Mind the gap: Does what we know about greenspace and wellbeing change what we do?

DOBSON, Julian <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6164-2707> and DEMPSEY, Nicola

Mind the gap: does what we know about greenspace and wellbeing change what we do?

In 2018 the UK government published a policy paper, *A Connected Society*, as part of what the prime minister, Theresa May, described as 'a national mission to end loneliness in our lifetimes' (HM Government, 2018[1]). It was curious that almost four decades after the election of the Thatcher government in 1979, which inaugurated an almost uninterrupted quest to shift state functions into the market economy, a Conservative government should seemingly shoulder the burden of a mission so amorphous and probably unattainable. But it illuminates the dissonance characterising public policy in the neoliberal era, a dissonance reflected in the specifics of policies on greenspace and wellbeing.

This chapter shows how such dissonance impacts on the decisions made on the ground in one of England's largest cities. We begin by presenting the broader picture: the political context in the UK that has led to a quest for particular types of evidence to inform decision-making; the complex governance arrangements through which practical decisions are made; and the role of evidence in a climate of austerity.

We then introduce Improving Wellbeing through Urban Nature (IWUN), a three-year project to investigate the role of 'urban nature' in wellbeing in the city of Sheffield. We outline the governance structures that influence practical decision-making and the logics applied by organisational actors, showing how such actors perceive their own capacity to achieve change. We conclude with some observations on the grounded use of evidence in practice, responding to the question of whether what we know changes what we do. The search for evidence, we suggest, functions as part of the 'myth and ceremony' (Meyer & Rowan, 1977)[2] of organisational life: evidence must be considered, but it does not necessarily change decisions.

Innovation before infrastructure?

Buried about halfway through the loneliness strategy cited above is a section on community spaces, including parks and green spaces. It stresses that 'green spaces in rural and urban areas have been shown to be highly beneficial to health and wellbeing and provide space for people to meet' (p37). It proclaims that the government is 'working closely with partners … to promote the value of public parks and green spaces'.

A casual reader - or one unfamiliar with the UK context - might imagine such warm words to signal a programme of investment and support, perhaps along the lines of the investment that followed the report of the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce in 2002 (DTLR, 2002)[3]. They might be surprised to find that only two years before Theresa May's announcement, members of Parliament had declared public parks to be at a 'tipping point' of decline (House of Commons, 2017)[4] and that in one city, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, funding for municipal parks and green spaces had been cut by 90 percent.

The sight of government ministers singing the praises of the public services they have systematically dismembered over nearly a decade has become familiar in the UK. It highlights that the agenda of 21st century neoliberalism is not purely to shrink the state; it is

to recast a set of relationships between state and market, between central and local, that shifts resources from the public sphere to the private and moves both funding and the policy agendas dependent upon it from localities and regions to the centre. Indeed, the state can be quite interventionist in the pursuit of policies designed to shift resources and control, and in promulgating discourses of 'efficiency' that simultaneously suggest that public services should be better and that they should have less money (Christophers, 2018)[5]. Furthermore, while municipal investment in parks and green spaces continues to shrivel, pots of funding from other sources - within and beyond the state - are available to find new ways of either paying for green spaces or demonstrating their worth. In 2017 the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government announced £500,000 for a Parks Action Group to 'help England's public parks and green spaces meet the needs of communities now and in the future'[6]. This is being spent on preparing 'a business case for parks' to 'set out the social, economic and environmental returns that can be secured for local communities, government and the private sector from continued investment into our much loved parks and green spaces' (The Parks Alliance, 2019)[7]. In 2018 Nesta, which describes itself as a 'global innovation foundation', teamed up with the Big Lottery Fund and National Lottery Heritage Fund to award grants totalling £2 million through its Rethinking Parks project. This is specifically focused on funding innovation in parks which identifies 'new ways of running parks more sustainably' (Nesta, 2019)[8].

In the academic world, too, there is funding to study the value created by parks and greenspaces. The £6.5m Valuing Nature programme - which includes the research reported here - brings together four academic research councils and the UK Government's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) to 'consider the economic, societal and cultural value of ecosystem services'.

To understand why there is (currently) money for innovation and research, but little for cutting grass, clearing litter, keeping facilities open or employing staff, it is necessary to understand some of the consequences of austerity in the UK, and especially in northern English cities. In brief, such impacts are reductive: there is less money to go around. They are distributive: some areas and groups are more negatively affected than others. And they are aggressively selective: both formally and informally, places and groups are forced to compete for the resources that remain, without the opportunity to design the rules of competition. Work by the Institute of Fiscal Studies (2018)[9] and the Centre for Cities shows the scale and unequal distribution of local government spending cuts since 2010; for example, between 2009/10 and 2017/18 the number of cities spending more than half their entire budgets on social care increased eightfold (Centre for Cities, 2019).[10] The local budgets allocated to the discretionary service of green space provision and management are therefore understandably decimated (HLF, 2016)[11]. The resulting competition for any available funds is both formal - small pots of money open to competitive bidding processes, a process adopted by governments since the 1990s - and informal, with a constant internal jockeying for position and influence within and between municipalities and public sector organisations. In such a climate, argument and advocacy, and the quest for evidence to support it, grow while the resources available for services diminish.

Fractured governance

The competition for diminishing resources is exacerbated by governance models that distribute responsibilities and resources among different institutions to meet the demands of common agendas. At a political level, the UK government continues to support the creation and upkeep of green spaces and recognises the importance of mental wellbeing. Mental illness is the largest cause of disability across the UK and is calculated to cost the economy the equivalent of 4.1% of GDP (OECD, 2018)[12]; there is also belated political recognition of the impact of species loss, with a 60% reduction in wildlife globally since 1970 (WWF, 2018)[13].

Yet at an urban level, the responsibilities for meeting these agendas are splintered. Parks and green spaces are the responsibility of local government, but because they are not a statutory duty they are low on the agenda. Spatial planning, which is a statutory responsibility, also rests with local government; as do public health, education, and social care. All are overseen by elected councillors who agree and implement local political priorities. Direct healthcare for people diagnosed with mental health conditions rests with the National Health Service, either through hospital treatment for those with acute conditions, or with the primary healthcare system. Primary healthcare is provided by general practitioners, physicians who operate as independent contractors within the NHS and have wide freedom to decide what services to offer at a locality level. Within the NHS, resource distribution has traditionally favoured secondary rather than primary care, and treatment of individual conditions rather than action to address the wider social determinants of health (Imison et al., 2017)[14]. But healthcare is seen as a function of central government, so there is no direct democratic accountability.

Wellbeing services are also provided at a community level through an assortment of civil society organisations, many of them underfunded or not funded at all, while public sector organisations receive a cost-free benefit from their existence. But their efficacy is at risk because they have little capacity to take on new work. There is also strong community involvement in the upkeep of parks and green spaces, but because this is through volunteers it is neither consistent nor evenly distributed. Despite recent rhetoric lauding the role of voluntary organisations in taking on tasks that previously fell to the state, the capacity of civil society organisations has also been reduced (Lobao et al. 2018)[15] and their influence in decision-making processes is often limited and superseded by the interests of the landowner, which is often the local municipality (Mathers et al., 2012)[16].

The ability to implement cross-cutting policies thus depends on interaction between arms of local and central government and local civil society, none of which are directly provided with the resources to work together and agree joint priorities. Progress is a matter of negotiation and brokering, in a context of competing and conflicting targets, demands and lines of accountability ‘between actors who are attempting to “square the circle” of contemporary mixed motivational demands, and institutions which themselves contain legacies of different mixed motivational demands from the past’ (Lowndes & Roberts, 2013, p13)[17].

In addition to the challenges of fragmented resources and responsibilities, local governance is faced with the headache of conflicting rationalities. A legacy of community development, participatory planning and deliberative practice (Healey, 1993)[18] persists, especially among civil society organisations, indicating an expectation that they will play an active part in governance processes. A stronger and more recent heritage is that of 'new public management' (Rydin, 2003), with an emphasis on efficiency and achievement of policy targets[19]. Alongside this, with varying levels of political commitment, is the aspiration of localism - the notion of devolving power from the central to the local state and from the local state to community-based organisations (Davoudi & Madanipour, 2015)[20]. This gives rise to unspoken but constantly simmering conflicts over both the purposes and the practices of local governance. In the climate of austerity that has become entrenched since 2010 in the UK, the discourses of devolution and localism have become further tainted with an insistence on public sector cost savings as the primary objective.

Austerity urbanism (Peck, 2012) involves institutional buck-passing from the central to the local level - the 'systematic dumping of risks, responsibilities, debts and deficits, to the local scale' (p. 650)[21]. Cuts must not only be made at local level, but managed locally: localities are required to take ownership of centrally imposed budgetary constraint. In the UK, despite the efforts of some local authorities to protect the poorest populations, this has played out in terms of disproportionate cuts to urban areas, and reductions in resources for the services most used by people in greatest need (Lowndes & Gardner, 2016; Hastings et al., 2017).[22] [23]

This rapid overview of governance arrangements affecting greenspace and wellbeing in the UK will be familiar to many, with varying permutations and distinctive challenges in other jurisdictions. The reason for highlighting these governance complexities at the outset is that they skew linkages between evidence and action in ways that often escape the attention of researchers tasked with gathering the evidence.

Evidence in governance

The austerity context imposes conditions on how evidence can be translated into action. It delineates the parameters of the permissible, influencing how knowledge is deployed and what knowledge is demanded. In a climate of financial constraint, evidence becomes a resource in a quest to continue existing activity and to legitimise proposed activity, and a tool in both advocating and resisting institutional change (Jasanoff, 2010).[24]

As funding cuts bite deeper and demands on organisations increase, organisations seek 'proof' that what they do is effective and justifiable. Such evidence may take the form of academic research that demonstrates the efficacy of a particular approach in comparable contexts; evaluation of an organisation's own activities; or case studies - ranging from in-depth to anecdotal - of 'best' or 'good' practice (Bulkeley, 2006).[25]

Within organisations, the anecdotal and the taken-for-granted may carry more clout than the academic. Time-pressured staff have neither the time to read academic research directly

nor the privileges to access it. Even parliamentarians tend to get most of their knowledge from think tanks (Kenny et al., 2017).[26]

Within professional milieux, much effort is devoted to feeding this justificatory appetite. To provide just one example, the Royal Town Planning Institute in the UK produced a research report on 'the value of planning' (Adams & Watkins, 2014)[27]; this has spawned, among other outputs, an online tool developed in partnership with the Welsh Government, a report for decision-makers on 'delivering the value of planning'[28], and another on 'the worldwide value of planning'. In a climate in which the role of planners is under threat (Haughton & Allmendinger, 2016)[29] such activities provide an ammunition dump of targeted policy-relevant material.

As well as seeking to justify what they are already doing, organisations look for evidence to legitimise what they would like to do. In the context of urban green spaces, this plays out in the national and international search for appropriate ways of valuing greenspace and urban nature (see Chapter 5). This drive is not new, but has gathered momentum. Natural capital accounting (TEEB, 2010)[30] has been designed as a way to quantify the benefits provided by greenspace and biodiversity. Other studies seek to capture the social return on investment in green spaces (Greenspace Scotland, 2013)[31]. More recently, healthcare researchers have mooted the possibility that 'a dose of nature' might be more medically cost-effective than traditional interventions in addressing physical conditions such as obesity and cardiovascular disease (Shanahan et al., 2015)[32] and as the equivalent of 'a drug for mental health and well-being' (Barton & Rogerson, 2017)[33].

In the hurly-burly of everyday bureaucracy, however, researchers' caveats vanish. It falls to academics to note that 'surprisingly little work has been done on the relations between … costs and benefits, and how the match or mismatch between those who bear the former and those who enjoy the latter affects the provision of green infrastructure' (Wild et al., 2017)[34]. It is seldom spelled out that the imagined returns on investment do not always accrue to the investing organisation, and in any case tend not to be cashable, taking the form of future costs avoided in the long term rather than extra income gained that can appear in a set of management accounts (Dobson, 2018)[35].

In a world of 'shrinking-pie resource allocation' (Peck, 2012), evidence forms a bargaining chip. It is used both as a tool of advocacy and as a resource for resisting change. Particular forms of knowledge are advanced and celebrated within epistemic networks (Haas, 1992[36]; Olsson et al., 2006[37]), where expertise can permeate and transcend institutional boundaries. Such networks can become centres of resistance to established paradigms, generating and validating their own canonical knowledge; 'knowledge-based experts' influence policy environments by 'articulating the cause-and-effect relationships of complex problems' (Haas, 1992, p. 2). Their work supports new 'network imaginaries' (Muñoz- Erickson et al., 2017[38]), and introduces and legitimises 'cosmopolitan knowledge' from different local environments (Hulme, 2010)[39]. Such knowledge may conflict with local 'logics of appropriateness' (March & Olsen, 1989)[40] or taken-for-granted ways of understanding and practising an organisation's ethos and purpose. 'Discourse coalitions'

(Hajer, 1993)[41] cluster around competing interpretations of data, seizing on research or seeking to discredit it as they tussle for influence and resources.

Within the context of current debates on the value and funding of urban greenspace, we can see how evidence is mobilised for particular ends, and how actors are enrolled in such mobilisation. Two examples are illustrative. A UK greenspace charity, Fields in Trust, estimates that frequent use of local parks and green spaces can have a positive health and wellbeing impact nationwide worth £34.2 billion, and can save the National Health Service a further £111 million through reduced visits to medical practitioners. As the charity's policy manager points out, 'as long as there is a threat to our public parks and green spaces then making the case in economic terms can help to change the conversation' (McCann, 2018).[42] The second example is the notion of a 'dose of nature', discussed above. Here knowledge about the health effects of urban greenspace is deployed to justify changes in healthcare practices. In the first illustration, a quest to provide an acceptable economic valuation of greenspace mobilises economics for the purposes of protecting and justifying investment, but enrols policy actors into a discourse in which whatever cannot be shown to have economic value drops out of the conversation. The conversation is changed, but not necessarily in the way that those who value their local parks and green spaces would want. In the second, a quest to show the health benefits of greenspace leads to the reduction of complex experiences to a 'dose of nature' and the enrolling of academic actors into a discourse that values the more-than-human world according to its utility in supporting human health and wellbeing. However noble the objectives, this locks in a view of the natural world as a resource to be exploited.

Within epistemic networks, cultures and shared beliefs coalesce and new understandings gain traction. Epistemic networks establish 'social meanings' as well as agreed facts (Jasanoff, 2010)[43] and reinforce their position by claiming expert authority (Raven, Schot, & Berkhout, 2012)[44] and acting as arbiters of 'best practice'. Such mutually-validated expertise enables epistemic networks to influence policy agendas and inform institutional strategies (King, 2005)[45]. At an organisational level, knowledge networks influence change in five ways: they inspire, legitimise and facilitate change; they challenge slow progress; and they can also constrain change by excluding options where evidence is considered inadequate or unhelpful (Dobson, 2019[46]). Evidence is thus political: a tool to achieve the ends of governments, institutions, and interest groups (see also Henneberry et al, Chapter 5).

The more robust and detailed the evidence, the less amenable it is to the swift resolution of policy and practice dilemmas (see Dempsey, Chapter 8). Good research - rigorous in its conception, conduct and conclusions - is more likely to raise questions than provide answers. In an austerity context, decision-makers demand answers to questions such as 'if we adopt policy X, how much money will it save us?' or 'if we adopt policy Y, will we achieve our targets on issue Z?'. Academic evidence tends to respond with variations on the theme of 'it depends…'. As Pawson and Tilley (1997[47]) highlight, interventions in policy and practice are mechanisms inserted into variable contexts, with variable outcomes depending on the environment, the duration and resourcing of the intervention, and unforeseen external factors. This does not mean they have no value. It means that the value

is dependent on factors that it may not be possible to influence. Our own research, however, suggests that practitioners do not view evidence in this way.

A case study from Sheffield, UK

Sheffield provides a case study in how evidence for the wellbeing effects of urban green spaces is selected, deployed or sidelined in practice. Over three years researchers conducted a study to investigate how the city's green spaces and natural environments contribute to good mental health and what interventions could support these salutogenic processes and properties.

Improving Wellbeing through Urban Nature (IWUN)[48] was funded by the UK's Natural Environment Research Council and led by researchers in the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Sheffield with colleagues in the University of Derby, Heriot-Watt University, Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust and the Centre for Sustainable Healthcare. IWUN aimed to define the characteristics of natural environments that promote health and wellbeing; explore the diversity of values and beliefs that influence people's connections with nature; investigate the potential for assessing the value of natural environments in terms of health and wellbeing outcomes; examine the policy and governance frameworks needed to implement appropriate interventions; and work with stakeholders to translate such findings into practice.

Sheffield is the UK's fifth largest city and is characterised by high levels of urban deprivation typical of post-industrial cities. However, it is well provided for in terms of green spaces: natural environments form 70 percent of the city's land cover, with 80 public parks and a total of 947 publicly accessible green and open spaces. A study by Vivid Economics (2016)[49] found that the city's parks and green spaces provide benefits valued at nearly £1.3 billion for public services in the city (including £145 million in respect of mental health).

IWUN had four work packages, working simultaneously on different aspects of the relationships between natural environments and human wellbeing (Dobson & Dempsey, 2018)[50]. An epidemiological study examined the correlation between green spaces in Sheffield and general wellbeing - physical health as well as mental (Brindley et al, 2018)[51]. The second work package examined individuals' feelings about and connections with the natural environment through a series of interviews and facilitated workshops. Participants were mental health service users and infrequent users of green space, especially from deprived areas of Sheffield and including significant numbers of BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic) participants. These intensive qualitative interviews and workshops produced a wealth of material highlighting the variety and richness of connections with nature, including the importance of childhood experiences and encounters with the natural world, the use of spaces for solitude and recovery from the stresses of life but also for companionship and sociability, and attachments to animals, flowers, birdsong and domestic pets. The third work package centred on a smartphone app, which prompted users to respond to the natural environment within 'geofenced' green spaces in Sheffield. Users were asked what they noticed and how they felt. Participants were asked to take part in either a 30-day or a 7-day experiment in which they used the app regularly. Results from the seven-

day trial indicate marked improvements in wellbeing and an increased sense of connection with nature among participants, especially among those suffering from mental health problems such as depression and anxiety (McEwan et al, 2019)[52].

The fourth work package had two strands. The first aimed to synthesise IWUN's research with existing academic studies and to work with practitioners and local stakeholders to identify interventions that would maximise the wellbeing benefits of Sheffield's green spaces. We identified five interventions that could be implemented by practitioners within Sheffield. We also worked with stakeholders to understand the decision-making processes involved in putting such interventions into effect. The second strand of this work package involved a cost-utility analysis of the proposed interventions, testing the hypothesis that it is possible to put an accurate economic value on the wellbeing benefits generated through specific interventions in urban natural spaces in cities in order to inform decision-making (see Chapter 5).

However, insights from organisational studies alert us to the absence of simple logical chains between research findings, recommendations, political or management decisions and on-the-ground action. A wealth of scholarship from sociology and organisational studies sheds light on the 'embedded agency' of individuals working within institutional contexts (e.g. Barley & Tolbert, 1997[53]; Seo & Creed, 2002[54]). Within organisations, individuals adhere to 'logics of appropriateness' (March & Olsen, 1989). A new policy or process, particularly when imposed or advocated from outside, may clash with such logics of appropriateness and meet with resistance.

But actors within organisations do not act uniformly. Organisational culture is celebrated, followed or challenged to different degrees through the process of 'institutional work' - individuals' actions that maintain, disrupt or repair institutional structures (Lawrence & Suddaby, 2006[55]). Actors follow established logics of practice or 'logics of inaction' (Sharman & Perkins, 2017[56]; Dobson & Dempsey, forthcoming[57]). In any organisational situation, multiple logics vie for influence (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012[58]) and the rules, practices and narratives that shape behaviour are subject to different degrees of contest and enforcement (Lowndes & Roberts, 2013). Change is only indirectly related to evidence and policy - hence the growing scholarly interest in the creation of 'niches' where new ideas can be incubated in a deliberate effort to challenge existing ways of working (Grin, Rotmans, & Schot, 2010[59]).

Grounded governance and fragmented agendas

An examination of one Sheffield park, the Ponderosa, shows the multiple governance structures and agendas at work. It was developed in the 1960s as part of a network of three parks that stretches from the university campus in a northwesterly direction towards the city's main river and historic centre of industry, the Don. Each of the parks - Weston Park, Crookes Valley Park and the Ponderosa - contain landscaped grassed areas, mature trees, and in the case of the first two, water features (Crookes Valley was a former reservoir). Weston Park hosts the city's main museum and contains tennis courts. Crookes Valley Park hosts watersports activities, contains a children's play area and bowling green, and has a bar

and restaurant. The Ponderosa, unlike the other two, was never intended as a park: the site was originally earmarked for housing. Its accidental nature is reflected in its name, a nickname adopted by local children after a ranch in a 1960s TV programme. A horseshoe of woodland at the top descends to a flat area of sports pitches surrounded by tower blocks, and to one side is a small orchard planted many years ago by local environmental volunteers. It has no café or social hub.

All three parks are managed by Sheffield City Council's Parks and Countryside department. Netherthorpe, the neighbourhood surrounding the lower end of the Ponderosa, is among the 10% most deprived in the UK (IMD 2015)[60]. Within the municipality, it is a priority area for social services, education, and public health. Direct healthcare is provided via the Upperthorpe Medical Centre in the adjoining neighbourhood. The nearest hospitals are accessible by car, but public transport is limited. Community activities are provided by local voluntary organisations including Zest, a 'community anchor' organisation that has taken over a former library and swimming pool and has been established in the area since 1997. Local residents are involved in the upkeep of the Ponderosa, Crookes Valley and Weston Park through the activities of the Friends of Crookesmoor Parks. Residents can also influence municipal decision-making via elected representatives for the Walkley ward, with three councillors covering a total population of just under 28,000. Some matters are the responsibility of national agencies: the Environment Agency is responsible for water quality, while Natural England is responsible for biodiversity and wildlife management. Such distributed and fragmented governance is typical of English urban areas. Because the upkeep and use of green spaces involves multiple interests and responsibilities, ranging from biodiversity to sports, decisions are made in order to satisfy varying - and often competing - agendas.

As part of our research we consulted stakeholders and practitioners to identify interventions that would maximise the wellbeing impacts of green spaces, and to understand the decision-making processes involved. We were interested here not only in formal decision-making processes but in the understandings embedded in daily practice, the 'local forms of knowledge which may or may not be codified' (May and Perry, 2017[61]). In consultation with project advisers, we identified the public, private, and voluntary sector organisations and individuals involved in health and greenspace governance. A total of 122 respondents completed an exercise to choose their preferred interventions from a list of 35 options. The shortlist was discussed at a stakeholder event with 30 participants; in six focus groups involving 28 participants; and in six semi-structured interviews with individual stakeholders. The focus groups were conducted with parks professionals; volunteers associated with 'friends of parks' groups; local government planners; public health professionals; community workers engaged in health promotion; and a group of clinicians recruited by the Centre for Sustainable Healthcare. Individuals interviewed included two medical general practitioners; the head of therapy in an NHS institution; an academic specialist in public health and physical activity; a primary care worker based at a Sheffield leisure centre; and a housebuilder engaged in major housing schemes in the city.

Interviewees and focus group participants were selected on the basis of their existing interest in green space and wellbeing, and their knowledge of decision-making processes. All

interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed, and thematically coded to identify decision-making processes including trade-offs, the use of evidence, justifications of resources and reasons for inaction. Table 1 shows the shortlisted interventions. It is important to note that these were informed by local context and knowledge, so would not necessarily be generalisable to other urban contexts.

Table 1. The shortlisted interventions

The green space interventions considered to have the greatest potential mental health benefits for Sheffield's residents (in no particular order).
1. Improved access to green spaces, including walking and cycling routes
2. New or upgraded toilets and cafés in parks and woodlands
3. Set and maintain a minimum standard of regular, sustained maintenance
4. Employ parks staff to encourage outdoor activities and volunteering
5. Support voluntary and community organisations to animate green spaces

Do actors believe they can achieve change?

In the course of our interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders, we identified a wide range of reasons for proceeding with the interventions that had been prioritised (Table 2, centre column). These logics of action illustrate how, in the context of practice, an action might be justified and advocated on the basis of existing knowledge - both academic and tacit. Given that these logics support actions that had already been agreed as priorities, it is not surprising that participants offered a substantial set of justifications. Their understandings of the benefits of greenspace interventions either mirror academic evidence (for example, in terms of the health benefits of greenspace) or go beyond it (for example, in the belief that cash savings for health services can be generated).

Of greater significance is the range of reasons offered in the right-hand column for not going ahead with an intervention. These are the rationalisations of inaction that practitioners either encounter in their daily work or have internalised as reasons for not intervening. In a large majority of cases, each argument for action had a counterpart logic of inaction. What this table demonstrates is that evidence alone, whether scholarly or practice-based, is insufficient to generate action, or even to provide adequate justification for action. Financial, political, and organisational logics may outweigh 'evidence'.

The table aggregates the justifications expressed by participants across this strand of the research project, rather than segmenting them by individuals or roles. It shows that across a broad swathe of relevant professions in one city, the logics of inaction balance, and frequently outweigh, the logics of action.

Table 2: Investing in greenspace for wellbeing: Logics of action and inaction identified from research

	Logics of action	**Logics of inaction**

Logic	Theme	Theme
Wellbeing logics	'Green spaces are good for you' • Multiple benefits across a population • Being in nature connects with biological rhythms • Use of greenspace encourages positive social norms	The value of 'nature' is subjective • Many people aren't interested in the outdoors • People with high support needs can find natural surroundings intimidating • Green spaces support 'unhelpful' coping strategies – drinking, drug use
	Green spaces reduce healthcare dependence and health inequalities	***Persistence of biomedical model of healthcare*** • ***Non-medical knowledge is devalued*** • ***Social prescribing is 'plan B'*** • ***Little capacity to try new and untested initiatives***
	Green spaces are cost-effective - nature-based interventions promote self-care	Funding for 'green' or social prescribing is short-term – projects are not sustained
	Greenspace activities help to address loneliness and isolation • ***Volunteering benefits both the volunteer and wider community*** • ***Green spaces provide opportunities for group activities*** • ***Walking provides quality time and deeper social interactions***	
	Greenspace activities help reduce fear of crime • Social activities address fear of going out • Park rangers provide sense of safety	Green spaces are difficult and dangerous • They attract undesirable activities (e.g. drug taking) • They involve physical risk • Genuinely 'wild' places are dangerous
	Group activities or volunteering increase employability skills, confidence	
	Academic research shows greenspace is important for stress relief, attention restoration and physical activity	Academic evidence isn't regarded as sufficient or appropriate – does not involve large population cohorts or randomised controlled trials; long term outcomes not demonstrated
Financial logics	Cost-effectiveness of 'green' interventions (cheaper, more local, more tailored to personal needs and preferences)	Upfront funding – therapeutic interventions and greenspace investments have direct and immediate costs. Evidence of costs and benefits is inadequate
	Provides cash savings: reduces pressure on other services and potentially releases funds for reinvestment or reduces healthcare waiting lists	***Savings are notional savings at some future date. Savings may accrue to organisations that do not pay for interventions.***
	Commercial activities in parks can generate income to spend on healthcare interventions or new facilities	Limited commercial markets; investments may have unintended consequences
	Some money is available now	***Funding can't be sustained***
	Basic levels of maintenance and care prevent green spaces becoming liabilities	There are more immediate problems. Greenspace is seen as a luxury, 'nice to have'
		Creating new green spaces is costly and residents of new developments do not want to pay greenspace management costs
Wider economic logics	Quality of life attracts investors and boosts the city's reputation	The economy comes first: there are insufficient links between greenspace and attracting new investment and jobs. Roads and infrastructure are seen as more important.
	Greenspace investment increases land values	***Development does more to increase land values than green space. Green spaces can make new housing developments 'unviable'***
	More walking and cycling via green spaces reduces congestion and air pollution	

Civic and community logics	Good quality spaces encourage nature connections. Recruiting development workers increases confidence and use	Improving access and transport links is expensive
	Investment in green spaces creates opportunities for volunteering and participation and is good for young people	***Target groups aren't perceived to be interested in 'nature'***
	Well maintained spaces create a sense of ownership and reduce antisocial behaviour. Park staff increase a sense of security	Greenspace is associated with risks – crime, safeguarding, objects of fear (needles, drug paraphernalia). Unpoliced environments are intimidating
	There is strong political support for greenspace and appropriate planning policies	***Greenspace is not the top political priority and elected councillors focus on parochial interests. Homelessness, poverty and the economy come first***
Organisational logics	Joined-up working enables different organisations to meet shared objectives on poverty and inequality. There are opportunities to pool or match resources.	Silo working – there are 'organisational firewalls' between departments and organisations • Services are ineffectively signposted • There is competition and duplication between organisations • Officers are risk-averse
	Existing policies supporting green infrastructure • ***Some planning policies support greenspace creation*** ***Neighbourhood planning may create new opportunities***	***Policies are sometimes weak and the regulatory regime is weaker. Wellbeing and greenspace not prioritised in development plans*** • ***Development industry doesn't value greenspace*** • ***Development pressures favour rapid decisions*** • ***Informal and community spaces not identified as a need*** • ***Land ownership prevents action – different public green spaces owned by different organisations/departments***
Environmental logics	Green spaces support climate change adaptation and mitigation. Improved air quality has direct wellbeing benefits. Flood resilience (SUDS schemes) provide opportunity to create new biodiverse spaces	
	Green routes can be wildlife corridors	***Biodiversity is not valued – people chop down garden trees and pave over gardens***
Wider social logics	Investment in greenspace can support equality and diversity objectives	Greenspace groups are dominated by retired white people
	Community ethos: people-centred values of voluntary and community organisations working in green spaces	***Community sector is bottom of the professional hierarchy***
	Nature-based learning alleviates stress among young people	
		Media and political attention focuses elsewhere – deterioration of green spaces is not a big enough crisis to warrant attention
		Housing developers say buyers don't want green spaces

This balancing of logics is played out in the course of everyday professional practice. Academic evidence may emphasise the value of natural open space in offering opportunities for peace, relaxation, and social activities (e.g. Ward-Thompson and Aspinall, 2011)[62]. But

practitioners told us they needed to show the economic effects of such findings. One community worker described how data generated through a social prescribing initiative were dismissed by potential funders because of the failure to demonstrate cash savings:

> …from day one of doing that work [voluntary organisations have] got really consistent data about the impact it has on individual people's wellbeing, on how much it makes them feel good, but the reality is that's not getting them any money to carry on doing the work, it's not encouraging people to invest. We know it makes people feel good, anybody would be able to say that, and what they're being consistently asked for is data around cost savings.

Even where policy goals are seen in terms of health and wellbeing outcomes rather than purely in monetary terms, proposed investments are frequently discounted because the evidence is not considered robust, or it is not aligned with existing policies and targets. One clinician told us:

> …what the healthcare trust gets funded [is] measured against certain targets, so that becomes then the priority for the clinician … because they've got massive caseloads, they can't spend their time to include other areas unless it's something that's also a measured target that they've got to evidence, to prove that it's something that they're doing for a reason.

For medical practitioners, we were told, actionable evidence should appear in relevant journals such as the *BMJ* (British Medical Journal) or *The Lancet*; ideally it should be supported by a randomised controlled trial. Evidence that does not fit that model is regarded as less valid; but to fit the criteria valued by medical practitioners, much of the qualitative and practice-based knowledge of the value of greenspace would have to be discounted.

Local government, similarly, demands evidence that supports municipal objectives, whether they be objectives of economic development or public health outcomes. A local government planner, discussing the idea of 'green corridors' to link neighbourhoods with parks and woodlands, questioned whether connections could easily be made between the creation of a route, the likely increased use, and eventual health gains:

> We could say yeah, great, there's an increase in cyclists, therefore you can correlate that there is likely to be a better quality of life, people's health is likely to improve, but there's no empirical evidence to support that, or at least it's disparate.

Our research highlighted the difference between what can be established from academic inquiry and the information practitioners say they need. What is evidenced is not necessarily a sufficient argument for changing policy or practice. One health expert emphasised the pressure for 'a more politically attractive argument':

> It's unlikely that we will convince people to [invest] purely on a health argument. If we could, we'd have won that argument years ago because the evidence is

> overwhelming, so it's going to need to be a different argument. Probably a more politically attractive argument around the economy.

The same interviewee added:

> We've used the academic evidence as part of a jigsaw puzzle … and we've combined that with local tacit evidence, more substantive theory, and a few hunches if you like, and chucked that into a pot and said okay, this is our best guess based on the totality of that information, local insight, academic literature, which is not always context specific…

The logics and arguments of the practitioners involved in our research signal a culture in which new investments are viewed as risky and the potential outcomes of such investments, though desirable in principle, are viewed as lower-order priorities than actions where quantifiable returns can be demonstrated. This risk-averseness is exacerbated by financial constraint. This plays out not only in a reluctance to incur costs, but in a reduction in organisational capacity. The ability to innovate or to connect between different organisations (or different parts of the same organisation) is reduced both through a shortage of time and a lack of information. One parks worker told us:

> One week you'll find out that something's happened across the city that's really aligned to some of our aims - well, didn't anyone know about this? Because no-one's got the time to go along to meetings and stuff like that.

Capacity is reduced in order to concentrate resources on what are perceived to be more pressing problems. One community worker explained:

> It's well known that prevention is better and more effective in the long term. But at the moment in the current climate everybody's fighting fires and not actually able to put that funding into the preventative services. It might be more expensive in the short term but in the long term it really does help to invest in the community and voluntary sectors. We're picking up a lot of the bulk of what statutory services used to …

The practitioners we interviewed believed the interventions they had selected were necessary and justifiable in supporting wellbeing, but could not currently be justified in the terms demanded by financial decision-makers or in terms of organisational priorities. Nam and Dempsey (2018[63]) report similar reluctance to innovate in the case of community food growing in urban parks, as it would impose additional responsibilities on parks managers. Logics of inaction become self-reinforcing: after repeated rebuffs, practitioners focus on what they believe they can achieve rather than on the outcomes they would like.

Evidence-seeking as myth and ceremony

Reflecting on these connections and disconnections between evidence and action as observed in Sheffield, it is salutary to revisit Meyer and Rowan's classic depiction of the 'myth and ceremony' of organisations (Meyer & Rowan, 1977[64]). Their view was that organisational practices and procedures arise as 'reflections of rationalised institutional rules'; these rules function as myths that enable organisations to accumulate legitimacy, resources, and stability - and to survive. Meyer and Rowan considered that as organisations adopted similar rules they become isomorphic in terms of structure, but such structures become 'loosely coupled' with the actual activities pursued. Instead of pursuing Taylorist principles of coordination, inspection and evaluation, such organisations relied on 'a logic of confidence and good faith'. Such practices may be inefficient but help to guarantee survival and continuity.

The notion of myth and ceremony relates to the following of rules in the context of activities and outcomes that bear limited relation to them. As Meyer and Rowan observe (p343):

> …structural elements are only loosely linked to each other and to activities, rules are often violated, decisions are often un-implemented, or if implemented have uncertain consequences, technologies are of problematic efficiency, and evaluation and inspection systems are subverted or rendered so vague as to provide little coordination.

More recent literature has extended the notions of rules as myth and ceremony to practices of workfare in the United States, characterised by 'myths' of rights, contracts and client satisfaction (Handler, 2005[65]); the drive by nation-states to institute national stock exchanges (Weber, Davis & Lounsbury, 2009[66]); and the 'bureaucratic ceremony' of managing ex-offenders after their release (Wacquant, 2010[67]). As Wacquant points out (p613) organisations are able to thrive, not despite their inefficiencies but *because* of them; they provide a 'ceremonial façade' for business as usual. Such decoupling, the literature suggests, is endemic in organisational life.

If we were to consider the search for evidence of the wellbeing benefits and economic value of green spaces and the natural environment as embodying myth and ceremony, rather than simply taking it at face value, this would lead us towards a different analysis of why evidence does not result in appropriate action. Rather than adopting a view that the evidence is inadequate, or inappropriate to the particular circumstances pertaining in one or another location, or that it is unconvincing because it is not based on the gold standard of randomised controlled trials, we might explore the discursive functions of evidence in policy and practice environments.

Public policy, informed by the bureaucratic principles of new public management, requires a process of evidence-seeking and evidence-presentation in order to justify decisions. The myth of evidence-based policy also enables proposals to be rejected on the basis of insufficient evidence, effectively masking the politics of decision-making. A concern with 'what works' and 'good practice' provides an appearance of logical inevitability for what is actually a political choice. As a recent systematic review on 'places, spaces, people and

wellbeing' (Bagnall et al., 2018[68]) found, in practice the evidence is mixed: choices are always made on the basis of inadequate information. Further and more detailed studies to compare different interventions might provide decision-makers with more nuanced abilities to choose between alternative approaches. But as Pawson and Tilley (1997) observe, 'what works' is a question of what works for whom in what circumstances. An intervention is a mechanism adopted within a context, and its effectiveness is influenced by context.

We should question, then, not only whether the evidence of 'what works' is sufficient or not to justify action and investment, but also whether the perceived knowledge gaps justify inaction. Our study leads us to conclude that to identify reasons for inaction we need to look beyond the evidence to examine the context. In a context of financial stringency and declining resources, the demand for more evidence can be the equivalent of kicking the can down the road. A finance director can always turn down an investment proposal on the grounds that evidence is insufficient: such a refusal is a low-risk option within an organisational environment. The refusal becomes the final step in an elaborate ritual which begins with a proposition, perhaps advanced by local residents or a voluntary organisation; moves on to discussion within the lower levels of municipal bureaucracy, perhaps within a parks department; is then shunted to a finance or chief executive's department; and is then returned with a 'finance says no' sticker attached. On some occasions, where a proposal has influential backers or is seen as particularly meritorious, it may also go through the steps of consideration by elected councillors, adding a layer of democratic legitimacy to the final refusal.

This is not simply a complaint that proposals get rejected. Neither is it a blanket assertion that what we know doesn't change what we do; rather, knowledge is no warranty of change. So this chapter, along with Chapter 8, is a call to pay attention to the function and use of evidence within an organisational context. Outside the organisational studies literature it appears to be frequently assumed that there can be a relatively seamless transition from evidence to policy, and from policy to action. Our research suggests that evidence, policy, politics and the interests of actors within organisations form a complex and sometimes volatile mix, and outcomes can seldom be predicted with accuracy. As Hajer (1993) has highlighted, it is often the discursive treatment of the evidence that can make a difference between what is done or not done; the identification of a problem as 'ours' rather than 'theirs' can rely on a particular combination of evidence, culture, and political opportunism. In the case of urban green spaces, perhaps rather less attention should be focused on categorising and quantifying their benefits, and rather more on examining how and why, despite the accumulation of evidence, neglect and deterioration are so frequently permitted to continue.

1 HM Government (2018). A connected society: a strategy for tackling loneliness. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-connected-society-a-strategy-for-tackling-loneliness

2 Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363.

3 Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (2002). Green spaces, better places: Final report of the Urban Green Spaces Taskforce. London: DTLR.

4 House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee (2017). Public parks: Seventh report of session 2016-17. Retrieved from: https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmcomloc/45/45.pdf

5 Christophers, B. (2018). The new enclosure: The appropriation of public land in neoliberal Britain. London: Verso.

6 https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-pledges-500000-for-new-action-group-to-grow-future-of-public-parks

7 The Parks Alliance (2019) The Parks Action Group. Available at: https://www.theparksalliance.org/the-parks-action-group/

8 Nesta (2019) Eight pioneers developing promising and innovative models for parks. Available at: https://www.nesta.org.uk/feature/8-pioneers-developing-promising-and-innovative-models-parks/

9 Institute of Fiscal Studies (2018): 'Council-level figures on spending cuts and business rates income'. Retrieved from: https://www.ifs.org.uk/publications/8780

10 Centre for Cities (2019). Cities Outlook 2019. https://www.centreforcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/19-01-28-Cities-Outlook-2019-Full.pdf

11 Heritage Lottery Fund (2016). State of UK Public Parks 2016. Heritage Lottery Fund.

12 OECD/EU (2018), Health at a Glance: Europe 2018: State of Health in the EU Cycle, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/health_glance_eur-2018-en

13 WWF. 2018. Living Planet Report - 2018: Aiming Higher. Grooten, M. and Almond, R.E.A.(Eds). WWF, Gland, Switzerland

14 Imison C, Curry N, Holder H, Castle-Clarke S, Nimmons D, Appleby J, Thorlby R and Lombardo S (2017), Shifting the balance of care: great expectations. Research report. Nuffield Trust.

15 Linda Lobao, Mia Gray, Kevin Cox, Michael Kitson; The shrinking state? Understanding the assault on the public sector, Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society, Volume 11, Issue 3, 29 October 2018, Pages 389–408, https://doi-org.sheffield.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/cjres/rsy026

16 Mathers, A., Dempsey, N. and Burton, M. (2012) Open space management – can communities take on long-term responsibility? Town and Country Planning, 81(12): 514-519.

17 Lowndes, V., & Roberts, M. (2013). Why institutions matter: The new institutionalism in political science. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

18 Healey, P. (1993). Planning through debate: the communicative turn in planning theory. In: Fischer, F. & Forester, J. The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning. London: UCL Press.

19 Rydin, Y. (2003). Urban and environmental planning in the UK (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

20 Davoudi, S., & Madanipour, Ali. (2015). Reconsidering localism. New York; London: Routledge.

21 Peck, J. (2012). Austerity urbanism. City, 16(6), 626-655.

22 Lowndes V and Gardner A (2016) Local governance under the conservatives: Super-austerity, devolution and the 'smarter state'. Local Government Studies 42(3): 357–375.

23 Hastings, A., Bailey, N., Bramley, G., & Gannon, M. (2017). Austerity urbanism in England: The 'regressive redistribution' of local government services and the impact on the poor and marginalised. Environment and Planning A, 49(9): 2007-2024.

24 Jasanoff, S. (2010). A new climate for society. Theory, Culture & Society, 27(2-3), 233-253.

25 Bulkeley, H., 2006. Urban sustainability: Learning from the best practice?. Environ. Plan. A 38 (6), 1029–1044.

26 Kenny, C., Rose, D. C., Hobbs, A., Tyler, C., & Blackstock, J. (2017). The role of research in the UK Parliament Volume One (pp. 1–68). Retrieved from https://www.parliament.uk/documents/post/POST_Role of Research in UK Parliament 2017.pdf

27 Adams, D. & Watkins, C. (2014). The value of planning: RTPI Research Report no. 5. London: RTPI.

28 https://www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1916022/rtpi_research_briefing_-_delivering_the_value_of_planning_20_august_2016.pdfe

29 Haughton, G. & Allmendinger, P. (2016). Think tanks and the pressures for planning reform in England. Environment & Planning C: Government and policy, 34(8), 1676-1692.

30 TEEB (2010) The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity: Mainstreaming the Economics of Nature: A synthesis of the approach, conclusions and recommendations of TEEB. [online] http://www.teebweb.org/our-publications/teeb-study-reports/synthesis-report/

31 Greenspace Scotland (2013). Capturing the changes that count: A review of greenspace scotland's SROI programmes and projects. [Online] http://greenspacescotland.org.uk/SharedFiles/Download.aspx?pageid=133&mid=129&fileid=448

32 Shanahan, D., Fuller, R., Bush, R., Lin, B., & Gaston, K. (2015). The health benefits of urban nature: How much do we need? BioScience, 65(5), 476-485.

33 Barton, J., & Rogerson, M. (2017). The importance of greenspace for mental health. BJPsych International, 14(4), 79-81.

34 Wild, Henneberry, & Gill. (2017). Comprehending the multiple 'values' of green infrastructure – Valuing nature-based solutions for urban water management from multiple perspectives. Environmental Research, 158, 179-187.

35 Dobson, J. (2018) From contest to context: urban green space and public policy. People, Place and Policy, 12(2), 72-83. https://doi.org/10.3351/ppp.2018.3824435278

36 Haas, P.M. (1992). Introduction: epistemic communities and international policy coordination. Int. Organ. 46 (1), 1–35.

37 Olsson, P., Gunderson, L.H., Carpenter, S.R., Ryan, P., Lebel, L., Folke, C., Holling, C.S. (2006). Shooting the rapids: navigating transitions to adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. Ecol. Soc. 11 (1).

38 Muñoz-Erickson, T.A., Miller, C.A., Miller, T.R., 2017. How cities think: knowledge co-production for urban sustainability and resilience. Forests 8 (6), 203.

39 Hulme, M. (2010). Problems with making and governing global kinds of knowledge. Global Environmental Change,20(4), 558-564.

40 March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics. New York: The Free Press.

41 Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse coalitions and the institutionalisation of practice: The case of acid rain in Britain. In F. Fischer & J. Forester (eds.), The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning. London: UCL Press.

42 McCann, A. (2018). Policy: valuation in practice. Fields in Trust. Available at: http://www.fieldsintrust.org/News/policy-valuation-in-practice

43 Jasanoff, S. (2010). A new climate for society. Theory, Culture & Society, 27(2-3), 233-253.

44 Raven, R., Schot, J., & Berkhout, F. (2012). Space and scale in socio-technical transitions. Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions, 4(2012), 63-78.

45 King, M. (2005). Epistemic communities and the diffusion of ideas: Central bank reform in the United Kingdom. West European Politics, 28(1), 94-123.

46 Dobson, J. (2019) Reinterpreting urban institutions for sustainability: how epistemic networks shape knowledge and logics. Environmental Science & Policy 92, 133-140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.11.018

47 Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). Realistic evaluation. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

48 Improving Wellbeing through Urban Nature is led by the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Sheffield. The IWUN project is supported by the Natural Environment Research Council, ESRC, BBSRC, AHRC & Defra [NERC grant NE/N013565/1].

49 Vivid Economics (2016). The contribution made by Sheffield's parks to the wellbeing of the city's citizens. www.vivideconomics.com/wp-content/ uploads/2016/11/Briefing-The-value-of-Sheffields- parks.pdf

50 Dobson, J. & Dempsey, N. (2018). Beyond 'green is good' - the policy and practice dilemmas of urban nature and human wellbeing. Town & Country Planning, December 2018, 514-518.

51 Brindley, P., Jorgensen, A. and Maheswaran, R. (2018). Domestic gardens and self-reported health: a national population study. International Journal of Health Geographics, 17:31, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-018-0148-6

52 McEwan, K., Richardson, M., Brindley, P., Sheffield, D., Tait, C. … et al. (2019). Shmapped: development of an app to record and promote the well-being benefits of noticing urban nature, Translational Behavioral Medicine, https://doi.org/10.1093/tbm/ibz027

53 Barley, S.R., & Tolbert, P.S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. Organization Studies, 18(1), 93-117.

54 Seo, M-G, & Creed, W. E. D. (2002). Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. Academy of Management Review, 27(2), 222–247.

55 Lawrence, T. B., & Suddaby, R. (2006). Institutions and institutional work. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of organisation studies (pp. 215-254). London: SAGE.

56 Sharman, A., & Perkins, R. (2017). Post-decisional logics of inaction: The influence of knowledge controversy in climate policy decision-making. Environment and Planning A, 49(10), 2281-2299.

57 Dobson, J. & Dempsey, N. (forthcoming). Known but not done: how logics of inaction limit the benefits of urban green spaces. Environment & Planning C.

58 Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

59 Grin, J., Rotmans, J., & Schot, J. (2010). Transitions to sustainable development: New directions in the study of long term transformative change. Abingdon: Routledge.

60 http://dclgapps.communities.gov.uk/imd/idmap.html

61 Tim May & Beth Perry (2017) Knowledge for just urban sustainability, Local Environment, 22:sup1, 23-35, DOI: 10.1080/13549839.2016.1233527

62 Ward Thompson, C., & Aspinall, P. (2011). Natural environments and their impact on activity, health, and quality of life. Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 3(3), 230-260.

63 Nam, J. and Dempsey, N. (2018) Community food growing in parks? Assessing the acceptability and feasibility in Sheffield, UK, Sustainability, 10, 2887; doi:10.3390/su10082887

64 Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340-363.

65 Handler, J. (2005). Myth and ceremony in workfare: Rights, contracts, and client satisfaction. Journal of Socio-Economics,34(1), 101-124.

66 Weber, K., Davis, G., & Lounsbury, M. (2009). Policy as Myth and Ceremony? The Global Spread of Stock Exchanges, 1980-2005. The Academy of Management Journal, 52(6), 1319-1347.

67 Wacquant, L. (2010). Prisoner reentry as myth and ceremony. Dialectical Anthropology, 34(4), 605-620.

68 Bagnall, A-M., et al. (2018). Places, spaces, people and wellbeing: full review. What Works Centre for Wellbeing. Retrieved from: https://whatworkswellbeing.org/product/places-spaces-people-and-wellbeing/