

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Bridging the theoretical and applied facets of environmental psychology

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/49r6h4k1>

Author

Stokols, DS

Publication Date

1996

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

search on design or design changes (PDR) produced environments more suited to human behavior, some of which were later evaluated by POEs. These include a treatment center, public housing, offices, parks, neighborhoods, and city centers. Missed by this book is the most famous POE of all, one done by Trites, Galbraith, Sturdavant, and Leckwart (1970) in which the radial design of a hospital was compared to conventional single- and double-loaded corridors. This study demonstrated the superiority of radial design so effectively that intensive treatment units the world over have become radial in design. It bears repeating that a paradigm may not have rules that are agreed on, but it nevertheless remains a paradigm.

REFERENCES

- Bechtel, R., & Srivastava, R. (1978). *Post-occupancy evaluation of housing*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Cherulnik, P. (1993). *Applications of environment-behavior research: Case studies and analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Deming, W. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Friedman, A., Zimring, C., & Zube, E. (1978). *Environmental design evaluation*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolution* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrence, D., Habe, R., Hacker, A., & Sherrod, D. (Eds.). (1988). *People's needs/plant management: Paths to co-existence* (EDRA 19). Edmond, OK: Environmental Design Research Association.
- Nasar, J., Grannis, P., & Hanyu, K. (Eds.). (1995). *Proceedings* (EDRA 26). Edmond, OK: Environmental Design Research Association.
- Stokols, D. (1995). The paradox of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist*, 50, 821-837.
- Trites, D., Galbraith, F., Sturdavant, M., & Leckwart, J. (1970). Influence of nursing unit design on the activities and subjective feelings of nursing personnel. *Environment & Behavior*, 3, 303-334.
- Zimring, C. (1989). Post-occupancy evaluation and implicit theory: An overview. In W. Preiser (Ed.), *Building evaluation* (pp. 113-126). New York: Plenum Press.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Robert B. Bechtel, Department of Psychology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to barker@ccit.arizona.edu.

Bridging the Theoretical and Applied Facets of Environmental Psychology

Daniel Stokols
University of California, Irvine

In an earlier article (Stokols, October 1995), I suggested that the identity of environmental psychology as a distinct area of study has become more diffuse and transparent over the past 30 years as a result of its multidisciplinary and international scope and the gradual incorporation of environmental perspectives into several areas of psychological research (e.g., within cognitive, developmental, social, personality, and health psychology). Bechtel (1996, this issue) and Craik (1996, this issue), long-standing and distinguished contributors to environmental psychology, offer two divergent perspectives on the core identity and concerns of this field. Their different characterizations of environmental psychology underscore certain points made in my earlier article about the diffuseness of environmental psychology's identity and the diversity of its core concerns.

Bechtel's (1996) vision of environmental psychology is anchored in what he regards as the "true paradigm of environmental psychology," postoccupancy evaluation (POE; p. 1187). POE is a process and a set of methods for evaluating how well buildings and other designed environments work, or support the needs and activities of their occupants. POE is closely related to pre-design research (PDR), which is conducted prior to the design and construction of built environments to ensure that occupants' needs are considered by design professionals and incorporated into their plans for future developments. Bechtel notes that although POE and PDR have not been recognized as core paradigms within mainstream psychology, they have exerted substantial influence on several programs of environment-behavior research, especially those concerned with the design, evaluation, and enhancement of built environments. Bechtel observes that more POE studies have been published by environment-behavior researchers than any other kind of study.

Whereas Bechtel's (1996) vision of environmental psychology highlights its applied contributions toward improving the design of built environments, Craik (1996) emphasizes the theoretical foundations of the field. Craik regards environmental psychology as a core research program (Gholson & Barker, 1985) that has attained a clear-cut scientific identity in its own right and "is

organized around one of the handful of core issues examined by contemporary psychological science" (p. 1186). The seven core research programs of modern psychology identified by Craik encompass broad areas of inquiry such as human evolution, cognitive and affective processes, life span development, the individual in social interaction, and environmental psychology's focus on the person transacting with the environment. Craik notes that environmental psychology's distinctive identity resides in its conceptualization of key facets of person-environment transactions and its provision of an ongoing forum for basic theorizing about the nature of person-environment relations.

The contrast between Bechtel's (1996) emphasis on the applied contributions of environmental psychology and Craik's (1996) focus on its core theoretical concerns is striking. Their divergent characterizations of the field reflect its multidisciplinary roots—spanning psychology, architecture, urban planning, behavioral geography, urban sociology, and other fields—and the diffuseness of its intellectual borders. When viewed from the vantage point of professionally oriented fields such as architecture and urban planning, the applied contributions of environmental psychology are readily apparent. In the context of psychological science, however, theoretical concerns about the nature of person-environment transactions are more salient features of environmental psychology that have increasingly influenced "traditional" domains of psychological research on cognition, human development, health, and social behavior. As Bechtel notes, many colleagues in psychology would view POE and PDR not as "true" paradigms of environmental psychology but rather as one research stream among many within this highly diversified field.

At the same time, Craik's (1996) characterization of environmental psychology as one of seven core research programs in psychological science accords more centrality and coherence to this area than seems warranted. Whereas certain core programs identified by Craik (e.g., social, cognitive, and developmental psychology) have a well-defined presence in psychology departments and graduate training programs, environmental psychology does not. There are very few graduate programs in environmental psychology where students can learn to theorize about person-environment relations. Although every core program manifests some degree of transparency as evidence of its influence and importance, the dearth of environmental psychology graduate training opportunities in the United States suggests that American psychologists assign less centrality to this area than to other core programs of psycho-

logical science. The rarity of environmental psychology training programs in this country may be attributable, in part, to the fact that this multidisciplinary field draws on all of the core research programs mentioned by Craik and, thus, resists definition as a separable and distinct area of psychological science.

Despite the relatively small number of U.S. doctoral training programs in environmental psychology, its diverse theoretical and applied concerns reflect a vibrant and active field rather than one that is moribund and stagnant. Several of the most exciting research directions in this field encompass multiple core programs of psychological science and bridge the perspectives of psychology and related disciplines. Some of these directions pertain to the psychological and social impacts of new telecommunications technologies, the behavioral underpinnings of global environmental change, and the changing nature of public and private spaces in the community.

In the future, the distinctive intellectual contributions of environmental psychology may be more effectively fostered by interdisciplinary training programs emphasizing societal issues and community problem-solving efforts than by traditional psychology departments organized around core paradigms of psychological science. By encouraging theory development in the context of purposeful efforts to resolve social and environmental problems—epitomizing Lewin's (1946) notion of "action research"—environmental psychology will continue to generate novel theoretical and applied contributions and strengthen its distinctive identity and coherence in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Bechtel, R. B. (1996). The paradigm of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist, 51*, 1187-1188.
- Craik, K. H. (1996). Environmental psychology: A core field within psychological science. *American Psychologist, 51*, 1186-1187.
- Gholson, B., & Barker, P. (1985). Kuhn, Lakatos, and Laudan: Applications in the history of physics and psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*, 755-769.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and social problems. *Journal of Social Issues, 2*, 34-36.
- Stokols, D. (1995). The paradox of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist, 50*, 821-837.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Daniel Stokols, School of Social Ecology, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-7050. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to dstokols@uci.edu.

Improving the Journal Review Process: The Question of Ghostwriting

Arthur G. Bedeian
Louisiana State University

Recognizing a widespread discontent among reviewees, Epstein (October 1995) offered a dozen suggestions for improving the journal review process. Furthermore, he described various constructive changes he had made in his own behavior (both as a reviewer and reviewee) and urged others to follow his lead. Finally, he expressed the hope that his remarks stimulate additional suggestions for improving the review process. It is for this reason that I offer the following comments.

My concern centers on the question of where in the journal review process detailed editing and reviewing end and ghostwriting begins. This question touches not only on the areas of writing, editing, and reviewing but on the ethics of authorship (Garfield, 1985). No one denies that reviewers provide a reservoir of knowledge that no single editor could hope to equal. Conscientious reviewers can also protect authors from making careless errors. And we all agree that skilled copy editing can enhance a manuscript's clarity. What seems to be a relatively new puzzle, however, is whether editors and reviewers ever "cross the line" of authorship and function as ghostwriters.

In my own experience and in that of many colleagues, this quandary has arisen repeatedly, as editor and reviewer comments have become increasingly more detailed and demanding. It is not uncommon, for example, for an author to receive a set of editor and reviewer comments that equals the length of the submitted manuscript. Editors and reviewers (not to mention copy editors if a manuscript is finally accepted for publication) seem to think nothing of rewriting and even retitling an author's work.

Although this commingling of the legitimate roles of author, editor, and reviewer is troublesome, what is even more disturbing is the final product: a manuscript that its author may not have intended to write, which expresses in someone else's language thoughts the author may not have intended to convey, under a title the author may not have selected. Such situations turn editors and reviewers into ghostwriters, thus blurring the responsibility for a manuscript's content and raising the question of legitimate authorship. This unfortunate scenario pushes the role of

editing far beyond maximizing the clarity of an author's ideas.

A spectrum exists from reviewer or editor to ghostwriter to coauthor. My suggestion is that journal editors develop and enact practices that protect the integrity of the scientific enterprise while respecting the prerogatives and ethics of authorship. In particular, they should bear in mind that authorship is a scholarly endeavor in which the true origins of thoughts, and the words used to express them, should be known. This suggestion is, of course, consistent with the "Open Letter to Authors for APA Journals" that is provided to everyone who submits a manuscript to an APA journal. I quote: "Authors should cite the sources of their ideas." What neither this "Open Letter" nor the APA "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (1992) addresses, however, is how manuscript changes resulting from editor and reviewer comments should be acknowledged. As Garfield (1985) asked, "Should explicit acknowledgment be done on a line-by-line or word-by-word basis?" (p. 8). Acknowledgements could easily reach absurd lengths, recognizing not only significant contributions but also points at which material was omitted on an editor's or a reviewer's demand.

As forms of human expression, words are explanatory constructs that reflect ideologies. To tamper with these constructs or to color an author's logic and rhetoric with the overly invasive demands of editors and reviewers denies the author full intellectual responsibility for his or her work and permits subrosa influences to be exerted on both a discipline's current character and its future development.

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 47*, 1597-1611.
- Epstein, S. (1995). What can be done to improve the journal review process. *American Psychologist, 50*, 883-885.
- Garfield, E. (1985, December 2). Ghostwriting—The spectrum from ghostwriter to reviewer to editor to coauthor. *Current Contents, 17*, 3-11.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Arthur G. Bedeian, Department of Management, 3148B CEBA, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-6312. Electronic mail may be sent via Internet to mgbede@lsuvm.sncc.lsu.edu.