

COLLEGE OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
School of Urban Studies & Planning  
USP 581/681: Environmental Psychology  
Winter, 2005  
When: Wednesdays, 13:00-15:40  
Where: URBN 311

Dr. Nancy Chapman  
OFFICE: 370M URBN  
HOURS: W 10-12 or by appt.  
TELEPHONE: 503-725-5174  
EMAIL: chapmann@pdx.edu

Content:

Examination of the relationships between people and the physical environment, with an emphasis on the urban environment. Issues of density, social relationships in the city, and environmental perception and cognition will be explored. The course will begin with an overview of the field in the first half, followed by a focus on more specific topics that are current in the field today.

**Requirements:**

Two projects, class presentation based on major project, and class participation

**Textbooks:**

Lofland, Lyn H. (1998). *The public realm: Exploring the city's quintessential social territory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. (also available electronically through the PSU catalog)

**The additional required readings are available through the library, either via electronic or regular reserve. To retrieve items on electronic reserve, follow these steps:**

1. Go to this web site: <http://psu-eres.lib.pdx.edu/eres>
2. Click on Electronic Reserves
3. Select an instructor's or department then click GO
4. Select the course you want
5. Click accept
6. Select a document you want
7. Enter password (chapman)
8. Click continue
9. Now you can view or print it out.

Note: you have to have Adobe Acrobat Reader to open or view documents.

## OUTLINE

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>
<b>January 5</b>	<b>Introduction, conceptual framework for studying environmental psychology, methodology</b>

Assigned Reading:

1. Sundstrom, E. et al. (1996). Environmental psychology: 1989-1994. In *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 485-512.

<b>January 12</b>	<b>Environmental perception &amp; cognition</b>
-------------------	---

Assigned Reading:

1. Nasar, J. (1989). Perception, cognition, and evaluation of urban places. In I. Altman & E.H. Zube (Eds.), *Public places and spaces* (31-56). New York: Plenum.
2. Churchman, A. (2002). Environmental psychology and urban planning: Where can the twain meet? In R. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.), R. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.) *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 191-200). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
3. Bronzaft, A.L. (2002). Noise pollution: A hazard to physical and mental well-being. In R. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 499-510). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

<b>January 19</b>	<b>Environmental stress: Density</b>
-------------------	--------------------------------------

Assigned Reading:

1. Evans, G. W. & Lepore, S.J. (1992). Conceptual and analytic issues in crowding research. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 12, 163-173.
2. Evans, G.W., Saegert, S, & Harris, R. (2001). Residential density and psychological health among children in low-income families. *Environment & Behavior*, 33, 165-179.
3. Chapman, N.J. & Lund, H. (2004) Housing density and livability in Portland. In C. Ozawa (Ed.), *The Portland Edge: Challenges and Successes in Growing Communities* (pp. 206-229). Washington, DC: Island Press.

**January 26**

**Urban social relations: neighborhood**

Assigned Reading:

1. Sullivan, W. C., Kuo, F. E., & DePooter, S. F. (2004). The fruit of urban nature: vital neighborhood spaces. *Environment & Behavior, 36*, 678-700.
2. Marcus, C.C. (2000). Site planning, building design and a sense of community: An analysis of six cohousing schemes in Denmark, Sweden, and the Netherlands. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research, 17*, 146-163.
3. Leventhal, T. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Children and youth in neighborhood contexts. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 12*, 27-31.
4. Spencer, C. & Woolley, H. (2000). Children and the city: a summary of recent environmental psychology research. *Child: Care, Health and Development, 26*, 181-198.

**February 2 Testing the Claims of New Urbanism**

Assigned Reading:

1. Saelens, B. E., Sallis, J. F., & Frank, L. D. (2003). Environmental correlates of walking and cycling: Findings from transportation, urban design, and planning literatures. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 25* (2), 80-91.
2. Lund, H. (2003). Testing the claims of new urbanism: Local access, pedestrian travel, and neighboring behaviors. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 69* (4), 414-429.
3. Wilson-Doenges, G. (2001). Push and pull forces away from front porch use. *Environment & Behavior, 33*, 264-278.
4. Kim, J. & Kaplan, R. (2004). Physical and psychological factors in sense of community: New urbanist Kentlands and nearby Orchard Village. *Environment and Behavior, 36* (3), 313-340.

**February 9**

**Place attachment.**

Assigned Reading:

1. Manzo, L. (2003). Beyond house and haven: Toward a revisioning of emotional relationships with places. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23*, 47-62.
2. Brown, B., Perkins, D., & Brown, G. (2003). Place attachment in a revitalizing neighborhood: Individual and block levels of analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23*, 247-258.

**February 16                    Public Spaces: I**

Assigned Reading:

1. Lofland, Chapters 1-4
2. Taylor, R. (1988). *Human territorial functioning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5(A perspective on human territorial functioning). Pp. 79-116.
3. Banerjee, T. (2001). The future of public space: Beyond invented streets and reinvented places. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 67, 9-24.

**February 23                    Public Spaces: II**

Assigned Reading:

1. Lofland, Chapters 5-8
2. Taylor, R. (2002). Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED): Yes, no, maybe, knowable, and all of the above. In R. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 413-426). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

**March 2                         The natural environment**

Assigned Reading:

1. Kaplan, Stephen, (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 15, 169-182.
2. Vining, J. & Ebreo, A. (2002). Emerging theoretical and methodological perspectives on conservation behavior. In R. Bechtel & A. Churchman (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* (pp. 541-558). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

**March 9                         Post-occupancy evaluation & citizen participation**

Assigned Reading:

1. Eubank-Ahrens, B. (1987). A closer look at the users of *Woonerven*. In A. Vernez Moudon (ed.), *Public streets for public use*. Pp. 63-79. New York: Columbia University Press.
2. Whitehouse, S., Varni, J., Seid, M., Cooper-Marcus, C., Ensberg, M.J., Jacobs, J. R., & Mehlenbeck, R.S. (2001). Evaluating a children's hospital garden environment: Utilization and consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 301-314.

**March 16                    Student presentations. Class will meet at the same place, same time.**

## First Assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to encourage you to think in more depth about the relationship between density and livability. This assignment will add to the database that was developed for the chapter by myself and Hollie Lund for *The Portland Edge* (see January 19 readings.) You may work in groups of two or three students to complete the assignment.

1. Choose an area (say ½ mile by ½ mile on average) of the metropolitan area that has shown either new development or infill development since 1980. The size may be adjusted based on the size of the group.
2. Following the general approach used in the chapter, carefully assess the area using the following new urbanism criteria (using the relevant scales from Patterson):
  - Street connectivity (not calculated, just an estimate)
  - Sidewalks
  - Planting strips & trees
  - Front porches
  - Location of garages
  - Street width
  - Set-back distance
  - Centralized area with civic buildings
  - Convenient retail
  - Housing type diversity
  - Transit service
  - Green space/open space/park

Also

- assess the usability of parks & green spaces for different user groups
- the quality of the public and semi-public spaces: are there transitions between public and private space? Adequate social gathering spaces (public or “third places”)

**Paper 3-5 pages.** Much of this data can be summarized in tables. How does the area chosen “stack up” re. new urbanism characteristics and the quality of public and semipublic spaces? For older neighborhoods, does there appear to have been a positive or negative impact on livability as a result of increases in density? Are there other factors that should have been considered to capture the impact of density on livability?

**Due Date: February 2**

## Major Assignment

These papers will be due on **Wednesday, March 16 or earlier**. A paragraph describing the topic is due on **January 26** and a one-page outline on **Feb. 23**.

**Length: 15 Pages for USP 581 students; 25 pages for USP 681**

**Presentation in class: March 16 or earlier**

### Option 1

The purpose of this assignment is to give you an opportunity to look critically at the field of environmental psychology, assessing its present state and where it is going. Choose a narrow topic that has been the subject of recent research in environmental psychology, and that is of particular interest to you.

- (a) Review the state of knowledge around this question, focusing on work done in (roughly) the last ten years. You may well need to take a look at the history of the field over a longer time period to understand its development.
- (b) What do you see as the major current and emerging issues in the area: theoretical, conceptual, methodological, or practical/application?
- (c) Do you see directions that it could/should be going, but does not seem to be?

### Option 2

Purpose: to apply your understanding of environmental psychology to a real-world problem. Below are some examples of the kinds of projects that have been done in the past or could be done. These may be based entirely on the literature, as with (a), or on designing and conducting a pilot project or a research project that could be completed in a following term.

1. The urban growth boundary has as its intention increasing the density of development in urban areas, particularly at the fringes of those areas. Local officials have been heard to make statements such as “increased density will increase the crime rate.” Based on in-depth research into the literature on density and crowding, write a white paper regarding the relationship between density and positive/negative outcomes. In particular, focus on how higher densities can be designed to mitigate any potential negative outcomes. You might choose to take just one major theoretical approach to understanding the effects of density, explore that literature, and make recommendations deriving from that theory.
2. Traffic noise is often an issue of major importance to neighborhoods, but often receives little attention/funding from the transportation departments at various levels of government. Write a paper for transportation officials summarizing the impact of traffic noise and the effectiveness of various approaches to mitigation.
3. There has been increasing attention to sense of place and place attachment. How might the literature in this area be applied to questions of urban design?