

Interactive comment on “Science, Poetry, and Music for Landscapes of the Marche Region, Italy. Teaching the Conservation of Natural Heritage” by Olivia Nesci and Laura Valentini

John Gordon (Referee)

jeg4@st-andrews.ac.uk

Received and published: 11 June 2020

This paper makes a valuable contribution in two respects: 1) in exploring new and engaging ways of promoting geoscience and geoconservation to the general public; and 2) in demonstrating links between geoheritage and cultural heritage.

1. My main comment is that the conceptual framework could be strengthened and more clearly set out in the introduction by reference to the wider literature on best practice in interpretation*, particularly in relation to stimulating emotional responses and encouraging memorable experiences involving a range of senses and interactive engagement. Emotional experience and making personal connections can be a powerful

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



basis for subsequent positive actions or behavioural changes by those participating - either people attending the events described or visitors to the sites. At present this is scattered through the text: e.g. lines 83/84 (establish a personal connection so that the public cares to further understand and appreciate the landscape); lines 445/446 (The communication of information of any nature through the emotional sphere is recognized to be much more effective than traditional communication methods); Lines 67, 73, 465 (foster desire to protect the landscape). *For example, building on Freeman Tilden's principles, a key reference here is: Ham, S.H. 2013. Interpretation: Making a Difference on Purpose. Fulcrum: Golden, CO, USA. And on the power of imaginative storytelling, see: Strauss, S. 1996. The Passionate Fact. Storytelling in Natural History & Cultural Interpretation. Fulcrum: Golden, CO, USA.

2. Evaluation of the methods adopted is critical in demonstrating the wider value of this type of approach and it is encouraging to see this noted as a next step (line 450).

3. I appreciate the focus of this particular paper is on promoting better awareness among local people, but I think the authors could draw more links with geotourism and point out the potentially wider relevance and value of their work to this field, particularly in the conclusion.

4. In places the text is written in a personal style (frequent use of 'you') and using emotive language (e.g. 'guzzling by the jaws of erosion'). I can see that this is appropriate for presentations to the public but is less suited for a scientific publication where more measured language is appropriate.

5. There are some further comments, edits and points of clarification which I have itemised separately to assist the authors in finalising the paper. I have also made suggestions for alternative wording for the authors to consider to help clarify the meaning.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://gc.copernicus.org/preprints/gc-2020-5/gc-2020-5-RC4-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-5>, 2020.

GCD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

