ABSTRACT

Contemporary societies are distancing themselves from nature, driven by urbanization, biodiversity loss, connection loss, industrialization and green space access... all reducing our empathy for nature. Conservation and grassroots reporting highlight nature’s wellbeing, requires impactful citizen-led responses. Youth leaders are reflecting mirrors on humankind, stating 'our world is on fire' and
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demanding action. Natural world interactions provide health benefits, resilience, proving transformative to our attitude, values and behaviour. The My Naturewatch project facilitates engagements with people’s environment and, by doing so, helps its comprehension. Nature observations help connect, engage and foster custodians, at a time where separation with wildlife necessitates active engagement. Activities specifically challenge our understanding of ‘designed engagement(s)’, not as passive activities but as impactful active engagements, openly accessible. This article proposes criteria encouraging public participation within the natural world, presenting value to NGOs, design, funders and agents. Thirty experts from design, ecology, conservation, museology, engagement, rewilding, wildlife and community work were interviewed, informing ‘design for environmental change through active engagement’. Work identifies design’s role in creating interventions that better engage people with the surrounding natural world, yielding long-term mutual benefits. The objective fosters active public–nature engagement, identifying barriers, opportunities and pitfalls leading to nature-engaged interaction(s).

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The CC BY licence permits commercial and non-commercial reuse.

**DEFINING ‘NATURE’**

The State of Nature Report combines data and expertise from over 50 organizations, providing an update on how wildlife is faring across the United Kingdom. The 2016 report stated, ‘between 2002 and 2013, 53% of species [have] declined, with 7% of urban species threatened with extinction from Great Britain’; wildlife is facing the biggest challenge of its time (Burns et al. 2013: 6). This context presents a design space requiring action to engage audiences who might not be aware of their impacts on wildlife, or even what their surrounding wildlife is. During the last twenty years, environmental issues have had more media coverage, and agencies authored ‘enhanced environmental legislation’ (Law Commission, Reforming the Law 2012: 52). The authors present ‘Engaging Design’ (ED), directly instigating our interaction with wildlife and the natural world, shifting beyond mere mitigation of consequence to design ‘direct action’ for the benefit of nature. The view is taken from a design perspective, comparing different approaches combining design and wildlife, and integrating co-constructive processes of trial and action (Koskinen et al. 2011: 18). Buckley identifies ecotourism and increased traffic as having adverse effects, including ‘soil erosion and compaction, damage to vegetation, disturbance to wildlife, water pollution, vandalism and noise’ (Buckley and Pannell 1990: 25). Whilst national parks encourage public engagement, ‘biologists [comment] that protected areas are not playgrounds’: wildlife ‘parks are assets for tourism, but they are not tourism assets’ (Buckley 2009: 26). The authors use design to foster community engagement through the prism of co-defined issues and questions situated within public contexts. The opportunity does not deal with consequence(s) but how you/we enable people to comprehend their impact(s) and, moreover, their role in the proliferation of species (rather than the dominating narrative of their demise). Naturalist Sir David Attenborough,
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... advocate and spokesperson of the natural world, states, ‘no one will protect what they don’t care about, and no one will care about what they have never experienced’ (Shepherd 2017: 5). Nature’s value is immeasurable, and while agents place great importance in connecting to the natural world, it continues to be undermined by human activity. The 2015 Nature Awareness Study highlights the importance of our nature relationship:

People with mid-level education, and citizens between the ages of 50 and 65 show an above-average degree of support for the principles of a sustainable use of nature, whereas the figures for people aged between 18 and 29 are lower than the population average.

(Kuchler-Krishun et al. 2015: 11)

The report comments, ‘urban nature is predominantly associated with parks and public green spaces’, not wild spaces or gardens (Kuchler-Krishun et al. 2015: 12). As designers, this raises the question: what role can design play in creating interventions that better engage people with the natural world surrounding them? What can be created to enable long-term change or better custody of the natural world? Authors borrow from Voros’ ‘probable futures’ highlighting topics ‘likely to happen, extrapolating from current trends’ (Hancock and Bezold 1994: 24).

This article reports and analyses on a leading expert representative round table, including The Urban Birders, Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust, biodiversity consultants, Countryside Education Trust, Bronze Oak Project, The Wildlife Trusts, The Design Museum, Citizen Science experts and more, helping audiences ‘engage with nature’.

‘ENGAGING DESIGN’

Currently we design for worlds of convenience, created to ‘purchase in a click’, publicly share and connect. Sustainable design practice engages with the consequence of materials, manufacturing processes and human behaviour to highlight our negative habits. Often design is tasked with the tacit incentivization of people to ‘do good’ as a means to facilitate more positive impacts on the environment. Human activity with sprawling cities, funding reductions and extended working hours have transformed our relationship with wildlife, natural systems and landscapes. We are at a distance from protecting or connecting with our surroundings by ‘othering’ nature (Uggl and Olausson 2012: 98). Additionally, whilst sustainable design indirectly seeks to engage with implicit notions of ecological benefit, it is often preoccupied with symptoms of production and consumption within a paradigm of growth for economic sustenance. It rarely explicitly undertakes design directions with the specific intent of propagating biodiversity and benefiting nature.

Von Hippel introduces ‘lead users’, people who ‘present strong needs to lead members of a marketplace months or years in the future’ (2005: 6). In Politics of the Everyday, Manzini comments the ‘role of design experts is to build a collective design intelligence’ producing ‘design capability of participants’ providing agency (2019: 19). Creating tools, techniques or processes to enable others is foundational to the training scheme reported on. Traditionally ‘inclusive design’ remains within the realms of customizing for ‘physical needs for agility/ability’ (Dong et al. 2004: 306). The authors believe that design for
inclusion removes financial barriers, age or gender issues, and opens items to adaption, reducing barriers to all.

The authors present ‘Engaging Design’ (ED), an emerging approach going beyond ‘product’ and aiming for impactful positive engagement of audiences, with the exemplar being the *My Naturewatch* project. The perspective compares different approaches aligning design and natural world integration of co-constructive processes of trial and action (Koskinen et al. 2011: 45). Understanding the world beyond products as ‘design can change or evolve behaviour’, enacting transformation, even if it remains local (Lilley 2007: 3). In this context, ED instigates our interaction(s) with wildlife and the natural world, shifting beyond mitigation of consequence to direct design action for the benefit of nature. For example, engaging in a forest school can contribute to the development of collaborative learning skills, by encouraging children to work with others on challenging outdoor activities (Coates 2019: n.pag.). These are designed experiences, interactions and engagements.

Design researchers often classify this approach as ‘research in the wild’ as it ‘evaluates prototypes in context and integrated within people’s lives’ (Chamberlain et al. 2012: 795). However, it is about engaging audiences through those integrated prototypes. The authors acknowledge that ‘sustainable development goes well beyond the level of the individual [as it is] too hard to alter by one person’, so targeting engagements with communities is more successful (Grund and Brock 2019: 893). Co-design, however, is about material development in partnership with design(ers), and sometimes participants are ‘test subjects’ validating concepts. The authors see the powerful shift ED can bring. ED is not about designers co-habiting or just co-designing with participants. Instead, it is about providing ‘designed agency’ to the participants so they can empower communities by proxy, resulting in embedded interventions. It is more specifically about deeply ‘activating audiences’ (meeting mutual agendas) and then providing impact where they want and require it, from a grassroots perspective. The Natural England’s *Access to Nature Report* stresses that nature engagements can ‘increase communities’ sense of ownership within local natural places, by establishing strong partnerships between communities, voluntary organizations, local authorities and others’ (2010: 10).

In *Citizen Designer, Perspectives on Design Responsibilities*, Heller and Vienne, advocating for human-centred design, highlight that ‘[h]uman-centred design develops solutions based on direct interaction with actual individuals [opposed to] user-centred design [that] relates to consumers’ (2003: 22). The authors believe that to achieve ‘ED’ we should design for humans and communities, not scenarios and personas.

**DESIGNED ENGAGEMENTS IN NATURE/DESIGN CONTEXTS**

Designers are questioning creative decisions and their impacts and looking for challenges focusing on specific affects rather than operating in traditional fields, that is, good manufacture, services, experience, etc. The latter requires stakeholder engagement at different levels and differing depths, nurturing long-term positive engagement. Design for ‘active engagement’ seeks to connect with audiences and cultures enacting change, a recognizable trait in a great deal of *sustainable design*. Flip-flopsam and Jetsam (Gant and Dean 2011) and Sea Chair (Jones et al. 2011) both seek to protect the marine environment by addressing issues of plastic pollution, but this is indirectly achieved through engaging ‘publics’ in a cultural conversation and connection. A digital design...
engagement example is BBC’s Weather Watchers – ‘[s]har[ing] what’s happen-
ing to the weather’ in your location. At the time of writing, it has ‘165,000
registered Weather Watchers across the UK’ (BBC 2018b). Hackalay presents
‘DITOs Escalator’, demonstrating seven levels of ‘engagement’ from everyone
to high engagement in DIY Science (2018). Hackalay states that the number
of people at the engagement level of BBC programmes Blue Planet II (BBC
2018a) and Planet Earth II (BBC 2016) has viewing figures of fourteen million
and ten million, respectively, estimating these ‘passive consumers’ at 25 per-
cent of the population (Hackalay 2018). The most engaged level include[s]
those in DIY Science, exploring DIY Bio, developing sensors, etc. estimat-
ing 0.001% of the UK population at most (Synenergene 2014).

Engagement is in itself a designed process; the intension promotes sustain-
ability, environmental action or protection.

NATURE’S ‘VALUE’

Placing a monetary value on nature is impossible, but elements can be meas-
ured, especially in global economics, for example, ‘Mexico’s mangrove forests
provide an annual $70 billion, to their economy through storm protec-
tion, fisheries support, and ecotourism’ (Sukhdev 2018). In 2001, the United
Kingdom suffered a foot-and-mouth disease epidemic, with ‘2,000 cases’
during the outbreak, when ‘overseas visitors to the UK dropped by 10%’ (Bates
2016). Impacting tourism and outdoor recreation/sports highlight some of
nature’s interdependencies. The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature
presents economic values of nature, including ‘eco-tourism is the fifth largest
industry in the UK support[ing] 2.2 million jobs, contributing £97 billion to
the [UK] economy’ (HM Government 2012: 52). What Has Nature Ever Done
for Us presents natural health service(s), soil care, pollination, the oceans and
business cases, including ‘25–50%, proportion of $640 billion pharmaceuti-
cal market is based on biodiversity’ (Juniper 2013: 45). Juniper highlights that
‘statins [ antidepressants] cost £9,500 per year, while exercise-based activity
costs about £440’, twenty times less, offering a ‘National Nature Healthcare
Service’ (2013: 18). Juniper stresses that ‘children with attention deficit disor-
der have been found to show significant improvements if they play in natu-
ral areas, or have views of trees and grass outside homesteads’ (2013: 28).
Findings supported by the State of Nature Report unite 50 nature conserva-
tion agencies ‘giv[ing] a cutting edge overview of the [UK’s] state of nature’, high-
lighting ‘between 1970 and 2013, 56% of species declined, with 40% showing
strong or moderate declines’ (Hayhow et al. 2016: 12).

The National Trust’s Natural Childhood presents nature’s positive effects:
health benefits, mental health, reduction in ADHD, and comments that more
nature engagements could offer ‘sav[ings] to the health service [to] the order
of £2.1 billion per annum in England alone’ (Moss 2012: 5). Dr William Bird
(medical advisor to Natural England) comments, ‘[T]he outdoors can be seen
as a great outpatient department whose therapeutic value is yet to be fully
realised’ (2007: 22). The Office for National Statistics made a ‘first attempt to
put a monetary value on “nature capital” for the UK in 2011 as £1,573 billion
(over £1.5 trillion)’ (Juniper 2013: 18). Britain’s ‘nature is an economic and secu-

rity asset with enormous social value’ (Juniper 2013: 59). Finally, ‘rural tourism
is believed to be worth £14 billion per year, with an estimated 17 percent of
all UK tourism trips involved nature or wildlife watching’ (Juniper 2013: 23).
The recent 2018 Living Planet Report presents ‘[a]ll economic activity depends
on services provided by nature, estimated to [annually] be worth US$125 trillion’ (Grooten and Almond 2018: 7). The report disseminates biodiversity’s importance:

Without healthy natural systems researchers are asking whether continuing human development is possible, our health, food and security depend on biodiversity. From medical treatments to food production, biodiversity is critical to society and people’s well-being.

(Grooten and Almond 2018: 11)

CONTEXTUAL PERSPECTIVES ON NATURE

Nature is complex, polemical, generating contention and disagreement for best practice. Ragwort (a common English weed), prolific in abandoned urban areas, roadsides, countryside and gardens, divides experts and is a contextual reference (Butterfly Conservation Trust 2018). In 2003, the Ragwort Control Act was created restricting the weed spread (London Stationary Office 2003); if eaten by ‘horses or livestock, ragwort can be poisonous with long term irreparable liver damage’ (World Horse Welfare 2018). The plant also ‘provides nectar for numerous butterfly species’, so is favoured by wild gardeners, permaculture experts and rewilding projects (Nikon 2018). Designing ‘natural engagement(s)’ requires consideration and must be contextually approached. In Can We Save Britain’s Wildlife Before It’s Too Late, Cocker states that ‘the overarching goal is to radically change the ethic and methods by which nature is governed’, potentially influencing behaviour and comprehension over time (2018: 18). Miller suggests that ‘more effort [needs to] be invested in making the natural world part of people’s lives’ (2005: 25).

NATURE ENGAGEMENTS

Securing Nature for Future Generations questions, ‘What role should the natural environment play in the UK’s future’, commenting ‘climate change, consumption, population growth, changing land use and competition for resources are already impacting nature heavily’ (British Ecological Society 2018). Cornel supports this in Deep Nature Play, explaining that ‘play is a great learning tool that energizes us, fosters creativity and helps build relationships’. We must ‘awaken enthusiasm, focus attention, offer direct experience and share inspiration’ (2017: 22), something that good nature engagements should embed. Bird defines ‘the critical age of [nature] influence’ as preteen (12 years old), as ‘contact with nature in all its forms, in particular wild nature, appears to strongly influence a positive behaviour towards the environment’ (2007: 22). Sterling comments in Sustainable Education, Revisioning Learning and Change that we must evolve ‘educational culture which both develop and embodies the theory and practice of sustainability in a way, which is critically aware’ (2001: 18).

In Beyond Knowing Nature: Contact, Emotion, Compassion, Meaning, and Beauty Are Pathways to Nature Connection, the authors list ‘contact, meaning, emotion, compassion and beauty indicators of, pathways towards nature connectedness’ as five strong indicators for a positive nature engagement (Lumber et al. 2017: 12). Robert M. Pyle defines the Extinction of Experience as ‘the loss of neighbourhood species endangers our experience of nature. If a species becomes extinct within our own radius of reach, it might as well be
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gone altogether. Local extinction has much the same result as global eradica-
tion’ (Soga and Gaston 2018: 223). Miller presents Shifting Baseline Syndrome
as a ‘psychological and sociological phenomenon whereby each human gener-
ation accepts as natural or normal the situation in which it was raised. With
ongoing local, regional and global deterioration in the natural environment,
this results in a continued lowering of people’s accepted norms for these envi-
ronmental conditions’ (Soga and Gaston 2018: 223).

Conservationist Chris Packham established the Peoples Manifesto for Wildlife,
stating that ‘we have plenty of tools in the conservation box – we can rebuild,
restore, reinstate or reintroduce. But we have one collective [disability] –
we shy away from seeing the bigger picture’ (Packham et al. 2018: 5). These
expert perspectives frame exploration and experience and foster practical
embodiment of sustainable learning, transforming public resilience in envi-
ronmental change. These engagements have different depths for the public:

Observational engagements. Wildlife-viewing – the RSPB’s pioneering
engagements, including ‘The Big Wild Sleep out’, ‘encouraging anyone to
spend a night immersed in nature’ and ‘The Big Garden Bird Watch’ (with
600,000 participants in 2011), demonstrate the public’s motivation to partic-
ipate (RSPB 2018). 17,000 people participated in City Nature Challenge
(Higgins 2018) and 73,000 in the Christmas Bird Count (BirdNote 2018).

Participatory engagements. Calls to action, for example, The National Trust’s
50 Things To Do Before You’re 11 ¾ (The National Trust 2018). Activities range
from building dens to bug hunts around their national properties. Another
participatory mechanism is 30dayswild, a social media campaign run by The
Wildlife Trusts, fostering activities for one month annually (The Wildlife
Trusts 2018a). In 2016, ‘12,400 people formally signed up for 30dayswild’ (The Wildlife
Trusts 2018a).

Equipped engagements. Quitmeyer’s work creates ‘Digital Naturalists’, ‘help-
ing ecologists design and build personal computational tools, extend[ing] their
tool-making traditions into the digital realm’ (2017: 185). Digital Naturalists
empower experts with computational tools, investigating local content. A
second example is the WonderSphere (Stoudemire 2018), a sealed mobile
chamber empowering paediatric patients with scientific and ‘natural wonders
through multi-sensory learning experiences, promoting joy and well-being’
(Stoudemire 2018: n.pag.). Built-in ‘gloves enable hospitalized children (with
compromised immune systems) to plant, dig, water, and touch nature without
danger of infection, providing a bedside hands-on field trip’ (Stoudemire 2018:
185).

My Naturewatch is an example of Designing Active Engagement as it
‘connects audiences young and old in fun or serious activity’ (www.mynature-
watch.net). The My Naturewatch Camera is designed to capture pictures of
wildlife when it detects movement; and as it uses off-the-shelf parts, it can
be assembled on a kitchen table without tools. Inexpensive, easy for people
to make themselves, and aligned to the interests of the BBC’s Natural History
Unit, it is specifically designed for use in people’s gardens or local green
spaces to record images of nearby wildlife. My Naturewatch engagements
(to date) include film trailers with local independent cinemas, design work-
shops (Figures 1 and 2), passive engagements, expert engagement, television
broadcasts, Bio-Blitz’s, talks and an expert training scheme. The work has
also fostered independent nature engagement activities documented live on
social media. In My Naturewatch Camera: Disseminating Practice Research with
a Cheap and Easy DIY Design, the authors commented ‘the fact that so many
people have made My Naturewatch Cameras shows that, with appropriate
design and adequate publicity, research products can circulate widely outside
commercial markets’ (Gaver et al. 2019: 302).
DESIGN SPACE SUMMARY

The authors have defined the coalescing themes as a ‘design space’, for example, *Nature* is perceived as the natural world and ecosystem that surrounds us – not solely the ‘countryside’ but all environments within reach. *Nature’s value* is evident in material provision, health, wellbeing and preserving the ecosystem relied on for life on earth. ED is a new strategy, offering a deeper level of active engagement amongst audiences, created to instil ‘active responses’ rather than mere ‘participation’, and considers the ‘buy in’ from audiences for different levels of engagement. Open Design, and the transparency of making, gives people agency and brings different complexities of repair, re-skilling, assembly and appropriateness. Design is transforming to a more open and sustainable system, enabling reuse or repurposing, and adding complexity by substituting and adapting designs. To address this design space, the authors required a cross-disciplinary position, as the theme combinations are exceptionally complex, sensitive and require expertise. Design is comfortable in numerous areas of discourse. However, it needs to cope with the integration of sustainable ecosystems and work in parallel with our natural world, instilling ownership and responsibility into local communities that reside within it. As the topic areas (Open Design, ED, Nature) unite, the complexities require processes for navigation. The following question unites presented literature and themes:

What role can design play in creating change/interventions that better engage people with the natural world surrounding them – with the specific intention of yielding long-term benefits to both people and the natural world?

METHOD

The areas (Open Design, ED, Nature) combine and foster active engagement, as motivation to preserve nature is intrinsic, but the interdependencies are complex, with far-reaching impacts. The authors see the value in this design space to enact change over time. The roundtable united national experts (Figure 3) accompanied by facilitators and pre-trained interviewers. Senior experts presented their fields with ten-minute ‘topic shares’; this demonstrated their perspectives on the interpretations of terms above to attendees. The participants mapped their expertise to help define their interests, which is included in the analysis. The method probed the combination of areas, as there is topic bleed between experts. The agenda was not just a future casting exercise, but unpicked how these design spaces function as our civic responsibilities change over time. The authors do not see this as co-design as the entire process was intent on encouraging active engagement with the public and not just their ‘participation’. The authors presented the opportunity for the proposed design space uniting the elements and wanted to unpick potential pitfalls and opportunities. The participants were carefully selected based on the research team’s mapping of expertise, and participants then mapped themselves (Figure 3).

The scoping presentations grounded audiences in each other’s cultures and approaches, creating an inclusive approach undetermined by a hierarchy of knowledge. During roundtable discussions, all attendees were interviewed. The participants were frontline workers and close to the issues at hand,
making them key stakeholders. Interviews with key informants ‘allow[ed] a
free flow of ideas and information, interviewers frame questions spontane-
ously, probe for information and takes notes, which are elaborated on later’,
providing information directly from experts (Binnendijk 1996: 83). Interviews
with key informants ‘provide flexibility to explore new ideas and issues not
anticipated during planning’ (Binnendijk 1996: 84). Participants were inter-
viewed individually, avoiding the ‘Hawthorne effect’ where participants behave
differently when they know they are being observed’ (Chipchase 2018: 41,
original emphasis). The interviewees were briefed, initiating from an ident-
tical script ‘enabl[ing] strict comparison between interviews’ as it ‘is easier
for a novice to follow’ (Chipchase 2018: 68). This process levelled all of the
interviewees ensuring parity and clarity of activities. Questions were sent
to interviewees in advance, avoiding participant discomfort or pressure. The
topics went from ‘closed responses to answers that are more open’, keeping
‘the questions short’ (Chipchase 2018: 82). Questions covered measurements
of success in engaging people with nature; occurrences of negative nature
impacts; design’s role in this change; and potential long-term positive effects
of change for society and mitigation of negative impacts. Interviews were
recorded, transcribed and comparatively analysed through coding ‘covering
key themes, concepts, questions and ideas’ (Binnendijk 1996). Key points and
excerpts have been extracted, and should be read in context to the question
and the expert’s discipline. The responses were then affinity-mapped into
themes of importance. They were prioritized by topics and insights previ-
ously unidentified in design and nature literature. The experts of that area
were then given priority, based on where they mapped themselves, during
the accompanying activity.

Figure 3: Expertise mapping of roundtable participants. Image credit: authors.
RESULTS

Q1: Identifying challenges for the public to engage with nature and barriers informing change?

Question context: A ‘disconnected relationship with nature is a consequence of an anthropocentric viewpoint’, this is compounded by ‘busy lives’, distance working and complex issues (Merchant 2006: 514). Current barriers to nature include peoples’ perception of weather (Lumber et al. 2017), access to green space (Cox et al. 2018), perception of lack of knowledge (Schultz 2002), urbanization (Cox et al. 2018), social mobility (Maas et al. 2009), smartphone use (Richardson et al. 2018), lack of understanding (Barry 2009), people not having the time (Guiney and Oberhauser 2009), peoples’ willingness/motivation (Kals et al. 1999), public perception that they have to ‘go somewhere’, motivation as people expect a certain type of interaction and/or the reward can be frustrating (Monroe 2003: 115), and an increase in indoor activities (Nordbakke 2019: 359). The following challenges are specific to the organizations; however, they have been extrapolated and key themes identified, which were then revalidated by stakeholders.

Lucy Robinson, Head of Citizen Science, Natural History Museum, highlights the key theme of large ‘ill-informed or ill-managed’ engagement(s). The public perceive loads of people going to nature reserve[s] and trampling plants. Once people have a level of engagement with nature and understanding of it, they don’t trample plants because they know the impacts. I think you have to accept that there might be a short-term negative impact, but it’s for long-term positive gain […] It’s not that everyone has to love
nature or [be a] super-nature enthusiast, but people appreciating that nature touches different parts of your life. It’s the food you eat. It’s if you have asthma, that could be something to do with pollen etc [...] We [the NHM] don’t tend to look at what actual features of projects hinder learning or engagement, or foster it. I think evaluating it and recognising it would actually be digging into the specific designs of programmes and understanding impacts.

Q1: Summary
The experts continually highlighted that the biggest challenge is managing impacts over time in specific areas because untrained visitors do not foresee their impacts. There is an opportunity in perceiving impacts and encouraging responses during different seasons/specific events, often highlighting their
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potential impact to the public. This could be through designing out challenges and/or educating participants to make wiser, less-impactful choices. Projects of this nature need to design out ‘over-disturbance’ in engagements, either in holiday-booking, visiting or education reducing high-level impacts.

Q2: What can design (as a practice) do to transform/change how we engage with nature?

Table 2: What can design (as a practice) do to transform/change how we engage with nature?

| Agent                                      | Benefits                                                                 | Pitfalls                                                                 | Challenges                                                                 | Opportunities                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dr Julia Lorke, postdoc, Natural History Museum | My Naturewatch is the only example where I feel environmental education and connecting with nature overlaps. | Adding another activity that excludes locations and individuals due to geographic location | Finances, resources and facilities to achieve within the curriculum and/or parental learning | Explore the link between education and nature connectedness |
| Teresa Dent, CEO, Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust | Could lead to another economy for agricultural industry on a small/medium scale | Invite many ‘nature enthusiasts to see it’ | Finding ways to measure agricultural/nature trends from baseline to satisfy farmers that they are succeeding | Digital intervention that celebrates ‘bragging rights’ for individuals that can be safely shared |
| Chris Sandom, rewilding expert, Head of Sandom Labs | Increase in health and wellbeing in countryside locations | Only works in countryside locations | We need to consider how we design our nature connection back into our lives | Designing landscapes and/or daily interactions that build over time |
| Lucy Robinson, Head of Citizen Science, Natural History Museum | Top-down outputs have sustainable future and ‘design for exit’. | Things naturally occur in a top-down way because organizations exist to achieve particular outcomes. | Outputs becoming ‘top-down’ and not reaching the appropriate audience | Co-create with the intended audience and find mutual intrinsic motivation for participation/engagement |

Q2: What can design (as a practice) do to transform/change how we engage with nature?

Question context: Design can be a force for large-scale change, ‘tackling the biggest challenges of our time, bringing about positive change in people’s lives’ (Design Council 2017). In the future, ‘companies will need to demonstrate their products’ positive contribution to society as well as minimizing their negative environmental/social impacts’ (Shin et al. 2015: 368). These impacts can also be used to create engagements as a force for good (Shin et al. 2015: 368). Some examples of this ‘design/nature’ alliance include the following projects: The Animal Diplomacy Bureau (ADB), featuring designed game experiments that provide agency to participants; Pokémon GO (PokemonGo 2018); and 30dayswild (The Wildlife Trusts 2018b). Experts believe that increasing people’s ‘nature engagements’ could lead to regenerative cultures, potentially affecting participants’ mindsets (Phillips and Kau 2019).
Bernard Hay, Senior Learning Producer, The Design Museum, describes the largest challenge. The bigger question is how do we shift participants’ awareness of the surrounding environment so that they’re aware of nature and their impacts? That could be through spatial interventions, in terms of parks, that could be about signage or interaction design experiences […] [We] need a greater commitment to thinking about how we change people’s perceptions of what the natural world is, with design. I think there’s a standard view of nature that focuses on beautiful mountains, or these unspoilt landscapes you see on Blue Planet […] [It’s] about adopting the aptitudes and skill sets that we have, for example empathic thinking, curiosity, being an amateur, prototyping, testing, getting feedback, iterating your products.

Table 3: How should change be nurtured to influence our approach to environmental transformation?

| Agent                                      | Benefits                                                                 | Pitfalls                                                                 | Challenges                                                                 | Opportunities                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bernard Hay, Senior Learning Producer, The Design Museum | People could be fostered encouraging more engagement over time, without guilt or peer-to-peer comparisons. | It could be a short-term engagement that does not evolve and does result in any impact. | Participants require background knowledge, or practice, to sensitively intervene in context. | Designing so volunteer efforts are acknowledged and they feel valued. |
| Jane Cooper, CEO, Countryside Education Trust | Inform policy through grassroots action                                  | Interventions get forced on communities                                   | A mix of policy and local approaches building economic capacity           | Defining at what scale a design intervention can inform policy and vice versa |
| Rachel Bicker, biodiversity consultant, Gatwick Airport | Designed interventions meet local need and requirement, working in parallel with international locations. | Outputs designed in isolation and not long-term                        | Designed to meet a need or a demand, rather than just trying to tick boxes in a funding opportunity | Include funding councils in the need and requirement for engagements to be designed |
| Lucy Robinson, Head of Citizen Science, Natural History Museum | Designed interventions meet local need and requirement, working in parallel with international locations. | Outputs designed in isolation and not long-term                        | Designed to meet a need or a demand, rather than just trying to tick boxes in a funding opportunity | Include funding councils in the need and requirement for engagements to be designed |
| David Lindo, The Urban Birder and television presenter | How we live within wildlife and can evolve our architecture              | One-size design solution does not always fit all.                      | Being formulaic because you know it will work                              | Open-source design to share and build from, reducing cost. |

Table 3: How should change be nurtured to influence our approach to environmental transformation?

Bernard Hay, Senior Learning Producer, The Design Museum, describes the largest challenge. The bigger question is how do we shift participants’ awareness of the surrounding environment so that they’re aware of nature and their impacts? That could be through spatial interventions, in terms of parks, that could be about signage or interaction design experiences […] [We] need a greater commitment to thinking about how we change people’s perceptions of what the natural world is, with design. I think there’s a standard view of nature that focuses on beautiful mountains, or these unspoilt landscapes you see on Blue Planet […] [It’s] about adopting the aptitudes and skill sets that we have, for example empathic thinking, curiosity, being an amateur, prototyping, testing, getting feedback, iterating your products.
At home, parents say, ‘Don’t touch that worm, it’s dirty’.

Change laws, incentivize people; if they positively impact nature, they can reduce their council tax.

Outdoor learning has been proven to have huge benefits, both in terms of educational attainment and kids’ wellbeing.

Encouraging people to treat gardens as small nature reserves as they are essential for biodiversity.

Creating interrelated international practices and approaches.

Table 4: What is the best practice to establish and engage people in environmental change?

Q3: How should change be nurtured to influence our approach to environmental transformation?

Question context: Behaviour-centred design (BCD) ‘encompasses a theory of change, a suite of behavioural determinants and a programme design process’ (Aunger and Curtis 2016: 426). Professionals ‘including policy-makers,
marketers, educationalists, environmentalists, international development practitioners, governance and justice campaigners, health promoters, city planners, sports psychologists and web designers are all looking for advice on how to change behaviour’ (Aunger and Curtis 2016: 426). The approach of BCD is transformational, but our (publics) approach has to change to engage with it. Parallel activities that have had a huge impact over time are the United Kingdom’s plastic bag tax ‘dropping consumption by 86%’ (GOV.UK 2019), the public smoking ban that reduced emergency hospital admissions (GOV.UK 2019) and the potential up-and-coming sugar tax (Brownell et al. 2009: 10). The following are the key stakeholder responses.

Roberto Fraquelli, Head of Design, Schumacher College, shares the underlying point. By

designing opportunities for new paradigms that aren’t about the existing world views that we have based around gross domestic product, but to design new curricular, new ways of living […] more community living, thinking more about bioregions. We must move away from the culture we have manifested, particularly in urban spaces which tends to not focus on nature and the opportunities in nature.

Q3: Summary
The challenges are providing motivation that goes ‘beyond the self’ to encourage participants – designing new paradigms, tax relief, design for transition, design to meet the need for ‘sustainable change’ and creating systems that enable agency and grassroots appropriation.

Q4: What is the best practice to establish and engage people in environmental change?

Question context: The concept of best practice is to unify approaches that others can benefit from (Mao et al. 2005: 106). In The Knowledge Gain and Behavioural Change in Citizen-Science Programs, Jordan et al. comment that trial participants claimed the largest motivating factor for Citizen Science participation is ‘content knowledge’ (2011: 1151). Content knowledge is the education that users experience from exploring the world through the practice of Citizen Science. Part of Citizen Science practice is to offer training opportunities where volunteers can increase their skills, expertise and ‘content knowledge’. In The Rise of the Expert Amateur: DIY Projects, Communities, and Cultures, Kuznetsov describes the main motivation of users contributing to DIY projects as the ‘learning of new skills and communal sharing’ (Kuznetsov and Paulos 2010: 1). Kuznetsov and Jordan et al.’s work aligns the main motivating factor in Citizen Science and DIY activities as learning new content. In November 2012, the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Natural Environment Research Council) commissioned and published a report, Understanding Citizen Science and Environmental Monitoring (Roy et al. 2012). Within this report, Roy et al. comment:

Volunteers are motivated by enjoyment of participation but also by having confidence in the utility of the data. Initiatives with specific aims for underpinning policy or contributing to hypothesis-driven research would be welcomed by, at least, some of the citizen science community.
It is important to respect the diverse motivations of volunteers. For example, not all will be willing to modify their existing activities to engage with policy-citizen science. Engagements should be innovative and imaginative combining the collation of high quality and useful data while appealing to the volunteer community. (2012: 26)

Mathew Frith, Director of Conservation, London Wildlife Trust, defines what we need from the next generation. We need ambassadors to show that things can be done. So it goes back to that point about hope; it’s not all a long, steep climb. One of the things we suffer from is a funding world, which basically does short-term projects. So we do something for three years, and then we have to walk away. So you get – One of the big issues, and a particular interest for me, are the quality of the landscapes around our housing estates in London [...] So it’s about marrying the local expertise, the local knowledge, the experience that no one else can match from actually being in that place and being part of that community, with the professional input, which is to do with strategy, in some ways.

Q4: Summary

Provide embedded motivation or provide influence through transparent impacts. This can be through ambassadors who enable communities to build sustainable futures. The important element is to unite local knowledge, expertise and local communities through a clear approach and narrative.

DISCUSSION

The section is subdivided into four subthemes: spatiality, interactions, motivation and impact. These areas maintained the highest frequency amongst the interview results. They also highlight the opportunities within the proposed design space. The authors acknowledge there is no ‘one size fits all’ solution as this area is complex; with legal ramifications, health and safety issues, and more. This is an exceptionally multifaceted space to navigate with many long-standing forces at play. Codes of conduct could help foster independence, that is, ‘take only pictures, leave only footprints’, and encourage people to engage in this space with expert care (Mears and McNutt 2002: 8). Richard Louv, the leading nature journalist who coined ‘Nature Deficit Disorder’, The Nature Principle and Vitamin N, is a leading opinion in the area. Louv remarks on our relationship between nature and technology in Our Wild Calling. Louv argues:

Analogue and digital must merge in order to create a new space of nature in which the positive, empathetic, loving relationship between mankind and creation is the most important condition for the survival of the species. And the Internet is the key to this new space. (2019: 146)

Subtheme: Spatiality

The World Wide Fund for Nature highlights issues with smartphone apps recording wildlife sightings, specifically in Yellowstone, a national park in the
United States. Not only does the app remove the ‘wild nature of discovering wildlife’ with ‘grizzly bear sightings at such spots are especially challenging for park rangers, who have to both direct traffic and keep people a safe distance away’ (Gaukel Andrews 2012: n.pag.). This is an extreme example of ‘logging wildlife’, but it does raise the issue of health and safety, drawing people who do not have the subsequent knowledge to cope with the environment to certain locations. The Dorset Wildlife Trust has reported that smartphone apps imitating bird song have been used negatively to lure species for amateur photography (Gonzalez 2013). Tony Whitehead, Public Affairs Officer for the RSPB, stated, ‘[R]epeatedly playing a recording of birdsong or calls to encourage a bird to respond in order to see it or photograph it can divert a territorial bird from important duties, such as feeding its young’ (Gonzalez 2013). This intervention could have large impacts if inappropriately scaled. Finally, military-grade sonar usage has been linked to whale ‘beaching’ or ‘stranding’. Reporting ‘the number of whales known to have been harmed by sonar is relatively small, but until we know exactly how whales respond to sonar, and what sound exposure causes these responses, we cannot assess the full scope of the problem’ (Cressey 2008). All of these touch points are scenarios where people have been unaware of their impacts. The question is, how do you make them aware of scenarios that do not exist yet, or should we be continuously fearful?

- Semi-permanence requires consideration, the free flow of movement and repositioning of interactions, touch points and over time not contributing to site-specific increased footfall.
- ‘Wild’ is messy and risky; that is a good thing; do not sanitize it or design it out.
- Wildlife is not just in the countryside; it is also in your public space, garden, park, place of work or outside the window.
- Designing new paradigms; rather than looking at traditional ownership models, to engage people.

Subtheme: Interactions

Hartig et al. discuss the health benefits of ‘nature experiences’, including physiological impacts, restorative aspects, learning, and personal development supporting ‘views about nature and health, are using methods and theories now viewed as scientifically credible’ (Nilsson et al. 2010). One gaming platform that surprised health experts was Pokémon GO, a ‘Real World Gaming Platform us[ing] real locations to encourage players to search far and wide in the real world to discover Pokémon. Pokémon GO allows you to find and catch Pokémon as you explore your surroundings’ (Tateno et al. 2016). This platform was designed to create profit and establish exploration; it never considered the health implications of simply getting people to explore the world around them. In studies, Igmar et al. (Althoff et al. 2016) documented that 32,000 users ‘added a total of 144 billion steps to the US physical activity’. There are further cases highlighting Pokémon players going to previously unvisited locations (Colley 2017) and helping people with social withdrawal (Tateno et al. 2016). Recently the National Trust commissioned a report, Natural Childhood, written by lifelong naturalist Stephen Moss, original producer of the BBC series SpringWatch. In the report, Moss highlights, ‘Nature Deficit Disorder:
Causes and Consequences focuses on the lives of Britain’s children, particularly with regard to their lack of engagement with nature. Three specific categories are examined: physical health problems including obesity, mental health problems, and children’s growing inability to assess risks to themselves and others (2012: 10). Moss continues to identify:

Imagine a world where our children are physically and mentally healthier, communities more cohesive and connected, and everyone enjoys a closer relationship with the natural world, and all its benefits. Reduced costs to the NHS, higher educational attainment in our schools, and happier, more fulfilled families are just the start. Ultimately, this would help produce generations of children with a more balanced approach to risk-taking, deeper bonds with their peers, and a genuine self-awareness and perspective on the wider world – ready to take their place in adult society.

(2012: 10)

- Be aware, this approach is not about replacing ‘nature’ but enhancing experiences.
- Question how interactions function, i.e., group, at a distance to build empathy? Group interactions; work at a distance; collective medium, etc.
- Design appropriate steps for proposals that are sensitive and attuned to their surroundings.
- As many people as possible need to have access to the interventions even if they are embedded into environments for all to use.

**Subtheme: Motivation**

- Present a clear picture of what audiences are contributing to with a considered level of intrinsic motivation, as it should align to their interest(s) or need(s).
- Create incentives that are opportunities rather than regulatory-driven as a negative campaign.
- Fostering grassroots connections and projects that are embedded in local communities rather than just top-down mechanisms.

**Subtheme: Impact**

Impacts are often hard to predict as they become highlighted on mass or over time. The RSPCA has advised that ‘Sky Lanterns’ (flammable balloons released at events) can cause ‘ingestion, entanglement and entrapment to wildlife’ (2013). The public feeding of Mallard ducks with ‘white bread causes problems, as excess starch makes them lethargic, leading to health problems’ (Furness 2013: n.pag.). Overfeeding Mallard ducks can also cause ‘over-populations of males in environments leading to forced mating’ (RSPB 2013: n.pag.). Recent research has also shown ‘that baleen whales [are] affected by military mid-frequency sonar’ (Goldbogen 2013: 1765). In 2011, the RSPB documented ‘two wildlife photographers fined £1,100 for disturbing a pair of nesting white-tailed eagles on the Isle of Mull’. This case could have been amplified by multiple users sharing information online. Would more awareness of codes...
of conduct and indirect impact in this area have a positive effect? A simple example of this unknown impact was the foot-and-mouth outbreak in 2001. Foot-and-mouth is spread by foreign contaminants transferred to footwear and freely distributed. The South Downs recreation area (1600 km²), located in East Sussex, was closed to reduce the spread of the disease. The public misunderstanding of their foot traffic’s impact exacerbated its spread. The disease claimed farms and ‘resulted in losses of £3.1 billion to agriculture’ (DEFRA 2004: n.pag.). Another simple example is everyday bird feeders. *Trichomonas gallinae* is a common parasite to pigeons. Studies in 2012 documented a ‘30% reduction in green finch numbers’ due to the transmission of parasites to other species (Robinson et al. 2010). The RSPB stated that *Trichomonas gallinae* ‘is spread as birds feed one another with regurgitated food during the breeding season, and through food and drinking water contaminated with freshly regurgitated saliva’ (2014: n.pag.). The cure relies on the ‘public to clean their bird feeders, regularly’, as this act of kindness could erode species over time (RSPB 2014: n.pag.). The authors think the following points are critical in mitigating against impacts for the types of ventures discussed.

- **Creation of ambassadors** on a local level that are arbiters amongst the most relevant peers, youth or community groups.
- **Change of public mindset**, creation of awareness that is more granular, informing potential actions or behaviours.
- **Public notion of diversity** in environment can be extended with more local knowledge.
- **Grassroots informing policy**, concepts need to be backcast, so grassroots opportunities can see what their work could inform.

**CONCLUSION**

The activities have been independently validated by the *My Naturewatch* project via a research through design approach (Gaver 2012). Designing ‘Active Engagement for Nature’ provides agency but requires expertise, time, patience, deployment and appropriate constraints. Design was recognized by participating organizations as a valued tool and set of processes, and several identifiable, traditional and, perhaps, more emergent design disciplines were identified as having been deployed by the contributors. These included communication design, service and systems design, and landscape design – the contributors also recognized the need to ‘design engagement’ into many of their activities and approaches. Finally, the areas of Spatiality, Motivation, Impact and Interactions must be appropriate to their context of deployment.

**FUTURE WORK**

1. Investigating the means to provide ‘capability and capacity’ to charities/NGOs so they can undertake this type of ‘engaging’ work.
2. Designing for ‘Science Families’, ensuring interactions are not isolated but embedded in a community where guardians and children benefit through appropriate engagement.
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