Children's Behavioral and Conceived Domains in Neighborhood Environment
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Abstract
Children's psychologically important places and their neighborhood activities were investigated in open-ended field interviews and behavioral observations in a typical Korean high-density apartment neighborhood. Interview data were analyzed in conjunction with behavioral data. The analysis reveals that there is correspondence between domain of children's neighborhood uses and domain of their places of psychological significance. The children tended to make such valued places in accessible, proximate designated play areas. Meanings associated with such places indicated that possibility for pursuing desired activities and behavioral opportunities or functional supports are important aspects of the psychological experiences in the places. Places are settings where their sociophysical features support children's preferred, joyful, and important day-to-day activities. Activities in the places (and near the places) differed from activities outside the places: the former were, in general, more place-specific, resource-dependent, and purposive whereas the latter were relatively transient, short-lived, and environmentally independent. The study concludes that the behavioral domain contributes to the psychological domain and yet there are some activities more effective than others.
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1. Introduction
Rapoport (1977) summarizes human experience of the environment in terms of a four-staged hierarchical process. In his suggestion, experience evolves from that of actual environments, through perceived and behavioral to experience of meaning in conceived environments. The distinction among experiences of these four domains, he posits, is one of degree rather than kind. These domains are linked: "The latter cannot exist without the former, and yet the former is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the latter" (Rapoport, 1977, pp.316).

The interest of this study is in the linkage between use and symbolic meanings that children obtain in their experience of neighborhood environments. We assume that these meanings stem from children's behavioral domain and conceived domain respectively as they develop one form of meaning to the other in their everyday use of neighborhood spaces.

Place theory has long focused on this process by which an individual imposes personal meanings on a setting through continuing experience (Tuan, 1977; Proshansky et al., 1983). Canter (1983, 1991), for example, emphasizes the role of purposive actions in making a setting into one where an individual's especially meaningful experiences occur (including the symbolic experiences). Stokols (1981) also attributes emergence of such meanings to particular activities that occur in a setting on a regular, predictable basis. Place dependence, one of his core concepts, implies the degree to which people perceive themselves as being strongly associated with the essential functions of their setting.

Place researchers focusing on facets of place point to three major aspects of one's valued setting: environmental (physical, social, and temporal), behavioral, and symbolic (meaning, conception, and identity) (Relph, 1976; Canter, 1997; Rowles, 1983; Gustafson, 2000). They maintain that behavioral processes, continued interactions, and pursuits for meeting personal needs are a core mode for giving personal meanings and values to the setting. These researchers and many others (e.g., Seamon, 1982; Feldman, 1990; Vorkinn and Riese, 2001) emphasize the relationships between behavioral experience of a setting and sense of place, place identity, and place attachment that emerge in the setting.

It is posited, therefore, that children may have such valued places in their neighborhood that they depend on for their important behavioral and symbolic experiences: Their behavioral domain (use locations) and conceived domain (valued places) may correspond to each other. Do their behavioral experiences of a setting contribute to the meanings emerging in the setting? The literature reveals that this is not always
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We conducted multiple behavioral observations for also marked by the city's thoroughfares all around. The periphery of the neighborhood (the boundary is defined as locations of outdoor activities to 25 story) apartment neighborhood. Behavioral of 7 to 12-year old children living in a high-rise (10 to 11-year old children in New Mexico favor homes and friends' houses most due to preferred activities, togetherness with family or friends, place features, and mental well-being. Owen's study of Australian teens' valued places (1994) indicates that teens also value a setting where they can do something with others, do things they like, and feel better in it. These studies illustrate that places important to children in terms of personal meanings and values differ from settings designed for children and they are important due to behavioral, social, and emotional experiences that children have in the places.

2. Method
2.1 Study
This study investigates locational relationships between the behavioral domain and conceived domain of 7 to 12-year old children living in a high-rise (10 to 25 story) apartment neighborhood. Behavioral domain is defined as locations of outdoor activities of the children occurring within the planned fenced periphery of the neighborhood (the boundary is also marked by the city's thoroughfares all around). We conducted multiple behavioral observations for identifying this domain and for recording activities in different locations. Conceived domain refers to a sum of neighborhood places that children report as most important to their everyday life. Unstructured field interviews with open-ended questions were performed with children playing outdoors in order to identify places important to them as well as meanings associated with such places. Indoor private places (e.g., homes) and places located outside the boundary (e.g., a theme park) were recorded but excluded from the analysis for obtaining a spatial compatibility between behavioral and conceived domains. Two specific research questions were developed that guided the collection and analysis of data. They included, "Is children's activity in a setting related to their personal meanings given to the setting?" and "Are there differences among different activities in contributing to children making their important places in their neighborhood?"

2.2 Measures
Previous researchers have used various constructs for examining children's psychological association with neighborhood places: valued (Owen, 1994), favored or favorite (Malinowski and Thurber, 1996; Newell, 1997, Korpela et al., 2002), meaningful (Schiavo, 1988), and important (Lieberg, 1994; Gustafson, 2001). These constructs were not clearly differentiated and have been employed interchangeably in the literature (Chawla, 1992). Place theories, on the other hand, emphasize people's ontological (identity) and behavioral as well as emotional attachments to a setting while treating preference as only a derivative variable (Canter, 1983; Stokols, 1981; Proshansky et al., 1983). In order to obtain data about a child's multi-faceted attachment to a neighborhood setting, we assumed that important places should be differentiated from preferred places and could better represent the possible multi-faceted meanings that a child might have about its conceived domain. Our interview questions, therefore, started with, "Do you have places you consider as especially important to your everyday life?" When the child did not seem to understand the question immediately, we added probing questions using 'especially meaningful or valued' but did not use such terms as 'favorite' or 'preferred'. For the meanings that the child associated with each important place, we also asked, "Why do you think those places are important to you?"

Field observations for identifying the children's behavioral domain utilized a walk-through method using a predetermined observation route. The route was developed based on neighborhood maps and field pretests so that it provided the observer with unblocked, unobtrusive visual access to all outdoor spaces of the neighborhood. The observer walked along the route, visually scanned the areas, and stopped for recording activities as spotting them visually. Each of the areas where activities were concentrated (e.g., busy playground) was scanned only from one
end to the other (not making a behavior map). Streams of children's activities were divided into activity units (i.e., observed activity cases) based on Barker's (1963) behavior episode and Magnusson's (1981) concept of situation, both emphasizing observers' ability for articulating the inherent nature and goal of an activity.

2.3 Setting

This investigation is a case study of a typical Korean neighborhood called Hansol Village. For obtaining better generality of research findings (at least to the Korean situations), we had to make a careful selection based on how well the study setting represented recent housing developments in Korea. Starting from a wide search of planned estates during the past decade in metropolitan Seoul and based on the final list of 10 candidates, we believed that Hansol was an ideal case since it was typical in many aspects – location, size, density, building type, facilities, and residents.

Hansol village was built in 1994 and developed by the Korean Housing Authority. The neighborhood is located in the middle of a new town about 10 kilometers south from the municipal border of Seoul. Hansol was a housing estate of fifty-one 10 to 25-storied apartment buildings for 5,277 middle income families with over 1,000 primary school children (7 to 12-year olds, 0.2 school-aged children per family, which is about the national average). A total of 15,300 residents were living in apartments of 42 to 105 square meters, which is the national standard for public apartments.

Enclosed by thoroughfares all around, it is a large and self-sufficient residential super block having within it schools (an elementary and a high school), community centers, retail stores, various play areas, rest areas, grassed areas, and neighborhood parks (including a large developed park at the northern edge called Hansol Park). The entire area was divided by two crossing central pedestrian paths into four sectors with each having 10 to 17 apartment buildings.

2.4 Procedure

During the three-year span (September to November, 2002, April to May, 2003, and March to May, 2004), two researchers made a team (one asking questions and the other recording data) and performed 150 field interviews. A schedule was first made to show the day and time for each interview session which covered both weekdays and weekends and both early afternoons (2-5 p.m.) and late afternoons (4-7 p.m.). The schedule also divided the neighborhood into four sectors and indicated a particular quarter to start from in each session.

Entering a sector on a scheduled day, we searched for children's outdoor activity situations. In each situation, a child was chosen who appeared most helpful and accurate in giving responses (pretests of the field interviews had shown that locations of the interviews were not related to the locations of responses regarding important places). The interview started at the child's or parents' approval. During the interview, the children were encouraged to give as many responses as they could. Probing questions were actively employed to get data about exact locations and psychological implications of important places mentioned. Since each interview took about 20 minutes, we decided to conduct two to three interviews in each sector and moved to next sectors to cover the whole neighborhood within each session. No specific sampling strategy was applied except that we tried to choose different genders and age groups across the interviews. About 10 children were interviewed in each of the 15 sessions, and 97 boys and 53 girls were interviewed. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed in verbatim.

The behavioral observations were carried out three times by one observer, once every year immediately
before (2002) and after (2003, 2004) the year’s interview sessions. They took place on Friday (4-7 p.m.), Saturday (3-6 p.m.), and Sunday (2-5 p.m.) respectively when the weather seemed to encourage children to go outside. It took the observer about three hours to complete the predetermined walk-through route in each observation. Excluding walking and simple passing behaviors, the observer collected 222 children's afternoon outdoor activities during the three observation sessions. Each activity was recorded using a series of photographs in different sizes. Locations of the observed activities were marked on a neighborhood map. Locations of moving activities (e.g., riding bicycles) were determined by marking the spots where the activities were first visually spotted.

3. Results
3.1 Locations of Important Places
The interview of 150 children revealed 366 responses to important places (2.4 places per child) covering 88 different locales that ranged from child's own home to city facilities. Ninety-three children (62.0 percent) presented only one or two places whereas the rest gave three places or more. Age and gender were not significantly related to the number of places mentioned per child (at the significance level of 0.05).

Among 88 locales of 366 responses, 'my home' (32 children), Hansol park (at the northern edge, 32...
children, and the neighborhood's central playground (8-shaped playground, 24 children) were most frequently mentioned. Yet these most popular places each represented only 8.7 and 6.6 percent of the total responses. Given this extreme variation (more than half the 88 locales were mentioned by only one child even when homes and schools were counted as one locale each), the responses were grouped into five categories of place types. The table shows that many children mentioned places in designated play areas and parks whereas neighborhood open spaces such as streets, courtyards, rest spaces, and parking lots were least mentioned (Table 1).

Table 1. Types of Children's Important Places (f, %)

| Designated Play Areas | Parks and Green Areas | Community Facilities | Home | Other Neighborhood Open Spaces |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| 155 (42.4)            | 65 (17.8)             | 59 (16.1)            | 38 (10.4) | 49 (13.4) |
| Playgrounds and Playfields | Hansol park, grassed areas, woods, city and community parks | School, neighborhood retail stores, private academies, libraries | My own home, friends' home, relatives' home | Courtyards, rest areas, vacant areas, streets, parking lots |

All the responses were again divided into outdoor versus interior settings. In general, outdoor settings (281 responses, 76.8 percent) were more frequently mentioned than indoor settings (homes, classroom, video game rooms, etc.). When the total responses were sorted to settings within the bounded neighborhood and settings outside the neighborhood boundary, the former outnumbered the latter (79.5 versus 20.5 percent). Overall, the children opted to retain important places in outdoor areas near home. This propensity for immediately accessible and instantly usable outdoor places was not significantly related to age and gender.

Responses of neighborhood open spaces within the neighborhood boundary (called 'proximate neighborhood outdoor places (PNOP)' here) were collected and marked on the site map (blank triangles in Fig.4.). The map also indicated that play areas, parks, and the settings near the long central walkway attracted most of the responses.

3.2 Reasons for Important Places

The children gave 319 individual reasons for why they thought such places were important. A content analysis was performed to identify salient implications of the responses and to categorize them into 10 different concepts. The result showed that many reasons were either directly behavioral or relevant to physical features and friends enabling and supporting preferred activities. Ninety-seven of 319 reasons clearly pointed out the activity issues such as 'pursuit of desired activity' and 'pleasure of playing in the places'. These were only 30.4 percent. Yet, taking into account the responses that implied both activities and physical/social affordances (bold letters in Table 2), this figure increased to 85.3 percent.

3.3 Results from Observations

The observations collected 222 activities. They were mapped together with 253 PNOP interview responses in order to see the extent to which they accorded with important places in terms of location (Fig.4.). The map showed graphically that, in general, the locations of actual outdoor activities (black circles) and those of self-reported important outdoor neighborhood places (blank triangles) overlapped and corresponded to each other.

These visual data indicated that the children showed preference to areas prepared specifically for their use (playgrounds, playfields, parks, and rest areas). Yet, not all designated play/rest areas were equally used. Play setting along the central pedestrian paths, near the crossings of major circulations, and adjacent to community facilities were used more often (black dots in Fig.4.).

3.4 Activity in, near, and outside Important Places

Locations of 222 observed activities were categorized as those within the important places, Table 2. Important Aspects of Place Experiences of Neighborhood Children

| Concepts/Reasons | f(%)   | Typical Responses                                                                 |
|------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pursuit of Desired Activity | 76 (23.8) | - This place is good for police-and thief game that we get together and do everyday. Playing with friends are most important to me. This is the place we always come and play. |
| Pleasure of Playing in Place | 21 (6.6) | - I enjoy playing soccer. This place is where I do it with friends. Playing here is a lot more fun than in other playgrounds. |
| Presence of Interesting Elements | 30 (9.4) | - Play things are fun in that playground. I don't find them elsewhere. - I come to this area because of the game machines. |
| Supportive Physical Attributes | 23 (7.2) | - We come here for riding bikes. It's wide and flat when cars are not around. - This place is more spacious for a real soccer game. |
| Access (Location) | 16 (5.0) | - Because it is close to my house. I walk my doggie there. - We stop by here everyday on the way from school. I see many friends here. |
| Sense of Affiliation (by playing with friends and peers) | 60 (18.8) | - I go there and my friends are always around. We can play together. - How can I see my friends if not playing with them in this place? |
| Special People for Special Events | 36 (11.3) | - They are my special guys. We come here and do private things. - This place reminds me of my real good friend. We used to play here together all the time. |
| Frequent Use | 10 (3.2) | - Every evening after dinner, we all get together here playing soccer. I don't know why, but I meet friends and go there always. |
| Psychological Importance | 30 (9.4) | - This place is special to me. I buried my pet here the other day. - What can I be without home? This is where I live and see family. |
| Importance to Life and Being | 17 (5.3) | - I feel comfortable and relaxed every time I go there. - School is where I do what I must do for now and the future. |
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near these places, and outside these places. Activities observed in the settings mentioned as important places by more than three children were included as in-place activities. Near-place activities were those seen as having clear perceptual and functional relationships with the places. The analysis showed that 160 (72.1 percent) of the observed activities were in or near the important places whereas only 62 activities diverged from the interview data. This again implied that the important places were geographic centers for many activities.

Activity group size was analyzed to see whether the in-place activities differed in terms of the number of children per activity. The ANOVA test resulted in a significant difference in the means: 3.7 per in-place activity, 2.9 per near-place activity, and 2.6 outside the places ($F=6.87$, df=2, $p<0.05$). However, gender and age group were not significantly related to this category, indicating that gender and age did not make differences in adjacency to the places.

A chi-square analysis was performed between types of activity and the adjacency categories. The result indicated that activities occurring in or near the important places differed from those observed outside the places ($x^2=71.67$, df=18, $p<0.001$). Ball plays, cognitive/nature plays, and using play equipment occurred within places more frequently. These activities, in principle, included more of those that depended on environmental features of the places (e.g., spacious areas for ball plays, sand in playgrounds, designed play equipments, bugs and berries in grassed areas, etc.). On the contrary, activities often observed outside the places (wheel plays, social games, roaming, and playing around) were less dependent of such environmental affordances and instead more relevant to portable play resources (friends for games, bikes, toys, etc., Table 3).

### Table 3. Activities Types in, Near, and Outside Place

| activity type                                                 | in place | near place | outside place | total | characterized as                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------|
| ball game/ball play                                          | 15       | 3          | 7             | 19    |                                         |
| structured games with a ball, sports using balls, and simple  | 78.9%    | 15.8%      | 5.3%          | 100.0%|                                         |
| ball plays                                                   |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| cognitive/nature play                                       | 22       | 7          | 7             | 36    | environmentally dependent,               |
| sand/dirt plays, playing with natural elements (bugs, leaves, |          |            |               |       | stationary, organized                   |
| etc.), play house, pretend plays, and other constructive and  | 61.1%    | 19.4%      | 19.4%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| imaginative activities                                       |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| using playground equipment                                   | 25       | 0          | 2             | 27    |                                         |
| using slides, enjoying swings, and other activities on various|          |            |               |       |                                         |
| designed play equipments                                    | 92.6%    | 0.0%       | 7.4%          | 100.0%|                                         |
| toy play                                                     | 15       | 2          | 7             | 24    |                                         |
| plays depending on manufactured toys such as tops, water     | 62.5%    | 8.3%       | 29.2%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| guns, and electronic gamers                                 |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| social gathering                                             | 10       | 7          | 5             | 22    | functionally preparatory,               |
| gathering mainly for socializing and talking with some        | 45.5%    | 31.8%      | 22.7%         | 100.0%| supplementary                           |
| resting involved                                             |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| rest/relax                                                   | 10       | 6          | 2             | 18    |                                         |
| taking a rest while talking, eating, watching others, and    | 55.6%    | 33.3%      | 11.1%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| doing other minor actions                                   |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| wheel play                                                   | 7        | 8          | 8             | 23    | environmentally independent,            |
| riding bikes, roller skates, and in-lines and enjoying other| 30.4%    | 34.8%      | 34.8%         | 100.0%| mobile, provisional                     |
| wheeled vehicles                                             |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| structured game                                             | 6        | 2          | 5             | 13    |                                         |
| various social games with agreed-upon game rules             | 46.2%    | 15.4%      | 38.5%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| roaming/simple mobile hang-out                               | 1        | 7          | 13            | 21    |                                         |
| wandering doing nothing specific and looking for fun,        | 4.8%     | 33.3%      | 61.9%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| moving around for plays to join, etc.                        |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| playing around                                              | 3        | 4          | 12            | 19    |                                         |
| hanging out playing this and that (wrestling, jumping,       | 15.8%    | 21.1%      | 63.2%         | 100.0%|                                         |
| throwing things, sliding, etc.)                             |          |            |               |       |                                         |
| total                                                        | 114      | 46         | 62            | 222   |                                         |
| total                                                        | 51.4%    | 20.7%      | 27.9%         | 100.0%|                                         |

**4. Discussion and Conclusions**

This study is one of rare examples that perform psychological analyses and behavioral observations simultaneously. From a larger perspective, it attempts to see the relationship between functional and psychological realms of children by comparing the domain of their psychologically important places with observations of their actual activities. Chawla (1992) raised an intriguing question regarding whether it is a correspondence or difference that characterizes the relationship between children's preference to and actual use of neighborhood settings. Although she suggested that Moore's distinction between locus of activity and locus of meaning may well deserve attention, the present analysis offers a contrary view that settings with frequent use, by and large, coincide with settings where the psychological meanings emerge. Behavioral resources, interesting elements, functionally supportive features, and social encouragement for behavioral engagement are an important aspect of a neighborhood.
setting that helps make the setting a place of psychological significance (Weisman et al., 2001).

The relationship between use and meaning is presumably mutual rather than unidirectional. Once a setting becomes a child's place of psychological importance, it will be an important habitat for activities and frequented by children having behavioral goals.

In addition, the opposite is also true. As a setting is used more, it will become a habitat of psychological meanings. Children will become more attached to the setting psychologically as well as behaviorally. Not only can such emotional and psychological studies about preference, importance, and meanings (Schiavo, 1988; Korpela, 1992) help with an effort to identify the behavioral world of children, but studies concerning physical and social affordances of neighborhood settings (Heft, 1988; Kyttä, 2002) can also help with understanding children's psychological domain of the neighborhood, since a setting with an abundance of such affordances will likely become a child's psychological place. This also is a lesson in design, as design is basically an effort to increase such functional capabilities of a setting. A well designed setting is not only well used but also becomes a valued place to a child.

Although the results of the present analysis advocate a positive correlation between functional and psychological meanings of a setting (Rapoport, 1977), they should be presented with some cautions. The study deals with a case project which is specifically relevant to the recent situation in Korea. Theoretical and practical implications of the current analysis should be carefully interpreted before they are applied to different contexts. The case project is a high-rise, high-density multifamily housing estate in a heavily developed new town. Although there are some parks and woods in the neighborhood, the surrounding environs are different from those of other residential areas. An analysis of neighborhoods with more natural landscapes available for children may give some different ideas about the correspondence between the behavioral and conceived domains (compare different views to the role of natural elements in different contexts, Korpela et al., 2002; Matthews et al., 2000). Basically, there are few studies that measure behavioral and psychological issues simultaneously, which means that the present analysis has few to compare with directly.

It is unfortunate to leave many relevant issues unanswered. Children's behavioral and psychological dependence on designated play areas is an old but unresolved research problem. Even among studies of higher density planned housing estates, there have been confusions about children's use of designated play areas (Moore and Young, 1978). A plausible hunch has been that children's use of designated play settings is negatively related to the availability of other play options, natural and man-made (Moore, 1985). The findings of this analysis can be interpreted in the same perspective. Yet studies of play areas have been rare recently, and the relevant wisdom may be outdated.

Although the interviews performed in this study solicited as many responses as possible about psychologically important places, the average number of places per child (2.4) was a disappointing figure as we had expected considerably more. The reason for this has remained unclear (note that gender and age are not related to the figure). It is again perhaps because the studied neighborhood restricts, rather than supports, children's freedom to move around and explore potential affordances (Kyttä, 2004). Also, why is there such variance in meaningful places of different children? Meaningful places were dispersed all across the neighborhood and nearby community areas. None of them is shared by more than 10 percent of the children interviewed for this study. A possible explanation is that a psychological place is by nature psychological and personal. Then, no further explanations can ever be made regarding possible influences of the external environment. This also deserves further empirical clarification.

Last but not least, it is noted that activities do occur outside the psychological realm as well. Neighborhood streets are used well, but then few children consider the street as a psychological domain (Chawla, 1992). Streets (including sidewalks and pedestrian paths) comprised about 20 percent of observed activities in this analysis. A similar discrepancy was found in heavily used rest areas and densely occupied courtyards (including plays in parking lots).

Place researchers generally define a valued place as a physical setting imbued with psychological and emotional meanings (Seamon, 1982; Proshansky et al., 1983), which means a place is one's own spatial and spiritual turf. In the studied neighborhood, as in many high-density planned neighborhoods in Korea, there are planned distinctions that powerfully control people's sense of ownership over different neighborhood open spaces. There are distinctions between areas for children and adults, between settings for families and singles, and between spaces for no one and spaces for everyone. This may help explain such heavy occupancies of streets, rest areas, and courtyards which, however, do not necessarily mean that these settings are one's psychologically meaningful places.

Yet there can be other explanations derived from the study results. Looking at the reasons and meanings for the valued places, we can understand that not only activities in a setting themselves but also physical and social affordances (behaviorally supporting resources) of a setting have great influence on psychological experiences in the setting. Settings where both behavioral and psychological relations emerge (e.g., playgrounds, parks, and neighborhood retail stores) have such affordances that are noticeably identifiable and clearly definable by everyday users (e.g., play equipments, sand, trees, game machines, etc.). Settings
with discrepancies between use and meaning (e.g., streets, courtyards, and parking lots), on the contrary, provide affordances hardly perceivable or affordances that are detectable and yet demand more effort to detect and utilize.

Finally, the study suggests that different activities have different effects on place experiences. Activities observed in children's psychologically valued places tend to be more dependent on behavioral resources of the places, stationary rather than mobile, and more clearly defined in terms of what the children are doing in the places. It is posited, therefore, that these place-specific, environmentally dependent, purposive activities contribute to children's psychological place experiences (Moore and Young, 1978; Stokols, 1981; Canter, 1983). Activities in streets, courtyards, rest areas, and parking lots are not so strongly tying the children to the setting. They transient, temporary, and preparatory (e.g., riding through, hanging out, short-lived gathering, and playing around). Goals of the activities are not as clear as those in the important places.

These findings, overall, suggest that there is correspondence between children's behavioral domain and conceived domain in neighborhood open spaces (at least in some typical Korean high-density apartment neighborhoods). Use of a setting is an important aspect of psychological experiences in the setting, and yet not all uses are equally effective but affordance-specific, setting-dependent, purposive behaviors can really contribute to the emergence of a place of psychological importance.
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