Settings*, published in 1970, began the decade of institutionalization of the field. The editors brought together extraordinarily diverse collections of papers that situated people in relationship to the built and natural environment as well as specific institutional settings. The collection expressed a deep commitment to the idea that human behavior had to be understood as always situated within a physical milieu. The psychological works represented stemmed from divergent theoretical perspectives from the Lewinian inspiration of Proshansky and Rivlin through Ittelson's transactional approach to visual perception, to several contributions by authors from the behaviorist tradition. The success of these readers and the program in environmental psychology lies in part in bringing these separate pieces together into one area of psychology.

The early readers clearly defined the field as interdisciplinary. The seminal works of anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1966) on an anthropology of space, urban sociologists' contributions on the lives of slum dwellers and suburbanites (cf. Gans 1982a, 1982b), and urban planners such as Kevin Lynch's *The Image of the City* (Section 2) and Jane Jacobs' *Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Section 7) inspired and are represented in the collections. The influences of architecture, urban design, and resource management are evident as well. Many selections also testified to the important cross-fertilization of geography and environmental psychology described by Cindi Katz below. The second edition (1976) of *Environmental Psychology: People and Their Physical Settings* reflected the growth of an actual area of research called environmental psychology, especially around topics of continuing importance such as environmental stress, mental maps, and the role of the environment in child development.

In the time since the initial volumes were published, the program at The CUNY Graduate Center and the field itself moved in increasingly interdisciplinary directions (Saegert and Winkel 1990). The editors of this volume saw a need for a collection that would situate the reader in a much-changed landscape of everyday life, local and global relationalities, and people–environment

problematics, including the ever-worsening environmental crises; awareness of the global dimensions and historical, political, and economic power relations that lead to unjust access to and control over environmental resources; and cultural diversity and other differences in the nature of people–place transactions. Research and theorizing have expanded to include a wide range of issues of how people experience, prosper, suffer, and make habitats from urban communities and homes through everything from foodscapes to the physical construction and inhabitation of specific locales, regions, and the globe itself. At the same time, long-standing concerns such as wayfinding, environmental attitudes, environmental aesthetics, place attachment and identity, and the meaning of spaces of everyday life have built significant bodies of research.

The intellectual landscape and cast of characters has changed as well in recent years to shift and multiply our lenses for examining inequality. Identity politics joined with Marxist and critical social theory to influence the growth of feminist, queer, critical race, and disability theories and sensibilities. The hegemony of white and US and European scholars gave way, at least in the discourses that situate this book, to critical race and postcolonial theory. The totalizing narratives of modernism and scientism were challenged by postmodernists, standpoint theorists, and poststructuralists. The work of environmental social science continues to build on past understandings and research into the person-in-the-world, but now engages with a far wider set of concerns. The diverse disciplinary backgrounds of the editors suggest the nature of this broader conception and approach.

EMBODIED SPACE: THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPACE AND PLACE

Setha Low, anthropologist

The anthropology of space and place represented in this volume incorporates what I have called *spatializing culture*, the linking of culture and space through material, metaphorical, and social conceptualizations grounded in the field. Regardless of whether it is an ethnographic multi-sited study, a survey of human bone locations, or an archeological dig, in anthropological research there is always an encounter with the inherent materiality and human subjectivity through fieldwork that situates the researcher at their interface. Studies of space and place that emerge from the sediment of anthropological research draw on the strengths of studying people *in situ* producing rich and nuanced sociospatial and critical encounters that are included in the various sections.

I joined the environmental psychology program in 1989 to contribute to this interdisciplinary work, focusing on the social production and social construction of space, and developing the theoretical concept of embodied space to emphasize the importance of the body and bodies in the co-production of the built environment. Methodologically this has meant training students in the craft of ethnography. Ethnography uncovers enabling social structures and political and economic constraints, and their material and symbolic expression through long-term, intimate contact with people in their everyday environments. Participant observation, in-depth interviewing, augmented by activity maps, movement maps, mental maps, photographs, drawings, and many other spatial techniques drawn from environmental psychology and landscape architecture make up a methods toolbox for deciphering the role of culture in the production and construction of space and place.

Historically, anthropologists have contributed "culture" to environmental psychology theory and research. Edward Hall (1966) and his discussion of proxemics, the so-called hidden cultural dimension that guides human-to-human and human-to-environment spatial relations was a first attempt. Architect Amos Rappaport (1969) and social psychologist Irwin Altman (1972) used an essentialized concept of culture to explain why built environments varied in ways that could not be explained by an environmental deterministic point of view. A few anthropologists, including Denise Lawrence Zuniga, Ellen Pader, and myself, took academic positions in design schools that brought us into contact with environmental psychologists who were interested in the cultural aspects of design (see Low and Lawrence 2003).

Today, anthropological discussions of space often start with Pierre Bourdieu (1977) because he moves beyond the constraints of the structural analysis of space by focusing on how meaning and

action, or *practice*, interact in interdependent ways to inculcate and reinforce cultural knowledge and behavior. He argues that space can have no meaning apart from practice; the system of generative and structuring dispositions, or *habitus*, constitutes and is constituted by actors' movement through space (1984) (see Section 5). Because social practice activates spatial meanings, they are not fixed, but invoked by actors who bring their own discursive knowledge and strategic intentions to their interpretation.

Anthropologists often use narrative to elicit details of how local populations construct perceptions of and experience place. Much of this kind of ethnography describes "local theories of dwelling" (Feld and Basso 1996) and draws implicitly or explicitly upon phenomenological approaches and *thick description* (Geertz 1973). Narrative and its interpretation are at the center of ethnography, according to Steven Feld and Keith Basso, who suggest that cultural constructions of the environment can only be understood by talking to natives about landscapes.

The inscription of place with meaning is not limited, however, to telling stories, but includes a complex set of sound, smell, touch, and other sense-based perceptions (Feld 1990; Peterson 2010.) But "people do not simply "experience" the world; they are taught—indeed disciplined—to signify their experiences in distinctive ways" (Myers 2002, 103). Alberto Corsín Jiménez goes even further in his insistence on a socially constituted notion of space. For Jiménez, social relationships are inherently spatial, and "space an instrument and dimension of space's sociality" (2003, 140). In his analysis the material landscape recedes as space becomes a dimension and form of agency that configures well with environmental psychology's interest in action and advocacy.

Thus, anthropologists examine the social and environmental forces that produce physical space and place, as well as the lived experience of individuals and their constructions of meaning. This kind of analysis is not a simple task, since there are significant disagreements about the prioritization of space or place and the nature of their relationship, but anthropologists are uniquely anchored in fieldwork in a way that is particularly useful. The goal of the addition of anthropological theory to the mix, therefore, is to demonstrate how anthropological theory, research, and methodology is deployed to understand space and place, and suggests that anthropologists offer an ethnographic and grounded approach to this interdisciplinary endeavor.

One point, however, that needs to be added is that the concepts of place and space—central theoretical constructs in geography, architecture, and planning—pose such a concern for anthropologists that they are often avoided. One reason is that at least for ethnographers it is difficult to discuss *place* or *space* in a way that does not confine the inhabitants. Arjun Appadurai (1988) and Margaret Rodman (1985, 1992) correctly criticize ethnographic conceptions of place and space that provide taken-for-granted settings to locate their descriptions or reduce the ethnographic to a locale that imprisons natives. Instead, anthropologists require a flexible and mobile conception of space, one that speaks to how space is produced historically and physically and came to be in its current material form, but also how it is created by bodies in motion, embodied dreams and desires, and social interaction and environmental interrelations.

The anthropological perspective offers a process-oriented, person-based perspective and allows for agency and new possibilities, even though historically ethnographies relegated space to the description of fixed material culture markers. One solution to this dilemma that continues to develop in the literature during recent years is to consider place and space as always embodied. Their materiality can be metaphoric and discursive, as well as physically located, and thus carried about. Introducing embodiment into sociospatial analysis problematizes these concepts in a way that allows for the exploration of their social construction and production at diverse global and local scales. The body (and bodies), conceptualized as embodied space(s), incorporates metaphors, ideology, and language, as well as behaviors, habits, skills, and spatial orientations derived from global discourses and faraway places, and yet is grounded at any one moment in a specific field context. It is through embodied space that the global is integrated into the inscribed spaces of everyday life where attachment, emotion, and morality come into play. Research that identifies the embodied spaces of individuals and groups as sites of translocal and transnational spatial flows as well as of personal experience and perception solves some of the misplaced rootedness found in anthropological thought. Some topics, however, are not directly discussed in anthropological theories and for these concerns we must turn to the contributions of geography.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND CHALLENGES FROM GEOGRAPHY

Cindi Katz, geographer

Interest in the connections between people and space has followed a number of strands in geography as well. As environmental psychology emerged as a discipline in the 1960s, scholars in geography were thinking through and trying to systematize the role of perception and cognition in practical interactions concerning the environment from policy to everyday practices. One of the key sites of this research was Clark University, where geographers who had done research on environmental perception and behavior had teamed up with psychologists to study the role of perception in individual and social behaviors around hazardous environments, both "natural" and built, resource definition and use, and the management of transformations of the "human environment" (e.g., Kates and Wohlwill 1966; Burton and Kates 1964). Among their influences were economist Kenneth Boulding's (1956) iconoclastic book *The Image*, Kevin Lynch's (Section 2) pivotal *The Image of the City*, and René Dubos' (e.g., 1965) writings, all of which creatively insisted that it was how things, relations, places, or environmental stimuli are seen, symbolized, imagined, known, and understood that matters.

These ideas led planners and other professionals to address environmental problems and hazards such as flood plain management or nuclear facility siting in terms that might resonate more meaningfully with affected populations. Understanding the role of the image—of environmental perception and cognition—in environmental activity and behavior influenced policy and practice in urban design as much as around resource management, the siting of hazardous technologies, the management of environmental risk, and possible responses to large-scale phenomena such as global climate change. These concerns remain vital today as the effects of climate change and the interconnections of global and local practices become everyday more urgent.

At the same time, geographers and developmental psychologists received funding from the US Office of Education for the groundbreaking "place perception project," which examined young children's spatial cognition and the development of their place learning and behavior, including the acquisition of mapping skills in early childhood (Blaut and Stea 1971; cf. Wood 2010). This work eventually expanded to encompass research on children's place experience, knowledge, and home range (Tindal 1971; Hart 1979; Wood 2006), and on the development of children's environmental learning and knowledge (Kates and Katz 1977; Wood and Beck 1994; Katz 2004). These lineages may be seen in the abiding concerns of environmental psychology with cognitive mapping, children's geographies, environmental education, and the development of environmental concern and care (e.g., Chawla and Cushing 2007). There was plenty of important work in behavioral geography that did not address children and the environment. Inspirational here was William Kirk's (1952) original research on the behavioral environment, which engaged psychology theory and emphasized the role of perception—as itself a cultural process filtered through values—in human geography and environmental engagement. Pioneering geographers pursued similar concerns, addressing behavior as an outcome of environmental perception, wherein action is understood as rooted in the images produced at the interface between people and their environments (e.g., Downs and Stea 1973; Golledge 1981, 1998; Gould and White 1986; Downs 1967, cited in Wood 1970; Wood 1992; Kitchin et al. 1997). From its inception, behavioral geography was a counterweight to geographic thought that homogenized "man" as rational decision-makers operating in an objectively knowable world. Drawing insights from the cognitive sciences as much as from phenomenology, the multiple strands of behavioral geography insisted on the place of people—individually and collectively—as social actors; thinking beings with histories, incomplete knowledge, emotions, and agendas, making decisions about, negotiating, and triggering geographic processes and making the worlds they inhabited.

Time-geography was another strand of influence in the late 1960s and grew out of allied concerns with experience and behavior. Associated predominantly with the Swedish geographer Torsten Hägerstrand (e.g., 1970, 1978), time-geography offered a way of looking at the person in space with time as its other dimension to discern patterns in everyday interactions across historical geographies and over the life course. Addressing the various constraints on mobility and activity in time-space,

time-geography reckoned with embodiment and understood space as a malleable social form (cf., Pred 1977, 1981, 1984). Although criticized for its masculinism (Rose 1993; but see Friberg 1993; Scholten et al. 2012) and its problematic abstraction from any sort of political economic framing, time-geography offered insights into everyday life and the overlapping structures of the behavioral environment.

These strands of geography, which looked at the role of perception in behavior; the experience of place and environmental cognition; the maps and worlds in people's heads; emotion and environment; and the person in space or the behavioral environment, shared much common ground with—and offered critical insights into—the burgeoning concerns of environmental psychology as they coalesced in response to the social, political economic, and environmental crises of the 1960s/1970s. Among the other important strands of this braid that I can only touch on here was work in humanistic geography, which examined the sensory and affective experience of space and place (see Buttimer 1976; Lowenthal 1961). Among its early and most influential practitioners is Yi-Fu Tuan's pioneering and often beautiful work focused on the relationship between place and space and people's fluid relationships to the two at all scales from the body to the globe. In a series of books, he explored place attachment, love, and reverence as well as fear and insecurity in everyday environmental interactions, in the imagination, through the senses, and in all manner of representations, including mental maps (e.g., Tuan 1974, 1977). As humanists, these scholars looked at relationships between people and place thinking through the role of memory, imagination, identity, emotion, embodiment, and sedimented cultural forms and practices.

Another important strand, scale, is one of the key ideas of geography (see Section 10). Before the contemporary debates on the production of scale (cf., e.g., Smith 1993; Marston 2000; Sheppard and McMaster 2004; Marston et al. 2005), geographers in the late 1960s were considering not just the received descriptive notions of geographic scale such as global, regional, urban, and local, but also the quite intimate such as the body, the home, the city street. They were mindful of the fluid interpenetrations among these scales and the material social practices associated with them. There was a radical impulse to much of this work, a sense that while the environmental impacts of people would be more legible at smaller scales, the global and local infused one another and neither one could be altered—or understood—without attending to the other. James Blaut, for example, examined the geography of a one-acre farm in great detail, and drew on it and other "microgeographies" to interrogate development, agroecology, and diffusion models of knowledge and practice (e.g., Blaut 1953). William Bunge and his collaborators in the Detroit Geographical Expedition and Institute (DGEI) examined one square mile of the city intensively to assess not just the state of the city but also the nation. The DGEI analogized their project to a medical examination wherein a drop of blood can reveal the health of a patient (Bunge 2011). Their work—like that of many of the scholars reviewed here—traverses the porous boundary between the geographical and the psychological, making and remaking the still lively grounds of environmental psychology. The materiality of those grounds is addressed in the next section.

QUESTIONING THE CONVENTIONS OF ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

William Mangold, designer

While much of the scholarship in architecture has focused on questions of avant-garde form-making, the interdisciplinary approach of environmental social science offers architecture a critical and dynamic way of thinking about the spaces we design and the places we inhabit. The conventional narrative of 20th-century architecture emphasizes the development of aesthetic styles over the creation of new social situations, but there have always been critics and designers who have used architecture as a medium to discuss and imagine alternative social and spatial situations.

Architecture initially took up questions of space in the late 19th century and has since contributed to understanding the way in which space provides a conceptual and literal territory for social relations (see Forty 2004 for a history of how the term *space* evolved in the architecture discourse). Propelled by material and structural innovations in the use of steel, concrete, and plate glass, the early work

of Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier, and Mies van der Rohe, especially as championed by Sigfried Giedion (1940), provided built examples of this novel concept of architecture as space-making. Excited about the new types of spatial relations, designers were also interested in what this meant for social relations. Transparency, openness, mobility, and interconnection were ideas that permeated design and were intended to challenge the existing spatial and social conventions. However, over time these social ideas were obscured and this early modern architecture became known for the aesthetic style it introduced, rather than for the new social relations these spaces offered.

However, there have always been designers who insisted on understanding and integrating social concerns into their design work. William Morris' pursuit of small-scale craft production in the face of industrialization, and Hannes Meyer's development of the Bauhaus curriculum are early modern examples that contest the emphasis on aesthetic style. Victor Papanek (1971) wrote a scathing critique of design in the context of mass production and advocated for a "high social and moral responsibility from the designer." Felicity Scott (2007) traces a number of critical junctions when designers and critics pursued alternative socio-spatial possibilities, such as those by Buckminster Fuller or Emilio Ambasz, but shows how they were subsumed or rejected by mainstream architectural practice. Other designers and activists have advocated for space to be a terrain of freedom, creativity, and connection. In this volume, Guy Debord and the Situationists, site-specific and socially engaged art practices such as those advocated by Miwon Kwon, and the urban design work of Michael Sorkin each represent attempts to rethink the spatial status quo. These *socially responsible design* practices emerge in response to demands of production and highlight ways in which designers can create spaces that are more democratic, sustainable, and just.

When the aesthetics of modern design were adopted as the style of corporate and bureaucratic architecture in the latter part of the 20th century, social critics also began to voice their objections. In this volume, Henri Lefebvre and David Harvey (1989) feature prominently for their poignant critiques of the ways in which space is used by hegemony to dictate or obfuscate social relations. Using Marxist thought to analyze urban development allows for an understanding of how financial capital shapes spaces and social relations to the benefit of corporate power and capital accumulation. Contemporaneous with these theoretical critiques was the start of research in the social sciences (see Sommer 1969; Hall 1966; for Robert Gutman's writings, see Cuff and Wriedt 2010) concerned with the social and psychological impacts of the spaces that were being mass produced in the boom following World War II. Critics like Jane Jacobs and Kevin Lynch took issue with the way cities were being re-engineered for automobiles instead of people. Others, like J.B. Jackson and Dolores Hayden (1981), all included here examined the impact on the landscape as highways were built and suburbs expanded. These scholars from the edges of architecture were able to look critically at design practices and have contributed significantly to understanding how places shape social life.

During this period, some designers teamed with social science researchers to find more conscientious approaches to design and building. One long-standing concern has been the lack of voice by the people who are living in the places designed for them. David Chapin and his ARC Group colleagues developed ways of studying and making places that involved both children and the elderly (see Bakos et al. 1978, 1980). This alternative is known as the process of inclusive or *participatory planning* (Blundell Jones et al. 2005), and is a user-based process that seeks to gather and integrate ideas from the people who will inhabit the buildings or communities being designed.

Another idea from environmental social science that challenges architecture is a shift in emphasis from space to place. From psychology, we have a better understanding of how and why people like or dislike particular places, and what makes them feel comfortable or uneasy. Sometimes labeled *place attachment*, this research has shown that the formal or aesthetic aspects of design are only part of what creates connection between people and their physical settings (see Section 3). Memories, social interactions, the ability to modify surroundings, and a sense of security are all significant contributors to attachment (see Low and Altman 1992; Bachelard 1994; Cooper Marcus 1992). These qualitative and affective aspects of the relation people have to their environment contribute to what makes a space a place.

Many architects and designers have attempted a more humanist approach to building, emphasizing the qualities of materials and the experience of place over the smooth surfaces, structural logic, and open, empty spaces of modern architecture. Notable figures include Juhani

Pallasmaa (1996; see also Section 10), who argues for a more sensual and multi-sensory experience of place, and Christopher Alexander (Alexander et al. 1977), whose notion of *pattern language* provides a radical template for the built environment based on the scale of human inhabitation. The work of contemporary designers such as Peter Zumthor (2010) and the firm of Diller and Scofidio (1996) also pay close attention to the experiences and interactions of people in the places they create. The field of interior design is likewise concerned with the experiences of inhabitants and tends to emphasize the sensory qualities of materials and spaces. Through attention to the surfaces, details, and objects that people come into direct contact with, interior design remains attentive to the needs and experiences of inhabitants (Weinthal 2011).

While environmental social science has challenged and contributed to design in many ways, well-designed places often remain exclusive, as a privileged class of people often controls the design process. The way in which architecture engages with the power of capitalism continues to be an important issue; many designers and scholars are rethinking this relationship (Awan et al. 2011; Bell et al. 2008; Fisher 2006; Lavin 2011; Thorpe 2012) and how to create meaningful places for people. With increasing pressure for socially and environmentally sustainable responses to our sociospatial conditions, new possibilities are emerging. Developing alternatives depends upon a rich understanding of people, place, and space. Perspectives like those outlined in this volume can enrich the work of designers and architects, and invigorate the discourse in ways that are more socially and environmentally responsible.

EMERGING THEORIES AND METHODS ADDRESSING IDENTITY AND PLACE

Jen Jack Gieseking, geographer and environmental psychologist

Environmental psychology emerged in the context of the civil rights, feminist, lesbian and gay, peace, anti-nuclear, and environmental movements during the 1960s. Each of these movements afforded instances of recognition and ways of multiplying identities and perspectives, and places and experiences. These emerging relationships and spaces have been addressed by revived theoretical approaches, including Marxism and pragmatism, while other critical feminist, racial, and queer perspectives helped develop new theoretical and methodological approaches. Environmental social science has adopted these theories and methodologies because they are able to work across disciplines and support efforts towards social and spatial justice. *Social justice*, based on principles of equality and human dignity, is sought through research and activism to effect structural changes, as well as allow for agency in everyday decisions and practices.

In this vein, Audre Lorde and Adrienne Rich (1981) write, "feminist answers can best be found by movement *toward* all points of stress and difficulty." Feminism, one core theoretical foundation to environmental social science, argues that the personal is political. Bridging critical race and feminist theory, Kimberlé Crenshaw (1996) calls for recognizing the multiple, *intersectional identities* of human beings, including gender, class, race, and so on. In her contributions to theorizing space through a feminist, queer, and critical race lens, Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) presents the concept of the *borderlands* that calls for an intentional crossing and mixing of identities and borders. Queer theory situates pleasure and politics side-by-side to understand practices and processes, and offers ways of being that refuse the common binary distinctions posed in much social theory. The work of queering heralds and makes room for difference, both socially and spatially, by providing recognition and consideration for alternative perspectives that break away from norms (see Sommeila and Wolfe 1997). These frameworks draw upon marginalized perspectives to critique and rework conventional hegemonic narratives, practices, and structures.

Feminist, critical race, queer, and other theories addressing disability and postcolonial perspectives are useful for and embedded in the interdisciplinary work of environmental social science because they engage mutuality, voice, and active listening to different standpoints, all of which are helpful in understanding relations between people and place more fully. Through these theories and methods, the assumed qualities of our environments and our behaviors within them come into question and allow for variation and sustained acceptance of difference. In this volume,