From its conception and from the beginning this seminar was different and meant to be different from the other seminars at workshops. While these dealt with more or less circumscribed or limited fields of empirical research on what may be called appropriation of space (home space, work space, institutional settings, etc.), the locales seminar, first of all, had the task and the burden to start and to discuss what may be properly called appropriation of space. The task involved in this task – and in these three days it turned out to be a controversial issue – was the following. For our group of our participants (of the seminar and primarily of the whole conference) appropriation of space was a mere label, a fashionable or even national linguistic preference, covering whatever had been going on in the field of "Architectural Psychology", which, in turn, was considered to be a national preference of, say, British and Swedish colleagues. And you will have discovered that the jingoistic title of our common conference was "De la psychologie de l'espace construit". So for this first group, whatever they were particularly interested in, was man - environment relations in general as we know it mainly from TIBA conferences.

For a second group (inside and outside the locales seminar) appropriation of space was not a word only but a concept to be debated, defined, discussed, and, finally, questioned as to its usefulness in theory construction and theory-guided empirical research. This could meaningfully be done in several ways: (a) by means of conceptual clarification, (b) by admitting models of appropriation, and (c) by empirical specification. Whichever the approach (here existed little doubt that a useful construct of appropriation of space could not be a purely psychological one), it rather had to mean explicit that man's representation of, and activity in, manmade environment has historical, political, economic, societal, psychological, and physiological dimensions. Since none of us at the present time is able to deal simultaneously with all dimensions of such a multi-faceted construct, the number, in a way, had to be a division of labor by necessity. As could be expected, the division was not clear-cut, but there were emphases.
On the first morning the concept of appropriation was traced back to its philosophical and anthropological origins in the work of Karl Marx and its adoption as a psychological concept by VON HITZEL and LEIBFRIED in Soviet and by E. H. G. R. M. in contemporary German psychology. From these conclusions were drawn as to its applicability in environmental psychology. The ensuing discussion showed clearly that the basic meaning of appropriation, i.e., objectification, objectification and alienation, holds for both social and individual appropriation, primary (productive) and secondary (reproductive) appropriation. It further revealed that construction (building) and instruction (education) are closely correlated, or rather interdependent.

Again arguing from Marx's critical framework of political economics Mr. PAPADOPOULOS presented a social-cybernetic model of space appropriation in the social self-organization. In a more sociological perspective, this speech stressed the dialectical relationship between a "productive" and a "utilizing" appropriation. A really social self-organizing or self-generation is a, presumably, unnamed stage well beyond so-called participation models.

Starting from Piaget's theoretical framework Mr. MANDIQUA then presented his views on the mutual relationship between body identity and appropriation of places. In the discussion of personal vs. social identity concepts it was interesting to see how related theoretical concepts, dialectical, symbolic interactional and Piagetian could be related to the concept of appropriation.

On the following day Mr. FREISER introduced the seminar group into his own research on the use of space, a term which is preferred to equate with and substitute for appropriation of space. Although his main stress was on different criteria of, and approaches to, the ability of space, the following discussion concentrated, repeatedly, on the controversial equation of appropriation and use of space.

In a very brief extra-scheduled information Mr. van NOODALEN reported on some conceptual tools for the analysis of non-environment systems. Again focusing on cybernetic conceptions (as the Miller-Galanter-Fritsche NOTE-system) the speaker concentrated on the role of the wall as the interface between inside and outside, showing how rules and norms as non-material systems exert control over material systems. Finally, Mr. NOODALEN emphasized the importance of space and space use by means of observations in an experimental laboratory for architecture.

For the presentation of case studies Mr. ROBERTS introduced two case studies. In the first, a social unit of 5,000 people, which was a re-urbanization project in the city of Upsala. The case study was characterized by a very high level of participation, both in terms of participation in the planning stage and in terms of post-planning involvement. The case study was presented as an example of how participatory planning can be used to achieve social and environmental goals.

In the second case study, a group of students from the University of Karlsruhe presented a project for the rehabilitation of an old factory building in the city of Karlsruhe. The project was characterized by a high level of participation, both in terms of participation in the planning stage and in terms of post-planning involvement. The case study was presented as an example of how participatory planning can be used to achieve social and environmental goals.
In his paper on physiological and philosophical aspects of the use of space, Mr. Hilles introduced experimental evidence relating visual information rate to cortical arousal and heart rate with the help of a theoretical model, the major dimensions of which are human activity, reaction tendency, as well as input from the built environment and the social environment. All these factors were maintained to contribute to the activation level of the system. The discussion of this model focused on evidence for the interaction between a subject's perception of, and activity in, a concrete environment.

Appropriation in terms of participation was the explicit topic of the final paper and the concluding discussion when Mr. Wenneg presented his conception of a participatory-relational theory for architectural psychology. Again, symbolic interactionism served as a theoretical frame of reference unifying the psychological and sociological aspects of human social existence. That appropriation of space was once more treated as a political problem led to a very lively discussion and re-discussion of the various theoretical and political views as expressed during the proceedings. Only the bus taking us to lunch stopped this discussion which demonstrated the strong involvement of the participants as well as the potential usefulness of a concept of appropriation of space, if taken seriously.