Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh

Nature Play: Nature Conservation

Final Report

February 2015

Executive Summary

The **Nature Play: Nature Conservation** project is a partnership between the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (RBGE) and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation with support provided by The Conservation Volunteers (TCV). The Project is also part of a wider programme to develop the area of the RBGE known as the Demonstration Garden into a space for community engagement and participation. The research builds on the Edinburgh Beltane project led by Dr. Jenny Roe from OPEN Space/Heriot Watt University which began to investigate opportunities for and barriers to nature play by young children and their carers, from the local community within a designated play area. The current project looks in more depth at the content of nature play and the balance between impact and nature conservation in the context of a botanical garden.

Nature play as a form of outdoor, early childhood education has a long history and the benefits of spending time with nature are now widely accepted. However, an understanding within situated agendas and locales is limited and there is a paucity of empirical research into this genre of play in botanic gardens to inform management policy. By closely investigating nature play by adult and child participants within an area of semi-natural vegetation, the Project hoped to develop a better understanding not only of what participants do, but also determine user needs and wishes. The findings of this research provide a basis from which to prepare a series of Guidelines for nature play both at RBGE and beyond, so that lessons learnt in this study can be shared worldwide with the management of other botanic gardens and urban nature reserves.

Six themed 'Intervention' days were devised, one per month between April and September 2014: 'Wood', 'Listen', 'Stone', 'Meadow', 'Earth' and 'Water'. The research design recorded how pre-school children and their adult carers engaged in nature play within an area designated by a map. Data collection comprised observations and assessment of the impact of play. Participants were encouraged to feedback through annotation of their maps, in conversation with the researchers and via questionnaires emailed to adult participants following their visit. Data were analysed interpretively and reflexively by the research team.

Findings indicate that nature play was enjoyed and suited to the context of a botanic garden. Visitors valued the freedom and time to investigate, explore and be creative with natural and non-natural resources. There was evidence of meaningful human-nature interactions and in particular, participants liked the continuity of experience and the opportunity to return to the same site under different conditions. There are families, however, within the local community for whom nature play is not routine and while informed about the opportunity, were reluctant to attend. The results from this study are transferable and relevant to comparable sites and eleven Guidelines are presented to help management enhance their provision. Further research and next steps are also offered.

Key Findings and Guidelines

1. ***Nature play is popular and readily accommodated***

There are regular visitors to RBGE with young children, both boys and girls, who are eager to participate in nature play. Indeed, a community was seen to be developing that comprised participants who attended more than one Intervention who shared comparable attitudes and values towards nature play. Nature play opportunities can be readily accommodated and even a small area of semi-natural vegetation is a sufficiently rich source.

Guideline:

Recognise how minor adjustments are often all that is necessary to adopt nature play. Giving regular users of RBGE permission to take part in nature play is attractive and liberating to them when in a space where such behaviours were previously 'not allowed'.

2. ***Locally, there are harder to reach groups***

While there is a community of adults who actively seek and want their children to spend time playing with nature, families remain within the local community who do not routinely choose to participate in nature play at RBGE. The Project had limited success in attracting these non-users and demonstrated how nature play attracts visitors with similar dispositions. Word of mouth is significant in communicating about opportunities between participants.

Guideline:

Build upon enthusiasm of existing advocates of nature play to attract others to such initiatives. Establish the concept with existing audiences and staff before seeking ways to extend nature play.

3. ***Nature Play is spontaneous and unpredictable***

Nature play is difficult to plan for and control. It will rain, high winds will impact on safety, children will get stung, there will be chance occurrences and interactions will vary (see 5, below). These characteristics are inherent both to nature and the play conducted within it. Resources that are fluid and generic can better accommodate spontaneity and visitor choice. Loose parts and tools can be added to increased opportunities or play, however, finite resources may be the source of conflict behaviours.

Guideline:

Be flexible, both in the use of the setting and its resources. Suggest subtle traps in favour of planned, compartmentalized activities that limit freedom. While both natural and non-natural tools and resources are popular, there is value in open-ended, generic resources (eg. stones, fallen tree trunk) versus more prescriptive items (eg. buckets, magnifying lenses).

4. Taking time pays dividend

Nature play participants can be encouraged to slow their pace to help them to engage in meaningful human-nature interactions. Seating helps adults to increase the duration of their visit. Less journeying increases the likelihood of child-led exploration. Likewise, when children are on foot, human-nature interaction increases.

Guideline:

Provide appropriate spaces and means to sit. Ideally, seating is durable, washable and weatherproof as well as portable to allow choice in where to sit. Offer adults the opportunity to leave buggies and prams to better afford children direct contact with nature.

5. Guidance is prudent

Demarcation of a nature play area is vital for all stakeholders. Visitors were aware that some nature play behaviours were less appropriate beyond the boundaries of the designated site. In the context of RBGE, some visitors looked for guidance until comfortable with permitted activities (see 10, below). This project has shown maps help to guide and suggest rather than prescribe and direct activities

Guideline:

For visitors, a map is a fundamental source of information and we advise maps are offered. For management, the maintenance of a site in unison with tolerance and understanding of the characteristics of nature play are important and will help different agendas to co-exist.

6. Creativity and fantasy play are common features

Observed child behaviours were routinely creative and make-believe was a pervading facet. Children's imaginations can be reliably effective and simple resources (for example, sticks and fallen leaves) can hold a child's interest for sustained periods (see 3, above). There is a fine line between mess or disorder (for example, scattered pebbles, muddy hands) and creativity.

Guideline:

Promote nature play in as broad a frame as feasible and allow scope for context driven interpretations. Disarray may not sit comfortably with the orderliness of a botanic garden. Familiarity of and tolerance for the characteristics of nature play are key.

7. There is longevity and continuity in nature play

Nature play spans time frames imposed by humans. Relationships with nature can take time to establish and may do so via continuity of experience and opportunities for repeated behaviours, given that the same locations may be visited on multiple occasions during different seasons. Den building and make-believe scenarios are examples from this project where participants looked for and made reference to previous experiences and artifacts.

Guideline:

Recognise that visitors may expect constancy. Carefully consider the potential impacts of the introduction and removal of resources and artifacts.

8. Work with what each setting affords

A relatively small area of semi-natural vegetation will have a diversity of natural resources to facilitate nature play. Even in an urban setting, nature play can exist side-by-side with traffic noise or construction work. Each site will afford different stimulation and experiences to different visitors on different days.

Guideline:

Work and become familiar with what each setting affords ahead of investment in equipment, permanent features and other resources.

9. Monitoring impact and diversity

Overall, the physical impact upon the site was minimal. With the exception of the meadow, disturbance was less than expected and the vegetation proved resilient so that where damage did occur it was short-term and not significant. Inherently diverse areas, like the flowery meadow, were appealing to families but also represent high conservation status and potentially vulnerable spaces. Even when not closely supervised, participants tended to keep to pathways and other open spaces.

Guideline:

Signs or barriers restricting activity to the paths are to be avoided. A site should be professionally assessed both ahead of designation and regularly re-assessed to monitor impact. Building the level of activity slowly will avoid detrimental impact.

10. Adults have an impact too

Parents and carers showed a preference for morning sessions and their actions had both positive and negative effects on their playing children. The facets of nature play alleviate the need overt supervision by staff. Realistically, sessions are going to involve both adult-led and child-led activity, but an objective of nature play is to increase the behaviours that are stimulated by the child's own curiosity and imagination with adults encouraged to hold back. The presence of a trained specialist may add to the nature play experience, however, adult intervention may mediate child behaviours and diverge from individual discovery.

Guideline:

Be aware of adult mediation. Train staff to understand the concept of nature play and to know how to subtly support an unstructured discourse and to handle contingencies.

11. Housekeeping

Parents coped well with the absence of any facilities on site for hand-washing, toilets or baby-changing but it was equally clear that these would be welcomed and may encourage longer and

more relaxed dwell times. Participants were pleased to know that these will be available in this area from September 2015.

Guideline:

While providing facilities is not essential and resourceful adults may cope, locating nature play sites near existing toilet and hand-washing provision makes good sense. Such facilities help to reduce disruptions to play sessions, increase dwell-time as well as improve hygiene and privacy.

Introduction

Background to the Project

RBGE has made steps to address social integration and engage with the local community in social and ecological agendas (Edwards, 2006; Roe, 2012; Vergou & Willison, 2013). RBGE in partnership with Calouste Gulbenkian and supported by The Conservation Volunteers (TCV) proposed the Nature Play: Nature Conservation project to look specifically at what occurs when visiting families play with nature at the site. This understanding will inform RBGE's long-term goal of community engagement via a management regime that seeks to enhance biodiversity and maximize opportunities for direct contact with nature.

Project objectives

The Project remit was to determine the content of human-nature interactions taking place in a semi-natural habitat within the Garden. The area constituted a small urban nature reserve within the more formal landscape of the Botanic Garden. While at RBGE, nature play has been a gradually evolving process, the better understanding sought required establishing nature play as a legitimate activity within the Garden. In essence, the research set out to establish what actually happens during nature play in this context. From this empirical basis, guidelines could be drawn.

Project Partners and the Project Team

Between February and April 2014 the Project Leader, Ian Edwards, recruited on behalf of RBGE the following members of the Project team:

Clare Nugent (Moray House, University of Edinburgh) - Lead Researcher
Sarah Hutcheon (Moray House, University of Edinburgh) - Volunteer Research Assistant
Jaimie MacDonald (freelance) - Community Engagement Officer
Sabine Hellman (freelance) - Photography/Filming

TCV contributed to different aspects of the project. From the outset, TCV[1] were involved in the project planning and the form of the research interventions and TCV representatives attended each intervention day. The organization also designed and constructed the dipping platform over the pond that was integral to the Water intervention. The Findings section of this report note that requests for more structured, activity-led days were forthcoming and in response, TCV planned and lead three Family Days during July, August and September. These days, one each month, differed from the format of the main Project in that they were delivered on a "drop-in" basis and were more activity-led. While data from the Family Days have not contributed to the findings of the Project report, their processes and outcomes are significant. To this end, a summary and review of the Family Days has been prepared by TCV and comprises **Appendix A: TCV Family Days – Summary report**

[1] The contribution of TCV staff is recognised as part of Appendix A.

Review of relevant literature

Offered here, is a succinct review that sets the context for this Project and addresses nature play within a managed setting such as a botanic garden. For more detailed commentary, readers are directed towards the texts suggested in **Appendix D: Suggested further reading.**

Nature Play

Nature play is a distinct form of outdoor early childhood education. In UK society, close relationships with nature are not as comprehensively evident as in some other cultures and steps to establish nature play, it could be said, are in their infancy. Forest School, for example, was only established in the UK in late 1990's in response to the Danish approach (Knight, 2009; Williams-Siegfredsen, 2012) and examples of Nature Kindergartens and Forest Kindergartens remain in the minority.

There is notable physiological and psychological value in 'aimless exploration, especially in natural settings' (Heerwagen & Orians, 2002, p.55). Research has advanced widespread acceptance of the positive benefits to childhood of spending time with nature by virtue of its restorative qualities (Kaplan, 1995) and its capacity for the development of creativity (Wilson, 2012). Advocates of nature play, albeit adult or child, enjoy exploration and investigation first hand. These 'immediate and direct' (Beames, Higgins and Nicol, 2012, p. 61) experiences afford participants the opportunity to interact with nature's resources in dynamic ways such as digging, rearranging, pouring, mixing and transporting. Morgan et al (2009) refer to the enhancement of learning in these scenario and for young children, such an approach is in contrast to environmental awareness borne of more abstract means say, knowledge gleaned from the media of global warming or the conservation of tropical rainforests (Ghafouri, 2014). Nature play can routinely include risk-taking behaviours (Stephenson, 2003; Sandester, 2009) and the Pilot study recognises the characteristic freedom to roam, play noisily and the enjoyment of an unrestricted utility of resources.

The context: A contemporary botanic garden

Botanic gardens have evolved throughout history in response to the demands of the changing societies that they serve (Vergou & Willison, 2014). Modern day Gardens are no longer for 'display' purposes only. Rather, active interaction and direct engagement are seen as having positive currency in environmental education (Kopczak, Kisiel & Rowe, 2013).

Recent calls draw attention to an ecological approach in the outdoor classroom (Mullins, 2014) and childhood interactions with nature environments form an important contribution to pro-environmental interests in adulthood (Louv, 2011; Vadala, Bixler & James, 2007). Studies also show how the resource can inform the youngest members of our society. For preschool children,

however, learning is more likely play-based than formally instructive and it is from this stance that the context of this study derives.

Nature is inherent to the context, however, as botanic gardens are often perceived as "showcases" (McIvor, 2004) and home to biologically diverse habitats such features may not be readily perceived as resources for unstructured play. While for botanic gardens, 'the visual preference of visitors' has been noted (Chang, Bisgrove & Liao, 2008), playing children routinely learn through sensorial interaction and 'are natural fiddlers' (Andrews, 2012). First-hand interaction is intrinsic to nature play. Indeed, interactions *with* nature are more effective and beneficial than simply playing with others in a natural environment and authors conclude that unless engaging *with* nature, any users' environmental interests may not wholly develop (Vadala, Bixler & James, 2007). Here then, the distinction between *with* and *in* nature calls for visitors to be allowed access to botanic environments by means beyond mere visual display to stimulate other sensory cues via touch, smell, taste and sound. Understanding that active participation during early childhood has lifelong benefit, and can be habit forming, is appropriate for management of botanic gardens to help realise their full potential in this important role within the social and cultural landscape.

Given that time spent with nature is widely recognized to contribute to children's development, then botanic gardens have a key role to play in keeping a community in touch with nature. These settings can serve as a community's meeting place and are a familial link between people and their local, natural environment (Konijnendijk, 2008; Morgan et al, 2009).

Research design

The Project design was forged between members of the partnership and project team at three meetings at RBGE during early 2014. At this point, a series of planned "Interventions" each with a different focus were agreed as an appropriate way forward (see Figure 1). While each intervention highlighted one particular natural resource, the research design accommodated free access to the whole site. Participants could choose to play at the focus resource, or not, and move between all areas of the site at will.

Figure 1: Foci of the Interventions

Date	Focus
April 29th	Wood
May 21st	Listen
June 21st	Stone
July 28th	Meadow
August 26th	Earth
September 22nd	Water

The Project's Community Engagement Officer (CEO) promoted the sessions and oversaw the booking of participants into each Intervention. Participation was free of charge and interested parties could book to attend either a morning (10am-12 noon) or afternoon (2-4pm) session.

The "entrance" to the site came to be known amongst the research team as the "Gap In The Hedge" (from here GITH) and it was here that the sign-in tables, manned by the CEO and RBGE volunteers, were positioned for each Intervention. From the outset, the use of GITH was of value as this feature marked a clear portal to the designated site. This entrance indicated to participants that nature play activities were limited to this area and behaviours appropriate to the nature play area ought not be transferred to other areas of the Garden.

Engagement of the wider community

In the original project proposal, the intention was to specifically target families from low income areas of the North Edinburgh Area of Multiple Deprivation (APD). However, during the process of research design concern was raised that if we made this our exclusive audience there was a risk, as experienced in the Pilot, of days when there were very few or no families participating even when free transport was provided. As the engagement of specific communities was secondary to studying the characteristics of nature play and it's impact, and because we required a certain minimum number of interactions to provide a rich data set to interpret, it was agreed to broaden our scope to attract families from a wider social and economic group. This strategy still involved encouraging and facilitating the involvement of families from the APD[2], but also enabled us to promote the Interventions more widely within the local communities adjacent to the RBGE. The resultant participants were a good mix of families from across the range of socio-economic backgrounds in Edinburgh.

[2] Appendix B comprises a record of those groups contacted by the Project's Community Engagement Officer.

Research questions and methods of data collection

The research asked:

RQ1: How do visitors to a nature play site at RBGE interact with nature?
RQ2: How do nature play behaviours impact nature conservation in the context of a botanic garden?

Our key objective in seeking answers to these research issues was to compile a set of guidelines to advise best practice for managers of botanic gardens and other sites of high biodiversity who want to develop opportunities for safe and rewarding nature play without impacting negatively on their resource.

Data were recorded using three methods: time-sampled observations; annotation of intervention specific maps; follow-up questionnaires. A coding framework was devised to analyse the data set into themes. Systematic member checks were carried out on the full data set by the first author in conjunction with two other members of the research team to ensure consistency and reliability.

Ethics

Ethical considerations were a key part of the research. At no time was any participant under any commitment to take part and participants were aware that their participation was voluntary. Participants provisionally indicated their agreement to participate with the Community Liason Officer in person, during a telephone conversation or by signing up via Eventbrite. Upon arrival at a session, both adult and child participants were invited to sign-in at the GITH and entrance to the nature play area and take a name sticker. By voluntarily wearing a sticker, adults and children alike gave their informed consent to be observed and filmed. Similarly, sticker wearing also provided a means by which non-participants were avoided from being observed and inadvertently included in the study.

Findings

Attendance of the Interventions

The Project was greeted with enthusiasm by parents who showed genuine interest in being a part of the lifecycle of their local resource. That said, the majority of participants who readily signed-up for the Interventions were already familiar with RBGE, routinely visited the site and would continue to do so without the prompt of a research project.

The booking and attendance data showed the following results:

- Overall, during the six-month research period of the project 171 families signed-up to

attend. This led to 371 participants[3] attending at least one Intervention;

- All six Interventions were well attended. Listen and Water proved to be the most popular;
- While no participants attended all six sessions, a small core of participants attended more than one session – two families attended three sessions, two attended four and one mother and her two girls attended five of the possible six Interventions;
- Each of the morning sessions were better attended than the afternoon sessions, apart from Meadow when equal numbers were recorded. The reduced uptake of the afternoon sessions may be explained by the age-group of the child participants;
- In total, 118 girls and 104 boys took part across the six Interventions.
- Participants used all available ways to sign-up for a session(s). The majority of families noted their interest to attend electronically via Eventbrite (*n* = 141 families).
- Sections of the local community do not routinely choose to use this facility.

Findings by Intervention from the data set

Data were interrogated both within and across interventions. Resources added to the site and those afforded by the site were taken into consideration. The main findings are as follows:

Wood

- There was notable evidence of make believe and fantasy play;
- Participants brought expectations of what they might find and do, based on previous experiences;
- Moving and transporting of loose resources was a pervasive feature together with construction (see Photograph 1);
- 'Static time' routinely involved talking and watching without talk.

Photograph 1

[3] A participant includes both adults and children.

Listen

- Hammocks, sit-mats and blankets afforded relaxation time (see Photograph 2);
- Participants returned for reasons of routine, to seek constructions and artifacts from earlier interventions and/or curious to experience new resources;
- Personal connections to the space were apparent.

Photograph 2

Stone

- The pebble pit (see Photograph 3) afforded flexibility and was extremely popular, but was depleted;
- Barefoot play was to become a common feature;
- Environmentally positive, negative and neutral behaviours were captured;
- Play was creative.

Photograph 3

Meadow

- Mown pathways (see Photograph 4) through the meadow were well used and, later in the day, exploration into un-mown grasses developed;

- Participants paused or stopped for prolonged periods making good use of hammocks, mats and blankets;
- A small community of participants was emergent;
- Free, unstructured play routinely developed especially when adult behaviours encouraged this (see Photograph 5).

Photograph 4

Photograph 5

Earth

- Participants came prepared to enjoy soil and mud;
- Dry soil and leaf litter was used, however, mud was the main focus (see Photograph 6);
- Human-nature interactions were ones of enjoyment and joint discovery;
- There was conflict over finite resources.

Photograph 6

Water

- Pond dipping was facilitated by a platform built for this Intervention, resources and volunteer staff;
- Water play at the pond was perceived less safe to water play at the hose, but both resources were popular;
- Play became messy;
- There was limited conflict and adult mediation.

Photograph 7

Across the whole intervention period:

- Nature play was popular and participants were happy to stay for lengthy periods and return for more;
- Nature play was readily accommodated even in small area with simple resources;
- There were unexpected behaviours, occurrence and weather;
- Participants, both adult and child, like to know what is allowed or otherwise;
- Adverse impacts can occur, but were shown to be of low significance during these particular sessions;
- Maps were used by participants to guide their session and for feedback;
- Questionnaires were returned by only a handful of participants.

Feedback and dissemination of findings

It is important to feedback the Project's findings to those local families who took part in both the Interventions and the TCV Family Days and thank participants for their contribution. To this end, during Spring 2015, RBGE will host a short presentation of the completed project together with a screening of the film. All participant families will be emailed an invitation and the event will be also advertised on the RBGE website.

Further research and next steps

This was a localized study using one, small site during one season. Further consideration is due to potential negative impact of nature play where there is a higher volume of users, a longer time period and across a range of seasons and weather. It is our intention to use the community space within the Demonstration Garden for this purpose over the next two years. This will include the first year of the Botanic Cottage, a new facility immediately adjacent to the nature play space that is likely to increase community use considerably.

Following the success of this study we feel confident in trying to broaden participation and further research will investigate how to capture the interest of a wider sample of participants from a range of backgrounds. The Calouste Gulbenkian Communities in Nature Project will formally end in 2015 but has laid the basis for developing and expanding the social role of botanic gardens, and in the specific case of the RBGE of reaching out to communities in the disadvantaged North Edinburgh APD and inviting them in to participate in the established programme of activities, including nature play. This change will be facilitated by the RBGE community engagement staff and monitored closely to build on the results of this and the previous pilot studies.

Conclusions

Nature play is a new role for botanic gardens. There has always been a culture of keeping people and the plant collections separate: a look but do not touch policy, which has not encouraged free play or interaction with nature. This study has shown that within the context of a diverse, semi-natural or naturalistic landscape, containing a variety of native trees, shrubs and herbs, nature play involving intimate contact with plants, bark-chip and mown paths, stones, soil, water and small creatures can have a benign effect on the plants and landscapes. Regular, interactions of relatively short duration but high intensity have had no lasting impact on the habitat.

Manipulating the resources for play, for example, adding stones, leaving a tap dripping, cutting back nettles, supplying mats or blankets, rather than providing specific play equipment, was all that was required to facilitate play sessions that could last, in many cases, for an hour or more. The way in which the children used these resources and natural found items was unpredictable so risk assessment had to be generic rather than specific. Generally, children and parents explored and experimented with the resource in a cautious way, no particular hazards were identified and no accidents occurred. A culture of trust, respect and responsibility appeared to become established among participants who felt comfortable with the offer and returned regularly.

The overall conclusion has been that enabling and encouraging nature play within a designated area can create an overwhelmingly positive experience for the participants without posing a serious risk to either the plants or annoying other garden-users. The recommendation is that

botanic gardens consider, as part of their social role, creating or designating an area of semi-natural vegetation for nature play and encourage its use in partnership with the local community.

Appendix A: TCV Family Days – Summary report

We wish to acknowledge contributions from The Conservation Volunteers, in particular Graeme Anderson, John McFarlane, Chris Peach, Noelia Collado Salas and Andy Ruck. While three days were planned by TCV, the August day brought torrential rain and there were no participants. Summarised here, by TCV, are details of the two days that were successful.

The Conservation Volunteers Scotland joined the Harvest Festival held at the RBGE on the 20th September 2014 and the Family Garden Party on the 13th July.

Throughout both days, TCV provided a range of outdoor natural play activities including a scavenger hunt for families to collect natural materials and use them in a nature collage at the stall, mud kitchens, bunting and flags created with natural materials from the area and tree cookies.

The families who attended the event also took part in a variety of biodiversity activities at TCV's mini laboratory area. These included a citizen science nature hunt for all ages, badge making and the observation of freshwater invertebrates.

They key aim of the day was to offer children and adults of all ages the opportunity to maximise their contact with nature through a balance between adult led and child led activities.

The event was really successful with more than 250 people taking part in TCV's activities. Some of the quotes obtained were:

"*I love the tree cookies, great idea for all ages*", parent at the event.

"*Thank you so much, it's been great and she has really enjoyed it*", parent at event.

"*We would love to hear more about what you guys do*", parent at event.

'*That's the first time I've seen a dragonfly in the middle of Edinburgh!*' Parent at the wildlife walk

Appendix B: Record of the local organisations and groups contacted for participation

Name of organization or group	Details of contact	Outcome	Repeat contact
Lothian Association of Youth Clubs	Emailed	Potential contacts were requested; none forthcoming	
Pilton Community Heath project	'Phoned	Informed that there were no relevant groups I could go along to talk to; emailed them information about the sessions and registration forms. 1 adult and 1 child attended Wood intervention	Yes On contact list and included in all mail outs
North Edinburgh Grows	'Phoned and emailed	Informed that information had been passed onto members	Yes
North Edinburgh Childcare	'Phoned and emailed	Informed that information had been passed onto members	Yes
Leith Community Centre	'Phoned and emailed. Promotional poster emailed	Assured that project information would be passed on to Dr Bells Centre and the Multicultural Family Base the following week.	Yes
Edinburgh Community Food	'Phoned and emailed.	Informed that information had been passed onto relevant families	No
Fort Early Years Centre	'Phoned and emailed.	Repeated attempts to arrange to talk to the group via Project Worker were successful at the end of the research period	Yes
Granton Library	Librarian visited by Project's Community Engagement Officer in May 2014	Two families signed up to attend the Meadow Intervention; cancelled place ahead of the event; one attendee	No
Stockbridge Library	Librarian visited twice	No further contact	
Leith Community Croft	Project information provided	No further contact	

References

Andrews, M. (2012). *Exploring play for early childhood studies*. London: Sage

Beames, S., Higgins, P. J., and Nicol, R. (2012). *Learning outside the classroom: Theory and guidelines for practice.* Abingdon: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Chang, L.S., Bisgrove, R.J. and Liao, M.Y. (2008). Improving educational functions in botanic gardens by employing landscape narratives, *Landscape and Urban Planning, 86* (3-4), 233-247.

Edwards, I. (2006) Social Integration for all, *Roots, 3* (1). Accessed 20.10.2014 at https://www.bgci.org/resources/article/2047/

Ghafouri, F. (2014). Close encounters with nature in an urban kindergarten: a study of learners' inquiry and experience, *Education 3-13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 42*(1), 54-76.

Heerwagen, J.H. and Orians, G.H. (2002). The ecological world of children. In Kahn, P.H., Jr. & Kellert, S.R. *Children and Nature: Psychological, Sociocultural, and Evolutionary Investigations*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kaplan, S. (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integration framework, *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 15,* 169-182.

Knight, S. (2009). What makes a forest school? In S. Knight, *Forest schools and outdoor learning in the early years* (pp. 14–29). London: Sage.

Kopczak, C., Kisiel, J.F. and Rowe, S. (2013). Families talking about ecology at touch tanks, *Environmental Education Research,* DOI: 10:1080/13504622.2013. 860429

Konijnendijk, C.C. (2008). *The Forest and the City: The Cultural Landscape of Urban Woodland,* New York: Springer.

Louv, R. (2011). *The Nature Principle: Human restoration and the end of Nature-Deficit Disorder.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.

McIvor, L. (2004). A changing role for botanical gardens, *Pappus,* Winter/Spring: 27(8)

Morgan, S.C., Hamilton, S.L., Bentley, M.L. and Myrie, S. (2009). Environmental Education in Botanic Gardens: Exploring Brooklyn Botanic Garden's Project Green Reach, *The Journal of Environmental Education, 40*(4), 35-52.

Mullins, P.M. (2014). Conceptualizing skill within a participatory ecological approach to outdoor adventure. *Journal of Experiential Education 37*(4), 320-334.

Roe, J. (2013). Increasing Social Inclusion and Access in the Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh (RBGE)

Sandseter, E. B. H. (2009). Affordances for risky play in preschool: The importance of features in the play environment. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 36*(5), 439–446.

Stephenson, A. (2003). Physical Risk-taking: Dangerous or endangered? *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development* 23, 35-43.

Vadala, C.E., Bixler, R.D., and James, J.J. (2007). Childhood play and environmental interests: Panacea or snake oil? *The Journal of Environmental Education, 39*(1), 3-18.

Vergou, A. and Willison, J. (2013). Communities in Nature: Growing the Social Role of Boatnic Gardens Richmond, Surrey: BGCI.

Vergou, A. and Willison, J. (2014). Relating social inclusion and environmental issues in botanic gardens, *Environmental Education Research* DOI: 10.1080/13504622.2014.984161

Williams-Siegfredsen, J. (2012). Understanding the Danish forest schools approach. London: Routledge.

Wilson, R. (2012). (2nd Edition) *Nature and Young Children: Encouraging creative play and learning in natural environments.* Abingdon: Routledge.