Evidence-Centered Evaluation of Everyday Public Space and Rural Construction

Abstract

Built-Environment Evaluation is being reorganized around the joint demands of performance with evidence quality, resource limits, and transfer across settings. The discussion is organized around integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings. The review triangulates 2 focal papers with 12 independently retrieved publications screened through Crossref or the named publisher. The analysis is organized around indicator design, spatial analysis, post-occupancy evaluation, stakeholder perspectives, and policy translation. The analysis declines to treat outcomes from different settings as equivalent, the review compares problem boundaries, design logic, and conditions of validation. Across the literature, the evidence indicates that advances in built-environment evaluation become credible when place, user, indicator, and intervention are evaluated together and when uncertainty about stakeholder divergence is reported explicitly. The framework consequently connects method selection to application risk, identifies recurring threats to external validity, and proposes a research agenda centered on well-specified controls, robustness tests, and reproducible workflows.

Keywords

Built-Environment Evaluation; Indicator Design; Spatial Analysis; Post-Occupancy Evaluation; Stakeholder Perspectives; Policy Translation

1. Introduction

Research on built-environment evaluation bridges scientific ambition and practical constraint. A mature account offers not only stronger nominal performance but also explanations that explain both success and failure. The issue is particularly acute for integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings. A conclusion supported by a particular material, corpus, cohort, geography, or load profile may be fragile outside its original boundary. The comparison accordingly needs to preserve the unit of analysis and the decision context. It should further distinguish a mechanism from a correlation, a benchmark advantage from a deployment advantage, and an interpretable diagnostic from a causal explanation.

This review uses five analytical lenses: indicator design, spatial analysis, post-occupancy evaluation, stakeholder perspectives, policy translation. Taken together, the lenses are valuable because they jointly cover the technical object, measurement chain, and prerequisites of external validity. The synthesis is structured by place, user, indicator, and intervention. Under that principle, originality needs evidence beyond a headline metric; the comparison also requires aligned controls, explicit uncertainty, and credible resource or safety assumptions. The present article offers conceptual synthesis and does not claim new experiments, participants, measurements, or performance results.

2. Spatial and Evaluation Foundations

A tractable account separates the input evidence, the transformation applied to it, the output used for evaluation, and the decision that follows. In built-environment evaluation, these elements are commonly tuned in isolation even though errors propagate across them. Upstream noise may grow as it passes through a flexible model; an apparently accurate output can still be poorly calibrated for the final decision. For that reason, spatial scale should accompany aggregate performance. Rigorous analysis declares its controlled factors and permitted variation, then selects metrics that correspond to the intended use rather than to convenience alone.

Scope discipline is equally important. Indicator design defines the local design problem, while policy translation determines whether the design can survive outside that boundary. Trade-offs become visible through spatial analysis and post-occupancy evaluation connect those ends by exposing trade-offs that a single score conceals. Under this view, negative evidence and sensitivity evidence maps the conditions under which the explanation remains viable. For applied work, documentation of policy implementation is therefore part of the scientific result, not an administrative afterthought.

3. Evidence Integration

The target study JIANG-01, Correlation Analysis Between Everyday Public Space and Urban Built Environment and a Study of Its Evaluation Framework: Taking Tianjin as an Example [1], addresses a concrete part of built-environment evaluation through built-environment indicators, spatial correlation, and a dual-perspective evaluation framework for everyday public space. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings, the paper is read as a case whose boundary must be retained: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis records the design boundary before comparing assumptions across sources.

The target study JIANG-02, Performance Measurement and Mechanism Diagnosis in Rural Construction: A Dual-Perspective Post-Occupancy Evaluation of China Resources Hope Towns [2], addresses a concrete part of built-environment evaluation through post-occupancy evaluation and mechanism diagnosis for rural construction. It identifies a representation, mechanism, or evaluation boundary needed to compare claims. Against the focus on integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings, the paper is read as a case whose boundary must be retained: transfer may depend on its sensing regime, preparation, workload, population, or benchmark. The synthesis records the design boundary before comparing assumptions across sources.

Across the focal studies, indicator design should be interpreted jointly with spatial analysis. A design can improve one but transfer cost into the coupled dimension. The design space can be represented as a matrix whose rows are operating conditions and whose columns are evidence quality, computation or process cost, robustness, and consequence of failure. This organization helps prevent an attractive mechanism from being detached from the circumstances that support it. It also clarifies which ablations are informative: removing a component should test a stated causal role, not merely create another number.

Post-occupancy evaluation relates the method to the choice it informs. A minimally complete evaluation should separate familiar inputs from perturbations and retain distributional summaries, and test plausible alternative explanations. Where stakeholder divergence is central, calibration or sensitivity is as important as ranking. Where costs or hazards are asymmetric, utility-weighted assessment is more revealing than undifferentiated accuracy. These comparison choices do not require identical designs;

they make the reasons for their differences auditable.

4. Comparative Evidence

A complementary strand is visible in Post-occupancy evaluation of urban public housing in Korea: Focus on experience of elderly females in th... [3]; Post-occupancy Evaluation of a Built Environment: The Case of Konak Square (İzmir, Turkey) [4]; Healing environment correlated with patients' psychological comfort: Post-occupancy evaluation of genera... [5]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate indicator design: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

For triangulation, the literature includes Post-occupancy evaluation: A diagnostic tool to establish and sustain inclusive access in Kyrenia Town C... [6]; Post-occupancy evaluation and human-centered indoor environmental quality in higher-education buildings:... [7]; A post-occupancy evaluation of a green rated and conventional on-campus residence hall [8]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate spatial analysis: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

The design space is broadened by Post occupancy evaluation of architectural design studio facilities [9]; Post-occupancy evaluation and codesign in mental healthcare buildings: User's input as a driver for func... [10]; Suburban Landscape and Public Housing: The Post-Occupancy Evaluation as a Tool for Built Environment Reg... [11]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate post-occupancy evaluation: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

A first comparison set connects Privatized Transformation of Public Space: Construction of a Marketplace through the Cooptation of a Pub... [12]; A machine vision–based, quantitative method of capturing spatiotemporal activity for post-occupancy eval... [13]; Post Occupancy Evaluation of the Built Environment: A Case Study of Mosque Facilities [14]. These publications were retrieved and verified through DOI or publisher metadata, and their titles directly intersect the problem boundary of built-environment evaluation. Together they illuminate stakeholder perspectives: some emphasize representations or mechanisms, whereas others foreground validation and application conditions. The useful comparison is not a leaderboard across incompatible settings, but a structured reading of what each study controls, leaves variable, and treats as a meaningful outcome. Divergence can then reveal a change in scale, data process, endpoint, or operating constraint.

5. Planning Implications

Deployment decisions benefit from a sequence of checks. First, define the decision and its failure cost. Second, specify the evidence and operating envelope. Third, choose a method whose inductive assumptions match that evidence. Fourth, test stakeholder perspectives and policy translation under controlled perturbations. Finally, retain provenance so that an unexpected outcome can be traced to data, configuration, material batch, environmental condition, or user interaction. These stages keep integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings connected to observable requirements.

At a wider level, responsible progress in built-environment evaluation depends on interfaces as much as components. Interfaces determine how uncertainty moves between measurement and inference, between algorithm and operator, or between microscopic design and system behavior. A shared protocol should state acceptance conditions and what would overturn a claim. When those agreements are explicit, optimization need not trade away validity, safety, or intelligibility without notice.

6. Limitations and Future Directions

The principal review limitations are cross-study variation in labels, design choices, and reporting precision. A valid DOI record authenticates bibliographic facts without independently certifying empirical conclusions. Fast-moving records create a further version-control problem. The focal citations supplied as Scholar-verified records were preserved; uncertain or malformed records were documented separately rather than silently rewritten.

Further investigation ought to preregister comparison protocols where feasible, retain machine-readable setup details while testing at least one nontrivial shift in policy implementation. Research should also classify failures by causal mechanism as well as prevalence. For built-environment evaluation, a valuable shared benchmark would combine standard-condition utility, efficiency, confidence quality, and fault recovery. Such a benchmark would reward designs that remain useful when evidence is incomplete or conditions change.

7. Conclusion

Research across built-environment evaluation forms an evidence network rather than a list of results rather than a collection of isolated scores. The focal studies show how integrating spatial indicators, user experience, and mechanism diagnosis across urban and rural settings; the additional literature reveals the assumptions required to interpret those contributions. Across indicator design, spatial analysis, post-occupancy evaluation, stakeholder perspectives, and policy translation, alignment is the most durable principle: the representation or mechanism must match the problem, the metric must serve the decision while deployment remains inside the tested boundary. The consequence is evidence that travels more safely and fails more informatively.

References

1. Chen, L., Wan, H., Hu, H., Zhang, H., & Liu, L. (2025). Correlation Analysis Between Everyday Public Space and Urban Built Environment and a Study of Its Evaluation Framework: Taking Tianjin as an Example. Buildings, 15(23), 4348. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15234348

2. Jiang, Z., Chu, H., Tian, Y., & Wang, Z. (2026). Performance Measurement and Mechanism Diagnosis in Rural Construction: A Dual-Perspective Post-Occupancy Evaluation of China Resources Hope Towns. Land, 15(2), 316. https://doi.org/10.3390/land15020316

3. Rieh, S. Y. (2018). Post-occupancy evaluation of urban public housing in Korea: Focus on experience of elderly females in the ageing society. Indoor and Built Environment, 29(3), 372-388. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x18782578

4. Malkoc, E., & Ozkan, M. B. (2010). Post-occupancy Evaluation of a Built Environment: The Case of Konak Square (İzmir, Turkey). Indoor and Built Environment, 19(4), 422-434. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x10365819

5. Mahmood, F. J., & Tayib, A. Y. (2019). Healing environment correlated with patients' psychological comfort: Post-occupancy evaluation of general hospitals. Indoor and Built Environment, 30(2), 180-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x19888005

6. Güvenbaş, G., & Polay, M. (2020). Post-occupancy evaluation: A diagnostic tool to establish and sustain inclusive access in Kyrenia Town Centre. Indoor and Built Environment, 30(10), 1620-1642. https://doi.org/10.1177/1420326x20951244

7. Ghiai, M., Bassaw, C., & Niknia, S. (2026). Post-occupancy evaluation and human-centered indoor environmental quality in higher-education buildings: a structured review. Frontiers in Built Environment, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2026.1837203

8. Bonde, M., & Ramirez, J. (2015). A post-occupancy evaluation of a green rated and conventional on-campus residence hall. International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment, 4(2), 400-408. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2015.07.004

9. Ezz, M. S., Mahdy, M. A. F., Baharetha, S., Hassanain, M. A., & Gomaa, M. M. (2025). Post occupancy evaluation of architectural design studio facilities. Frontiers in Built Environment, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2025.1549313

10. Goulart, F. d. M., & Ono, R. (2022). Post-occupancy evaluation and codesign in mental healthcare buildings: User's input as a driver for functional and technical adaptations in post COVID-19 reality. Frontiers in Built Environment, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbuil.2022.962940

11. Borriello, L., Forte, F., Russo, Y., & Scardapane, S. (2025). Suburban Landscape and Public Housing: The Post-Occupancy Evaluation as a Tool for Built Environment Regeneration: A Case Study in the City of Naples, Italy. Land, 14(2), 211. https://doi.org/10.3390/land14020211

12. Filipi, J. (2013). Privatized Transformation of Public Space: Construction of a Marketplace through the Cooptation of a Public Space by Private Enterprise and the Aesthetic of Exclusion/Inclusion. Built Environment, 39(2), 236-244. https://doi.org/10.2148/benv.39.2.236

13. Dong, X., & Cheng, S. (2022). A machine vision–based, quantitative method of capturing spatiotemporal activity for post-occupancy evaluation research. Science and Technology for the Built Environment, 29(2), 185-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/23744731.2022.2151272

14. Hassanain, M. A., Kajak, M., Hamida, M. B., & Ibrahim, A. M. (2021). Post Occupancy Evaluation of the Built Environment: A Case Study of Mosque Facilities. International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability, 8(3), 107-119. https://doi.org/10.11113/ijbes.v8.n3.831