

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

# Linking Human Wellbeing and Urban Greenspaces: Applying the SoftGIS Tool for Analyzing Human Wellbeing Interaction in Helsinki, Finland

Richard leBrasseur<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dalhousie University

**Funding:** The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.

**Potential competing interests:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## Abstract

This paper reviews a study into the relationships between urban greenspaces and the benefits to psychological, social, and physical aspects of human wellbeing in a population using those environments. This relationship is theorized, analyzed, and measured through the transactional paradigm and is operationalized through the use of a public participation geographic information system (PPGIS), SoftGIS, which activates the greenspace - human wellbeing relationship through interaction and its map-based survey data collection. Over 1800 unique place-based relationships were analyzed. Results indicate what type of human wellbeing affordances were received from indicated greenspace within the Helsinki Urban Region. The implications are interdisciplinary and include community planning, urban geography, and human health as well as insight into the design and strategic management of greenspaces in urbanizing regions to provide continued and improved benefits to humans and nature.

**Richard leBrasseur<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *Green Infrastructure Performance Lab, Dalhousie University*

*Department of Plant, Food and Environmental Sciences, Truro, Nova Scotia, Canada.*

Email address: [r.lebrasseur@dal.ca](mailto:r.lebrasseur@dal.ca)

**Keywords:** urban greenspace<sub>1</sub>, human wellbeing<sub>2</sub>, public participation GIS<sub>3</sub>, urban planning<sub>4</sub>, affordances<sub>5</sub>.

## 1. Introduction

As urban regions continue to expand and cities evolve, environmental change results. This spatial transition is most noticeable with a city's greenspaces, impacts both ecological systems and human activities including both ecological function (Forman, 1995) and human wellbeing (Wu, 2013; MEA, 2005). The role of greenspace and human wellbeing is

important to study as cities densify and urban development continues.

Urban planning and the advancement of healthy and responsive cities has emerged as an important practice requiring an integrated, strategic approach to develop multi-functional and ecosystem service providing greenspaces in city regions. Urban planning and land use decisions in cities require comprehensive information in order to support effective decision making. Contact with the natural environment such as urban greenspace is a fundamental component of human wellbeing (Wilson, 1984). The role of urban greenspace in cities must better respond to human wellbeing constructs in order to increase the capacity for shaping healthier cities.

Yet, moving current practice in urban greenspace planning towards a holistic approach poses many challenges, such as the need for more inter- and transdisciplinary perspectives, comprehensive information about greenspace functions and benefits as well as more integrated assessments (Kabisch et al., 2022; Czembrowski et al., 2019). Human wellbeing is evidently linked to the environment, particularly in cities, however it remains difficult to assess human behavior within those environments and how urban greenspaces specifically contribute towards human health and the wellbeing of the people engaged with them (Hansen and Pauleit, 2014). Negotiating what will have the maximum impact for urban residents is contextual, subjective, and ultimately problematic within spatial planning decisions.

There is an increasing need for a contextualized and transactional research approaches in which the focus is directed toward a real-life event and embedded in a locally meaningful context (Gobster et al., 2007). Ecological and spatial planning knowledge must be inclusive of the residents use of their environment (Kyttä and Kahila, 2006). The role of urban greenspace and human wellbeing within the human-nature relationship is the focus of this research and critical to understand in the face of continued growth in the number, size, and density of urban areas in much of Europe and the world. Cities will place more pressure on their existing greenspace(s) for diverse ecosystem services through urban resident interaction. This paper advances conceptual frameworks and approaches to study and analyze the human-urban greenspace relationship specific to HWB by asking the following questions:

1. What are the paradigms used to articulate the human and urban greenspace relationship?
2. How can ecosystem services be framed within a transactional paradigm of the human-nature relationship?
3. Which approaches can be applied to best integrate spatial data and citizen knowledge specific to measure human wellbeing?
4. What types of people use what types of urban greenspaces for what types of human wellbeing benefits?
5. What types of urban greenspaces provide the most affordances or interactional benefits to human wellbeing measures?
6. How can landscape planning and design in the context of dynamic urbanizing environments contribute to improving human wellbeing?

First, a literature review frames the important concepts within this paper and provides operational definitions. The next section presents the theoretical background in establishing the relationship between urban greenspaces and human wellbeing. This is followed by the data collection procedure, followed by results and analyses. Finally, the last section presents the discussion and conclusions.

### 1.1. Human wellbeing and ecosystem services

Human wellbeing (HWB) remains an ambiguous concept, without a universally agreed definition and often faced with dissimilar interpretations (e.g. Dolan et al., 2011). In this regard, HWB must be regarded as a multidimensional concept (e.g. McGillivray and Clarke, 2006). The World Health Organization defines HWB as: *"To reach a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing, an individual or group must be able to realise aspirations, to satisfy needs, and to change or cope with the environment. Health is, therefore, seen as a resource for everyday life, not the objective of living. Health is a positive concept emphasizing social and personal resources as well as physical capacities"* (WHO, 1986).

Many definitions in the literature for HWB refer to a person's 'happiness', 'quality of life' and 'life satisfaction' (Pollard and Lee, 2003) where wellbeing is being *"healthy in a way that includes physical, mental, spiritual and emotional health."* (Dolan et al., 2006). Components of HWB have perhaps most famously been articulated by Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1968), which includes physiological or survival needs as well as other aspects such as needs for esteem, belonging, and safety. Though literature disavows the hierarchical structure of Maslow's model, the components are still considered relevant. Similar to natural science's ecosystem health assessments of the biophysical landscape (e.g. Rapport et al., 1998), which include deconstructed ecological components, the social sciences have developed wellbeing components for humans. In reviewing over 22 studies, Hagerty et al. (2001) found the following seven broad HWB components included in most research frameworks: relationships with family and friends; emotional well-being; material-well-being; health; work and productive activity; feeling part of one's community; and personal safety.

Research often equates wellbeing with these other components or constructs. Not only does this discount the diversity of characteristics of wellbeing, it also omits other important aspects. As a result, Gasper (2009) argued that new measures need to respect the diversity of wellbeing. The literature classifies measures of HWB into two categorizations: objective and subjective measures. Objective wellbeing is measured through factors such as economic, social, and environmental statistics, typically with cardinal metrics. Subjective wellbeing, alternatively, is measured through the individual's feelings or experiences, with ordinal metrics (McGillivray and Clarke, 2006) and is considered to be more direct measures of an individual's wellbeing.

HWB, thus, is primarily a subjective measure within the social sciences (Diener, 2009), and is influenced not only by life conditions and prior experiences, but also by personal values (Keith, 2001). Hone et al. (2014) refers to HWB as 'flourishing', as first noted by Keyes (2002); 'positive functioning' (Huppert and So, 2013) has also been documented. The subjective wellbeing measures are often simple and direct – assessing individual's thoughts and feelings about one's life and circumstances, and the level of satisfaction with those components. This is typically enacted through a self-reported measure.

Reflecting the interconnectedness of anthropocentric and ecological, or socio-ecological landscapes in cities, recent conceptual frameworks of HWB strive to illustrate the linkages and between HWB and their UGS, with this being achieved predominately through the concept of ecosystem services (ES) or natural capital (Smith et al., 2013; Costanza et al., 2007; MEA, 2005). ES is an integral component of EU policy and grew out of the desire for a better understanding of the relationship between the environment and HWB through the significant initiatives of the Convention on Biological

Diversity (United Nations, 1992) and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). Although the concept of ecosystem services has permeated many disciplines, four primary definitions are most common in the literature:

- the benefits people receive from ecosystems (MEA, 2005);
- “the conditions and processes through which natural ecosystems, and the species which make them up, sustain and fulfill human life” (Daily, 1997);
- “Ecosystem services are components of nature, directly enjoyed, consumed, or used to yield human well-being” (Boyd and Banzhoff, 2006);
- “the benefits human populations derive, directly or indirectly, from ecosystem functions” (Costanza et al., 1997).

Taken as a whole, these four established definitions illustrate human-based benefits; though there are continued discussions to the varied meanings and semantics of the terms used such as ‘outcome’ and ‘function’ (La Notte et al., 2017).

Although the ES approach is increasingly significant within literature, there are still challenges to be acknowledged, the ES framework is value-based, and often hedonic, in that ecological processes are conceptually translated into value-laden entities or components (Costanza et al., 2014). The concept for ES grew from conservation-based dialogue expressed through economic-based goals. As such, the ES ‘value’ is viewed as similar across the board – for all people of all characteristics, though recent advances in this model are becoming prevalent and more contextual (Andersson et al., 2021; Maund et al., 2020). Beyond the utilitarian approach and potential commodification impacts to ecological resources (e.g. Norgaard, 2010), the ES approach has not illustrated strong applicability to the phenomena found within the human-nature relationship, specifically human actions or responses including management (Baskent, 2020; Vatn and Vedeld, 2012).

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment’s (MEA) classification system is the most accepted and prominent in literature. The MEA report unfurled a wider understanding and use of ecosystem services and offered an expanded classification system (2005) for analysis. However, Boyd and Banzhaf (2007) provided the following updated definition informed by economics and accounting principles: “...*ecosystem services are components of nature directly enjoyed, consumed, or used to yield human wellbeing*”.

The MEA’s definition of cultural ecosystem services, however, opened the door to benefits beyond the economic-oriented end-products of ecological systems and phenomena (e.g. clean water, clean air) to include cultural meaning, recreation, psychophysiological, and spiritual fulfilment (MEA 2005, p. 40; see also de Groot et al., 2010). Simply termed as ‘cultural goods and services’ (UNESCO, 2004), these cultural benefits do not fit Boyd and Banzhaf’s traditional economic valuation perspective, but are nonetheless important to meet ecosystem service necessities of ‘wellbeing’ and “human welfare” and cannot simply be disregarded. For example, ES benefits are not easily accounted for including the concept of social capital, for example, knowledge sharing and social-wellbeing benefits achieved through social interaction (Vallés-Planells et al., 2014).

Cultural ecosystem services (CESs) are an evolving framework focusing on the comprehensive suite of benefits humans receive from the landscape (Millenium Ecosystems Assessment, 2005), both directly and indirectly,

including recreation, personal wellbeing, and social interaction and other non-material benefits for people, often through interaction with greenspaces.

## 1.2. The influences of greenspace upon human wellbeing

A breadth of literature across multiple disciplines discusses the influences of greenspace and, to a degree, urban greenspace upon HWB, often through the lens of ecosystem services (e.g. Taylor, 2000; Bogaert et al., 2005) such as air quality, water infiltration, and carbon offset, among others. However, research encompassing the human-based benefits and impacts such as wellbeing and human welfare, particularly beyond public health spheres, is limited, especially as related to spatial planning and policy decisions.

An exhaustive review of the varied connections made in the literature between humans and nature or greenspaces would be imprudent. This research aims to identify those specific facets of the human-nature relationship that have been identified as the HWB characteristics specific to urban greenspace (UGS). The literature provided to support these relational effects focuses on empirical research from multiple disciplines with measurable outcomes and results. Furthermore, the human-nature relationship pervades seemingly inexhaustible subject areas and disciplines; hence it was impossible to provide a complete review. Overall, this research highlights the substantive facets and notes those poorly represented in scientific literature.

Contact with the natural environment such as UGS is a fundamental component of HWB. Matsuoka and Kaplan (2008) reviewed 90 studies from the scientific journal *Landscape and Urban Planning*, and like Coppel et al.'s (2017) analysis concluded there was strong evidence that greenspace within the urban landscape is important for HWB. Furthermore, nearby greenspace influences wellbeing beyond spatial interaction (Ekkel & de Vries, 2017; Kaplan, 2001). The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals emphasize the importance of greenspace provision in cities "*to foster prosperity and quality of life for all*" (UN, 2017). Furthermore, the World Health Organization notes greenspaces as a "*necessary component for delivering healthy, sustainable, livable conditions*" (WHO, 2016).

International studies in the Netherlands, Denmark and the United Kingdom have also found that nearby greenspace positively influenced various aspects of human wellbeing. Higher levels of perceived general and mental health, lower stress levels, lower likelihood of obesity and fewer health complaints were among the health measures associated with greener environments (Korpela et al., 2014; Maas et al., 2009; Mitchell and Popham, 2007). Recreational parks and UGS provide opportunities for healthy physical activity and the relief of stress (Hunter et al., 2017). Furthermore, the passive benefits to physical and mental health of an urban landscape with trees have been documented (Ward-Thompson, 2011); enjoyment of green areas may help people to relax or may give them fresh energy. Such findings broadly confirm the conclusions of others concerning contact with nature, reduction of stress, and escape from dense urbanity (Hedblom et al., 2019; Kaplan, 1995; Ulrich, 1983).

Alternatively, greenspaces are not always regarded as having a positive impact on humans and the benefits derived from interaction with them not always beneficial. For instance, UGS, particularly in dense cities, are viewed as dangerous (Jorgensen et al., 2012). Other UGS characteristics, such as a lack of maintenance and cleanliness, or dense vegetation, may reduce social interaction and thus the development of social ties and social cohesion. UGS carry disease and

allergens (Ribeiro et al., 2019); children can procure serious injury from play within UGS. UGS can become overcrowded (Arnberger and Haider, 2005) leading to potential user conflicts (Arnberger, 2006) and even violence, as well as the reduction in the quality of the vegetation due to overuse (Kissling et al., 2009).

Fisher, Turner, and Morling (2009) suggested that ecosystem services are those aspects of ecosystems utilized (actively or passively) to produce HWB. HWB is a multifaceted construct (e.g., Diener, 2009; Stiglitz et al., 2009) with interacting and changing subjective and objective measures. Yet there is no agreement as to which components should be included in a valid theory and measure of wellbeing (see Ryan and Deci, 2001; Hird, 2003). Regardless, whenever any of these terms and components are used, explicit qualification is required. For example, objective wellbeing does not fulfil the cognitive concept of 'needs' as clearly as subjective wellbeing (King et al., 2014). In summary, HWB is a distinct construct of the four human wellbeing domains: physical, psychological, social, and economic. Keyes (2002) supports this, stating that HWB requires the combined presence of high levels of emotional, psychological, and social wellbeing aspects through the lens of functioning, both individually and in society.

As evidenced, urban greenspaces provide many benefits to humans, such as places for social activities, physical exercise areas, and more contemplative spaces to connect with nature (Lachowycz and Jones, 2013). This research will focus on the social, physical, and psychological HWB benefits received from interaction with UGS. Notably, emotional wellbeing is inclusive of concepts and definitions of psychological wellbeing (Bradburn, 1969; WHO, 2010) and not identified as a separate construct. Social wellbeing relates to social interactions at community or societal level and relationships with others on a one-to-one, small group or family level. Physical wellbeing relates to the functioning of the physical body and is affected by disease and injury, often equating to physical health.

### 1.2.1. Social wellbeing benefits

An important aspect of UGS interaction is the social and socio-cultural benefits to HWB (Bell et al., 2008). This benefit is primarily met through an exchange or interaction between individuals or groups, often through communication such as talking, or gathering such as picnics, games, etc. (Thomas, 2011). Social ties among individuals, neighbors and members of groups are important to HWB (Chiesura, 2004). UGS provide opportunities where users can meet, talk, play, exercise and socialise. These UGS create opportunities for people of all ages to interact, increasing social health (Jennings & Bamkole, 2019) and providing a sense of connectedness (Leavell et al., 2019), meaning and purpose, thus reducing depressive symptoms (Kondo et al., 2018).

UGS provide places for people to meet and develop social connections (Larson & Hipp, 2022). A study by Maas et al. (2009) found that less UGS in the environment coincided with feelings of loneliness and with a perceived decrease in social support. Similarly, social safety is perceived as being increased with the presence of UGS (Sullivan, 2005), where enclosed UGS are associated with a lack of safety and security. Additionally, UGS encourages a sense of community (Gomez et al., 2015) and also offers spaces for outdoor education and learning (Wolsink, 2016). UGS are also associated with higher levels of social contact and increased feelings of social support among neighbors (Kim and Kaplan, 2004).

Another closely linked aspect of HWB within the social context is that of cultural benefits provided by UGS. Cultural values are connections made with the landscape that are based upon prior experience such as family, upbringing and education (Tuan, 1974). Additionally, evidence shows that social interaction with varied age groups, cultures, and ethnic



backgrounds are more prevalent with the availability of GS (Palliwoda & Priess, 2021), potentially leading to increased 'social cohesion' (Larsen, 2013) and social inclusion (Bush and Doyon, 2017). Social cohesion is defined as the ties that bind humans together in society and have a large bearing on individual wellbeing and the wellbeing of the larger community (Portinga, 2006). Community gardens are correlated with increased social interaction and improved social networks (Rogge et al., 2020) as well as social cohesion (Veen et al., 2016). Public parks allow for spontaneous interaction or the 'meeting of strangers' (Varheim, 2017). Informal social contact with other individuals increases psychological and social wellbeing (Kweon, Sullivan and Wiley, 1998) and overall social relationships (Douglas et al., 2017).

Social ties and a sense of community are also beneficial to groups of people and communities, not just individuals (Lee et al., 2015), providing 'social-control' within a UGS which supports police monitoring for undesirable behavior (Kuo, Sullivan, Coley, and Brunson, 1998). Weldon et al. (2007) support this capacity building aspect of greenspaces, particularly among young people, noting increased public use can also lead to local stewardship and community-based maintenance. UGS has been shown to reduce negative social behavior such as aggression and violence by instilling social cohesion and social identity (Dempsey, Brown, and Bramley, 2012).

### 1.2.2. Physical wellbeing benefits

Literature has shown the positive and direct benefits to human physical health arising from use of and interaction with UGS and include concepts of physical health, obesity reduction, increased recovery rates, and others (e.g. Ma et al., 2019; Kondo et al., 2018; Akpinar, 2016; Ward Thompson, 2011; Tyrväinen et al., 2005; Cooper-Marcus, 2005). Interestingly, some studies indicate that the benefits of outdoor GS are more substantial than those from indoor physical activity such as gyms and stationary bicycles with similar intensity (Pretty et al., 2005), which may be due to the greater positive psychological effect UGS provide. Studies have also shown higher rates of healing when hospitalized with the presence of GS (Cooper-Marcus, 2005) and reduced mortality (Heo and Bell, 2019). (Kaplan and Kaplan, 2011) noted that without exposure to GS humans suffer stress. Stress can produce physical symptoms such as headaches, pains and sore muscles, insomnia, and lead to colds or infections.

### 1.2.3. Psychological wellbeing benefits

A significant body of work by Rachel and Stephen Kaplan (1995) focused on attention restoration theory (ART) that provides evidence that UGS not only reduce mental fatigue and stress, important components for human wellbeing and quality of life, but restore a person's capacity to pay attention, two critical components to effective human functioning in the modern world. Similar to ART, Hartig (2004) refers to 'mental restoration' as important for human wellbeing. Both of these concepts evolved from Ulrich's (1983) psychophysiological stress reduction framework (Kaplan, 2002; Korpela et al., 2001). Recent studies correlate that more UGS results in increased mental health and lower levels of stress (Vujcic et al., 2019; Dzhambov et al., 2018)

A variety of UGS have been shown to provide psychological benefits, including both naturalistic UGS typologies as well as more anthropic ones (Grafius et al., 2018; Park et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2002). Additional psychological benefits of UGS interaction include reduction in depression (Astell-Burt & Feng, 2019), reduction in ADHD in children (McCormick,

2017), increased peacefulness and tranquility (Marafa et al., 2018), and fewer reported stress related illnesses (Reklaitiene et al., 2014). Furthermore, studies report that, even without direct interaction, just seeing a UGS can provide similar psychological and health benefits (Hitchings, 2013; Maas et al., 2009; Ulrich, 1983).

This research will focus on the social, physical, and psychological HWB benefits received from interaction with UGS, focusing on the city or urban context. These three wellbeing constructs and their associated benefits span the spectrum of critical dimensions of HWB found within the human-nature relationships of UGS. Although imperfections remain and interrelatedness is overt, these serve the purpose of categorizing the types of benefits and interaction with UGS that affect HWB to the best degree possible.

To date, much of the literature within the context of subjective HWB benefits and UGS has been confined to the more naturalistic characteristics of UGS (e.g. their sense of wildness or naturalness). Cities have multiple dimensions; so too do their UGS, facilitating diverse scenarios for interaction. Place based research on HWB has always proved difficult to correlate; understanding where and for whom UGS and other environments provide which specific benefit is complex. As argued by Lee and Maheswaran (2011), research must consider a broader range of factors to arrive at a better understanding of the causal mechanisms behind the multi-functional benefits that UGS yield. The work of Huerta & Utomo (2021), Sharifi et al. (2021), Navarrete-Hernandez & Laffan (2019), Gehl (2010), Giles-Corti et al. (2005) assessed subjective measures within UGS affecting HWB. Although most of these studies are inherently associated to UGS preference, they hold significant meanings specific to urban planning and the relational measures or assessments which can be applied.

### 1.3. Transactional relationships: Affordance Theory as a framework for studying human wellbeing and urban greenspace interaction

The evidence that UGS positively affect human wellbeing HWB is convincing but research is not unequivocal as to the mechanisms or processes that underscore the relationship (e.g. Korpela et al., 2014; Van Herzele and de Vries, 2012; Maas et al., 2009). Place based research on HWB has always proved difficult to measure and correlate; understanding where and for whom UGS and other environments provide which specific benefit is complex.

James J. Gibson and his wife, Eleanor, first proposed the concept of 'affordances' to describe how humans interact with their environment. Gibson stated that an affordance is a functionally significant property of the physical environment. Affordances are an 'opportunity for action' (Heft, 2001). Importantly, however, an affordance is not achieved until there is an interaction of the individual with the environment. Affordance, therefore, is both a physical characteristic of the landscape and a perceived characteristic of the individual; an affordance is met when the individual's characteristics and activity is supported or intention fulfilled by the environment's characteristics.

The theory of affordance, originating in the field of perceptual psychology, is finding increasing popularity in a variety of disciplines, particularly in the area of urban planning and urban design. Due to advances in technology and interdisciplinary theoretical relationships, the application of affordance theory has evolved and is able to reduce the cognitive influence, that is, the human-based perception, toward more functional and direct relations (Ciavola et al., 2015; Sun et al., 2020; Pyysiäinen, 2021). Affordance Theory provides a more integrated framework to analyze the individual-



environment relationship within urban contexts than the Capability Theory (Sen, 1985) which focus on an individual capacities a less on the functional relationship. Affordances are not passive, they exist through action and dynamic relation (Menatti and Casado da Rocha, 2016). Hartig (1993) refers to these mutually dependent landscapes of affordance as ‘transactional’ (Ittelson, 1996). Within this transactionalist perspective (Heft, 2010), the complex dynamic relationship between individuals and the environment is mutual.

Affordance theory is utilized in many objectivist perspectives on the human–nature relationship. Affordances, viewed as properties, often focus on elements or objects within the landscape. For example, a bench affords sitting in a much more accommodating way than a garbage can. But a bench offers more affordances than just sitting—for a human, it can be used to stretch legs over the back rest, it can provide a napping or sleeping surface, a social or solitary, resting place. A bench even provides shelter from rain or snow to small animals and birds. Though there are considered four categories of affordances (Gaver, 1991)—potential, perceived, utilized, and shaped—it is the functional affordance, the utilized or “actualized affordance” (Kyttä, 2002) that occurs after interaction with a UGS can be identified and documented, that is, the HWB benefit received through interaction. Affordances are “properties in the environment that have functional significance for an individual” (Heft, 2010, p. 18). Affordances, thus, indicate possibilities for action, particularly physical action or interaction, such as running or playing football, but also include passive interaction (Kyttä, 2004) such as observation or viewing, where sitting in an area may offer an expansive view of the landscape.

Overall, affordance theory’s transactional relationship and the human’s active role in the environment is thus a renewed theory to adequately study this critical relationship, thereby informing urban design, landscape management, and planning policy. Affordances within the landscape are physically tangible, and the process of action and engagement with greenspaces provides the mechanism to measure CES and HWB benefits. In other words, in order to fulfill a goal or objective within the landscape, the cognitive decision-making process guides this interaction (Pezzulo and Cisek, 2016). But it is the specific physical properties and characteristics of an environment, here an UGS, which invites a specific action; hence the mechanism for the causal relationship between intentional action and outcome. This functional, responsive feedback to a premeditated action is the mechanism which thus actuates the UGS–HWB relationship.

In this study’s context, affordances are not an abstract concept but the instrument and structure (i.e., mechanism) to more objectively document this interaction than traditional perception and cognitive-based measures (i.e., abstract measures). Thus, the transactional paradigm and its relational mechanism of “interaction” as expressed within affordance theory provide a model to measure explicit “in situ” actions. Such a ‘goal-oriented’ operational affordance model provides for clear (i.e., transactional) experiences within the landscape and is useful for the study in determining the functional affordance properties of the UGS, and how individuals use the landscape and its GS to enhance their physical, social, and psychological wellbeing. For example, Kyttä (2002) applied affordance toward another functional aspect of the landscape—the social aspects of HWB in children such as interaction and bonding. Similarly, Clark and Uzzell (2006) presented the town center as an important space for teenagers due to the social opportunities it affords. Affordance theory applications are not limited to children’s environments; studies have utilized greenspaces, rivers and streams, and other natural, semi-natural, semiurban, and urban environments (Said and Bakar, 2005; Ward- Thompson and Travlou, 2009; Araujo et al., 2019). In summary, viewing ecosystem services and cultural ecosystem services within the context of UGS and HWB interaction allow examination into the human–nature relationship through the transactional perspective found

within affordance theory (Gibson, 1979).

#### 1.4. Measuring human wellbeing transactional benefits through SoftGIS

The theoretical framework of the affordance-based paradigm moves beyond mental constructs or cognitive concepts of preference and perception to account for the normative function of UGS as indicated through use and interaction. Cognition, perception, and preference studies often focus on elements within the landscape, but not the interaction (Hart and Moore, 1973; Sevenant and Antrop, 2009; Zigmunde et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2020). Although behavior can be objectively observed and recorded, there are often no effective, continuous, and safe means to collect user data required in outdoor environments such as UGS. Additionally, it is not possible to accurately measure the affordance received through direct observation, particularly multiple benefits from the same behavior or action (i.e. synergistic effects). As such, direct and indirect behavioral observation (Golicknik, 2005) is limited in its application.

Participatory mapping has been a well-practiced exercise within spatial planning to attach human value and preference to places (Corbett and Keller, 2005) in a variety of contexts and completed with variable levels of success. Only relatively recently, however, has geospatial technology provided a more explicit means to express relationships between humans and place (Jankowski et al., 2016). Geo-questionnaires, found within constructs of participatory geographical information systems (PGIS) and public participation geographical information systems (PPGIS) (Dunn, 2007), involve a real-time, map-based interactional means to convey this relationship and promote communicative planning. The map-based methodology of SoftGIS developed by Kahila and Kytä (2009) is a geo-coded or spatially explicit social survey and most directly appropriates real-world phenomena such as human behavior and interaction. PPGIS questionnaires within the literature explore the various qualities of the landscape primarily through preferences or other value-based perceptions of spaces in order to gather information and inform planning decisions. However, this subjective methodology allows for misinterpretation and the synthesis of unreliable data.

#### 1.5. Cultural ecosystem services, participatory mapping, and urban planning

Though there have been previous attempts to map CES (Norton et al., 2012; Albert et al., 2014), the application of a comprehensive CES approach to landscape analysis, public knowledge, and decision making is still lacking in the planning process (Forkink, 2017; Maes and Jacobs, 2017; Cortinovis and Geneletti, 2019). Most research studies on CES utilizing participatory methods have been conceptual and exploratory (e.g., Opdam et al., 2015; Mascarenhas et al., 2016) and lack specific mechanisms to include the CES concept in urban planning actions (Kabisch, 2015; Bezák et al., 2017; Rall et al., 2019). Additionally, CES service measurement is challenging utilizing traditional ES methods such as economic valuations and quantification (Chan et al., 2011) and the qualitative data collected lack rigorous statistical analysis or spatial correlation (Milcu et al., 2013).

A review by Cheng et al. (2019) assessed 20 CES evaluation methods within the literature and concluded that

participatory mapping techniques which focus on the interactions between components were most suited to identify CES. The PPGIS is most often utilized as a social valuation or a preference method, but has been shown to be effective in assessing CES (Brown and Fagerholm, 2015) including UGS access and recreation use (Paracchini et al., 2014; Teff-Seker and Orenstein, 2018)) and landscape conservation or management qualities (Canedoli et al., 2017; Mukul et al., 2017). Most PPGIS studies focus on experiential aspects of landscape such as “sense of place” (García-Díez et al., 2020) and simple spatial location (Mascarenhas et al., 2016). Furthermore, only a handful of PPGIS approaches have studied CES within urban environments (Wang et al., 2019; Ronchi, 2021).

Literature’s different methods used for ES classification and mapping limit the comparability of outcomes and call for a more consistent but flexible approach (Crossman et al., 2013; Mascarenhas et al., 2015; Fisher and Brown, 2015; Maes et al., 2018). Overall, the interactional affordances for CES received from the landscape and UGSs are underdeveloped in the literature and participatory mapping; traditional PGIS studies are only able to capture perceptions, opinions, or comparative analysis (Viirret et al., 2019; Jones et al., 2020). Though the use of the PGIS as a participatory planning tool to document ES has increased recently, most studies focus on ES location and little on enhancing provision or actual use (Neugarten et al., 2018) and outcome benefits. Importantly, CES including HWB recognize that people choose where to spend their leisure time based on various greenspace characteristics and qualities (Gee and Burkhard, 2010; Lankia et al., 2015), thus the causal relationship between action and outcome is measurable.

The human–nature link exemplified within urban greenspaces and wellbeing are important components of city living and urban planning (Raymond et al., 2018). The continued development of spatial participatory techniques for practical CES assessment including the various constructs of human wellbeing is needed (Jones et al., 2020). Frameworks for capturing spatial interactions and quantifying CES benefits are important for planning and policy in urban regions (Nenko and Galaktionova, 2021). The PPGIS has been shown to influence policy and decision making (Boeraeve et al., 2018).


This study explores the UGS–HWB relationship through a PPGIS questionnaire within the case study urban region of Helsinki, Finland; the Helsinki urban region. To achieve this, a novel methodology to capture the transactional or affordance based HWB benefits of UGS interaction including CES is operationalized. The use of SoftGIS documents specific human–nature interactions, here, UGSs and the transactional benefit outcome for HWB. This unique application of SoftGIS allows for a more direct correlation between landscape and CES and the interactional relationships between users and greenspaces. This study’s research framework and results serve to inform spatial planning and policy through place-based citizen CES mapping and the knowledge of actual UGS use, not preference. The unique participatory approach to data interaction developed in this research has the potential to be adapted for CES selection in other strategic planning contexts.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The UGS-HWB relationship is theorized, analyzed, and measured through a modified affordance model and is operationalized through the use of a public participation geographic information system (PPGIS) – SoftGIS - which activates the UGS - HWB transactional relationship through data collection.

## 2.1. Study area

Helsinki is the largest and most dense city in Finland. It forms the core of the Helsinki Urban Region (HUR) (Finnish: Helsingin seutu). The HUR is defined as the four (4) municipalities of Helsinki, Vantaa, Espoo and Kauniainen and is considered an integrated urban region. The HUR has a total population of 1,491,845 inhabitants (2018), land area of 770.26 km<sup>2</sup> (City information and statistics, 2018) and a population density of 1,936.81/km<sup>2</sup>. See Figure 1.



**Figure 1. The Helsinki Urban Region.** Darker areas indicate urban population density, lighter areas are less densely populated areas. No density metrics are known, this is a diagram only to show the spatial relationship between the urban areas and the less urban areas only. Source: Author

The HUR is undergoing continued urban expansion and density increase. This urban development has put more pressure on the existing infrastructure as well as the remaining greenspaces. Continued planning and management of the HUR's UGS is required to maintain Finland's high ranking in many wellbeing indices (e.g. OECD Better Life Index, UNICEF, UN, Economist Intelligence Unit). Additionally, the New Economics Foundation's (NEF) National Accounts of



Wellbeing project profiled Finland as one of the highest in Europe (Michaelson et al., 2009).

## 2.2. Questionnaire distribution

The distribution of the questionnaire was completed through digital methods. The digital, on-line survey questionnaire, that is, an internet-based approach, allowed the questionnaire to reach multiple and diverse respondents. The questionnaire's digital distribution could then be circulated and shared electronically and enables wide distribution in an efficient and cost-effective manner. The questionnaire's "hot-link" or URL was distributed via direct email and social media and included both English and Finnish language versions. This questionnaire distribution did not provide a "hard-copy" or paper means though efforts were made to accommodate questionnaire completion.

In order to reach a wide spectrum of users, a series of publicly available email distribution lists were collected including government and municipal agencies. The email included a brief summary of the project and the questionnaire survey link or URL and was sent to local council members, municipal and national employees, agency members, NGO's, university groups, and government-funded agencies (n = 181). These direct emails asked for these individuals to not only complete the survey themselves but to forward to their constituents, community members, employees, friends, and other interested individuals or groups.

The primary social media distribution means, Facebook, is highly used in Finland and Helsinki has many existing Facebook pages and Facebook groups shared among the population. A Facebook page and Facebook group were created specifically for this project and included a brief summary of the project and the survey link or URL. These were shared among other similar Facebook pages and groups including councils, parks, social and recreational groups, gyms, community centers, churches, and other interest groups as available.

Last, four separate sessions were set up at community centers with a laptop and internet connection for visitors to complete the survey. The survey was completely anonymous and confidential and received ethics approval, opting-out could occur at any time by the participant. The survey was available for 4 weeks during the summer.

## 2.3. Questionnaire data collection - SoftGIS

The primary data collection tool for this research was a geo-questionnaire which functioned as a geocoded or spatially explicit, internet-based survey tool to measure spatial-based human behavior within the greenspaces. Geo-questionnaires are a specific type of participatory geographical information systems and public participation geographical information systems (PPGIS) (Dunn, 2007) often used to document geo-location based interaction to inform a diverse set of questions and activities within communities (Rantanen & Kahila, 2009).

The survey's data collection was operationalized through an on-line, interactive, geo-location based questionnaire, SoftGIS, as produced by Maptionnaire and Mapita, Inc. SoftGIS is a web-based, interactive tool that allows participants to map and evaluate their interaction or experience with that space. Unlike traditional empirical data collection and sampling captured exclusively through a survey, this research's questionnaire was digitally map-based (i.e. internet based) and

focused on collecting biophysical-based, geospatial data of specific UGS simultaneously with human-based data to inform the human-nature relationship. Specifically, this study's geo-questionnaire accrued both qualitative and quantitative data simultaneously, including socio-demographic information, UGS use interactions and those benefits achieved, and the UGS physical locations for those interactions (i.e. geocoded and map-based). The SoftGIS configuration for this research was designed to explore the interrelationship of both spatial and a-spatial data. The questionnaire's data collection was formatted into three distinct sections to collect data simultaneously on individual factors and greenspace interactions: respondent socio-demographic data, greenspace interaction or location data, and human wellbeing transaction data. It was estimated it takes 6-10 minutes to complete.

### 2.3.1. Part 1 - Socio-demographic data

The first question asked respondents to identify on the map (geo-locate and drop a marker) their *Home* location. Once placed, a pop-up question asked respondents for their age, gender, dog ownership, and car ownership. See Figure 2. This questionnaire did not ask for any socio-economic data such as income and education level. The desired age for respondents was from 18-75. This range estimates active persons able to utilize UGS while also being of age to be documented in the demographic data collected. Owning a car allows individuals to travel to a UGS, though other forms of transportation exist, and the spatial distribution of UGS in the HUR is notable and diverse.



**Find your Home**

Let's locate your Home.

Click on the Red Marker below.

You will then see the Map and you can move the marker or the Map to place it on your home location.

Your home can be anywhere on the map, not just inside the Green outline.

You can zoom in or out and move around the Map using your mouse and touchpad or the buttons on the Map.

Press **SAVE** to drop the Marker on your home.

**Place the Marker on your home**

Once you have located your Home, a pop-up question will appear. Click **SAVE ANSWERS** to finish your responses. Click **CLOSE** to start over. Once you have located your Home on the Map, click the **NEXT** button below.

**Place the Marker on your home**

**What is your age?**

☐ 18-24  
☐ 25-34  
☐ 35-44  
☐ 45-54  
☐ 55-64  
☐ 65-75

**What is your Gender?**

...

**Do you or your family own a Dog?**

☐ Yes  
☐ No

**Do you and your family own a Car?**

☐ Yes  
☐ No

**Save**

Figure 2. *SoftGIS Questionnaire – Part 1. Geo-locate home and socio-demographic information. Source: Author*

### 2.3.2. Part 2 - Greenspace interaction data

Part 2 used a series of questions designed to correlate specific, geo-coded UGS locations to HWB affordances received from interaction. It first asked respondents to identify on the map (i.e. geo-locate and drop a marker) their three greenspaces they most often visit in and around Helsinki within the same map-based format. See Figure 3. Having done



so, they were prompted with a similar pop-up window to pick one of three activities they did within the UGS. These answers were later coded to relate to Physical Wellbeing, Social Wellbeing and Psychological Wellbeing.




Figure 3. SoftGIS Questionnaire – Part 2. Geo-locate green spaces respondents like to visit. Source: Author

### 2.3.3. Part 3 - Human wellbeing transaction data

Once the marker was dropped on the UGS, a pop-up window appeared requesting the respondent to pick from a set of activities or interactions reflective of functional affordances they do within the UGS. These responses were then coded post-hoc to specific HWB benefits – physical, social or psychological as noted in Table 1. In this regard, the geomarkers represent activity or human interaction factors or affordances through behavior.

**Table 1. Part 3 – Respondents were asked to select which activities they do in the selected UGS.** More than one could be selected. The coded human wellbeing benefit to interaction type is noted in the italicized and capitalized words, and was not visible to respondents.

***What do you typically do at this Green Space when you visit? Please check all that apply:***

- 1 = Play sports and games or ride the bike. (PHYSICAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 2 = Sit and relax, read, be peaceful and enjoy nature. (PSYCHOLOGICAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 3 = Get together with friends and family, have picnics. (SOCIAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 4 = Walk the dog. (PHYSICAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 5 = Bring the kids to play. (SOCIAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 6 = Socialize with others, catch-up or gossip. (SOCIAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 7 = Walk, run, jog or hike. (PHYSICAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 8 = View wildlife and be in quiet natural areas. (PSYCHOLOGICAL HWB BENEFIT)
- 9 = Garden and Farm. (PSYCHOLOGICAL HWB BENEFIT)

### 3. Results

All collected data was processed using Mapita Software within SoftGIS. All data was coordinated to the respondent number. The results came within Microsoft Excel .csv format. The effective individual sample size of respondents was  $n = 162$ . The effective UGS sample size was  $n = 347$  or the total # of UGS markers placed with a HWB affordance.

#### 3.1. Part 1 - Socio-demographic results

Table 2 presents a summary of statistical results for the 162 individual responses. No weighing of responses and no inter-relational data analysis was conducted for these results. The results indicate the predominant profile of the respondents were male (52%) aged between 35–44 (26%) whose family did not own a dog (90%) and the household does not own a car (55%). The age results of the sample are mostly distributed evenly with 16 % between 18 and 24, 24 % between 25 and 34, 26 % between 35 and 44, 21 % between 45 and 54 but lesser on the older ages with 11% between 55 and 64, and finally two percent between 65 and 75. These results are similar to the current age statistics of Helsinki and Finland with 25–29 year old individuals holding the largest age group with an overall average age of the population is 40.7 years in Helsinki, and 42.9 in Finland (Urban Research and Statistics, 2019).

**Table 2. Part 1**  
**- Socio-**  
**demographic**  
**results.** Individual  
respondents ( $n=162$ )

<b>Gender</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	84	52%
Female	78	48%
<b>Dog</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	16	10%
No	146	90%
<b>Car</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	73	45%
No	89	55%
<b>Age</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
18-24	26	16.10%
25-34	39	24.20%
35-44	42	25.80%
45-54	34	21.00%
55-64	18	11.30%
65-75	3	1.60%

### 3.2. Part 2 - Greenspace interaction results

In Table 3, a simple UGS typology table was developed which coalesced the CORINE Land Cover Level II classification data (2018) to the best degree possible. This table was for informational purposes to qualify the UGS locations and no land cover data analysis was completed. Tables 6 through 8 indicate the certain types of UGS respondents visit –predominately Woodlands and Grasslands (37%), Park, Garden and Amenity UGS (13%), and Other Natural or Semi-Natural Greenspaces (13%) – are most often accessed by Walking (51%). Respondents least visited Cemeteries, Churchyards and Civic Spaces (0.5%). This result does not tell us if there is a high frequency or availability, overall, of each of those typologies of UGS within the region, only those which respondents indicated. The most often visited UGS were Lamasaari Island (15%), Paloheina Woodlands (10%), and an unnamed UGS near Fastholma (5%).

**Table 3. Part 1 - Greenspace interaction results.**

#	%	<b>UGS Type</b>
143	41%	Woodland & Grassland
45	13%	Other Natural or Semi-Natural GS
76	22%	Parks, Garden, & Amenity
35	10%	Green Corridor
13	3.50%	Community Garden, Allotment, & City Farm
12	3.50%	Outdoor Sports & Children's Play Area
24	7%	Cemetery, Churchyard, Civic Spaces
#	%	<b>UGS Location</b>
100	29%	Lamasaari Island
76	22%	Paloheina Woodlands
34	10%	Fastholma Green Space
20	6%	Kivinnoka Green Space
20	3%	Uutela Recreation Area
20	6%	Vantaa River near Silvola
1 (x77)	1%	All other UGS
#	%	<b>Mode of Access</b>
178	51%	Walking
104	30%	Bike
38	11%	Car
24	7%	Bus
4	1%	Train
0	0%	Tram

### 3.3. Part 3 - Human wellbeing transaction results

The questionnaire's UGS marker placement allowed for multiple affordances to the same marker. This simply means each marker was allowed to have multiple responses for an individual's use or interaction with the UGS attached to it as part of the questionnaire format. Not all questions allowed for multiple responses and the results were not weighted, just simply counted as one of the three types of HWB benefit; each UGS marker as noted by an individual could have no more than three HWB benefits attached to it, and only one of each. As such, the UGS could have multiple uses or HWB benefits assigned to it, similar to the way UGS function for people in the real world. For example, although there were 347 individual GS locations provided by respondents, the total number of HWB markers analyzed was 385. The results show that 222 respondents visited UGS for physical HWB benefit (29%), 50 for a social benefit (13%), and 222 for a psychological benefit (58%).

### 3.4. Data Analyses



A series of inter-relational analyses were completed with the data. Of the 385 responses, females and males chose similarly in their HWB benefits when visiting a UGS. Males chose physical benefits (42%) then psychological (32%) followed by social (26%). Females chose physical benefits (41%) then psychological (35%) followed by social (24%). Age wise, the largest group of respondents, aged 25-34, visited a UGS for a physical benefit (17%). The physical benefit UGS visited most often was by the age group of 25-34 (17%) followed by 35-44 (15%) with lowest 65-75 (1%). For social benefits, again 25-34 (9%) and 35-44 (6%) with lowest 65-75 (0%). For psychological benefits, also 25-34 (12%) and 35-44 (10%) with lowest 65-75 (0.5%).

Comparatively, based on the highest frequency results within the descriptive statistics, male respondents (42%), aged 25-34 (highest frequency age group) visited UGS most often for physical affordances. Additionally, 51% of respondents whose household owned a car visited a UGS for a physical HWB benefit. This result does not indicate if they drove there in order to receive a HWB benefit, only the status of car ownership.

The respondents in this research had distinct patterns of UGS interaction. 41% of all genders and ages predominately visited Woodland, Grassland, and Park UGS typologies. Furthermore, the 35-44 age group respondents mostly visited Woodland and Grassland UGS typologies for a physical HWB benefit (66%). Prior research has shown that dog ownership increases UGS visitation frequency (Arnberger et al., 2022). Although the suggestion from this research is that dog ownership does not influence UGS use, dog ownership is very low, making generalization difficult. However, dog owners primarily visited UGS with their dog for psychological HWB benefits (75%).

### 3.5. Geospatial mapping of human wellbeing and urban greenspace interaction

The spatial results of the Soft-GIS questionnaire illustrate the geo-located data, and when combined with statistical analyses, allowed the production of intensity or 'heat maps'. This research illustrates its geospatial statistical findings utilizing intensity maps through two distinct approaches: concentration of geo-markers, or points, and distribution of point values. The use of heat maps, often referred to as density maps or cluster heat maps, provides a graphic illustration of the geographic variables and values summarized from this research's analysis and is a statistical analysis technique often utilized in cartography and urban planning.

Figure 4-top illustrates each geo-marker location as represented by the diamond symbol and color coded to a specific HWB affordance or group of HWB affordances (See Map Key within Figure). Figure 4-bottom illustrates those same geo-markers as distributed by concentration. Each map, thus, illustrates the geographical location of specific HWB affordances provided through UGS interaction. These maps serve as a general illustration to then analyze specific UGS locations and UGS spatial characteristics at a more refined scale. Simply, these heat maps help visualize the spatial distribution and frequencies of the various UGS geo-markers and interaction patterns for HWB benefits.








Figure 4. Human wellbeing affordance locations (top) and intensity map (bottom). Source: Author



Specific HWB affordance maps provide a more focused comprehension of UGS and affordance relationships. Figure 5-7 illustrate the three HWB affordances and their geo-marker locations and intensity maps. Table 4 summarizes the three HWB affordances.

**Table 4. Human wellbeing affordances.**

Individual Psychological UGS affordances (n=112) provided by respondents. Individual Social UGS affordances (n=50) provided by respondents. Individual Physical UGS affordances (n=222) provided by respondents.

<b>Psychological HWB Benefit</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Psychological ONLY</i>	53	47%
<i>Psychological + Physical</i>	38	34%
<i>Psychological + Social</i>	6	5%
<i>Psychological + Physical + Social</i>	15	14%
<b>Social HWB Benefit</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Social ONLY</i>	7	14%
<i>Social + Physical</i>	22	44%
<i>Social + Psychological</i>	6	12%
<i>Psychological + Physical + Social</i>	15	30%
<b>Physical HWB Benefit</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<i>Physical ONLY</i>	147	66%
<i>Physical + Social</i>	22	10%
<i>Physical + Psychological</i>	38	17%
<i>Psychological + Physical + Social</i>	15	7%

### 3.5.1. Psychological Affordances

As shown in Figure 5 and Table 4, there were a total of 112 geo-markers indicating a UGS which provided a psychological affordance. 47% of those were unique to only a psychological HWB benefit. The highest multi-functional psychological HWB UGS also provided a physical HWB benefit (n=38, 34%). Psychological and social HWG UGS were the least, overall, multi-functional UGS only accounting for six geo-markers.







Figure 5. Psychological human wellbeing affordance locations and intensity map. Source: Author



### 3.5.2. Social Affordances

As shown in Figure 6 and Table 4, of the total 50 social HWB geo-markers, 7 indicated a UGS which provided only a social affordance (14%). The highest multi-functional social HWB UGS also provided a physical HWB benefit ( $n=22$ , 44%).









Figure 6. Social human wellbeing affordance locations and intensity map. Source: Author

### 3.5.3. Physical Affordances

As shown in Figure 7 and Table 4, of the total 220 physical HWB geo-markers, 112 indicated a UGS which provided only a physical affordance (66%). The highest multi-functional physical HWB UGS also provided a psychological HWB benefit (n=38, 17%).







Figure 7. Physical human wellbeing affordance locations and intensity map. Source: Author

Table 5 and Figure 8 illustrate the frequency of the UGS typology and its associated HWB benefit. Generally, respondents most often visited Woodlands and Grassland UGS types for Psychological HWB benefits (46%) and Physical HWB benefits (44%), and Parks, Gardens and Amenity UGS types for Social HWB benefits (34%).




### Psychological HWB and GS Typology




- Parks, Gardens and Amenity GS
- Woodlands, Grasslands and AG
- Other Natural or Semi-Natural GS
- Outdoor Sports and Children Play Areas
- Green Corridor
- Community Gardens, Allotments, City Farms
- Other - Cemeteries, Churchards, Civic Spaces

### Social HWB and GS Typology



- Parks, Gardens and Amenity GS
- Woodlands, Grasslands and AG
- Other Natural or Semi-Natural GS
- Outdoor Sports and Children Play Areas
- Green Corridor
- Community Gardens, Allotments, City Farms
- Other - Cemeteries, Churchards, Civic Spaces

### Physical HWB and GS Typology



- Parks, Gardens and Amenity GS
- Woodlands, Grasslands and AG
- Other Natural or Semi-Natural GS
- Outdoor Sports and Children Play Areas
- Green Corridor
- Community Gardens, Allotments, City Farms
- Other - Cemeteries, Churchards, Civic Spaces

Figure 8. Human wellbeing affordance locations and urban greenspace typologies. Source: Author

Table 5. Human wellbeing affordances and urban greenspace typologies. Individual UGS affordances (n=385) provided by respondents

HWB AFFORDANCE	Parks, Gardens & Amenity	Woodland & Grassland	Other Natural & Semi-Natural	Outdoor Sports & Children's Play Areas	Green Corridor	Community Garden, Allotment, & City Farm	Cemeteries, Churchyards & Civic Spaces
Psychological	15%	46%	14%	2%	12%	1%	9%
Social	34%	27%	11%	8%	8%	5%	6%
Physical	21%	44%	10%	4%	13%	1%	7%

In summary, these results suggest, generally, people who live in the Helsinki Urban Region, will visit certain types of UGS in order to achieve their affordance goals – here, predominately Woodland and Grasslands. This result does not tell if there is a high frequency, overall of those UGS typologies within the region, only which type the respondents visit. Furthermore, this population will, most often, visit a UGS of any typology for a Psychological HWB benefit. Of the total 347 selected UGS provided by the respondents, 77 or 22.2% were a singular marker and not shared by other respondents. This indicates respondents select uniquely when it comes to UGS visitation.

## 4. Discussion

Within this UGS – HWB relationship, interesting patterns emerge. The geo-questionnaire results and analyses not only provide insight to which UGS spatial characteristics are more related to specific HWB benefits or affordances, but which type of HWB affordances are the most associated to UGS interaction. A brief discussion of the results and their findings will be structured through two distinct yet interrelated formats: First, a discussion of the specific HWB affordances as related to the specific UGS characteristics and attributes and second, a discussion of those multi-functional UGS characteristics and attributes which provided for social, psychological, and physical wellbeing benefits simultaneously.

### 4.1. Human wellbeing and urban greens characteristic relationships

The Soft-GIS results illustrate the geographical location of specific UGS where an affordance was received. This allowed further analysis of these UGSs focusing on their specific physical characteristics (e.g., type, size, shape, and density) and greenspace qualities (e.g., amenities, level of naturalness, level of maintenance, and visibility). An orthophoto, visual review of specific UGS as well as an on-site field visit was completed by the author, considered an expert in greenspace planning, in order to provide a simple summary of common visible spatial characteristics. The physical features of a UGS and the benefits achieved by individuals interacting with those UGSs provide a more direct means to synthesize this relationship and the UGS's CES performance.

#### 4.1.1. Psychological wellbeing UGS characteristics

Of the 112 total Psychological HWB UGS markers, the most frequent was the *Ramsinranta Peninsula* (n= 26, 23%). This is a large area which includes nature reserves, forests, wetlands, beaches, national forests, and other greenspace types. This UGS is considered a Woodland typology and part of the overall Woodlands, Grasslands, and Agricultural UGS



typology in which psychological-based responses were noted in 46% of those locations.

This UGS, overall, was large in size, with an irregular shape, and multiple edges along the Gulf of Finland. It is close to a major highway and many housing developments. There are many designated hiking or walking trails within this UGS with negligible vertical elevation change. This UGS was equally visited by males and females, but mostly by those aged 35-44, with no family dog or family vehicle. There is a diversity in vegetation types and heights in this UGS, varying from water edge to dense evergreen forest. There are minimal anthropic elements in this UGS such as few benches, tables, restrooms, plazas, and lighting. In this regard, psychological HWB affordances are strongly influenced by more naturalistic, informal vegetation qualities and environment, as shown in Figure 9.



Figure 9. Beach-related walking when experience characterizes. Developmental Design, Oshkosh, Tex. DiscMap (2020). Developmental Design, Oshkosh, Tex. DiscMap (2020). Developmental Design, Oshkosh, Tex. DiscMap (2020).

**Figure 9. Psychological wellbeing urban greenspace characteristics. Helsinginranta Peninsula.** Ornithophoto Top – Bingmaps (2022). Perspective Photo Bottom – GoogleEarth StreetView (2022)

These results support other research findings in Finland. For example, surveys have reported that proximity to nature is considered important in housing developments and residents usually favor natural environments (Kahila & Kyttä, 2006; Korpela and Yen, 2007; Tyrväinen et al., 2007). In summary, the results show that HUR respondents were able to mentally relax, de-stress and enjoy nature more in a UGS that exhibits naturalistic characteristics.-

#### 4.1.2. Social wellbeing UGS characteristics

Of the 50 total Social HWB UGS markers, the most frequent was *Hesperia Park* (n=7, 14%). This is a small urban park located next to the central Helsinki train station and Botanical Garden. It is also connected to the Gulf of Finland is focused around its central water terminus feature. There is an abundance of paved and unpaved walking paths and contains numerous well-maintained facilities and amenities. It is mostly grassed with few areas of multiple tree groupings. It is openly visible from within and outside. The vegetation is well manicured and maintained and not considered 'wild'; this UGS is considered a Park typology. It is simple in shape and few edges and most edges adjoin an urban element such as a building or roadway. This UGS was equally visited by males and females, but mostly by those aged 25-34, with no family dog or family vehicle, as shown in Figure 10.





**Figure 10. Social wellbeing urban greenspace characteristics.** *Hesperia Park*. Orthophoto Top – BingMaps (2022). Photo Bottom – Author

The other social HWB UGS markers noted similarities among the results including less naturalistic, highly maintained, simple in shape, and small to moderate in size. Overall, this evidence suggests that the respondents felt these HWB aspects more within UGS that were these types of UGSs afforded a means of social and socio-cultural sharing conducted not within an indoor setting, but within the landscape, a landscape of greenspaces which Finns strongly

associate with their identity (Raivo, 2002). The relationship between UGS and social HWB findings supports aspects of community and personal identity, social cohesion or a 'sense of community,' cultural-value sharing, family bonding, and instilling a sense of belonging among others.

#### 4.1.3 Physical wellbeing UGS characteristics

Of the 147 total Physical HWB UGS markers, the most frequent was the *UGS near Toyrynummi* (n=22, 15%). This UGS was linear in shape, a Grassland land cover typology, contiguous or physically connected to another GS typology, with an irregular shape, and multiple edges. This UGS is close to a major highway and also a few dense housing developments. Importantly, it borders a linear trail along the Vantaa River, likely indicating hiking/running/cycling use. This UGS was equally visited by males and females, but mostly by those aged 25-34, with no family dog or vehicle, as shown in Figure 11.





**Figure 11. Physical wellbeing urban greenspace characteristics.** *Greenspace near Toyrynummi.* Orthophoto Top – BingMaps (2022).  
Perspective Bottom – GoogleEarth StreetView (2021)

These findings are strengthened by other UGS studies in Helsinki. UGS considered ‘safe’ are positive mediators in resident’s participation in outdoor physical activities (Pietilä et al., 2015). Furthermore, this area is considered a suburb

and not part of the urban city centre; thereby promoting a higher frequency of 'close-to-home' recreation activities (Neuvonen et al., 2007). Natural environments in Finland are also considered to positively influence recreational use of UGS (Semenzato et al., 2011). As this UGS includes a wide, multi-use path for bicycles, it is possible that this is considered a commuting route for which bicycle activity is considered a physical benefit.

## 4.2. Multi-affordance urban greenspaces


The geo-data analysis indicated those UGS which afforded or provided the full suite or all three HWB benefits to respondents – the Physical, Social and Psychological - within the Helsinki Urban Region. There were 15 of these UGS (4%) – these UGS are considered the 'big-hitters' from a human wellbeing interaction perspective. It is these unique UGS which respondents reported a comprehensive set of HWB benefits such as physical exercise, being with friends and family, and relaxing & enjoying nature. Though their frequency is relatively low, these multi-affordance UGS require further discussion.

The 15 multi-beneficial HWB UGS are, generally, large in size when compared to other UGS markers. Most of these UGS were considered a Woodland typology. They also had a sense of privacy with limited visibility within and into the UGS, with many enclosed and more 'private' spaces due to mixed species, randomly situated or 'wild' vegetation. These UGS also seemed adequately maintained (i.e. no overflowing trash bins, mowed grass areas, no damaged paving) with few facilities and amenities such as benches, tables, restrooms and drinking fountains and unpaved paths. Overall, these multi-beneficial UGS were considered physically contiguous to or adjacent to another UGS on at least one side. This means the UGS was part of a larger green structure or group of interconnected UGS. Last, these 15 UGS were often close to a heavily trafficked road allowing easy access from multi-modal transportation. Results show that these multi-functional UGS were most often associated with interactions of Paloheina Woodlands and the Fastholma Greenspace. The author visited these two UGS to visually document and subjectively analyze the UGS spatial characteristics.


The Paloheina Woodlands is the name given for a large, forested greenspace area near the villages of Paloheina and Roihupelto northwest of the Helsinki City Centre as shown in Figure 12. This UGS includes many designated wildlife refuges and is bordered by agricultural lands as well as a golf course, playground, dog park, a fitness center and hockey rink, a memorial park, and the Vantaa River to the north. There are predominately wide unpaved paths suitable for hiking, jogging and biking. It is relatively flat topography is dominated by mixed woodland vegetation and includes a designated old-growth forest area. There is a minimum amount of amenities and facilities within the UGS as well as being moderately maintained. There are dense housing developments on two sides of the UGS with multiple access points. This UGS is in proximity to a major roadway and forms part of the Helsinki Green Fingers.












**Figure 12. Multi-affordance greenspace characteristics.** *Paloheina Woodlands*. Orthophoto Top – BingMaps (2022). Photo Bottom – Author

The Fastholma Greenspace is the name given for a large greenspace area near the villages of Fastholma and Silvola northeast of the Helsinki City Centre, as shown in Figure 13. This area is most often associated with the Lammasaari Peninsula and its large birdwatching area and boardwalk trails. This Grassland UGS typology surrounds an bay from the Gulf of Finland with many wetlands as well as forests. There are agricultural lands and residential housing adjacent as well as a major roadway. The trails are predominately unpaved with few amenities. This UGS also includes a cemetery, a few small beaches, community gardens, cultural museums, and a sports park. There is a small university campus and commercial area on the north edge of the UGS.



**Figure 13. Multi-affordance greenspace characteristics.** *Fastholma Greenspace*. Orthophoto Top – BingMaps (2022).  
Perspective Bottom – GoogleEarth StreetView (2021)

Both these UGS had similar qualities and landscape composition. These UGS lacked, overall, numerous facilities or amenities such as paved paths, lights, trash bins, benches, and toilets as well as designated gathering areas with tables



and weather coverings. Both these UGS are considered natural, not urban; they have characteristics of being wild or had a sense of ruralness to it. These UGS had no formal recreation opportunities (beyond trail walking, wildlife viewing, etc). Though each UGS had a different predominant vegetation type – Woodland and Grassland, the composition was predominately natural or naturalistic. Overall, these UGS lacked a formal spatial composition with minimal to moderate management. It is these qualities of UGS which this study reports as providing the most diverse HWB benefits to residents.

#### 4.3. Summary - Human wellbeing and urban greenspace interaction

The literature has suggested that physical contact with UGS influences HWB by providing psychological restoration, physical interaction, and social opportunities, among many others. This research supports such findings by showing that interaction with UGS supports multiple aspects of HWB. These findings revealed that HUR's greenspaces provided, overall and generally to all users, mostly physical and social human well-being benefits; the psychological benefits such as reduction of stress and mental relaxation were not as frequent in these UGS interactions.

Perhaps not surprising, UGS based HWB benefits are interrelated, with each supporting one another and interacting to facilitate benefits, this is referred to as the *synergistic effect* of interacting with UGS. For example, physical health can be increased through strong social wellbeing (Uchino, 2006). Psychological wellbeing is shown to be more positive with strong social networks (Umberson and Montez, 2010). Physical and mental wellbeing are both components of positive UGS interaction where access, physicality, and mental restoration operate together. Jacobs (1961) demonstrated the correlations between human health and social interaction. Fan, Das and Chen (2011) concluded that parks “*directly promote physical activity, and indirectly mitigate stress via the spaces’ positive impact on social support*” (p. 1209). Similarly, walking, cycling, and other outdoor sports or activities have been shown to improve both physical and psychological wellbeing (Vujcic et al., 2019) and spiritual health (Irvine et al., 2013).

#### 4.4. Study Limitations

Establishing a causal relationship is difficult, as it is complex. Simplistic UGS interventions may, therefore, fail to address the underlying determinants of HWB that are not remediable by urban planning from a spatial perspective. Important greenspace or environmental factors such as accessibility, perception of safety, management quality, and others are key determinants of UGS use and the receipt of benefits. The individual factors affecting this relationship are myriad and future research studies should clarify these such as personality traits and preferences, socio-economic factors, ethnicity, cultural factors, and others. Additionally, respondents may achieve HWB affordances through other means than GS interaction, such as a gym, vacations and travel, work, or social groups so the overall transactional reporting may be skewed. Furthermore, subjective, human based questionnaires are open to response bias or reverse causality as well as confounding variables. Future study design should isolate these and other control variables to the best degree possible. This study did not provide any statistical analysis for the strength of relationships or significance.

The relationship between humans and UGS is also dependent upon the spatial qualities of the landscape. Each landscape, whether remotely rural or distinctly urban provides a diverse and unique array of physical features that in turn provide a wide variety of benefits to humans. A next step to this research's findings includes developing further relational provided by the specific UGS typological spatial and physical characteristics. This paper only provided a simple, subjective analysis; more detail on the qualities and other UGS spatial features would begin to clarify HWB-UGS affordances. As noted by Rietveld and Kiverstein (2014), the qualities, properties, and characteristics of the landscape or UGS are just as important as the behaviors or interactions in any holistic understanding of affordance and this human-nature relationship.

#### 4.5. Implications for urban planning and healthy cities

The overall concept of this papers UGS urban green infrastructure benefits are implemented in urban planning but are often considered by separate governmental entities and policies focusing on singular issues such a recreation, management, public health, or biodiversity (Davies & Laforteza, 2017). As urbanization occurs, the overall structure and characteristics of greenspaces change, so too will the spatial design and management of those greenspaces to deliver services to the changing communities who interact with them. Growing city regions such as Helsinki face choices for land use; competition for UGS, their adequate valuation, and policy-based priorities are common hurdles (Braquinho et al., 2015). The complexity of the landscape, its varied ecosystems, and how the users themselves are experiencing and interacting with them are critical to understand. Continued efforts are required to further identify and clarify the relationship between CES, HWB, and UGS, particularly those removing subjective valuation and integrating a plurality of benefits. Multifunctional valuation approaches such as participatory tools provide a means to obtain intrinsic and relational values beyond the economic-centric "benefits for humans".

This study's results support the trend toward evidence based design approaches such as documenting affordance based UGS distribution, informing management strategies (i.e., wild and natural vs manicured greenspaces), and urban design elements (e.g., inclusion of amenities such as benches and lights). Importantly, the methodology and results can inform multi-disciplinary policy decisions for land use in urbanizing regions. Spatial planning concepts of accessibility, maintenance and management, as well as equitable distribution integrate with the multifunctional concept of green infrastructure and greenspaces in urban areas. Future interventions to increase or improve UGS ecosystem services can deliver positive health and social, for many groups, but there is a need for better inclusion of health and equity outcomes in studies on UGS interventions, and an improved monitoring of local UGS management and related multiple facets of HWB impacts.

Recently, a new PPGIS approach, volunteered geographical information (VGI) (Goodchild, 2007), such as crowdsourced data or user-generated information such as social-media geotags, has evolved as a type of citizen science (Jiang and Thill, 2015) or community science. VGI can track an individual's movement and location and has been applied to quantify CES provision (Guerrero et al., 2016; Havinga et al., 2020) and spatially model cultural interactions in landscapes (Daniel et al., 2012). VGI participatory mapping has been applied within CES studies including the UGS preference value (Nenko et al., 2022) and landscape preference (Van Zanten et al., 2016). VGI is unique in that it is able

to provide a real-time record of in situ human–environment interactions as opposed to ad hoc SoftGIS; both provide spatial information about CES use. VGI data can be voluntarily and passively documented and are a valuable tool for revealing and quantifying CES in future studies.

This study and its public participatory methodology provide valuable insight to planners and decision makers which can engage the public, provide transparency, reduce stakeholder conflict, increase community cohesion, and inform more comprehensive planning and inclusive design solutions. There are many applications of this research. The results highlight the importance of including CES mapping within land-use planning and policy-making agendas to ensure the conservation of areas supplying cultural services that are critical for multifunctional wellbeing. Further research studies are needed on integration of different types of data and information (Cheng et al., 2019) but some straightforward opportunities exist. For example, in Helsinki, future studies can incorporate diverse sociodemographic and socio-economic information to better identify UGS use and benefit; thereby focusing future planning efforts to deliver CES to those communities best aligned to interaction. Additionally, the geospatial locations provide pathways to integrating infrastructures—green and gray—such as the ‘Green Fingers’ and transportation toward sustainable development and green cities (Hannikainen, 2019), thereby promoting CES-related decision making.

To conclude, this specific affordance-based study’s operationalization of data collection removed subjective perception to the highest degree possible by focusing on interaction and transaction through activity. The methodology applied, the SoftGIS questionnaire, correlated physical UGS location to an individual’s HWB benefit received as activated through behavioral interaction. In this research, survey participants were able to provide specific locations of UGS they visit and interact with, followed by descriptive attributes of what HWB benefit(s) they receive from that interaction. In this regards, the transactional perspective found within affordance theory could be accurately documented. The results indicate which UGS characteristics are influential with respect to the receipt of HWB affordances when residents interact with the UGS. The PPGIS survey used a series of questions designed to correlate specific, geocoded UGS locations to HWB affordances received from UGS interaction. This research’s interaction-based geospatial data collection provided a more direct means to document relationships between humans and urban greenspaces, ultimately improving pathways to urban planning and policy in developing regions across the globe.

## 5. Abbreviations

HUR – Helsinki Urban Region

HWB – Human wellbeing

PPGIS – Public participation geographic information system

UGS – Urban greenspace

## 6. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that

could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## 7. References

- Andersson, E., Borgström, S., Haase, D., Lanemeyer, J., Mascarenhas, A., McPhearson, T., Wolff, M., Laszkiewicz, E., Kronenberg, J., Barton, D. & Herreros-Cantis, P. (2021). A context-sensitive systems approach for understanding and enabling ecosystem service realization in cities. *Ecology and Society*, 26(2).
- Akpinar, A. (2016). How is quality of urban green spaces associated with physical activity and health?. *Urban forestry & urban greening*, 16, 76-83.
- Araújo, D., Brymer, E., Brito, H., Withagen, R., & Davids, K. (2019). The empowering variability of affordances of nature: Why do exercisers feel better after performing the same exercise in natural environments than in indoor environments?. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 42, 138-145.
- Arnberger, A. (2006). Recreation use of urban forests: An inter-area comparison. *Urban forestry & urban greening*, 4(3-4), 135-144.
- Arnberger, A., Haider, W., & Brandenburg, C. (2005). Evaluating visitor-monitoring techniques: A comparison of counting and video observation data. *Environmental Management*, 36(2), 317-327.
- Arnberger, A., Budruk, M., Schneider, I. E., & Stanis, S. A. W. (2022). Predicting place attachment among walkers in the urban context: The role of dogs, motivations, satisfaction, past experience and setting development. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 70, 127531.
- Astell-Burt, T., & Feng, X. (2019). Association of urban green space with mental health and general health among adults in Australia. *JAMA network open*, 2(7), e198209-e198209.
- Baskent, E.Z. (2020). A framework for characterizing and regulating ecosystem services in a management planning context. *Forests*, 11(1), p.102.
- Bell, S., Hamilton, V., Montarzino, A., Rothnie, H., Travlou, P. & Alves, S. (2008). Greenspace and Quality of Life: A Critical Literature Review. In: Scotland, G. (ed.) Greenspace Scotland Research Report. Stirling, Scotland.
- Bogaert, J., Farina, A. & Ceulemans, R. (2005). Entropy increase of fragmented habitats: A sign of human impact? *Ecological Indicators*, 207–212.
- Boyd, J., & Banzhaf, S. (2007). What are ecosystem services? The need for standardized environmental accounting units. *Ecological economics*, 63(2-3), 616-626.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). The structure of psychological well-being.
- Bush, J., & Doyon, A. (2017). Urban green spaces in Australian cities: Social inclusion and community participation. In *State of Australian cities conference*
- Chiesura, A. (2004). The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 129-139.
- Clark, C., & Uzzell, D. L. (2006). The socio-environmental affordances of adolescents' environments. *Children and their environments: Learning, using and designing spaces*, 176-108.
- Cooper Marcus, C. (2005). Healing havens. *Landscape Architecture*, 95, 85-9.

- Coppel, G., & Wüstemann, H. (2017). The impact of urban green space on health in Berlin, Germany: Empirical findings and implications for urban planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 167, 410-418.
- Corbett, J. M., & Keller, C. P. (2005). An analytical framework to examine empowerment associated with participatory geographic information systems (PGIS). *Cartographica: The International Journal for Geographic Information and Geovisualization*, 40(4), 91-102.
- Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., De Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., & Van Den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *nature*, 387(6630), 253-260.
- Costanza, R., De Groot, R., Sutton, P., Van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S. J., Kubiszewski, I., & Turner, R. K. (2014). Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Global environmental change*, 26, 152-158.
- Costanza, R., Fisher, B., Ali, S., Beer, C., Bond, L., Boumans, R., & Snapp, R. (2007). Quality of life: An approach integrating opportunities, human needs, and subjective well-being. *Ecological economics*, 61(2-3), 267-276.
- Czembrowski, P., Łaskiewicz, E., Kronenberg, J., Engström, G., & Andersson, E. (2019). Valuing individual characteristics and the multifunctionality of urban green spaces: The integration of sociotope mapping and hedonic pricing. *PloS one*, 14(3), e0212277.
- Daily, G. C. (1997). Introduction: what are ecosystem services. *Nature's services: Societal dependence on natural ecosystems*, 1(1).
- Davies, C., & Laforteza, R. (2017). Urban green infrastructure in Europe: Is greenspace planning and policy compliant?. *Land use policy*, 69, 93-101.
- De Groot, R. S., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., & Willemen, L. (2010). Challenges in integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in landscape planning, management and decision making. *Ecological complexity*, 7(3), 260-272.
- Dempsey, N., Brown, C., & Bramley, G. (2012). The key to sustainable urban development in UK cities? The influence of density on social sustainability. *Progress in planning*, 77(3), 89-141.
- Diener, E. (2009). Subjective Well-Being. In: Diener, E. (ed.) *The Science of Well-Being*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Dolan, P., Layard, R., & Metcalfe, R. (2011). Measuring subjective well-being for public policy.
- Douglas, O., Lennon, M., & Scott, M. (2017). Green space benefits for health and well-being: A life-course approach for urban planning, design and management. *Cities*, 66, 53-62.
- Dunn, C.E., (2007). Participatory GIS—a people's GIS?. *Progress in human geography*, 31(5), 616-637.
- Dzhambov, A. M., Markevych, I., Hartig, T., Tilov, B., Arabadzhiev, Z., Stoyanov, D., & Dimitrova, D. D. (2018). Multiple pathways link urban green-and bluespace to mental health in young adults. *Environmental research*, 166, 223-233.
- Ekkel, E. D., & de Vries, S. (2017). Nearby green space and human health: Evaluating accessibility metrics. *Landscape and urban planning*, 157, 214-220.
- Fan, Y., Das, K. V., & Chen, Q. (2011). Neighborhood green, social support, physical activity, and stress: Assessing the cumulative impact. *Health & place*, 17(6), 1202-1211.
- Forman, R. T. T. (1995). Some general principles of landscape and regional ecology. *Landscape ecology*, 10, 133-142.
- Gasper, D. (2009). Needs and well-being. In *Handbook of economics and ethics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gaver, W. W. (1991). Technology affordances. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in*



computing systems (pp. 79-84).

- Gehl, J. (2010). *Byer for mennesker* (Vol. 1). Nykøbing Sjælland: Bogværket.
- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *An ecological approach to visual perception*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Giles-Corti, B., Timperio, A., Bull, F., & Pikora, T. (2005). Understanding physical activity environmental correlates: increased specificity for ecological models. *Exercise and sport sciences reviews*, 33(4), 175-181.
- Glenberg, A. M., & Kaschak, M. P. (2002). Grounding language in action. *Psychonomic bulletin & review*, 9(3), 558-565.
- Gobster, P. H., Nassauer, J. I., Daniel, T. C. & Fry, G. (2007). The shared landscape: what does aesthetics have to do with ecology. *Landscape Ecology*, 22, 959-972.
- Goličnik, B. (2005). People in place: a configuration of physical form and the dynamic patterns of spatial occupancy in urban open public space.
- Gomez, E., Baur, J. W., Hill, E., & Georgiev, S. (2015). Urban parks and psychological sense of community. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 47(3), 388-398.
- Grafius, D. R., Corstanje, R., & Harris, J. A. (2018). Linking ecosystem services, urban form and green space configuration using multivariate landscape metric analysis. *Landscape ecology*, 33(4), 557-573.
- Hagerty, M. R., Cummins, R., Ferriss, A. L., Land, K., Michalos, A. C., Peterson, M., & Vogel, J. (2001). Quality of life indexes for national policy: Review and agenda for research. *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 71(1), 58-78.
- Hansen, R. and Pauleit, S. (2014). From multifunctionality to multiple ecosystem services? A conceptual framework for multifunctionality in green infrastructure planning for urban areas. *Ambio*, 43(4), pp.516-529.
- Hart, R. A., & Moore, G. T. (1973). *The development of spatial cognition: A review*. Aldine Transaction.
- Hartig, T. (1993). Nature experience in transactional perspective. *Landscape and urban planning*, 25(1-2), 17-36.
- Hartig, T. (2004). Restorative environments. In C. Spielberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 273–279). San Diego: Academic.
- Hedblom, M., Gunnarsson, B., Iravani, B., Knez, I., Schaefer, M., Thorsson, P., & Lundström, J. N. (2019). Reduction of physiological stress by urban green space in a multisensory virtual experiment. *Scientific reports*, 9(1), 1-11.
- Heft, H. (2001). *Ecological Psychology in Context: James Gibson, Roger Barker, and the Legacy of William James's Radical Empiricism*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heft, H. (2010). Affordances and the perception of landscape. *Innovative approaches to researching landscape and health*, 9-32
- Helsinki City Information and Statistics (2018). Retrieved from: <https://www.hel.fi/helsinki/en/administration/information/statistics/>
- Heo, S., & Bell, M. L. (2019). The influence of green space on the short-term effects of particulate matter on hospitalization in the US for 2000–2013. *Environmental research*, 174, 61-68.
- Hird, S. (2003). *What is wellbeing? A brief review of current literature and concepts* NHS Health Scotland: Glasgow.
- Hitchings, R. (2013). Studying the preoccupations that prevent people from going into green space. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 118, 98-102.

- Hone, L. C., Jarden, A., Schofield, G. M., & Duncan, S. (2014). Measuring flourishing: The impact of operational definitions on the prevalence of high levels of wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 4(1).
- Huerta, C. M., & Utomo, A. (2021). Evaluating the association between urban green spaces and subjective well-being in Mexico city during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Health & Place*, 70, 102606.
- Hunter, R., Cleary, A., Cleland, C., & Braubach, M. (2017). Urban green space interventions and health: A review of impacts and effectiveness. Full report.
- Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. (2013). Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social indicators research*, 110(3), 837-861.
- Irvine, K.N., Warber, S.L., Devine-Wright, P. and Gaston, K.J. (2013). Understanding urban green space as a health resource: A qualitative comparison of visit motivation and derived effects among park users in Sheffield, UK. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 10(1), pp.417-442.
- Ittelson, W.H. (1996). Visual perception of markings. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 3:171-187.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). The death and life of great American cities, New York, NY, Random House.
- Jankowski, P., Czepkiewicz, M., Młodkowski, M., Zwoliński, Z. (2016). Geo-questionnaire: A Method and Tool for Public Preference Elicitation in Land Use Planning Piotr.
- Jennings, V., & Bamkole, O. (2019). The relationship between social cohesion and urban green space: An avenue for health promotion. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(3), 452.
- Jorgensen, A., & Keenan, R. (2012). *Urban wildscapes*. Routledge.
- Kabisch, N., Frantzeskaki, N. and Hansen, R. (2022). Principles for urban nature-based solutions. *Ambio*, pp.1-14.
- Kahila M. & Kyttä M., (2009). SoftGIS as a bridge builder in collaborative urban planning. In: S. Geertman, J. Stillwell (eds.), *Planning Support Systems: Best Practices and New Methods*, Springer: 389–412.
- Kahila, M. & Kyttä, M. (2006). The use of web-based SoftGIS-method in the urban planning practices. In *Proceedings of the conference on urban conditions and life changes*.
- Kaplan, R. (2001). The Nature of the View From Home: Psychological Benefits. *Environment and Behavior*, 33, 507-542.
- Kaplan, S. (2002). Meditation, restoration, and the management of mental fatigue. *Environment and Behavior*, 33, 480–506.
- Kaplan, S. (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 15(3), 169-182.
- Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (2011). Well-being, reasonableness, and the natural environment. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3(3), 304-321
- Keith, K. D. (2001). International quality of life: Current conceptual, measurement, and implementation issues. *International Review of Research in Mental Retardation*, 24, 49–74.
- Keyes, C. L. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 207-222.
- Kim, J., & Kaplan, R. (2004). Physical and psychological actors in sense of community: New urbanist Kentland and nearby Orchard Village. *Environment and Behavior*, 36(3), 313-340.

- King, M. F., Renó, V. F., & Novo, E. M. (2014). The concept, dimensions and methods of assessment of human well-being within a socioecological context: a literature review. *Social indicators research*, 116(3), 681-698.
- Kissling, M., Hegetschweiler, K. T., Rusterholz, H. P., & Baur, B. (2009). Short-term and long-term effects of human trampling on above-ground vegetation, soil density, soil organic matter and soil microbial processes in suburban beech forests. *Applied soil ecology*, 42(3), 303-314.
- Kondo, M. C., Fluehr, J. M., McKeon, T., & Branas, C. C. (2018). Urban green space and its impact on human health. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 15(3), 445.
- Korpela, K., Borodulin, K., Neuvonen, M., Paronen, O., & Tyrväinen, L. (2014). Analyzing the mediators between nature-based outdoor recreation and emotional well-being. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 37, 1-7
- Korpela, K. M., Hartig, T. & Kaiser, F. G. (2001). Restorative Experience and Self- Regulation in Favorite Places. *Environment and Behavior*, 33, 572-589.
- Korpela, K.M. and Yen, M., (2007). Perceived health is associated with visiting natural favourite places in the vicinity. *Health & Place*, 13(1), pp.138-151.
- Kuo, F. E., Sullivan, W. C., Coley, R. L., & Brunson, L. (1998). Fertile ground for community: Inner-city neighborhood common spaces. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 26(6), 823-851.
- Kweon, B. S., Sullivan, W. C., & Wiley, A. R. (1998). Green common spaces and the social integration of inner-city older adults. *Environment and behavior*, 30(6), 832-858.
- Kyttä, M. (2002). Affordances of children's environments in the context of cities, small towns, suburbs and rural villages in Finland and Belarus. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 22(1-2), 109-123.
- Kyttä, M. (2004). The extent of children's independent mobility and the number of actualized affordances as criteria for child-friendly environments. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 24(2), 179-198.
- Lachowycz, Kate, and Andy P. Jones, (2013). Towards a better understanding of the relationship between greenspace and health: development of a theoretical framework. *Landscape and urban planning*, 118: 62-69.
- La Notte, A., D'Amato, D., Mäkinen, H., Paracchini, M.L., Liqueste, C., Egoh, B., Geneletti, D. and Crossman, N.D. (2017). Ecosystem services classification: A systems ecology perspective of the cascade framework. *Ecological indicators*, 74, pp.392-402.
- Larsen, C. A. (2013). *The rise and fall of social cohesion: The construction and de-construction of social trust in the US, UK, Sweden and Denmark*. Oxford University Press.
- Larson, L. R., & Hipp, J. A. (2022). Nature-based pathways to health promotion: the value of parks and greenspace. *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 83(2), 99-102.
- Leavell, M. A., Leiferman, J. A., Gascon, M., Braddick, F., Gonzalez, J. C., & Litt, J. S. (2019). Nature-based social prescribing in urban settings to improve social connectedness and mental well-being: a review. *Current Environmental Health Reports*, 6(4), 297-308.
- Lee, A. C. K., Jordan, H. C., & Horsley, J. (2015). Value of urban green spaces in promoting healthy living and wellbeing: prospects for planning. *Risk management and healthcare policy*, 8, 131.
- Lee, A. C., & Maheswaran, R. (2011). The health benefits of urban green spaces: a review of the evidence *Journal of public health*, 33(2), 212-222.



- Ma, B., Zhou, T., Lei, S., Wen, Y., & Htun, T. T. (2019). Effects of urban green spaces on residents' well-being. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 21(6), 2793-2809.
- Maas, J., Van Dillen, S. M. E., Verheij, R. A. & Groenewegen, P. P. (2009). Social contacts as a possible mechanism behind the relation between green space and health. *Health & Place*, 15, 586-595.
- Marafa, L. M., Tsang, F., Watts, G., & Yuan, X. M. (2018). Perceived tranquility in green urban open spaces. *World Leisure Journal*, 60(3), 221-234.
- Maslow, A. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York, NY, van Nostrand.
- Matsuoka, R. H., & Kaplan, R. (2008). People needs in the urban landscape: analysis of landscape and urban planning contributions. *Landscape and urban planning*, 84(1), 7-19.
- Maund, P.R., Irvine, K.N., Dallimer, M., Fish, R., Austen, G.E. and Davies, Z.G., 2020. Do ecosystem service frameworks represent people's values?. *Ecosystem Services*, 46, p.101221.
- McCormick, R. (2017). Does access to green space impact the mental well-being of children: A systematic review. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 37, 3-7.
- McGillivray, M. and Clarke, M. eds., (2006). *Understanding human well-being*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Menatti, L. & Casa Da Rocha, A. (2016). Landscape and Health: Connecting Psychology, Aesthetics, and Philosophy through the Concept of Affordance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
- Michaelson, J., Abdallah, S., Steuer, N., Thompson, S., Marks, N., Aked, J. & Potts, R. (2009). National accounts of well-being: Bringing real wealth onto the balance sheet.
- Millenium Ecosystems Assessment (MEA), (2005). *Ecosystems and human well-being: wetlands and water*. World Resources Institute.
- Mitchell, R., & Popham, F. (2008). Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an observational population study. *The lancet*, 372(9650), 1655-1660.
- Navarrete-Hernandez, P., & Laffan, K. (2019). A greener urban environment: Designing green infrastructure interventions to promote citizens' subjective wellbeing. *Landscape and urban planning*, 191, 103618
- Neuvonen, M., Sievänen, T., Tönnies, S. and Koskela, T., 2007. Access to green areas and the frequency of visits—A case study in Helsinki. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 6(4), pp.235-247.
- Norgaard, R. B. (2010). Ecosystem services: From eye-opening metaphor to complexity blinder. *Ecological economics*, 69(6), 1219-1227.
- Palliwoda, J., & Priess, J. (2021). What do people value in urban green? Linking characteristics of urban green spaces to users' perceptions of nature benefits, disturbances, and disservices. *Ecology and Society*, 26(1).
- Park, B. J., Furuya, K., Kasetani, T., Takayama, N., Kagawa, T. & Miyazaki, Y. (2011). Relationship between psychological responses and physical environments in forest settings. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 24-32.
- Pietilä, M., Neuvonen, M., Borodulin, K., Korpela, K., Sievänen, T. and Tyrväinen, L. (2015). Relationships between exposure to urban green spaces, physical activity and self-rated health. *Journal of outdoor recreation and tourism*, 10, pp.44-54
- Pollard, E. L., & Lee, P. D. (2003). Child well-being: A systematic review of the literature. *Social indicators research*, 61(1), 59-78

- Poortinga, W. (2006). Social relations or social capital? Individual and community health effects of bonding social capital. *Social science & medicine*, 63(1), 255-270
- Pretty, J., Peacock, J., Hine, R., Sellens, M., South, N. & Griffin, M. (2007). Green Exercise in the UK Countryside: Effects on Health and Psychological WellBeing, and Implications for Policy and Planning. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 211-231.
- Rantanen H., Kahila M. (2009). The SoftGIS approach to local knowledge. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90(6): 1981–1990. DOI: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2007.08.025.
- Raivo, P. J. (2002). The Finnish landscape and its meanings. *Fennia-International Journal of Geography*, 180(1-2), 89-98
- Rapport, D. J., Costanza, R., & McMichael, A. J. (1998). Assessing ecosystem health. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 13(10), 397-402
- Reklaitiene, R., Grazuleviciene, R., Dedele, A., Virviciute, D., Vensloviene, J., Tamosiunas, A. & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2014). The relationship of green space, depressive symptoms and perceived general health in urban population. *Scandinavian journal of public health*, 42(7), 669-676
- Ribeiro, A. I., Tavares, C., Guttentag, A., & Barros, H. (2019). Association between neighbourhood green space and biological markers in school-aged children. Findings from the Generation XXI birth cohort. *Environment international*, 132, 105070.
- Rietveld, E., & Kiverstein, J. (2014). A rich landscape of affordances. *Ecological psychology*, 26(4), 325-352.
- Rogge, N., Theesfeld, I., & Strassner, C. (2020). The potential of social learning in community gardens and the impact of community heterogeneity. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 24, 100351.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166.
- Said, I., & Bakar, M. S. A. (2005). Landscape for children to play and learn: a conceptual comparison between natural stream and playground. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 1â-10.
- Semenzato, P., Sievänen, T., Oliveira, E.S.D., Soares, A.L. and Spaeth, R. (2011). Natural elements and physical activity in urban green space planning and design. In *Forests, trees and human health* (pp. 245-282). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Sen, A. (1985). Well-being, agency and freedom: The Dewey lectures 1984. *The journal of philosophy*, 82(4), 169-221.
- Sharifi, F., Nygaard, A., & Stone, W. M. (2021). Heterogeneity in the subjective well-being impact of access to urban green space. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 74, 103244.
- Smith, L. M., Case, J. L., Smith, H. M., Harwell, L. C., & Summers, J. K. (2013). Relating ecosystem services to domains of human well-being: Foundation for a US index. *Ecological Indicators*, 28, 79-90.
- Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2009). Report by the commission on the measurement of economic performance and social progress.
- Sullivan, W. C., Kuo, F. E. & Depooter, S. F. (2005). The fruit of urban nature –vital neighborhood spaces *Environment and Behavior*, 35, 678-700.
- Taylor, A. F., Kuo, F. E. & Sullivan, W. C. (2002). Views of nature and self discipline: Evidence from inner city children.

*Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 22, 49-63.

- Thomas, P. A. (2011). Trajectories of social engagement and limitations in late life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52, 430-443.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu (1974). *Topophilia: a study of environmental perception, attitudes and values* Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Tyrväinen, L., Mäkinen, K. & Schipperijn, J. (2007). Tools for mapping social values of urban woodlands and other green areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 5–19.
- Tyrväinen, L., Pauleit, S., Seeland, K., & de Vries, S. (2005). Benefits and uses of urban forests and trees. In *Urban forests and trees* (pp. 81-114). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Uchino, B. N. (2006). Social support and health: A review of physiological processes potentially underlying links to disease outcomes. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*.
- Ulrich, R. S. (1983). Aesthetic and affective response to natural environment. In I. Altman & J. F. Wohlwill (Eds.), *Behavior and the natural environment* (pp. 85–125). New York: Plenum.
- Umberson, D. & Montez, J. K. (2010). Social relationships and health: A flashpoint for health policy. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51, S54-S66.
- UNESCO (2004). Yamato Declaration on Integrated Approaches for Safeguarding Tangible and Intangible Heritage.
- United Nations General Assembly. New Urban Agenda (2017). <http://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda>.
- Vare, S. & Rekola, L. (2007). Large contiguous forest areas as part of the ecological network of Uusimaa Region. Helsinki, Finland: Uusimaa Regional Council.
- Vårheim, A. (2017). Public libraries, community resilience, and social capital.
- Van Herzele, A., & de Vries, S. (2012). Linking green space to health: A comparative study of two urban neighbourhoods in Ghent, Belgium. *Population and Environment*, 34(2), 171-193
- Vatn, A., & Vedeld, P. (2012). Fit, interplay, and scale: a diagnosis. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4).
- Veen, E. J., Bock, B. B., Van den Berg, W., Visser, A. J., & Wiskerke, J. S. (2016). Community gardening and social cohesion: different designs, different motivations. *Local Environment*, 21(10), 1271-1287.
- Vujcic, M., Tomicevic-Dubljevic, J., Zivojinovic, I. & Toskovic, O. (2019). Connection between urban green areas and visitors' physical and mental well-being. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 40, 299-307.
- Ward-Thompson, C. (2011). Linking landscape and health: The recurring theme. *Landscape and urban planning*, 99(3-4), 187-195.
- Ward-Thompson, C. W., & Travlou, P. (2009). A critical review of research in landscape and woodland perceptions, aesthetics, affordances and experience. *Prepared for the Forestry Commission: the research centre for inclusive access to outdoor environments*.
- Ward Thompson, C., & Aspinall, P. A. (2011). Natural environments and their impact on activity, health, and quality of life. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3(3), 230-260.
- Weldon, S., Bailey, C., & O'Brien, E. (2007). New pathways for health and well-being in Scotland: Research to understand and overcome barriers to accessing woodlands. *Report to Forestry Commission Scotland, Edinburgh*.
- Wilson, E.O., (1984). *Biophilia*. Cambridge, Ma.
- Wolsink, M. (2016). Environmental education excursions and proximity to urban green space—densification in a



'compact city'. *Environmental Education Research*, 22(7), 1049-1071.

- World Health Organisation (2016). Urban green spaces and health—a review of evidence.
- Wu, J., (2013). Landscape sustainability science: ecosystem services and human well-being in changing landscapes. *Landscape ecology*, 28(6): 999-1023.