

EVALUATION REPORT
DEFRA Climate Challenge Fund CCF9
Project code AE017

GREENHOUSE BRITAIN. Losing Ground, Gaining Wisdom
Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison
and Harrison Studio & Associates (Britain)

Report prepared by Wallace Heim

15 April 2008

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1.0 EVALUATION SUMMARY

2.0 EVALUATION PLAN AND METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 Evaluation Plan
- 2.2 Methodology: what was done
- 2.3 Methodology: variations to and limitations of plan and requirements

3.0 EVALUATION IN FULL

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Targeting an audience
- 3.3 Evaluation results: Quantitative surveys
 - 3.3a Quantitative surveys and results
 - 3.3b The five statements required by DEFRA
 - 3.3c The questions themselves
 - 3.3d Conclusion
- 3.4 Evaluation results: Qualitative responses
 - 3.4a Responses from people involved in the project development
 - 3.4b The venues
 - 3.4b.1 Centre for Contemporary Art and the Natural World
 - 3.4b.2 CCANW: what was learned / evaluative summary
 - 3.4b.3 Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery
 - 3.4b.4 Shrewsbury Museum: what was learned / evaluative summary
 - 3.4b.5 Holden Gallery, Manchester Metropolitan University
 - 3.4b.6 Holden Gallery: what was learned / evaluative summary
 - 3.4b.7 The venues: practical considerations
- 3.5 The Harrisons' seminars / talks
- 3.6 The media and journal reviews
- 3.7 Variations in project from original proposal
- 3.8 Conclusion

4.0 APPENDICES

- 4.1 Questionnaire statistics summary (DEFRA 5 statements)

INTRODUCTION

This Close-out Report is the first evaluation report submitted by Wallace Heim for Greenhouse Britain, and represents her views and not those of the project partners or the exhibition venues.

The Evaluation is structured broadly in two sections: the first covering the more quantitative surveys of responses to the five statements on perceptions of climate change given by DEFRA; and the second on the more qualitative responses obtained through interviews and open questions on the questionnaires.

'The Harrisons' refers to Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison.

The evaluation has been assisted throughout by the project partners and venues without hindrance. For this assistance, I would like to thank David Haley, Chris Fremantle, Helen Mayer Harrison, Newton Harrison, Gabriel Harrison, Clive Adams and Johanna Korndorfer (Centre for Contemporary Art and the Natural World); Mary White and Adrian Plant (Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery), Neil Grant (Holden Gallery, Manchester Metropolitan University).

1.0 EVALUATION SUMMARY

The focus of this evaluation is on how the exhibition 'Greenhouse Britain. Losing Ground, Gaining Wisdom' (Greenhouse Britain) by Newton Harrison and Helen Mayer Harrison and the Harrison Studio (Britain) fulfilled the remit by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Climate Challenge Fund (CCF) to change public perceptions of climate change, and to bring about an 'attitudinal shift' broadly in line with the policy directive outlined in the Climate Challenge Fund brief.

Evidence and responses from the public were obtained by: 1) the evaluator attending the exhibition in three venues; interviewing members of the public and venue curators; and observation; 2) questionnaires made available to the public by email and post prior to a possible visit to the exhibition; 3) questionnaires made available to the public at the exhibition; 4) questionnaires available through the Greenhouse Britain website; 5) the evaluator conducting interviews away from the exhibition, primarily with people who were involved in the development of the project; 6) the evaluator attending public talks and seminars by the Harrisons.

The questionnaires included both the five statements required by DEFRA under CCF guidelines and open-ended questions devised by the evaluator in order to elicit more qualitative responses. The numbers of responses is small, 3% of those attending, but the detail obtained is sufficient to provide a basis for interpretation.

From the five DEFRA questions, the most assured finding is that the awareness of climate change among the public was extremely high, 98%, and that this awareness was also, already, translating into actions and behavioural changes in people's everyday life, although the question about the extent to which climate change was *more* of an issue was found to be problematic for many respondents. The questions about whether climate change was a natural occurrence or caused by human actions were too ambiguous to produce reliable answers. There was not any significant variation between figures for those responding before seeing the exhibition and those responding after. My view is that awareness of climate change is rapidly increasing, and those questions, apart from being problematic in their wording, had become almost redundant for the members of the public attending the exhibition, for whom an awareness of some kind was already high.

Responses across the open-ended questions answered by members of the public at the exhibitions provides valuable qualitative evidence for the effect of the exhibition. There was criticism of some the artistic methods of the exhibition, and some criticism of the proposals presented as to their feasibility, as to the technologies involved and as to their sensitivity to local British cultures.

In my view, the strongest recommendation for how the experience of the exhibition could have been improved is to have embedded in it more occasions in which members of the public, or groups of people could talk about it, could enter into a dialogue about it and with it. The talks and seminars by the Harrisons were effective, in part, in opening up questions about the exhibition, but from my own experience and that of the curators, being able to speak with someone while in the exhibition space almost always made people look again at the exhibition, spend time with it, and this opened up new ideas and perceptions.

The diversity of responses, and diversity of aspects of the exhibition that people found irritating or inspiring reflected the complexity of the exhibition content. But the majority of responses, across all open-ended questions was that the experience of the exhibition was positive, illuminating, thought-provoking, reassuring, and optimistic while recognising the reality and its consequences for the future as presented by scientific findings and observational evidence.

It provoked thoughts about how to respond, the need to make decisions collectively and politically. The more positive responses can be seen as expressing a sense of possibility, a sense that plans for adaptation can be envisioned and discussed, and that this may be as or more productive and socially engaging than discussions about light-bulbs, air travel and recycling. These responses can also be seen as expressing a feeling that, given the vision, political will and economic support, plans for adaptation can be realised. It was a change towards being able to look at the future, know the situation – ‘the news is getting worse’ – and take action which might be culturally and environmentally sustaining.

Also included in this evaluation are interviews with people who worked with the Harrisons in the development of the project; those conversations are an essential dimension of the Harrisons’ way of working. The responses were strong and unanimous that the experience was inspirational, challenging, educative, liberating. Also included is mention of the media reviews and journal articles. Those reviews reflect diverse critiques, but the majority present the ideas and ethos of the project to wider and more diverse audiences than can attend an exhibition; these reviews should be seen as independent from but integral to the project.

Finally, within the terms of the Climate Challenge Fund, it is my critical view that Greenhouse Britain exceeded that remit in substantive and vital ways.

It was art. It took place, as art, in offices, universities, while walking with architects through a city, in theatres and in galleries. If compared to a public service announcement or media campaign, the delivery was personal, ambiguous, challenging, controversial, and the audience numbers were fewer. But it had effect; it provoked. Given the chance to think that an exhibition provides, there was the potential to take an audience into a new realm of knowledge. And not only might the information and ideas presented add to one’s knowledge, the way of thinking about climate instability might also have been changed.

The ‘attitudinal change’ was less to do with acknowledging or accepting climate change as evidenced in science reports and government documents, or with offering lifestyle choices. It was more to do with changing one’s attitudes towards how plans for adaptation might be made. The CCF project may have reflected earlier government directions towards mitigation and towards the citizen as consumer. The proposals may be, at once, metaphoric and actual drafts to be revised; visionary and deeply problematic as to how they would be realised. Either way, they offer to the public a potential vision not entertained by short-term messages, and show that there may be ways of adapting to possible futures which will be radical, and could be life-sustaining.

Greenhouse Britain has come in advance of forthcoming UK and EU Directives on adaptation and climate change. The Harrisons have been making work about climate change for 40 years. I would agree with many of the criticisms expressed both of the artistic methods and some elements of the proposals. But as far as presenting to the public ideas which are rooted in the locales and sensibilities of the present while advancing into the next phase of understanding, the Harrisons are still doing it.

2.0 EVALUATION PLAN AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation Plan

The plan for the evaluation was changed from that in the original proposal by Harrisons Studio & Associates (Britain) by request to DEFRA . See: CCF7 Change Request Form v1 080109 AE017 Final.

The revised plan for evaluation as carried out by Wallace Heim was as follows:

The Evaluation will monitor the exhibition at Centre for Contemporary Art and the Natural World, (CCANW) nr. Exeter, Devon; the Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery, Shrewsbury (Shrewsbury Museum); and Holden Gallery, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester

(Holden Gallery). Surveys will be taken at the exhibition and where possible among potential audience members before the exhibition. These will be supplemented with interviews in-situ where possible. The surveys will assess qualitative changes in perceptions about climate change brought about by the exhibition. Quantitative data as to the numbers of persons attending will be collated; data as to the numbers of persons viewing the website and completing the survey online will be included. Where possible, numbers of people reached through publicity and media coverage will be included. Further to the exhibition evaluation, interviews with people who have worked on the project in partnership with Harrison Studios prior to the evaluation commencing will be included. The Evaluator will produce a final report.

The focus of the evaluation was on awareness of climate change and whether and how the exhibition may have changed perceptions about climate change, or brought about an 'attitudinal shift' as described in general in the DEFRA guidelines.

The evaluation was based on responses to the exhibition by members of the public attending and by a selection of people involved in the development of the project. The evaluation was not to be based on how the Harrisons themselves explain the exhibition; nor was it to provide for DEFRA an aesthetic interpretation of the exhibition.

Further to this, the Evaluator was to report on the variations in the project as planned from the initial proposal to the end of February. An evaluation of the management of the project, financially and in terms of the production and installations of the exhibition, is outside this remit.

2.2 Methodology: what was done

The evaluation began following the opening of the exhibition at CCANW in November 2007 and monitored the exhibition there and as it was presented at Shrewsbury and the Holden Gallery through 29 February 2008. I attended the exhibition at all three venues, as well as attending the Harrisons' talks at CCANW; at the University of Plymouth; at Shrewsbury; and their talk/seminar at Gunpowder Park, London. At each venue, I spoke with as many members of the public as possible who were attending. Further, I interviewed a selection of people involved with the project development, or who have worked previously on the development of projects with the Harrisons.

Questionnaires which included the five statements required by DEFRA for the standardised attitudinal survey were used in a number of ways. For an assessment of attitudes after seeing the exhibition, printed questionnaires were available for members of the public at each venue. Where possible, either myself or the exhibition invigilators used those questionnaires as a prompt for a conversation about the exhibition, which drew out more qualitative responses.

I discuss further below the requirement for assessing attitudes of members of the public before they attended the exhibition. Accepting from Kate Smith and the DEFRA guidelines that this was to be done, questionnaires were used differently for this purpose at each venue. At CCANW, it was possible to email the questionnaire to their mailing list. Although this was organised after the exhibition had opened, most people had not yet attended the exhibition. At Shrewsbury Museum, an advance emailing was not possible, for valid reasons according to how the Gallery communicates with its subscribing audience. At the Holden Gallery, it was possible to post a questionnaire with the advance publicity flier about the exhibition to their mailing list, and to post a web-site notice on an internal university site, directing people to the online questionnaire. As well, the questionnaire was available online on www.greenhousebritain.net.

Questions from the questionnaires were included in the interviews conducted. Responses in interviews to the DEFRA five statements are aggregated within those figures, and not given separately.

Additional questions were included on the questionnaire in order to draw out responses to the exhibition specifically, and to gain a more reflective or qualitative view of people's understanding of climate change.

In the interviews, I began with questions directed towards that persons involvement with the project or attendance at the exhibition, but conducted the interview in a semi-structured way, responding to the interviewee's comments in a more conversational method.

Reports on the numbers of people involved are included in CCF9.

2.3 Methodology: variations to and limitations of plan and requirements

The plan and requirements above were fulfilled, with the following variations.

The use of questionnaires and the five statements posed by DEFRA are discussed more fully in the 'Evaluation in full' section below. An adequate number of questionnaires were completed and returned to make an assessment derived from them. Because of difficulties with the statements as posed, and because of the specific contexts of Greenhouse Britain, I question below whether what has been learned from the surveys would have been significantly different with more numbers of people surveyed.

The questionnaires were used well in situations of face-to-face engagement, less well if left for the public to complete. Further, as regards the advance surveys of attitudes towards and perceptions of climate change, there was neither the time to plan, nor the budget, nor the availability of staffing for surveys to be completed by a significant number of members of the public before they attended the exhibition. Additionally, the attempts to have advance surveys completed may have diverted limited resources away from more, and more comprehensive, surveys of those people who did attend. As well, because it was necessary for the evaluation as a whole to include other questions, it resulted in questionnaires which were longer, and less inviting, than might have been otherwise.

Even with these limitations, the results obtained, particularly from the open-ended questions and those derived from conversations / interviews show a range and diversity of responses to climate change, and to the exhibition.

A longer timescale, and more qualitative approaches would have helped in more fully assessing effect of the exhibition on influencing those perceptions. My preference for an evaluation would have been to more fully attend to and incorporate the Harrisons' work with project partners in the development of the project, as this phase is integral to the work itself; As well, I would have preferred to have had more time in preparation with the venues as to how I could integrate an evaluation with their audiences and with any groups coming to the exhibition, as this would provide the opportunity for more in-depth responses than is possible with a questionnaire. Further, a more analytical evaluation reflecting on the work itself, on its place within the Harrisons' work, and on the artistic, ecological and political contexts in which it operates would have been a valuable contribution.

Realising these preferences was outside the revised timescale and budget. However, I was able to interview some of the people involved in the development of the project. The venues were not able to or did not plan for a substantial number of groups coming to the exhibition. However, I was able to meet groups of students at the Holden Gallery; was able to speak with one group of young people at Shrewsbury; but was not able to contact groups at CCANW, although I received a full report from Johanna Korndorfer, Education Projects Co-ordinator on those groups who did attend.

3.0 EVALUATION IN FULL

3.1 Introduction

The Evaluation starts with the interpretations of the more quantitative surveys carried out, based on the five required statements posed by DEFRA. This is followed a qualitative assessment which is based on interviews, conversations, and responses to the open-ended questions on the questionnaires. The qualitative assessment is divided into sections: 1) responses from people involved in the project development; 2) responses from each of the venues, with a description of the exhibition, audiences and evaluation activities at each venue; 3) a review of the seminars given by the Harrisons and 4) the journal and media coverage of the exhibition. The evaluation conclusion follows.

The statistical results and the responses data are included in the Appendices. This 'Evaluation in Full' is more my interpretations of the responses with a view towards what can be learned from them.

The limitations to the evaluation are outlined above in Section 2.3. There is a further distinction, particular to assessing artworks, which is that their effect on a viewer or participant is likely to be slow in

coming, developing within the context of that person's everyday life and interests over many weeks or months. This makes the initial experience, usually a short period of time with the exhibition, of great importance. An assessment at the time not only may be skewed, but may interrupt and diminish the experience itself, which is not the purpose of an evaluation. Observation and over-hearing was important to my approach, but do not appear in the statistics. The conclusions below are based on evidence, but also intuition, experience, my own interpretative abilities, observation and listening.

3.2 Targeting an audience

I am not aware of the project partners defining a 'target audience' as in marketing terms for the work. Rather, I think they did take a view that all members of the public are valuable and viable audience members. Mounting the exhibition in the galleries and spaces chosen will have by default chosen audiences which have an interest in art, an affinity with the gallery, and/or an interest in climate change. The reach of the media coverage will have been within wider, but again identifiable spheres. Greenhouse Britain was not a mass-communication exercise.

Similarly, I did not define a target audience for the evaluation, but within the time and budget limitations, tried to speak with people involved in as many aspects of the exhibition as possible, and to gather the questionnaire information as fully as possible.

3.3 Evaluation results: Quantitative surveys

3.3a Quantitative surveys and results

3.3b The five statements required by DEFRA

All questionnaires and interviews included the five questions required by DEFRA.

Before summarising those results, I would like to caution against making a strong interpretation of those responses as an indication either of people's perceptions of climate change, or of the exhibition's effectiveness in changing people's perceptions. My caution relates to the questions themselves.

3.3c The questions themselves

Firstly, although the questions may have seemed appropriate when the Climate Challenge Fund was initiated, the past 18 months have seen a significant increase in media coverage of climate change; in scientific and government reports issued; in the inclusion of climate change within the film, video and music industries; and more. The argument over scepticism about climate change, or general awareness about climate change has moved on to more complex ideas about its causes, the role of science and governments, and how to mitigate and/or adapt to its effects. This is evident in the answers to the first question:

1. The world's climate is changing

in which 98% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed, with 98% strongly agreeing or agreeing both before and after seeing the exhibition. This high number may reflect that the people interested in the exhibition were by definition already aware of climate change; or that a basic, public awareness is already high.

The second and third questions:

2. Climate change is the result of human behaviour

3. Climate change is a natural occurrence

generated confusion. Answers to question 2 depended on whether the respondent considered the question was making the assumption that climate change was *only* the result of human behaviour. Agreement could indicate wide variations in what constituted human involvement in climate change, and in how 'climate change' was defined. Disagreement could indicate that climate change is the result of human behaviour, but not only human behaviour. Closely related was the confusion over Question 3, which was dependent on the respondent's definition of 'nature' and 'natural occurrence', and whether human behaviour was, or was not, considered to be part of 'nature'. Agreement could indicate that human behaviour had no effect, that climate change was a continual and inevitable process, and the current term 'climate change' was nothing more than an observation of a continual process. Or, it could mean that human behaviour was implicated, but as humans are not outside 'nature', it is a natural occurrence. Disagreement could indicate that human behaviour had causal effect, with the human outside the 'natural'.

In the responses gathered through interviews, the frustration with the ambiguity of these questions was evident. The statistical results are below, but because of the ambiguity of the questions I would make no stronger interpretation than that most people responded that climate change, in itself, is a natural process, one which is affected in some way by human behaviour. Nor would I make strong claims about Greenhouse Britain influencing answers to these questions, although an increase in a willingness to consider human behaviour as in some way integral, if not causal, to climate change is slightly evident.

2. Climate change is the result of human behaviour

total strongly agreeing or agreeing = 86%
total neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 9%
total disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 4%

before / after seeing GB strongly agreeing or agreeing = 78.3% / 89%

before seeing GB neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 17.7% / 7%

before seeing GB disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 4% / 4%

3. Climate change is a natural occurrence

total strongly agreeing or agreeing = 65.7%
total neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 18.3%
total disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 16%

before / after seeing GB strongly agreeing or agreeing = 68.8% / 64.8%

before / after seeing GB neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 15.6% / 19%

before / after seeing GB disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 15.6% / 16.2%

The fourth question:

4. Climate change has become more of an issue for me in this last year.

again had an ambiguity which was evident when asking the questions in interview. For people who are actively and professionally involved in environmental issues, climate change often was not *more* of an issue, and so their answer was to disagree. The same was the case for people who had been following the issues for the past 18 months. For many respondents, because climate change is more evident in the wider media, there is more awareness of it, and an affirmative answer given, although there was no way of making the gradation between a vague increase in awareness, and the extent to which the issues may influence one's perceptions or behaviour. The statistical results are:

total strongly agreeing or agreeing = 64.7%
total neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 17.7%
total disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 16.6%

before / after seeing GB strongly agreeing or agreeing = 65.2% / 65.7%

before / after seeing GB neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 19.6% / 17%

before / after seeing GB disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 15.2% / 17%

The fifth question:

5. I personally can help to limit the effects of climate change.

generated less ambiguous responses, but more comments were made to qualify a respondent's answer to include the need for government efforts.

total strongly agreeing or agreeing = 88.9%
total neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 6.8%
total disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 4.3%

before / after seeing GB strongly agreeing or agreeing = 86.7% / 89.6%

before / after seeing GB neither agreeing nor disagreeing = 6.7% / 6.9%

before / after seeing GB disagreeing or strongly disagreeing = 6.6% / 3.4%

3.3d Conclusion

I would discount questions 2 and 3, except as indicative in a very general way that questions of what is natural and what is human are lively and valid questions for people in the context of understanding climate change.

Taking into considerations the comments additional to the questions 1, 4 and 5, it can be surmised that a general awareness of 'climate change' is high for people coming to the exhibition, and that the possibility that this awareness could translate into some form of personal action is high.

With the exception mentioned above, that there is a slight increase in a willingness to accept human behavioural implications in climate change after seeing the exhibition, there is not a significant change in before and after results. This does not mean that Greenhouse Britain had no effect. Rather, it means that the effects of the exhibition are not drawn out or measured by these questions.

3.4 Evaluation results: Qualitative responses

This section reviews firstly those responses obtained in interviews with people who were involved in the development of the project, or have worked with the Harrisons in the development of previous projects.

Secondly, this section reviews the responses from interviews with people attending the exhibition, working in the venues, and the responses to the open-ended questions on the survey. These are divided according to the venues.

3.4a Responses from people involved in the project development

Many art works in the field of socially and environmentally engaged art may include gallery exhibitions, but a line cannot be drawn around these more conventional public events as being exclusively 'the work of art'. The Harrisons, and others, have over several decades expanded the artist's realm of practice to include the dialogues, negotiations, partnerships and collaborations that lead to an installation, a sculpture, a performance, a plan for civic and environmental change. For some artists and projects, these are not merely procedures that lead to a work being exhibited. They are creative processes which are inherent to the work as whole; processes that necessarily involve people other than the artist. These conversational processes compose part of the work, conceptually, aesthetically, ethically; and the processes are as open to criticism as the more conventional material manifestations.

This is an area of arts practice in which the work of the Harrisons has been extremely influential. Any evaluation of their work would be incomplete without including, to some extent, the dialogues, processes and collaborations with other people that preceded the exhibition.

There is another level of justification for including these interviews which has to do with how the public, or publics can be defined. One of the lessons of climate change, I think, is that its effects will be felt disproportionately according to one's geographical location and economic livelihood, but its effects will be evident across the classifications of class, race, gender, ethnicity, education. 'The public' becomes all citizens, and not just a collection of people defined in a particular way for a particular purpose, or those people who are perceived as having no knowledge of an issue, or 'the person on the street'. That person on the street counts, as does that person who has an expertise, or that person if and when they are working in an office. As the Harrisons' work extends to those collaborations mentioned above, those people become 'members of the public' for whom the work may have an effect, as do people walking into the exhibition.

Further, what is of interest in evaluating an exhibition or work of art is what members of the public think and feel *after* they have had time to consider the work, the issues, the contexts which may affect their lives, and these interviews were after the event.

The people interviewed had worked primarily with Newton Harrison, but also Helen Mayer Harrison and Gabriel Harrison. Climate change is important to all of them; their level of knowledge is high. My questions were not to do with 'awareness' or perceptions, but with the qualities of the experience working with the Harrisons, and how it may have affected them. Their responses surprised me. They *all* reported that the experience was illuminating, informative, challenging, imaginative, liberating. Their respect for the cross-disciplinary knowledge of the Harrisons was high, including both the science, the land-use planning and architectural aspects, and including Newton Harrison's ability to ask 'the right questions.' Further, they had been taken on a journey, relieved of the strictures of their respective disciplines and work practices, and had found it in some way transformative of their way of considering climate change and possible adaptations to it. But, from their responses, the exercise was not just one of being relieved of limitations, but one which was highly informed, creative, and reflective, not just of their own methods of work, but of more conventional responses to climate change. They reported

feeling supported, mentored, and reported an appreciation of what this kind of process of 'art' can achieve in providing the context, the time and space for imagining possible futures, for rehearsing what may happen.

This aspect of the Harrisons' work does not overtly enter the public realm, and I was very appreciative of a glimpse into it. The effect of these meetings and conversations may well continue to 'work' and influence people's wider perceptions beyond the exhibition dates.

The exhibition is a discrete part of the work, and cannot replicate those experiences. The translation of that experience into the exhibition is a question for a more aesthetic evaluation. These interviews indicate to me that the 'work' of Greenhouse Britain during these meetings and the development of the project was significantly affecting, challenging and provocative for people. As well, I think that more possibilities for conversations during the exhibitions, not necessarily with the Harrisons, but with others, would have been beneficial, and a continuation of this process.

3.4b The venues

Each venue supported Greenhouse Britain differently, in keeping with their audiences and wider interests. The surveys remained basically the same. I briefly outline below the results of the evaluation in each venue. For evaluation methods in each venue, see above.

3.4b.1 Centre for Contemporary Art and the Natural World

Very valuable information on responses to the exhibition was given by Johanna Korndorfer, Education Projects Coordinator who invigilated the exhibition, who engaged in conversation about the exhibition with the public as possible, and who organised the groups of people who attended workshops and events as part of CCANW's education programme. As well, Korndorfer has written an article for *engage*, the journal of visual art and gallery education, which includes Greenhouse Britain.¹

She met with resistance from the education sector to bringing students to the exhibition on the grounds of not wanting to overwhelm young people with the scale and implications of climate change. From those people who did attend the exhibition, immediate responses were often that the representation of sea level rise started debates over the certainty or uncertainty of the science of climate change, over whether the exhibition was 'scare-mongering'. When she was able to talk with people, she was able to discuss the 'bigger picture' of climate change, and the breadth of ideas the exhibition scenarios presented. Through that conversational process, she was able to draw out opinions, questions and responses both emotional and rational, that had a greater depth than those immediate opinions and reactions.

Of special note are the responses by groups of excluded and hard-to-reach people for whom the maps were particularly engaging, which got them imaginatively thinking. Their concentration was good. They could find themselves on the map. For the young men / boys, the Lea Valley proposal, with high rise buildings was especially of interest, drawing out 'leaps of imagination'. They were absorbed in how those buildings would work, in the futuristic element of the plan.

From the surveys themselves, there were more questionnaires returned from people before seeing the exhibition than for the other venues. This audience could be considered informed and interested in climate change issues, and in art. The words and images associated with climate change are broadly those to do with, in order of prevalence 1) environmental changes, such as those in polar regions, more local floods, desertification, sea level rise; 2) uncertainty, apprehension; and 3) issues of human consumption patterns, personal and governmental responsibility. The audience's responses on the questionnaires after the exhibition (not the same people) were fewer, and mentioned flooding, uncertainty, crisis, but also opportunity, challenge, 'a deep call for action'.

From the 'before' sample, the question 'what questions do you have about climate change?' centred almost entirely on government responsibility. There were no questions on the smaller 'after' responses.

¹ Korndorfer, J (2008). 'On the Trail of the Lonesome Pine. Art and the Natural World at CCANW' in *engage* 21. Spring 2008. pp. 45-49.

The responses to the question asking for 'any comments' after seeing the exhibition indicated considerably more nuanced and thoughtful views about climate change, the roles of science and government, and the possibilities for positive public responses. I quote many of them below:

- As an individual limiting the effects of change is a daunting prospect. We need governments and organisations to take action and soon
- Climate change is a natural occurrence and human behaviour combination. There is however a lot more we can do to limit its effects
- I would be very happy to see more and more exhibitions, events, discussions, seminars involving artists and public in generally envisioning and preparing for the changes we are needing to make.
- Innovative ways of helping people to understand what the reality of this is - because it's based on what could be done for real communities.
- Thank you for shaking up some of my concepts and getting me thinking
- A valuable approach to an issue that is all too often too much complex science for me to grapple with. As always, art sends important messages.
- Our energy / material usage affects the climate and everyone using less will make a difference, though that change has to be put into place at a government level. If India, China, States, etc. aren't involved, it won't matter what we do. I think we are buggered!
- Found the exhibition illuminating, setting clearly out information about climate change but with the added insight providing creative solutions to the problems.
- Very powerful presentation - really enjoyed the opportunity in this great place to linger and appreciate it - thank you.
- A very good use of DEFRA's funds. Thank you
- very interesting and inspiring ideas. Can you show this to the planners of the Thames Gateway, please?

- Unfortunately, this exhibition was very poor at communicating: - too much info; - confused/jumbled/ not clever enough
- could do with a bit more positive and less negative message - beautifully presented floor model

Of the responses, the significant majority were like those more positive ones above; the proportion of positive to negative results was similar to that above.

3.4b.2 CCANW: what was learned / evaluative summary

I do not think Korndorfer overly persuaded people towards a point of view. I do think her responsiveness and conversational approach did make a significant difference to how people engaged with the exhibition. Some of this effect also is because having a conversation meant that time was taken with the exhibition, areas of interest were found and explored, even briefly, rather than a short 'walk through.'

This was a valuable lesson for how the exhibition could be presented in other venues. Unfortunately, the project and venues did not have the resources to plan for more groups to attend, or for someone to be so consistently part of the exhibition, although invigilators in both other venues were briefed. There may have been a reluctance, too, on the part of the project partners to offer further explanation in the form of hand-outs. I think also, this indicates that the exhibition itself did not have as strong capabilities to draw people into it as other works by the Harrisons.

Having said that, I think for those people for whom the exhibition had an effect, their 'awareness' of climate change may not have increased; it may have already been high. But what was offered and responded to was an experience in exploring that awareness, questioning future plans and actions on a collective, societal level in ways which left many people feeling, in general, as if the devastation and uncertainty evidenced in the words and images about climate change might not be inevitable, that there could be planning on a large scale which allowed for continued human settlement, if not environmental sustainability, whether or not the plans were those specific to Greenhouse Britain.

There is not the information available to make a summary about those people for whom the exhibition was not affecting or interesting, and whether this was because of the exhibition itself, the subject matter of climate change, or an audience member's views on art.

3.4b.3 Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery

The support for the exhibition by the Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery was a continuation of several years' associations with the Harrisons and David Haley through the Darwin Festival and events centred

on climate change and the local environment, events which incorporated the arts and socially engaged arts practices. The timing of the exhibition placed it within this year's Darwin Festival, and the associated events organised by Media Maker and the Museum, under the umbrella of *Greenhouse Shropshire*, provided a diverse context for Greenhouse Britain, and an effective programme in itself. Those events were a companion exhibition at the Museum by Sheilagh Jevons and David Haley '*... like there's no tomorrow*'; the exhibition '*Cloud Space*' by the Cloud Gallery Collective at the Shrewsbury Music Hall Gallery; and the exhibition '*No more excuses...*' curated by the Young Curators, showing works by young people on the theme of climate change, at the Belmont Arts Centre. It also included a seminar by The Cloud Gallery Collective on their plans for an environmentally sustainable arts venue.

It is outside the remit of this evaluation to comment on those events.² They did, however, show the strength and longevity of commitment to how the arts can engage with issues of climate change by the Museum and the wider arts community around Shrewsbury. This context also presented an audience sector which was more critical of Greenhouse Britain as a work of art.

As to wider audience numbers, this inclusion of Greenhouse Britain in the extensive publicity for the Darwin Festival may have attracted some people to come. It is difficult to assess this effect from the Museum's estimates, as the Museum had its historical collections closed for reasons to do with the building and the Museum's forthcoming move to a new building, which would have lessened the numbers of people coming to it.

It was not possible to send 'before' questionnaires to a prospective audience, and the Museum understandably was not in a position to support extra invigilation to attend specifically to Greenhouse Britain questionnaires. The return of questionnaires was very low. I did spend two days at Shrewsbury and was able to hold several interviews with members of the public attending and with people involved with the arts and with climate change issues.

From those interviews with members of the public at the exhibition, the responses were varied:

- I'd care about climate change if I had time to think about it.
- I think the exhibition by David Haley and Sheilagh Jevons is the better exhibition. It relates to this place. The other one is too much like a corporate or school science display. I can't get into it. I'm sure there are good ideas in it, but I'm not drawn in enough to read it.
- This is the way forward. These ideas (Pennine Ring) are what we need to be working with now, not in some distant future. This is fantastic.
- The Brits are getting a really raw deal out this. We don't contribute that much to climate change, but we're supposed to pay. It's government that has to make the tough decisions. They're just wasting money and wasting time.

From those interviews with people involved in the arts or engaged with climate change issues, the responses similarly were very varied, but more critical of the exhibition both as art and as a work dealing with climate change:

- It is top heavy. There is too much of a corporate feel. You have to delve for the ideas. It's difficult to penetrate.
- It needs to resolve itself in some way – as metaphor, as science, as planning, as art history.
- It missing the conceptual, new idea...The Harrisons' other work has had an epic quality to it, and showed a different direction; the whole process was the artwork. What's missing with the exhibition is the richness of that experience.
- There could have been more collaboration with people here.
- I have a huge resistance to Greenhouse Britain... It's representing ideas we already know, and it's offering technology-based solutions; it is conceptually wrong. (in reference to the Lea Valley proposals)... There are problems with the physicality of the exhibition. It is wrong for and in this space.
- There needs to be a shift in relationship between the environment and ourselves. We need to find different

² The exhibition mounted by the Young Curators group showed a good curatorial sensibility in assembling a group exhibition. The works made in response to the subject of climate change were highly varied; for example, from those using new media to attempt to show embedded energy in which the stronger interest was in experimenting with representation, to works which were more impassioned about the issues, such as works about sea level rise and its effect on small islands, by a young person from an island affected. It was most striking that the exhibition included works not made in response to climate change, but which affected the curators, and which could be interpreted as expressing some idea or emotion about climate change, which was explained in a written narrative accompanying the work. This made for a considerably more interesting and multi-dimensional exhibition about climate change than many professional group shows. The young people's perceptions about climate change and ability to articulate them were made considerably more sophisticated and complex by the experience.

- ways of co-existing with a changed natural environment. Greenhouse Britain doesn't do this for me.
- The shift in policy that they show as regards the Pennine Ring, the movement of the population to a higher level, is interesting, but it needs individual, collective and political responses incorporated into it.
 - The stream-of-consciousness in the voice over has a poetic structure. The projection is a beautiful object, but we've seen this on television, and that's the place for it. It's very 'old fashioned'.
 - People are more sophisticated about climate change and about art than the exhibition credits us with being. We have the ability to look at and assess these things in our daily lives.
- The exhibition was inspirational. Those projects could be done. It was reasonably practical. The issues are more to do with the political will to implement them.
 - It was visionary. The Pennine Ring opened up the discussion about the displacement of population by rising sea levels and questions of where they were going to re-locate.
 - It did feel like a planning exhibition, but the subject and how it was treated was not like a planner would do it. There was no doubt in my mind that it was art. It would be good to feed back into the exhibition.
 - There was no idea of the process of how any of the plans were to be done. But it did have metaphorical value. It made you to sit up and think, and have to have a serious discussion about the possibilities for change. But it was going to extremes of off-the-wall ideas of how to deal with something.

The exhibition did seem to polarise public opinions, between those who found the exhibition visionary and inspirational, and those who were highly critical, primarily on grounds of its lack of reference to the geographically and culturally local contexts, and its appearance as 'corporate' which was seen as hindering an engagement with it as 'art'.

3.4b.4 Shrewsbury Museum and Art Gallery: what was learned / evaluative summary

As to whether the exhibition raised general awareness of climate change, I would propose that for those people for whom climate change was not an issue, the presence of the exhibition, along with the other events and the Darwin Festival, did raise basic awareness, and this would be over a wide constituency of the city through the publicity and media coverage as much as by people walking through the door of the Museum. As to whether the exhibition itself enabled a change in perception by those people attending, this is more difficult to assess from the information obtained. It was reported to me anecdotally by the Museum curators that for some people, already interested in climate change, it was an exhibition that touched them, and they responded well to the content. I suggest that the members of the public with whom I spoke presented valuable critical assessments of the project as a piece of art, showing an interest in the work, whether that was more positively agreeing with the content and process, or more often, showing a critical perspective based on a desire to communicate in a particular way about climate change. It may be that prejudices were confirmed, rather than sensibilities significantly changed. As with CCANW, a programme of discussion or conversation with groups or open to the public, throughout the exhibition, might have resulted in even more controversy, but also more direct engagement with it.

3.4b.5 Holden Gallery, Manchester Metropolitan University

The audience was almost entirely arts students and faculty. The assistance by Neil Grant in getting advance questionnaires out to the gallery mailing list and on university bulk emails / website was very good, as was the attention given to the exhibition in terms of its get-in and the provision of continual invigilators. The gallery is also a passageway for many people, so that those seeing it would have repeatedly walked past it. For many students, the floor model and the lighting rig were novel in the gallery, and the initial attraction to the exhibition.

I was able to talk with one group of about 35 students, from an illustration and animation course, as a group and individually, as well as to individuals over two days at the exhibition. There was a diverse range of responses from them. For many students, their first interest was in critiquing the exhibition as a method of communication or technically in its execution. Their responses regarding this were first critical: it looked too 'corporate'; the visual quality of the video animation and the maps was not up to professional corporate display or public media standards. For some students, this was a shortcoming. For others, it indicated it was a work of art rather than a government or public service message.

When discussing climate change, again, the responses were diverse. Initial responses were that the exhibition was too scientific; that it did not present problems in other parts of the world; that it did not show the footage of actual disasters happening. There was a reluctance to read, and a lack of interest in the maps, unless they related to one's home area. On the other hand, many students found the subject of climate change compelling and were interested to see any kind of exhibition relating to it. Others found the poetry of the language very affecting, and the presentation of ideas for adaptation

were on a scale they found exciting. Most found the floor projection interesting, and others seem to divide between those interested in the language and those interested in the maps. Many were highly critical of the omissions on the maps of the Isle of Wight, Anglesey and Isle of Man.

Having time to talk with them, I was able to question some of their first responses. A group of men wanting displays of actual disasters were able to see that the exhibition was doing something different, and that this had value. There were open discussions on the inter-dependency of historical, cultural and economic factors of climate change globally and locally. The students interested in the poetic quality of the panels did not articulate that interest beyond how it communicated an optimism and sensibility about how to live on the land; they stayed longest with the exhibition. Many commented on how it was good to see an exhibition which was not about light-bulbs. Some commented that it was good to see a communication about climate change that did not treat people as if they were only consumers.

The question 'what questions do you have about climate change?' elicited responses to do with perceptions of the future, uncertainty and responsibility:

- Rather than presenting a climate change how can we adjust towards it?
- When will it become much worse? How will it effect us?
- Why haven't the government done more to prevent climate change? I.e. better recycling methods
- How prepared can we be?
- What are the real facts?
- How can the world work together to help with climate change?

Responses for the question 'Did any part of exhibition change your views?' include:

- I knew about it; it just reinforced the reality which is yet to come
- maps of Lea valley watershed; Simple diagrams shows a simple way of adapting to the environment
- floor model; text about Lea Valley; I could see how it would effect people's homes and that I'd like to understand more
- Bristol; unbelievable damage without a simple dam

Responses to 'Any other comments' / 'Was the exhibition affecting' included:

- I think that the sort of person who would attend this exhibition would already be in a position to 'make a difference'
- Had not considered where we'd live in the future, just that some people would have to move
- Want to put this exhibition outside the House of Commons
- It was interesting to see climate change explored in terms of its aftermath and imagined responses to that
- It was interesting, but it didn't catch my imagination
- I felt it washed over me a lot, I feel it took a lot to absorb it
- makes me think about buildings that could be built now with long term factors taken into account, community based areas already prepared for rising waters
- Utopian but positive, yes - learning more climate change - and what can be done - as a positive answer, there are things to do
- The floor model - it is a visualisation of the research - something we can see is something we can understand!
- It is interesting but I felt that I needed more pieces that impact the viewers and create a clear link to what we can do to help.

3.4b.6 Holden Gallery: what was learned / evaluative summary

For those people who stayed with the exhibition, and became drawn into it, the content of it was affecting. They found the optimism encouraging and novel; they found the plans provocative and possible. But for many of the students, the visual, aesthetic qualities of exhibition did not draw them in; they were most often adversely critical of the exhibition's techniques and execution.

As to whether the exhibition raised awareness, my impression was that many students were not well-informed about climate change, beyond school classes in global warming and a general disposition towards environmentalism and activism. There are exceptions, and a dozen students were extremely articulate and informed about climate change issues, and expressed a desire to stay longer with the

exhibition. There were a similar number of students very interested in the form of the exhibition, for whom climate change was a new subject for concern.

As to whether the exhibition changed perceptions, or reinforced existing ones, is not possible to surmise. This was a very artistically-orientated audience, and their first interest was in finding ways to critique the work. Most striking was their expectation for representations to be of a technical standard found in the broadcast media, and their reluctance to engage with a work which had textual elements. It would have been very productive to have more time discussing with them both the formal and the content elements of the exhibition and their responses to climate change.

3.4b.7 The venues: practical considerations

Looking at practical matters, at both Shrewsbury and the Holden Gallery, there were significant difficulties in setting the exhibition, resulting in structural changes to the buildings. Greater attention to the appropriateness of the material requirements of the exhibition to the venues would have been welcomed. Similarly, the effectiveness of the projected floor map and the voice-over were very strongly dependent on the space of each venue as to whether they could be seen or heard adequately.

3.5 The Harrisons' seminars / talks

The public talks and seminars were integral to the work as a whole, and showed some important aspects of it.

The Harrisons presented a history of their work to audiences, which often constituted more of the talk than their exposition about Greenhouse Britain, or their answering of questions from the public. I think that many in the audiences would have preferred to discuss and question Greenhouse Britain in greater detail.

The seminars did explain the exhibition, providing a narrative for the ideas presented, like 'settlement', 'form determinant', and narratives about the proposals themselves, which gave many people a way-in to understanding the exhibition. From the initial questions asked, it was this narrative that was needed so the exhibition could be understandable, and so that specific questions about it could fit within a context. First questions were often contentiously about whether the Harrisons had shown sufficient sensitivity to British culture and landscape; or about how to make any of the proposals realisable, the political, social and economic work that would need to be done, and by whom. Further questions included whether the focus on sea level rise and watersheds had excluded problems like environmental migration which may have specific, equivalent effects on Britain. Further questions were on the inter-disciplinarity of the Harrisons' work, as conceptual art, scientific research, land use planning; as metaphor, science and projection. The range of questions indicated an engagement with the work at the level of its ideas, as a substantive set of challenging proposals, whether they were agreed with nor not; but also a frustration at not being able to 'get' the exhibition, rather than 'get' isolated parts of it, despite the extensive text and illustrative maps.³

The Harrisons' responses to questions were often provocative, but they also did give people ways of understanding the exhibition which were helpful and added imaginative depth. The exhibition benefited from these talks, and when there was some form of conversation or discussion incorporated in the experience, when what was materially in the space was brought to life through questioning it together with another person. I think this showed a limitation of the exhibition, and showed the potential of the experience had more occasions for conversation been possible.

3.6 The media and journal reviews

The articles about Greenhouse Britain in the mainstream media such as the *Guardian*, and in the environmental journals, such as the *Ecologist*, and in arts journals, such as *engage*, provide more than quantified figures for publicity. Numbers of people entering a gallery can be small; numbers of people spending more than a few minutes with an exhibition are small; numbers of people willing to explain their responses is even smaller. The number of people reading about an exhibition is most often greater

³ An exception to this was the seminar at Plymouth University, with a panel discussion and attended by arts students from the Arts and Ecology MA at Dartington College of Arts, in which the discussion was less about understanding the exhibition, and more about aesthetically critiquing it and the relations of proposals to everyday life and potential political changes.

than those attending it; and their time spent spending reading and considering it can often be greater than the time spent passing through a gallery.

The number of people seeing Damien Hurst's diamond-embedded skull is minute compared to the numbers who can discuss it at length, and with strong opinions, who have read about it in journals and the media. Those articles, as well, present ways of thinking about the artwork. I do not want to propose that the experience of reading about an exhibition and attending it are similar; and would promote attending it as being the more full mode of experience.

But a work of art exists also in its criticism and representation; it also 'works' there. The articles that have appeared about Greenhouse Britain I would suggest should be seen as more than publicity numbers, and be considered as an extending of the work in that they promote not just awareness that it happened, but a dissemination of the content of the work. Most articles are positive, in that they see the work to some degree as it is explained by the Harrisons. That is, as imaginative and scientifically sound proposals for viable ways of living with climatic instability; as a conceptual work of art which engages with the possibility of an environmental citizenry capable of deciding its responses to climate change in material, social and environmental terms that can be life sustaining.

I think that the work of these articles and reviews fits with the exhibition intentions, in that they present ideas which can be mulled over; proposals which are not in the ordinary media or governmental domain of ideas; and a view of humanity and the environment which is both utopian and pragmatic. What is missing is, of course, the dialogue, the questioning and critique that direct audience engagement provides. In time, there may surface other actions, plans and projects which can show the influence of Greenhouse Britain derived not from being in Devon, Manchester, Shrewsbury or Bristol, but by reading about it. This separates a work of art from a transitory or a delivered 'communication message'.

3.7 Variations in project from original proposal

This evaluation began subsequent to the changes in the project being agreed with DEFRA. It has not been possible within my budget and time constraints to consider fully the economic, managerial and artistic reasons for those changes. The original proposal does appear overly ambitious in its outputs, given the budget, timescale and production staff. A scaling down would have been necessary. Retaining the exhibition element was essential; reducing its size so that it could fit in chosen galleries, was pragmatic. It is possible that the decision to make two identical versions of the exhibition was pragmatic in terms of fulfilling the requirement by DEFRA to show it in a number of venues in a limited timescale. In terms of the exhibition itself, those funds may have been better spent developing and managing the project / exhibition at whatever scale was possible and appropriate. A full assessment of whether all decisions made were sound has not been possible.

3.8 Evaluation Conclusion

My conclusion begins with an interpretation of the responses to the open-ended questions, building on the sections above. Following that, I offer my concluding thoughts.

The open-ended questions

Answers to the open-ended questions on the questionnaires gives a wide picture of the project, and one which is strongly positive towards the exhibition's effect in stimulating considerations about climate change. These considerations were more focussed on possible societal responses to climate change, showed positive attitudes toward collective action, and were appreciative of the role of the exhibition and art in engaging with the issues.

The questions of 'words or images associated with climate change' drew out those about polar regions, sea level rise, technologies, energy production and use, lifestyle, drought, stagnation, floods, turbulence, uncertainty; 'fertile areas turning into deserts', extreme weather – words of apprehension and disaster with only a few words referring to adjustment, preparation or resourcefulness.

To the question, 'what questions do you have', most responses before the exhibition were directed towards political and governmental leadership being lacking and necessary. The others were to do with the need for truthful information. After the exhibition, these were noticeably more to do with how to adjust, how climate change will affect one's life, with preparation, ideas on how to act, and on government responsibility and the need for information. I interpret that change in responses to indicate an engagement with the exhibition, moving considerations towards how one could, collectively and

politically, start to consider how to respond to climate change, in ways other than patterns of individual consumption, and on a larger scale.

Asking 'any other comments', for those responding before seeing the exhibition, the strong majority of responses mentioned the absence of government responsibility for taking action, and a few were observations of local changes in environments. For those responding after seeing the exhibition, most responses related to the exhibition, of which 85% expressed some kind of positive response, the strong majority of those relating directly to the exhibition as 'illuminating', 'eye-opening' or provoking of an idea, action or statement.

- As an individual limiting the effects of change is a daunting prospect. We need governments and organisations to take action and soon
- Believe that human 'lifestyle' has led to an acceleration in climate change (which as a natural cycle is inevitable) but a change in values can bring some balance back and aim to sustain life on an every-changing planet - rather than just live for today
- Very informative and certainly a that these proposals could and I hope will, be given the opportunities to be tested
- Innovative ways of helping people to understand what the reality of this is - because it's based on what could be done for real communities
- More projects like this needed. Too much cultural denial which this project may help break down
- Information sharing like this is so important - the thought of more and more trees is uplifting! And us living in closer proximity to them, wonderful. Not scary.
- The more we "network" at meetings and events like this, the easier it becomes to come together as a new community forging new directions under new thinking
- I am an active member of Transition Town Totnes, and feel that it is such community-led initiatives for change in our behaviour and government planning that is necessary to make a difference globally
- Many thanks for supporting this venture. Made us even more aware and we certainly want to protect us for the sake of our family and grandchildren

Under a third of these expressed a view about government responsibility or a related comments about climate change. The more negative responses were to do with technical difficulties with the exhibition, (the audio or the text), or that the exhibition had presented 'nothing new'.

- Was presented in quite an academic way even though the images were there. I think this is what people don't respond to very well being told stuff in reams of text, The images could have been better explained in relation to the text surrounding it.
- Unfortunately, this exhibition was very poor at communicating: - too much info; - confused/jumbled/ not clever enough
- more colour, sound, music and illustrations. Too much writing for me.

The question whether the exhibition was memorable or affecting resulted in 65% affirming 'yes' in some way, 15% in a middle ground, and 19% saying the exhibition had not been memorable. Whether the exhibition 'changed views', 70% responded yes, with an indicative sample below:

- how we can creatively respond and meet the changes in new active and positive ways
- It's made me feel positive that there are possibilities to explore and great ideas of how to handle the changes
- makes me more determined to do my bit - small changes add up. But also gov. needs to act re: new settlements
- more motivated to be involved in wider discourse
- It reminded me that a larger picture of change is vital.
- It looks less impossible to at least start conceptualising some solutions

Those responding 'no' was 22%; some indicating that they already knew the information presented. There were a few responses in a middle ground.

The responses to the question 'which plans would you like to be realised' was high, and was equally divided among the three.

I do not want to put too much weight on these responses; the sample was small and the method of collecting not as consistent as it might have been. By definition, these will have been people interested

enough in the exhibition to respond. But I do think they are indicative of how Greenhouse Britain did have an impact. It did provoke thought which was more nuanced than a reaction to a disaster shown on the media, or a freezing in fear. It provoked thoughts about how to respond, or how to think about responding collectively, how to plan, what might be possible. The more positive responses can be seen as expressing a sense of possibility, a sense that plans for adaptation can be envisioned and discussed, and that this may be as or more productive and socially engaging than discussions about lightbulbs, air travel and recycling. These responses can also be seen as expressing a feeling that, given the vision, political will and economic support, plans for adaptation can be realised.

Given the contrast between the words or images associated with climate change as dystopian, uncertain, extreme, and the tenor of the responses towards the exhibition, a change in attitude was evident for most, or many respondents. It was a change towards being able to look at the future, know the situation – ‘the news is getting worse’ – and take action which might, might, be culturally and environmentally sustaining.

The words used in the responses were not those in the exhibition or by the Harrisons; there was virtually no mention of ‘form determinant’, ‘defence’, ‘withdrawal’; or quotes from the text. The effect of the exhibition may have been more diffuse, more a gestalt than a focussed ‘message’; or it may have been that the diversity of artistic methods and diversity of ideas presented meant that members of the public could find interest in one aspect, while experiencing the ‘feel’ and import of the whole installation.

Conclusion

An aesthetic analysis is outside the terms of this kind of evaluation, but there are aesthetic criticisms that can be made briefly. Greenhouse Britain is good, but it does not have the conceptual rigour and consistency of previous works by the Harrisons or the coherence of those works in terms of visual imagery. It does have the Harrisons’ distinctive poetic language; and does have their resolve to meld conceptual art, dialogue, science, poetic and visual imagery with a long view of climatic instability; and does have their distinctive ability to ‘ask the right questions’ and to coalesce the concepts into a language that will continue to define the issues and the field of enquiry beyond the exhibition: the ‘form determinant’, ‘settlement’, ‘defence, withdrawal and defence, and withdrawal to the high ground’.

There are criticisms to be taken into account of the management of the project; the physical suitability for the exhibition in some venues; the connections between the Harrisons’ work and the given geographical and cultural community; the need for more dialogue and/or educational programmes at the exhibition; and critiques of the proposals themselves both as metaphors and as valid proposals – all of which, again, are outside this evaluation remit.

But within the terms of the Climate Challenge Fund, it is my view that Greenhouse Britain exceeded that remit in substantive and vital ways.

It was art. It took place, as art, in offices, universities, while walking with architects through a city, and in galleries. If compared to a public service announcement or media campaign, the delivery was personal, ambiguous, challenging, controversial, and the audience numbers were fewer. But it had effect; it was provocative and brought members of the public into a situation in which they could think about their responses to climate change, as is shown above, without their thoughts and feelings being proscribed. There was the potential to take an audience into a new realm of knowledge. And not only might the information and ideas presented add to one’s knowledge, the way of thinking about climate instability might also have been changed.

The ‘attitudinal change’ was less to do with acknowledging or accepting climate change as evidenced in science reports and government documents, or with offering consumer-based lifestyle choices. It was more to do with changing one’s attitudes towards how, collectively, plans for adaptation might be made. Greenhouse Britain has come in advance of forthcoming UK and EU Directives on adaptation and climate change. The Harrisons have been making work about climate change for 40 years, and to some extent, the public have caught up with their aesthetic methods; but as far as presenting to the public ideas which are rooted in the locales and sensibilities of the present while advancing into the next phase of understanding, they are still doing it.

Should DEFRA funding for climate change projects or the Climate Challenge Fund continue, and should the Harrison Studio choose to work again in Britain, I would recommend strongly considering a proposal from them.

Dr Wallace Heim
Evaluator: Greenhouse Britain
15 April 2008

APPENDIX 4.1: QUESTIONNAIRE STATISTICS SUMMARY (DEFRA 5 STATEMENTS)

This summary sheet is for the five statements presented by DEFRA only.

TOTALS

Total completed questionnaires		192
sub-totals: 'before and 'after'		
Total completed before person attended exhibition		45
Total completed during or after person attended exhibition		147
sub-totals by location or methodology		
Total completed at CCANW	135	
by email (all 'before')		27
on printed copy		108
sub-total 'before'		27
sub-total 'after'		108
Total completed at Shrewsbury Museum & Art Gallery	12	
on printed copy		4
by interview		8
sub-total 'before'		7
sub-total 'after'		5
Total completed at Holden Gallery, MMU	28	
on printed copy		28
by interview		0
sub-total 'before'		2
sub-total 'after'		26
Total completed in telephone interview / not related to location	8	
sub-total 'before'		4
sub-total 'after'		4
Total completed online / greenhousebritain.net	6	
sub-total 'before'		3
sub-total 'after'		3
Total completed from Gunpowder Park, London	3	
on printed copy		3
sub-total 'before'		2
sub-total 'after'		1

DETAIL

	number of responses	% choosing this option	numbers making additional comment or qualification to their answer	% making additional comment
1. The world's climate is changing.				
Total responses	191		6	3%
strongly agree	130	68%	3	
agree	56	29.3%	2	
neither agree nor disagree	3	1.6%	0	
disagree	0	0%	0	
strongly disagree	1	0.5%	0	
<i>not included in Total:</i>				
response by comment	1	0.5%		

totals for responses before or after seeing exhibition:				
before seeing exhibition				
		44		
	strongly agree	33	75%	1
	agree	10	23%	1
	neither agree nor disagree	0	0	0
	disagree	0	0	0
	strongly disagree	1	2%	0
after seeing exhibition				
		147		
	strongly agree	97	66%	2
	agree	46	32%	1
	neither agree nor disagree	3	2%	0
	disagree	0	0	0
	strongly disagree	0	0	0
2. Climate change is the result of human behaviour.				
	Total responses	190		16 8.4%
	strongly agree	67	35%	3
	agree	97	51%	8
	neither agree nor disagree	18	9%	2
	disagree	4	2%	2
	strongly disagree	4	2%	0
	<i>not included in Total:</i>			
	response by comment	1	0.5%	
	no response	1	0.5%	
totals for responses before or after seeing exhibition:				
before seeing exhibition				
		45	24%	
	strongly agree	15	33.3%	1
	agree	20	45%	1
	neither agree nor disagree	8	17.7%	2
	disagree	0	0	0
	strongly disagree	2	4%	0
after seeing exhibition				
		145		
	strongly agree	52	36%	2
	agree	77	53%	7
	neither agree nor disagree	10	7%	0
	disagree	4	2.6%	2
	strongly disagree	2	1.4%	0
3. Climate change is a natural occurrence.				
	Total responses	187		23 12.3%
	strongly agree	21	11.2%	4
	agree	102	54.5%	11
	neither agree nor disagree	34	18.3%	3
	disagree	17	9.0%	0
	strongly disagree	13	7.0%	2
	<i>not included in Total:</i>			
	response by comment	3		3
	no response	2		0
totals for responses before or after seeing exhibition:				

before seeing exhibition	45	24.0%		
strongly agree	9	20.0%	1	
agree	22	48.8%	1	
neither agree nor disagree	7	15.6%	2	
disagree	3	6.7%	0	
strongly disagree	4	8.9%	0	
after seeing exhibition	142			
strongly agree	12	8.5%	3	
agree	80	56.3%	10	
neither agree nor disagree	27	19.0%	1	
disagree	14	10.0%	0	
strongly disagree	9	6.2%	2	
4. Climate change has become more of an issue for me in this last year.				
Total responses	192		14	7.3%
strongly agree	51	26.7%	1	
agree	75	39.0%	5	
neither agree nor disagree	34	17.7%	1	
disagree	27	14.0%	6	
strongly disagree	5	2.6%	1	
totals for responses before or after seeing exhibition:				
before seeing exhibition	46			
strongly agree	15	32.6%	1	
agree	15	32.6%	0	
neither agree nor disagree	9	19.6%	0	
disagree	5	10.9%	3	
strongly disagree	2	4.3%	0	
after seeing exhibition	146			
strongly agree	36	24.7%		
agree	60	41.0%	5	
neither agree nor disagree	25	17.0%	1	
disagree	22	15.0%	3	
strongly disagree	3	2.0%	1	
5. I personally can help to limit the effects of climate change.				
Total responses	191		17	8.9%
strongly agree	69	36.0%	3	
agree	101	52.9%	10	
neither agree nor disagree	13	6.8%	3	
disagree	5	2.7%	1	
strongly disagree	3	1.6%	0	
<i>not included in Total:</i>				
no response	1			
totals for responses before or after seeing exhibition:				
before seeing exhibition	45			
strongly agree	21	46.7%	2	
agree	18	40.0%	0	
neither agree nor disagree	3	6.7%	1	
disagree	1	2.2%	0	
strongly disagree	2	4.4%	0	

after seeing exhibition	146		
strongly agree	48	32.8%	1
agree	83	56.8%	10
neither agree nor disagree	10	6.9%	2
disagree	4	2.7%	1
strongly disagree	1	0.7%	0