




Paper Type: Original Article

Place–Space: The Mediating Role of Environmental Art in the Reconfiguration of Urban Architecture from the Perspective of Henri Lefebvre

Samaneh Hosseinpourian^{1,*} 

¹Department of Architecture, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch; hoseinpourian@aihe.ac.ir.

Citation:

Received: ----

Revised: ----

Accepted:---

Hosseinpourian, S. (2026). Place–space: the mediating role of nvironmental art in the reconfiguration of urban architecture from the perspective of henri lefebvre. *Perspectives on Art and Beyond*, 3(1), PP.

Abstract

The concept of space in the contemporary city has evolved from a purely physical entity into a social, perceptual, and multilayered phenomenon, a transformation that is fundamentally articulated in the thought of Henri Lefebvre through his theory of the “production of space.” Within this framework, space is understood not as a neutral container, but as a social product shaped through the interaction of power structures, lived experience, and mental representations. At the same time, environmental art, as a contemporary artistic approach, emphasizes context, experience, and participation, thereby enabling a redefinition of the relationship between humans and space. The present study aims to elucidate the mediating role of environmental art in the reconfiguration of urban architecture and, drawing on Lefebvre’s spatial theory, analyzes how artistic interventions influence the perception, experience, and production of space. The research adopts a qualitative methodology based on an analytical–interpretive approach and is grounded in theoretical sources from the fields of spatial philosophy, architecture, and contemporary art. The findings indicate that environmental art can function as an active mediator among perceived space, conceived space, and lived space. Through transformations in the semantic and perceptual layers, it contributes to the reproduction of urban spaces. This reconfiguration occurs not necessarily through physical transformation, but rather through the activation of aesthetic experience and the redefinition of spatial practices. In conclusion, environmental art can be regarded as an effective tool for addressing the monotony and alienation of contemporary urban spaces, with the capacity to create meaningful and dynamic environments.

Keywords: Place, Space, Henri lefebvre, Production of space, Environmental art, Urban architecture, Lived space, Spatial perception, Spatial reconfiguration.

1 | Introduction

The transformations of the contemporary city, particularly within the context of modernity and late capitalism, have led to a fundamental shift in the understanding and experience of space. In this context, space is no longer regarded merely as a physical or material setting for human activities; rather, it is understood

 Corresponding Author:



 Licensee System Analytics. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).

as a multilayered phenomenon shaped by social relations, power structures, and systems of representation. This paradigmatic shift is particularly articulated in the thought of Henri Lefebvre through his theory of the “production of space,” which conceptualizes space as the outcome of the interaction among three dimensions: perception, conception, and lived experience [1]. Within this framework, one of the fundamental challenges of the contemporary city is the homogenization and abstraction of urban spaces; a process that has led to the decline in the quality of lived experience, the weakening of place identity, and the emergence of a form of spatial alienation. Formal architecture and urban planning have, in many cases, produced spaces that, while functionally efficient, lack richness and meaning in perceptual and aesthetic terms. In contrast, environmental art, as one of the important currents of contemporary art, with its emphasis on context, experience, and interaction, has the capacity to act as a mediating agent in redefining the relationship between humans and space. This form of art does not exist as an independent object, but rather emerges in relation to the environment and through interaction with the audience; in this way, it can reveal the hidden and neglected layers of space. The main research question arises from this point: how can environmental art, as a mediating factor, play a role in the reconfiguration of urban architecture? Despite the theoretical potential of environmental art and Lefebvre’s analytical framework, there is still no coherent and systematic explanation of the mediating role of environmental art in the reconfiguration of urban architecture. In other words, it is not clearly understood how artistic interventions can, at different levels of perception, representation, and experience, lead to the reproduction of urban spaces, nor what mechanisms enable this process. The significance of this study can be considered on several levels. First, from a theoretical perspective, the research seeks to establish a link between spatial philosophy, particularly Lefebvre’s thought, and the fields of art and architecture, disciplines that have often been examined separately. This integration can contribute to the enrichment of analytical frameworks in urban studies. Second, from a practical perspective, contemporary cities face crises such as spatial uniformity, loss of place identity, and the decline of lived experience quality. In this context, identifying the potential of environmental art as a tool for spatial intervention can open new horizons in urban design and regeneration. Third, this research can help redefine the role of art in the urban context; a role that goes beyond mere decoration or beautification and functions as an active agent in the production of meaning and spatial experience. The main objective of this research is to explain the mediating role of environmental art in the reconfiguration of urban architecture based on Henri Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space. The sub-objectives include analyzing the concept of space as a social phenomenon in Lefebvre’s thought, examining the characteristics and functions of environmental art in relation to space, explaining how environmental art influences spatial perception and experience, and identifying the mechanisms of space reproduction through artistic interventions. This research is theoretical and qualitative in nature and is conducted using an analytical interpretive approach. Data collection is based on library research and the review of credible sources in the fields of spatial philosophy, architectural theory, and contemporary art. In the analytical process, first the theoretical framework based on Henri Lefebvre’s views is elaborated, and then concepts related to environmental art are reinterpreted within this framework. Finally, by integrating these two domains, a conceptual model is presented to explain the mediating role of environmental art in the production and reconfiguration of space.

2 | Theoretical Foundations: The Concept of Space in Lefebvre’s Thought

2.1 | Space as a Social Product

In Henri Lefebvre’s thought, one of the most fundamental conceptual shifts is the transition from understanding “space as a container” to “space as a product.” In contrast to classical approaches in architecture and geography, which regard space as a neutral and a priori setting for human activities, Lefebvre argues that space itself is the outcome and construction of social relations. In other words, space is not something given in advance, but something that is “produced”; a production that takes shape within the interaction of economic, political, cultural, and ideological forces [1]. This approach situates space in an inseparable relationship with power relations and social structures, transforming it into a dynamic and

continuously evolving domain. In his seminal work, *The Production of Space*, Lefebvre emphasizes that every society produces its own space, and that this space is a reflection of its mode of production, class relations, and systems of meaning [1]. Consequently, any analysis of space that ignores its social and historical contexts will be incomplete and reductionist. Within this framework, architecture and urban planning are not merely technical activities, but rather social practices that play an active role in the production of space [2]. From this perspective, any intervention in space, whether physical or non-physical, constitutes a form of participation in the reproduction of social structures.

2.2 | Lefebvre's Spatial Triad

One of Henri Lefebvre's most important analytical tools for understanding the complexity of space is the concept of the "spatial triad." This triad explains space through three interrelated dimensions that are in constant interaction with one another: first space: perceived space.

This dimension relates to the material and objective aspects of space that can be observed in everyday experience and in people's practical activities. Movement routes, patterns of spatial use, and the physical organization of the city all fall within this domain. Perceived space is, in effect, the space in which everyday life unfolds, and through which individuals engage with their environment via the body and the senses. This space carries the habits, behavioral patterns, and practical orders of society. Second space: conceived space. This level refers to the mental and abstract representations of space the space that is "designed" and "conceived" by planners, architects, designers, and institutions of power. Maps, urban plans, architectural models, and professional discourses all belong to this domain. This space is often shaped by rational, technocratic logics and, in many cases, by economic and political interests. At this level, space becomes a "controllable object," and efforts are made to organize its complexities within orderly and predictable systems. Third space: lived space. This dimension is most closely associated with experience, emotion, imagination, and meaning. It is not merely what is seen or designed, but what is lived and felt [1]. Symbols, memories, cultural meanings, and aesthetic experiences take shape at this level. Lived space is a domain in which the possibility of resistance to formal structures and the redefinition of space emerges. Henri Lefebvre considers this dimension the most significant arena for intervention and transformation, as it is here that individuals can, through experience and imagination, endow space with new meanings.

2.3 | Lefebvre's Critique of Capitalist Space

Henri Lefebvre adopts a critical perspective in analyzing the production of space within capitalist societies. In his view, capitalist space tends toward "abstraction" and "homogenization." Abstract space is a form of space in which differences and local specificities are erased. Space is transformed into a measurable, exchangeable, and controllable unit. Economic logic comes to dominate all other dimensions of space, and the outcome of this process is the production of spaces that, while efficient and manageable, are impoverished in human and experiential terms. Furthermore, spatial homogenization in contemporary cities leads to the repetition of similar architectural and urban patterns on a global scale [3]. This process leads to the erosion of place-based identities and cultural differences. Urban spaces gradually become uniform, predictable, and devoid of distinction, spaces in which lived experience is limited and controlled. One of the most significant consequences of this trend is spatial alienation, a condition in which individuals lose their meaningful connection with their environment. Under such circumstances, space is no longer lived but merely consumed [4]. Individual experience is thus replaced by standardized patterns. Overall, the thought of Henri Lefebvre provides a framework in which space is understood as a social, multi-layered, and reproducible phenomenon. His spatial triad enables a more precise analysis of the relationships between physical form, representation, and experience, while his critique of capitalist space highlights the necessity of seeking ways to restore meaning and quality to urban environments. In this context, environmental art may be proposed as one such approach a topic that will be examined in detail in the following chapters.

3|Place and Space in Contemporary Architectural and Artistic Discourse

3.1|The Conceptual Distinction Between Place and Space

In contemporary architectural and artistic discourse, the distinction between “space” and “place” has become a fundamental issue. Although these two terms are sometimes used interchangeably in everyday language, at the theoretical level, there is a crucial difference between them. Space, in many approaches, is defined as an abstract, measurable, and geometric structure, a concept rooted in modern and rationalist traditions. In this sense, space is a framework that can be designed, organized, and controlled. In contrast, “place” is a concept closely tied to human experience, meaning, and lived reality. Place emerges when space acquires meaning through human presence, memory, perception, and action. In other words, place is the result of the lived experience of space [5]. Within this framework, it can be argued that space is potential, whereas place is actualized. Space is designed; place is experienced. This distinction provides a basis for analyzing the role of environmental art in transforming space into place a process directly related to “lived space” in Henri Lefebvre's thought.

3.2|The Transformation of the Concept of Place in Contemporary Architecture

In modern architecture, particularly within functionalist movements, the primary emphasis was on the rational organization of space and the fulfillment of functional needs. Within this approach, space was often defined as an efficient and controllable system, with less attention given to its experiential and meaningful dimensions. However, from the second half of the twentieth century onward, with the emergence of phenomenological and critical approaches, the concept of “place” entered architectural discourse as a human-centered and experience-based phenomenon [5]. Thinkers such as Christian Norberg-Schulz, through the introduction of the concept of *Genius Loci* (the “spirit of place”), emphasized the importance of the relationship between human beings, environment, and meaning. Within this perspective, architecture is no longer limited to the mere creation of space; rather, its task is to “reveal meaning” and “enhance lived experience” .Place, as a ground for the formation of identity, memory, and belonging, becomes the central focus of attention. This transformation opens the way for the entry of art as an active agent in shaping spatial experience, since art can reveal the hidden layers of place and endow it with greater semantic depth.

3.3|The Relationship Between Space, Body, Perception, and Place as the Ground of Aesthetic Experience

One of the important dimensions in understanding place is the attention to the role of the body and sensory perception in the experience of space. In contrast to abstract approaches that consider space independent of the subject, contemporary perspectives emphasize that space is always perceived through the body. Thinkers such as Maurice Merleau-Ponty, with his emphasis on the “lived body,” demonstrate that spatial perception is not merely a mental process, but a bodily and sensory experience [6]. Movement, touch, sight, and even sound all play a role in the formation of spatial experience [7]. Within this framework, space is not a static entity; rather, it is activated through interaction with the body. Spatial perception is dependent on position, movement, and individual experience. Meaning is produced through action and presence within space. This perspective aligns with the concept of “lived space” in the thought of Henri Lefebvre and demonstrates that spatial experience is multisensory, dynamic, and subject-centered. In contemporary art discourse, place is regarded not merely as a context but as an integral part of the artwork. Particularly in practices such as environmental art, the artwork is formed in direct interaction with the place and cannot be understood independently of it. Here, place becomes a ground for aesthetic experience, an experience that is not only visual but also multisensory and interactive. The audience is no longer a passive observer but participates as an “agent” in the process of meaning-making. This type of experience can disrupt conventional perceptions of space and draw attention to the often overlooked dimensions of place, thereby enabling the reinterpretation and re-reading of space [7]. As a result, place becomes a domain for the “production of meaning” and the

“recreation of experience.” In this section, the distinction between space and place was examined as one of the key concepts in contemporary architectural and artistic discourse, where space is understood as an abstract and designed structure, while place is understood as a lived and meaningful experience of two distinct yet interconnected levels of spatial reality. The shift from functionalist approaches to phenomenological perspectives led to the repositioning of place as a central focus, understood as a ground for experience, identity, and meaning [6]. Furthermore, the role of the body and sensory perception in the formation of spatial experience has highlighted the significance of lived spaces. These discussions provide the necessary theoretical foundation for understanding the role of environmental art an art form that intervenes precisely in the process of transforming space into place and at the level of lived experience. In the following chapter, this issue will be examined more directly, with a focus on the concept and functions of environmental art.

4 | Environmental Art: Definition, History, and Functions

4.1 | Definition of Environmental Art

Environmental Art is one of the significant tendencies in contemporary art in which the artwork is not conceived as an independent object, but rather is formed in a direct relationship with its surrounding environment, space, and contextual setting [8]. In this approach, the artwork moves beyond traditional display contexts (such as galleries and museums) and is situated within real environments, whether natural or urban. In contrast to classical art forms that emphasize the “art object,” environmental art focuses on “relationship” [8]. the relationship between human beings, space, and experience. In this sense, the artwork is not a final product but a process that takes shape through interaction with the environment and the audience. A fundamental characteristic of environmental art is its site-specificity. This means that the artwork is designed for a particular location, and its meaning and function are inseparably tied to the specific qualities of that place. As a result, relocating the work from its original context leads to the loss of a significant part of its meaning. From this perspective, environmental art can be understood as a form of “spatial intervention” that, through visual, sensory, and conceptual elements, redefines the experience of space.

4.2 | Distinction Between Environmental Art, Public Art, and Urban Art

Although environmental art, public art, and urban art overlap in many cases, there are conceptual differences among them that are essential for the theoretical precision of this study. Public art generally refers to works installed in public spaces that are accessible to everyone. These works can also carry meaning independently of their context and do not necessarily emphasize deep interaction with space. Urban art, on the other hand, primarily refers to artistic interventions within the urban context, such as graffiti, murals, or street installations, which are often engaged with social, cultural, or political issues. In contrast, environmental art emphasizes a profound engagement with context, considering space as an integral part of the artwork rather than merely its site of installation [8]. The audience’s experience is regarded as an essential component of the work. Consequently, environmental art can be said to have a deeper theoretical and practical connection to the concept of space compared to other categories, making it more suitable for analysis within the framework of Henri Lefebvre’s thought.



Fig. 1. Environmental art.



Fig. 2. Urban art.



Fig. 2. Public art.

4.3 | The Development of Environmental Art

The roots of environmental art can be traced back to the artistic transformations of the 1960s and 1970s, a period in which artists began to critically engage with art institutions and move away from gallery spaces and the art market. The Land Art movement, Land Art, was one of the earliest manifestations of environmental art, in which artists created large-scale works using natural elements such as soil, stone, water, and light [9]. One of the key figures of this movement is Robert Smithson, who, through his renowned work *Spiral Jetty*, established a new relationship between art, nature, and time. In such works, nature is not a mere backdrop but the very material and medium of the artwork, and natural processes such as erosion, growth, and the passage of time are considered integral components of the work [10]. This expansion into urban spaces in subsequent decades extended environmental art from natural contexts to urban environments. Artists began intervening in everyday spaces that had previously been considered devoid of aesthetic attention. At this stage, the city itself came to be regarded as an “artistic context,” and issues such as social concerns, urban identity, and everyday experience were incorporated into artworks. In interactive and participatory art, in its later stages, environmental art moved toward more interactive and participatory approaches. In this approach, the audience becomes part of the artwork, and meaning is formed through interaction and collective experience. This transformation has turned environmental art into a dynamic tool for redefining social relations within space.

4.4 | Aesthetic Characteristics of Environmental Art

Environmental art possesses characteristics that distinguish it from other artistic forms. The first characteristic is contextuality, in which the artwork is formed in direct relation to the spatial, historical, and cultural features of its context. The second characteristic is interactivity, in which the audience plays an active role in the experience and even in the formation of the artwork. The third characteristic is multisensory experience, in which the work is not limited to visual perception but also engages other senses such as hearing, touch, and movement. The fourth characteristic is ephemerality, in which many environmental artworks are not permanent and change or disappear over time. The fifth characteristic is process-orientation, which emphasizes the process of formation and experience of the work rather than the final product alone.[11]

Considering the above characteristics, environmental art can perform multiple functions in urban spaces, including spatial activation, in which inert and underutilized spaces are transformed into dynamic and experiential environments, and redefinition of perception, in which conventional patterns of spatial perception are challenged, and new modes of interpretation are enabled. It also adds new layers of meaning to space through symbols, forms, and experience, thereby contributing to the strengthening of place identity, as this emphasis on the specific qualities of each site helps foster a sense of belonging and identity. Furthermore, it provides a context for interaction, participation, and collective experience [1]. In this chapter, environmental art was introduced and analyzed as one of the most significant trends in contemporary art. This form of art, with its emphasis on context, experience, and interaction, departs from traditional artistic frameworks and is positioned as a form of spatial intervention. Characteristics such as contextuality, interactivity, and multisensory engagement make environmental art an effective tool for redefining spatial experience. These capacities, in relation to the spatial theory of Henri Lefebvre, provide a basis for analyzing the mediating role of environmental art in the reconfiguration of urban spaces. In the following chapter, this relationship will be examined directly, and the role of environmental art will be analyzed within the framework of Lefebvre's spatial triad.

5 | The Mediating Role of Environmental Art in the Production and Reproduction of Space

5.1 | Environmental Art as an Intermediary Between Human and Space

Within the theoretical framework of Henri Lefebvre, space is the result of the interaction between three dimensions: perception, conception, and lived experience. However, in the contemporary city, particularly under the dominance of technocratic logics, a rupture emerges between these dimensions. [2] In such a way that the "conceived space" (plans and programs) comes to dominate "lived space," while human experience is pushed to the margins. In this situation, environmental art can function as an active mediator: an intermediary that reduces the distance between formal design and everyday experience, enables the re-establishment of human-space relations, and reveals the hidden and overlooked layers of space. This mediation takes place through intervention in perception. Environmental art, by disrupting habitual modes of perception, draws the audience's attention to the neglected dimensions of space. As a result, space is transformed from a neutral background into a "field of experience." In other words, environmental art is not merely situated within space; rather, it reconfigures the relationship between human beings and space.

5.2 | Redefining Spatial Perception through Artistic Intervention

One of the most important mechanisms of environmental art's mediation is the transformation of the way space is perceived. In everyday life, spatial perception is often habitual and unconscious; individuals experience space without reflection, and many of its features remain unnoticed. Environmental art disrupts this process by creating a perceptual disruption. This interruption can occur through changes in scale, manipulation of light, sound, or movement, or the creation of visual or conceptual contrasts. As a result of this intervention, space is removed from its "taken-for-granted" condition, and the audience is prompted to reconsider it.[12] As a result, a new and conscious experience of space is formed. This process is directly related to "lived space" in the theory of Henri Lefebvre, as meaning is not produced in the initial design, but is instead reproduced through experience and perception.

5.3 | Environmental Art and the Reproduction of Social Space

In Henri Lefebvre's thought, the production of space is always accompanied by the reproduction of social relations. From this perspective, any change in spatial experience can lead to changes in forms of social interaction. Environmental art, by intervening in lived space, enables the reproduction of these relations. This can be explained in several ways. First, through the creation of interactive situations, in which environmental artworks often invite the audience to active participation. This participation may be individual (personal

experience) or collective (interaction among individuals). In both cases, space is transformed from a passive setting into a “field of action.” Second, through the redefinition of spatial meanings: urban spaces are usually endowed with fixed meanings shaped by design, function, and official discourses [13]. Environmental art can challenge these meanings and enable new modes of interpretation. In this way, space shifts from singular meaning toward polysemy, allowing for multiple interpretations to emerge. It also contributes to the strengthening of a sense of belonging and identity, as by activating lived experience, environmental art can foster a deeper relationship between individuals and space. This relationship becomes the basis for place attachment, spatial identity, and social participation. For a more precise understanding of the mediating role of environmental art, it can be analyzed in relation to Henri Lefebvre’s spatial triad. At the level of perceived space, environmental art alters patterns of movement and spatial use, creates new pathways, introduces points of pause and focus, and transforms the rhythm of movement within space.[8] At the level of conceived space, although environmental art emerges outside formal design systems, it can nonetheless influence them.

At the level of lived space, the most significant form of intervention lies in rethinking design approaches, incorporating experience and meaning into planning processes, creating aesthetic experiences, generating meaning through presence and interaction, and reconstructing emotional relationships with space. The result of this convergence is that environmental art operates at the intersection of these three dimensions and, through this position, contributes to the reproduction of space.

5.4 | Environmental Art as a Tool of Spatial Resistance

In continuation of Henri Lefebvre’s critique of capitalist space, environmental art can be understood as a form of “spatial resistance.” In opposition to the homogenization, abstraction, and controllability of space, environmental art highlights difference and specificity, revives individual experience, and enables the re-appropriation of space by its users. This form of resistance is not necessarily direct confrontation; rather, it is often symbolic and perceptual. However, it can have profound effects on the ways in which space is experienced and used [14]. In this chapter, environmental art was analyzed as a mediating factor in the process of the production and reproduction of space. This form of art, through intervention in perception, experience, and meaning, is capable of redefining the relationship between humans and space and leading to the creation of new lived spaces. Within the theoretical framework of Henri Lefebvre, environmental art operates at the intersection of the three spatial dimensions and, in this way, contributes to the reconfiguration of spatial and social structures. Furthermore, as a tool of resistance against the uniformity and alienation of urban spaces, it possesses the capacity to generate meaningful and dynamic experiences.

6 | Reconfiguration of Urban Architecture from the Perspective of Environmental Art

6.1 | Artistic Intervention in the Spatial Structure of the City

Within the theoretical framework of Henri Lefebvre, any change in space is considered part of its process of “social reproduction.” From this perspective, the reconfiguration of urban architecture does not necessarily imply large-scale physical transformations; rather, it can also occur through subtle and immaterial interventions. Environmental art operates precisely at this level; that is, without necessarily altering the physical structure of space, it reorganizes its perceptual and semantic dimensions.[14] These interventions can challenge stabilized readings of space, draw attention to overlooked elements, and generate new semantic structures. As a result, space is displaced from a static and pre-defined condition and becomes a “field of interpretation.” This form of reconfiguration is grounded less in material transformation and more in perception, experience, and meaning. One of the most important outcomes of environmental art intervention is the creation of “new lived spaces” within existing urban structures. As Henri Lefebvre emphasizes, lived space is a domain in which meaning, experience, and imagination are formed. In many contemporary cities, a significant portion of spaces—such as in-between spaces, passages, or underutilized public areas lack lived quality. Although these spaces exist functionally, they have a diminished or meaningless presence in the

everyday experience of citizens. Environmental art can transform these spaces from a “passive” state into an “active” one, turning them into arenas for experience, interaction, and pause, and enabling the formation of new spatial narratives. In this process, space is transformed not through construction, but through the redefinition of experience. In other words, environmental art has the capacity to extract “place” from within “space.”

6.2 | Redefining the Function of Architecture in Light of Environmental Art

The entry of environmental art into the field of urban architecture also leads to a rethinking of the role and function of architecture. In traditional approaches, architecture has primarily focused on the design and physical organization of space; however, in light of contemporary perspectives, particularly theories related to experience and perception, this role has been expanded.[15] Within this framework, architecture is no longer merely a producer of space; rather, it provides a setting for aesthetic experience, enables interaction and participation, and plays a role in the formation of meaning and identity. Environmental art, by entering this field, functions as a “complementary layer” and can compensate for the shortcomings of purely physical or formal design approaches.[16] This synergy leads to the emergence of an interdisciplinary approach to the reconfiguration of urban spaces. One of the important dimensions of urban reconfiguration is attention to the collective and social experience of space. Urban spaces are not merely places of passage or settlement; rather, they are grounds for the formation of social relations and human interactions [12]. In many cases, formal design leads to the creation of spaces that, while functionally efficient, have limited capacity for social interaction. Environmental art can transform this condition by creating participatory situations through inviting interaction and active presence, and by facilitating shared experiences. In this process, space is turned into an “event,” an event in which individuals not only experience space but also play a role in its formation.

This leads to the strengthening of a sense of belonging and the formation of a kind of “collective memory” within space, a concept that is fundamentally important for the sustainability and identity of the city.

6.3 | Reconfiguration as a Nonlinear and Dynamic Process

The reconfiguration of space in light of environmental art is not a linear or predetermined process, but rather dynamic, open, and multilayered in nature. In this process, meaning is gradually formed through interaction with users, experiences are multiple and variable, and space is constantly in a state of “becoming” rather than “being.” This characteristic is consistent with Henri Lefebvre’s view of space as a process. In this sense, space is not a final product but the outcome of continuous human actions. Environmental art, by emphasizing process, experience, and change, reinforces this dynamism and enables the continuous redefinition of space. In this chapter, the reconfiguration of urban architecture from the perspective of environmental art was analyzed as a process that goes beyond physical transformations. Environmental art, through intervention in the perceptual, semantic, and experiential layers of space, can lead to the reorganization of spatial and social structures without extensive physical changes. Within Lefebvre’s theoretical framework, this reconfiguration occurs through the activation of lived space, the redefinition of social relations, and the creation of new aesthetic experiences. Furthermore, this process leads to a rethinking of the role of architecture and the strengthening of the human and interactive dimensions of urban spaces.

7 | Discussion and Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this study indicate that the concept of space in the contemporary city cannot be explained solely in terms of physical or functional structures; rather, it must be understood as a multilayered and social phenomenon, a perspective systematically developed in the thought of Henri Lefebvre. Accordingly, space is the result of the interaction between perceived, conceived, and lived dimensions, and any intervention within it leads to the reproduction of these relations.

Within this framework, environmental art, as a mediating agent, has the capacity to reduce the gap between conceived space (formal design) and lived space (human experience). Unlike traditional architectural

approaches that primarily focus on physical organization, environmental art, through intervention in perceptual and semantic layers, enables the redefinition of space from within experience. The conceptual analysis suggests that the most significant function of environmental art lies not in the physical transformation of space, but in the transformation of its perception and experience. This shift, achieved through the disruption of habitual modes of perception and the activation of audience attention, leads to a more conscious and meaningful experience of space. As a result, space is removed from a neutral and taken-for-granted condition and becomes a field of interpretation, reflection, and action. On the other hand, the findings indicate that environmental art can play a decisive role at the level of lived space, which in Lefebvre's theory is considered the primary domain of meaning production. This form of intervention, through multisensory, interactive, and context-sensitive experiences, contributes to the reproduction of spatial meanings and strengthens the relationship between humans and their environment. It can also be argued that environmental art generates a form of perceptual and semantic resistance against the homogenization and abstraction of urban space, which are key features of the contemporary city. This resistance, by highlighting differences, reviving individual experience, and enabling multiple readings of space, helps restore human quality to the urban environment. However, it should be noted that the effectiveness of environmental art depends on contextual conditions, modes of implementation, and the degree of audience engagement. In the absence of a genuine connection to the social and cultural context, such interventions may be reduced to superficial experiences or decorative elements. Therefore, the realization of environmental art's mediating role requires a deep understanding of context and active interaction with space users. Overall, it can be concluded that environmental art, when applied consciously and contextually, can function as an effective tool in the reconfiguration of urban spaces, an instrument that, through intervention in experience, leads to the reproduction of spatial and social structures.

8 | Conclusion

This study, aiming to elucidate the mediating role of environmental art in the reconfiguration of urban architecture, was conducted within the theoretical framework of Henri Lefebvre. The findings indicate that space in the contemporary city is not merely a physical phenomenon, but a social, perceptual, and semantic product shaped through the interaction between human beings, power structures, and systems of representation. Within this context, environmental art, as one of the most important tools of spatial intervention, is capable of moving beyond object-centered approaches and redefining the relationship between humans and their environment. This form of art, with its emphasis on experience, interaction, and contextuality, operates at the level of lived space and, through transforming modes of perception, leads to the production of new meanings in space. The findings demonstrated that the mediating role of environmental art can be explained at three main levels: at the perceptual level, through the disruption of habitual visual and sensory patterns and the activation of conscious experience; at the semantic level, through the redefinition and multilayering of spatial meanings; and at the social level, through the strengthening of interaction, belonging, and participation in space. These three levels, in interaction with one another, lead to the reconfiguration of urban spaces—a reconfiguration that occurs not necessarily through physical transformation, but through changes in experience and meaning. Furthermore, this study showed that environmental art can function as a form of resistance against the homogenization, abstraction, and alienation of urban spaces. This resistance, through the revitalization of lived experience and the restoration of the human dimension of space, enables the formation of environments that are dynamic, meaningful, and multilayered. Ultimately, it can be concluded that the reconfiguration of urban architecture in the contemporary era requires an approach that goes beyond physical design; an approach in which environmental art, as a mediating agent alongside architecture, contributes to the production of spaces with higher perceptual and semantic quality.

8.1 | Suggestions for Future Research

A comparative study of real-world environmental art cases in different cities would place this research within a broader context. In addition, empirical analysis of the impact of environmental art on users' behavior and

perception would enhance the precision of case studies. This, in turn, would contribute to the development of interdisciplinary design models that integrate art and architecture, and could serve as a pathway toward the revitalization of inactive urban spaces.

Reference

Appendix

Authors can use supplementary sections, known as Appendixes, to provide additional information supporting the findings presented in their manuscript. These Appendixes serve the purpose of including details that might disrupt the main text's flow or are only relevant to a specific subset of readers. The supplementary sections may encompass comprehensive mathematical proofs, extra figures, more in-depth experimental particulars, or supplementary data.

When citing an Appendix in the main text, it is essential to reference it accordingly. In the Appendix, any referenced Figures, Tables, equations, etc., should be labeled with an "A" prefix, followed by a sequential numbering starting from 1 (e.g., Fig. A1, Fig. A2, etc.).