

# A framework for more-than-human placemaking with data-storytelling

Judit Boros, Valerii Shevchenko

2023

## Contents

0.1	Introduction . . . . .	1
0.2	Conceptual framework . . . . .	1
0.3	Research methodology . . . . .	1
0.4	Discussion . . . . .	2
0.5	Conclusion . . . . .	2
0.6	References . . . . .	2
0.7	Conceptual framework . . . . .	2
0.8	Discussion . . . . .	2

## 0.1 Introduction

1. current smart and green urban governance practices tend to be overly human-centered (Sheikh et al., 2023), ‘data capitalism’ (West 2019), controlling and commodifying nonhumans (Elmqvist et al. 2021)
2. Digital inclusion as a means for meaningful representation of MTH
3. Urban placemaking as practice is human-centered as it needs reorientation to MTH
4. There are scholars who do try to include MTH into placemaking processes.
5. The reason to reach for the placemaking approach instead of, urban governance, is that only this provides the necessary level of granularity (or zooming in) to see the actual animal or plant species and those nature elements with specific needs and behaviors and **how their lifecycle is entangled with the daily life of urban places that is used by humans as well**. So it gives opportunities for a different approach to data representation or data stories about the more-than-human instead of being represented as a bunch of numbers.
6. Contribution of the framework — how to collaboratively use data stories in more-than-human placemaking.

## 0.2 Conceptual framework

1. Placemaking
2. *Digital inclusion — ontological side and user-centered one?*
3. Analog tools like boards and QR-codes are **not sufficient to understand and meaningfully represent** the more-than-human life
4. This is why we need digital placemaking tools
5. Data stories: best of both worlds (meaningful representation and digital inclusion by objective measurement)
6. The co-creation process
7. Collaborative visualization design (Cay, Nagel, and Yantac 2020)
8. Non-human persona as a tool for inclusive representation

## 0.3 Research methodology

1. 3 workshops, audience, etc
2. Place
3. Our non-human persona
4. MTH goals / data inputs

5. Design concept example
6. Results / outcomes

## 0.4 Discussion

1. Practical implications: tools, processes, challenges
2. Theoretical reflections: limitations

## 0.5 Conclusion

3. Recap
4. *Next steps?*

## 0.6 References

## 0.7 Conceptual framework

1. Why bother about **more-than-human** in urban governance (regenerative design)
  - Sustainability is insufficient — **WHY?**
    - Conserving the status quo
      1. Limits to growth
      2. Thinking in ecosystems
  - What is wrong with human-centeredness
    1. (Sheikh et al., 2023)
    2. data capitalism
2. How to address the under-representedness of the nature
  1. **Digital inclusion** (Sheikh et al., 2023)
  2. Representation of MTH life in the urban area as means for humans to extract meaning and relevance
  3. What else is needed to extract meaning and relevance?
3. **Collectively constructed narratives** about natural agents
  1. If we use data to represent MTH in a meaningful way, it requires relatable way of representation
  2. Relatable for whom? And how to figure out what is relatable?
  3. Participatory design as a tool for co-construction of narratives about natural agents
4. Co-construction of data-backed narratives about natural agents as a tool for **placemaking**
  1. Why placemaking and nothing else
5. How to make it work (tie to methodology)

## 0.8 Discussion

1. Limitations of the framework
  2. Ontological limitations.
  3. Practical implications: tools, processes, challenges
  4. Theoretical reflections: limitations
- Sheikh, H., Mitchell, P., & Foth, M. (2023). More-than-human smart urban governance: A research agenda. *Digital Geography and Society*, 4, 100045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diggeo.2022.100045>