Pattern Discovery Toolkit

Parts 1-5: Theory, Method, and Field Application

February 2026 | Version 1.1 | CC BY-SA 4.0

ERDPULS MÜLLROSE

Center for Sustainability Literacy, Citizen Science & Reciprocal Economics

Discovering a Pattern Language of Place

A Transferable Toolkit for Sustainability Literacy and Citizen Science

Developed at Erdpuls Müllrose — Living Laboratory & Makerspace Garden

Version: 1.1
Date: February 2026

Changelog

Version	Date	Changes
1.1	February 2026	Institution name updated; license footer added; version updated for OER publication
1.0	October 2025	Initial release

Preface: Why This Toolkit Exists

Most sustainability education begins with global abstractions — carbon cycles, SDG frameworks, planetary boundaries — and asks learners to apply them locally. This toolkit inverts the direction. It begins at the center — the ground beneath your feet, the wall beside your hand, the water you can hear — and moves outward through concentric rings of attention until participants have collectively discovered and defined the living patterns of their sub-bioregion.

The method draws on Christopher Alexander's insight that every living environment is sustained by a web of recurring spatial, social, and ecological relationships — a *pattern language*. But we depart from Alexander in one crucial respect: we do not arrive with a pattern language to impose. We arrive with a method for discovering one. Every culture, every community, every landscape holds its own patterns. The phenomenological approach — careful, embodied, pre-theoretical observation — is how we find them.

The output of this process is not a report to be filed. It is a collectively authored, place-specific pattern language: a practical document that names the relationships that make a particular place alive, records the evidence (sensory and instrumental) that supports each pattern, and proposes how those patterns might be maintained, restored, or extended. It is simultaneously an act of citizen science, a sustainability literacy exercise, and a community-building practice.

This toolkit was prototyped at Erdpuls Müllrose, Brandenburg, Germany, at the gateway to the Naturpark Schlaubetal. But the method is designed to be transferable. Where we describe the specific rings of attention we used in Müllrose, other initiatives should understand these as *examples of the method*, not prescriptions. Your center will be different. Your rings will be different. Your patterns will be your own.

Part 1: Foundations

1.1 What Is a Pattern Language?

Christopher Alexander and his co-authors proposed in *A Pattern Language* (1977) that good human environments emerge from the interplay of recurring solutions to recurring tensions. A pattern is not a rule or a blueprint. It describes a relationship between a context, a problem (or tension), and a resolution that has been observed to work — repeatedly, in different hands, over time.

Patterns exist at every scale: from how a window relates to a wall, to how a town relates to its watershed. They connect to one another: a pattern at one scale creates the context for patterns at the next scale down. Together, they form a language — a generative system that allows people to compose new wholes from familiar elements.

Alexander's 253 patterns were drawn from observation of built environments primarily in Europe and North America. They are valuable but culturally situated. The deeper contribution is not the specific patterns but the *grammar* — the recognition that such languages exist everywhere, and that they can be discovered through disciplined attention.

The central claim of this toolkit: Every place has a pattern language. It may be legible in the arrangement of fields and hedgerows, in the seasonal rhythms of a community, in the way water moves through soil, in the stories elders tell about how things used to be done, or in the data streaming from an environmental sensor. The task is not to invent patterns but to notice them.

1.2 Phenomenological Observation as Method

Phenomenology, as developed by Husserl and Merleau-Ponty, insists that genuine knowledge of the world begins not with theory but with *description of experience as it presents itself*. Before we explain, we must observe. Before we categorize, we must attend.

In the context of this toolkit, the phenomenological method means:

Observation before analysis. Participants are asked first to describe what they perceive — through all senses — before offering explanations or judgments. What do you see, hear, smell, feel in this place? Not "what do you know about" this place, but what does it *show* you right now?

The body as instrument. Environmental sensors measure temperature, humidity, soil moisture, air quality. The human body also measures these things, though differently. The toolkit treats both as valid instruments and places them in dialogue. A thermometer says 14°C; your skin says "cool but sheltered here, exposed there." Both observations matter. The gap between them is where learning happens.

Suspension of habitual seeing. Most of us move through familiar places without truly perceiving them. The phenomenological discipline asks participants to encounter even the most familiar environment as if for the first time — to notice what habit has made invisible. This is closely related to the Goethean scientific method, which Goethe called *zarte Empirie* (delicate empiricism): a way of knowing that lets phenomena speak for themselves before the observer imposes categories.

Multilingual and multicultural perception. Different languages and cultural traditions parse the world differently. A pattern named in Polish may capture something that the German name misses, and vice versa. In cross-cultural and cross-border settings, this plurality is not a problem to solve but a resource to use. The toolkit encourages participants to name patterns in their own language first, then discuss what the translations reveal or conceal.

1.3 Citizen Science as Grounding Practice

Phenomenological observation is subjective by design — it attends to how the world appears to a particular perceiver. Citizen science complements this with structured, reproducible, shareable data collection. Together they form a complete practice:

- Phenomenological observation generates hypotheses ("this corner of the garden feels different — warmer, more sheltered, richer in insect life").
- Citizen science instruments test and extend these hypotheses ("the soil temperature sensor confirms a 3°C differential; the species count shows 40% more pollinators").
- The data, in turn, raises new phenomenological questions ("why does this micro-climate exist? What can I observe about the wind, the wall orientation, the planting that explains it?").

This reciprocal movement between experience and data is not a compromise between "soft" and "hard" knowledge. It is a more complete way of knowing a place than either alone.

The toolkit assumes that participating initiatives have access to at least basic environmental sensing (even a smartphone with a weather and species identification app suffices). More developed sensor networks (IoT, LoRaWAN, senseBox-type platforms) enrich the process but are not prerequisites.

1.4 The Concentric Ring Structure

The workshop method moves outward through concentric rings of attention, from the most intimate and immediate to the most expansive. At each ring, participants practice the same cycle:

Observe → Name the Pattern → Record → Cross-Reference → Reflect

The number and character of the rings will vary by site. What matters is the principle: *start from the center*. Do not begin with maps, plans, or abstractions. Begin with the ground, the body, the immediate surround.

A typical sequence might include:

Ring	Scale	Focus
0	The Body	Embodied perception as calibration instrument
1	The Site	The immediate built and cultivated environment
2	The Garden / Near Landscape	Ecological relationships in the cultivated-to-wild gradient
3	The Settlement	The town or village as pattern-rich environment
4	The Sub-Bioregion	Watershed, geology, ecology, and culture as defining boundaries

Each initiative should adapt these rings to its own geography and purpose. An urban initiative might have "The Block" and "The Neighborhood" where a rural one has "The Garden" and "The Fields." A coastal initiative might organize rings around the land-sea gradient. The method is the constant; the content is always local.

1.5 Proxemics as Spatial Grammar

Christopher Alexander gives us a grammar for patterns at environmental scale — how a window relates to a wall, how a settlement relates to its watershed. But between the body (Ring 0) and the building (Ring 1), between the building and the community (Ring 3), another spatial grammar operates: the grammar of human proximity, sensory reach, and culturally patterned distance.

Edward T. Hall, the cultural anthropologist who coined the term "proxemics" in 1963, defined it as "the interrelated observations and theories of humans' use of space as a specialized elaboration of culture." In *The Hidden Dimension* (1966), Hall demonstrated that the distances humans maintain from one another are not arbitrary but structured into zones, each with a distinct sensory profile and communicative significance.

Hall's four distance zones — intimate (0–45 cm), personal (45 cm–1.2 m), social (1.2–3.7 m), and public (3.7 m+) — are not merely spatial measurements. Each zone activates a different configuration of sensory channels:

Zone	Distance	Sensory Profile
Intimate	0–45 cm	Touch, smell, body heat, whispered voice, fine visual detail
Personal	45 cm–1.2 m	Soft voice, moderate detail, some thermal, selective touch
Social	1.2–3.7 m	Normal voice, full-body vision, no thermal or olfactory
Public	3.7 m+	Loud voice or amplification, panoramic vision only

Why this matters for the toolkit: The concentric rings of the pattern-discovery process are not only spatial scales — they are sensory regimes. As participants move outward from Ring 0 (the body) to Ring 4 (the bioregion), sensory channels progressively close. At Ring 0, all channels are open: you can touch, smell, taste, hear, and see the soil in your hand. At Ring 4, only vision remains: you cannot smell a watershed boundary, but you can see it from a hilltop. This progressive closure is a proxemic phenomenon with direct pedagogical implications.

When engagement drops during a workshop — when participants who were absorbed during the soil protocol become restless during the bioregion mapping — the cause is often proxemic: they have moved from an intimate/personal sensory regime (all channels active, high engagement) to a public one (vision-only, lower embodied engagement) without the transition being scaffolded. Facilitators who understand the sensory gradient can intervene: bring something to touch at Ring 3 (a building material, a heritage artifact); bring something to smell at Ring 4 (soil from the proposed bioregion boundary). Each sensory reactivation restores proxemic intimacy within a larger spatial frame.

The rings as proxemic zones of place-relationship:

Ring	Scale	Proxemic Zone	Sensory Channels
Ring 0 (Body)	The observer as instrument	Intimate zone — with oneself and with the ground	All channels: touch, smell, thermal, sound, sight
Ring 1 (Site)	Patterns of built environment	Personal zone — with walls, materials, micro-climate	Touch, detailed vision, thermal, some olfactory

Ring	Scale	Proxemic Zone	Sensory Channels
Ring 2 (Garden/ Near Landscape)	Patterns of cultivation and ecology	Transitional — personal to social	Touch (soil, plants), smell (garden), sound (insects, wind), sight
Ring 3 (Settlement)	Patterns of community and heritage	Social zone — with neighbors, community spaces	Normal voice, full vision, gestural communication
Ring 4 (Sub-Bioregion)	Patterns of watershed and geology	Public zone — with landscape and horizon	Vision dominant; sound of wind, water at distance

Alexander shows us *what* to observe at each scale. Hall shows us *how* we observe at each scale — which senses are available, which fade, and how the quality of attention shifts. Together, they provide a complete spatial theory: from the body's relationship with the ground to the community's relationship with its bioregion.

The cultural dimension: Hall's deepest insight is that proxemic behavior is culturally patterned. The distances at which people feel comfortable, the sensory signals they attend to, the meaning they assign to spatial arrangements — all vary across cultures. This is directly relevant to the toolkit's cross-border and multicultural applications. When German and Polish participants kneel side by side during a soil observation — shoulders 30 cm apart, hands in the same earth — they have entered each other's personal proxemic zone across a cultural boundary. The soil mediates this crossing. That mediation is one of the most powerful pedagogical mechanisms the toolkit deploys, and proxemics gives us the vocabulary to understand why it works.

Sociofugal and sociopetal space: Hall and Robert Sommer distinguished between sociopetal space (which draws people together — circular seating, shared worktables, campfire layouts) and sociofugal space (which pushes people apart — rows facing forward, individual workstations, corridors). Every workshop space, every zone on the campus, every arrangement of chairs and tables is either gathering people or dispersing them. The facilitator who understands this distinction can design spatial arrangements that serve the pedagogical purpose of each phase: sociopetal circles for the Wisdom Circle and the boundary deliberation; sociofugal dispersal for the solo observation phase of Ring 0; and the transition between them as a deliberate proxemic choreography.

Vertical proxemics: Hall noted that vertical distance communicates power. Looking down on someone asserts dominance; being at the same level communicates equality. This has immediate implications for facilitation across target groups: kneeling with children during soil observation; bringing samples to a

seated elder at comfortable height; ensuring that intergenerational pairings have the elder seated (above) while the younger participant does physical ground work (below) — inverting the usual age-power dynamic in which youth tower over elders.

Part 2: The Method in Detail

2.1 Ring 0 — The Body (Der Leib / Ciało)

Purpose: To calibrate participants as sensing instruments before directing attention outward. To establish that sustainability literacy begins with the capacity to *notice*.

Duration: 20–40 minutes

Core Practice:

Participants stand (or sit) at the center of the site in silence. They are asked to attend, sequentially, to each sensory channel:

- **Touch / Temperature:** What does the air feel like on exposed skin? Where is it warmer, cooler? Is there wind? From which direction? What is the ground texture underfoot?
- **Sound:** Close eyes. What is the nearest sound? The farthest? Which sounds are living, which mechanical, which elemental (wind, water)? What is the dominant soundscape?
- **Smell:** What do you smell? Can you distinguish organic from mineral from industrial scents? How does the smell change if you move two meters?
- **Sight (last, deliberately):** Open eyes. What is the first thing you see? Where does your eye rest naturally? What is the light quality — hard or soft, warm or cool? What colors dominate? What is moving?

Sensor Dialogue:

After the silent observation, introduce a single instrument reading — ideally one that corresponds to something participants just felt. For example:

- "You noticed the air felt cool and damp. The humidity sensor reads 78%. The temperature sensor says 11°C. Your skin said 'cool but not cold.' What does the difference between the number and your sensation tell you about how bodies and instruments perceive differently?"

This is not a trick to show that instruments are "more accurate." It is a genuine inquiry into two modes of knowing. Both are needed. Neither is sufficient alone.

Recording:

Participants make brief notes — not essays, but fragments: sensory impressions, single words, sketches. These are the raw material from which patterns will later be drawn.

Facilitator Notes:

This ring can feel strange to participants accustomed to informational workshops. It is important to frame it clearly: "We are calibrating our primary instrument — ourselves — before we begin observing the place." Resistance or discomfort is normal and should be named gently. The exercise works best outdoors and in genuine silence (no background music, no narration during the observation itself).

Proxemic Note for Ring 0:

Ring 0 operates entirely within the intimate and personal proxemic zones. Participants are attending to their own body (intimate distance with the self) and to the immediate ground, air, and sensory environment (personal distance with the site). All sensory channels are active: haptic (ground texture underfoot, air on skin), thermal (warmth, coolness, sheltered vs. exposed), olfactory (earth, vegetation, moisture, exhaust), auditory (near sounds, far sounds, the sonic horizon), and visual (deliberately last, to avoid its habitual dominance over the other senses).

The sequential sensory calibration in Ring 0 — touch/temperature first, then sound, then smell, then sight — follows a proxemic logic: it begins with the channels that operate only at intimate distance (touch, thermal) and moves toward the channel that extends to public distance (sight). This sequence progressively expands the proxemic field from the body outward, preparing participants for the movement through Rings 1–4 that will follow.

When introducing the sensor dialogue at the end of Ring 0, the facilitator is staging a proxemic encounter between the participant's body and the electronic sensor: "Your skin says 'cool but sheltered.' The thermometer says 11°C. These are two perceptions from different proxemic positions — your body at intimate distance, the sensor at its fixed point. Neither is more true. The gap between them is where learning begins."

2.2 Ring 1 — The Site (Der Hof / Podwórze)

Purpose: To discover patterns in the immediate built and cultivated environment through structured observation and sensor data.

Duration: 1.5–3 hours (depending on site complexity)

Core Practice:

Participants move through the site — the campus, the yard, the building complex, whatever constitutes the immediate center. They are not given a tour. Instead, they walk with a set of **pattern-finding prompts**:

Spatial Prompts: - Where do people naturally gather? Where do they avoid? - Where does inside become outside? Is the transition abrupt or gradual? - Where does old material meet new material? What does the boundary look like? - Where does water go when it rains? Follow it. - Where is something broken, worn, or adapted by use? What does the wear reveal about how the place is actually used (versus how it was planned)?

Relational Prompts: - What materials recur? (Brick, wood, steel, earth, glass…) What story does each material tell about where it came from and how old it is? - Where do different activities overlap or share space? Where are they separated? - What is repaired here? What is abandoned? What is in between? - What would an animal (a bird, a cat, an insect) experience moving through this space?

Temporal Prompts: - What is the oldest visible layer? The newest? - How would this place look in a different season? - What has been added? What has been removed? How can you tell?

Sensor Integration:

If environmental sensors are available on site, assign small groups to specific sensor stations. Their task: compare the sensor data with their embodied observation of the same parameter. Where does the data confirm what you feel? Where does it surprise you? What question does the discrepancy raise?

Pattern Naming:

After walking, participants gather in small groups (3–5) and attempt to name the patterns they observed. The format is deliberately simple at this stage:

> ***Pattern Name:*** *[a short, evocative name in the participant's language]* ***Where:*** *[location on the site]* ***What We Noticed:*** *[description of the observation — sensory and/or instrumental]* ***The Tension:*** *[what competing forces or needs does this pattern seem to resolve?]*

Participants should be encouraged to name patterns in their own language first. Translation and discussion of naming differences is a valuable part of the process, especially in multilingual groups.

Example Patterns (from the Erdpuls prototype):

These are illustrative, not prescriptive. Your site will produce different patterns.

Pattern Name	Tension	Observation
"Backsteingedächtnis" (Brick Memory)	Renovation vs. preservation	Three mortar eras visible in one wall; moisture sensors show the traditional mortar breathes, cement patches trap moisture

Pattern Name	Tension	Observation
"Schwelle" (Threshold)	Indoor workshop vs. outdoor garden	The covered passage between buildings creates a zone that is neither fully inside nor outside — tools migrate here, conversations start here, rain or shine
"Reparaturpfad" (Repair Path)	Efficiency vs. encounter	Bringing broken objects to the repair workshop creates a walking route through the garden; the detour is where cross-pollination between activities happens

---

2.3 Ring 2 — The Garden and Near Landscape (Der Garten / Ogród)

Purpose: To extend pattern-finding into the ecological gradient between cultivated and wild, and to deepen the dialogue between observation and sensor data.

Duration: 2–4 hours (or a full day with seasonal depth)

Core Practice:

If the site includes a garden, field, forest edge, waterway, or other near-landscape, this ring shifts attention from the built to the growing environment. The prompts shift accordingly:

Ecological Prompts: - Where do different plant communities meet? What happens at the edge? - What is growing where nobody planted it? What does its presence tell you? - Where is the soil darkest? Lightest? Wettest? Driest? What grows in each? - What insects, birds, or other animals are active? Where specifically? At what time of day? - What is decomposing? What is emerging?

Soil and Water Prompts: - Take a handful of soil. What color, texture, smell? Does it hold together or crumble? Is it cool or warm? - Where does surface water collect? Where does it drain? Follow the gradient. - Are there visible signs of erosion? Of deposition? Of waterlogging?

The "Questions to the Soil" (adapted from the Erdpuls 13 Questions):

This is an example of a structured phenomenological protocol that other initiatives can adapt. The original asks participants to approach a patch of soil with 13 sequential questions, moving from sensation to relationship to history. Initiatives should develop their own question sequences appropriate to their primary medium (water, forest, coastline, urban fabric, etc.).

Citizen Science Deepening:

At this ring, the citizen science practice moves from comparison ("does the sensor match my feeling?") to genuine data collection:

- Species identification and counting (using apps such as iNaturalist, Pl@ntNet, or Merlin for birdsong)
- Soil sampling protocols (pH, moisture, temperature at multiple depths)
- Microclimate mapping using portable or fixed sensors
- Photographic documentation of indicator species, erosion patterns, succession stages

The data generated becomes part of the pattern record and, if contributed to open platforms, extends the value beyond the workshop itself.

Pattern Naming:

The same format as Ring 1, but now ecological patterns emerge alongside spatial ones. Participants often find that patterns from Ring 1 (the built environment) are connected to patterns in Ring 2 (the garden/landscape) — e.g., the orientation of a wall creates a microclimate that supports particular plant communities. These connections are themselves patterns, and should be named.

2.4 Ring 3 — The Settlement (Die Siedlung / Osiedle)

Purpose: To extend pattern-finding to the human settlement — the town, village, or neighborhood — where social, economic, and cultural patterns overlay ecological ones.

Duration: Half day to full day

Core Practice:

Participants leave the site and walk through the surrounding settlement. This ring requires more preparation than the others, because the settlement includes other people's spaces, histories, and sensitivities. Facilitation should address respectful observation, the ethics of photographing inhabited spaces, and the difference between observation and judgment.

Settlement Prompts: - Where do paths converge? Where does the settlement feel most alive? - Where does the built fabric thin out into fields, forest, or water? Is the edge sharp or graduated? - What is the oldest visible layer of the settlement? What is the newest? Do they coexist or conflict? - Where does the settlement turn toward its landscape (river, valley, mountain, forest) and where does it turn away? - What sounds define the settlement? Traffic, church bells, birdsong, machinery, silence? - What names are on the streets, the buildings, the memorial stones? What history do they encode? What history do they omit?

Local Knowledge Integration:

This ring benefits enormously from the participation of long-term residents — particularly older community members. Their memory constitutes a temporal dataset that no sensor can replicate: "There used to be a stream here." "This was all orchards before the war." "The market was held in this square until 1990."

These oral testimonies are not merely anecdotal; they are longitudinal ecological and social data. If residents are willing, their contributions should be recorded (with consent) and integrated into the pattern record.

Historical and Cartographic Cross-Reference:

Where available, historical maps, aerial photographs, land-use records, and census data can be layered over present observation. The question is always: what patterns have persisted? What has been lost? What is emerging?

Pattern Naming:

At this ring, patterns become more complex and often more contested. A pattern that one participant reads as "village resilience" another might read as "resistance to change." This is not a problem — it is the beginning of genuine dialogue about values, sustainability, and whose patterns count. The facilitator should create space for disagreement without forcing resolution.

2.5 Ring 4 — The Sub-Bioregion (Die Teil-Bioregion / Subbioregion)

Purpose: To collectively define the bioregional context — the ecological, hydrological, geological, and cultural unit within which the site and settlement exist — and to discover the patterns that operate at this scale.

Duration: Full day, or an extended process across multiple sessions

Core Concept: What Is a Bioregion?

Bioregional thinking (Peter Berg, Raymond Dasmann, Kirkpatrick Sale) proposes that the meaningful unit for ecological and cultural life is not the administrative district but the *bioregion*: a territory defined by natural boundaries — watersheds, soil types, vegetation communities, climatic zones — and by the lived practices of its inhabitants.

Most people have never been asked: "Where does your place begin and end?" Administrative boundaries (the Landkreis, the county, the postal code) are familiar but ecologically arbitrary. Bioregional boundaries are real but unfamiliar. Discovering them is itself a profound sustainability literacy exercise, because it forces participants to think about interconnection, flow, and scale.

The Sub-Bioregion as Working Scale:

A full bioregion (e.g., "the North European Plain" or "the Baltic drainage basin") is too large for a workshop to discover through direct observation. The *sub-bioregion* is the appropriate working scale: the smallest coherent ecological-cultural unit that participants can walk, observe, and know. It might correspond roughly to a single watershed, a particular soil-and-vegetation association, or the area within which a community shares economic and social life.

Discovery Process:

This ring is more analytical than the previous ones, because it requires synthesis across multiple data sources. But it still begins with observation:

1. **Walking the Edges:** If feasible, participants walk toward the perceived boundary of "their" place in different directions. Where does the landscape character change? Where do the soils shift? Where does the water divide? Where do you begin to feel "this is somewhere else"?
2. **Watershed Mapping:** Water is the most reliable bioregional boundary-maker. Where does rainfall at your site eventually flow? What river system carries it? Where does your drinking water come from? Tracing the water upstream and downstream reveals the real geography of connection and dependency.
3. **Geological and Soil Reading:** The substrate beneath the landscape determines much about what grows, how water moves, what can be built, and what the place looks like. Even basic geological maps, combined with on-the-ground soil observation from Ring 2, begin to define bioregional character.
4. **Vegetation and Species Assemblages:** What plant and animal communities characterize this area? Where do they give way to different communities? Citizen science platforms (iNaturalist, observation.org) provide existing datasets that can be overlaid with workshop observations.
5. **Cultural and Economic Flows:** Where do people in this settlement go to work, to shop, to celebrate? Where do their children go to school? What shared stories, festivals, or practices define the cultural catchment? Where does the cultural landscape cross an administrative boundary? Where does an administrative boundary cut through a cultural unity?
6. **Historical Layering:** What did this sub-bioregion look like 50, 100, 500 years ago? What forces (glaciation, settlement, war, industrialization, rewilding) have shaped its current form? Place-names are often the deepest geological and ecological records: the Slavic, Germanic, Celtic, or other roots in local toponymy frequently encode landscape features that have since been obscured.

Collective Boundary-Drawing:

The culminating exercise of this ring is a collective map-making session. Using large-format base maps (topographic, satellite, or hand-drawn), participants propose and debate the boundaries of their sub-bioregion based on everything observed and collected. There is no single correct answer. The debate itself is the learning.

The resulting map should include: - Proposed bioregional boundary with rationale - Key ecological features (water bodies, forest types, soil zones) - Key cultural features (settlement patterns, heritage sites, gathering places) - The patterns discovered at each ring, placed spatially - Sensor locations and data summaries - Open questions for further investigation

---

Part 3: The Pattern Record

3.1 Pattern Card Format

Each pattern discovered through the process should be documented in a consistent format. The following template is offered as a starting point; initiatives should adapt it to their needs.

PATTERN CARD

Name: [In the language of the discoverer, with translations]

Ring: [0–4, or the initiative's own ring designation]

Location: [Specific place, with coordinates if available]

Discoverers: [Names or group identifier]

Date & Season: [Important — patterns may be seasonal]

The Tension: [What competing forces, needs, or tendencies does this pattern address? Every genuine pattern resolves a tension — between shelter and openness, between cultivation and wildness, between old and new, between individual and collective. If no tension can be articulated, the observation may not yet be a pattern.]

What We Observed: [Sensory description — what was seen, heard, felt, smelled. Be specific. "The morning sun hits the east wall of the barn and warms the soil strip below it. By 10:00, this strip is 4°C warmer than the soil three meters away. Bees arrive here first."]

Instrumental Data: [Sensor readings, species counts, soil samples, historical records, map evidence. Include dates, instruments used, and precision/uncertainty where known.]

The Pattern (Proposed Resolution): [How do the observed elements relate to each other in a way that sustains life, community, or ecological function? This is the heart of the pattern — the *relationship* that works.]

Connections to Other Patterns: [Which patterns at the same or different rings does this one depend on or support? Patterns do not exist in isolation.]

Questions for Further Investigation: [What don't we know yet? What would we need to observe across a different season, a longer time period, or with different instruments?]

Status: [ ] First observation / [ ] Confirmed across multiple observations / [ ] Contested

---

3.2 From Cards to Language

Individual pattern cards are observations. A pattern *language* is a structure — a web of relationships among patterns that, taken together, describe how a place works.

After generating pattern cards across all rings, the group faces the synthesizing question: **How do these patterns connect?**

Some practical methods for this synthesis:

Wall Mapping: Print or pin all pattern cards on a large wall, arranged spatially (by ring) or thematically. Use string, tape, or drawn lines to connect related patterns. Clusters and gaps become visible.

Dependency Chains: Ask: "Which patterns could not exist without which other patterns?" For example: the microclimate pattern (Ring 2) depends on the wall orientation pattern (Ring 1), which depends on the geological substrate pattern (Ring 4) that determined the building materials available. These chains reveal the deep structure of the place.

Cross-Scale Resonances: Often a pattern at one ring echoes or mirrors a pattern at another ring. A settlement pattern (Ring 3) may repeat the geometry of the watershed pattern (Ring 4). A body-sensation (Ring 0) may correspond to a measurable gradient (Ring 2). These resonances are not coincidences — they are how places cohere.

Narrative Synthesis: Finally, the pattern language should be expressible as a story — not a database. "This is a place where [the glacial moraine created sandy soils], which means [the water drains quickly and the forest is dominated by pine], which means [the settlements developed along the lake chain where water was accessible], which means [the building tradition uses brick from local clay rather than stone], which means [the repair culture here is a culture of brickwork, mortar, and slow accumulation]…" This narrative is the pattern language in its most communicable form.

Part 4: Adaptation Guide

4.1 Minimum Requirements

To use this toolkit, an initiative needs:

- **A place.** Not an abstraction, not a concept — a physical location that participants can walk, touch, and observe.
- **A facilitator** comfortable with open-ended, observation-based processes (not lecture-based instruction).
- **Participants** (6–25 is ideal) willing to slow down and attend.
- **Basic recording materials:** Notebooks, pencils, cameras/smartphones.
- **Time:** Minimum half day for a simplified version (Rings 0–1); full version requires 3–5 days.

4.2 Scalable Additions

The following enrich the process but are not prerequisites:

Resource	How It Enriches
Environmental sensors (IoT, senseBox, Arduino)	Deepens the observation-data dialogue at every ring
Citizen science platform accounts (iNaturalist, etc.)	Connects local observations to larger datasets
Historical maps and archival materials	Adds temporal depth, especially at Rings 3–4
Elder / long-term resident participation	Provides living longitudinal data
Multilingual participant group	Reveals cultural differences in perceiving and naming
GIS / mapping tools	Supports Ring 4 synthesis
Open Data APIs (weather, soil, land use)	Contextualizes local sensor data

4.3 Contexts for Adaptation

The concentric ring method has been designed with the following contexts in mind, though it is not limited to them:

Rural sustainability centers and nature education sites — The original context. The gradient from built environment through garden to open landscape is physically present and walkable.

Urban makerspaces and community gardens — The rings compress: Ring 1 might be the building, Ring 2 the garden or courtyard, Ring 3 the neighborhood, Ring 4 the urban watershed or metropolitan ecology. Urban pattern languages will foreground different tensions (density, noise, heat islands, social diversity) but the method is the same.

Schools and universities — The toolkit can structure multi-day field courses or semester-long projects. Ring 0 works well as a standalone exercise for introducing phenomenological observation. The full sequence aligns with project-based and inquiry-based learning frameworks.

Cross-border and intercultural initiatives — Where the administrative boundary cuts through a bioregional or cultural continuity, the Ring 4 exercise becomes particularly powerful. The sub-bioregion may straddle national borders, and the act of mapping it challenges participants to think beyond political divisions.

Indigenous and traditional knowledge contexts — The method's emphasis on observation before theory, on multilingual naming, and on elder knowledge creates space for traditional ecological knowledge alongside scientific instrumentation. However, facilitators must be attentive to the ethics of knowledge extraction and ensure that indigenous and traditional knowledge holders retain control over their contributions.

4.4 What This Toolkit Does Not Do

To maintain honesty about scope:

- It does not produce a **complete biodiversity survey** or environmental impact assessment. It produces a pattern language — a different kind of knowledge, complementary to but not replacing scientific inventory.
- It does not claim **universality**. The patterns discovered are specific to a place, a time, a group of observers. They are hypotheses, not laws.
- It does not resolve **political or economic conflicts** around land use, though the shared observation process often creates conditions for more productive dialogue.
- It does not require or assume **high technology**. The simplest version needs only human senses and a notebook. Technology enriches but should never replace direct perception.

Part 5: Theoretical Roots and Further Reading

This toolkit stands at the intersection of several intellectual traditions. None is treated as dogma; each contributes a particular quality of attention. Together, they form a layered spatial theory — from the body's intimacy with the ground to the community's relationship with its bioregion — that grounds sustainability education in embodied, place-based, culturally aware practice.

Christopher Alexander — *A Pattern Language* (1977) and *The Nature of Order* (2002–2005). The concept of patterns as recurring resolutions of tensions; the idea that environments possess a quality of "life" or "wholeness" that can be perceived and cultivated. Alexander provides the grammar of environmental pattern at every scale, from a window's relationship to its wall to a town's relationship to its watershed. His concentric, scale-linking structure — where patterns at one scale create the context for patterns at the next — directly inspires the toolkit's ring structure.

Proxemics (Edward T. Hall) — *The Hidden Dimension* (1966) and *The Silent Language* (1959). The study of human use of space as a culturally elaborated communication system. Hall's four distance zones (intimate, personal, social, public) and their associated sensory profiles (haptic, thermal, olfactory, visual, vocal) provide the grammar of interpersonal and sensory space that complements Alexander's environmental grammar. Where Alexander shows *what* to observe at each scale, Hall shows *how* we observe — which senses are available, which fade, and how cultural patterns shape spatial behavior. The toolkit draws on Hall's work in three specific ways: (1) the concentric rings are understood as sensory regimes, not merely spatial scales; (2) cross-cultural encounters (especially in the DE/PL cross-border context) are recognized as proxemic events shaped by culturally different spatial norms; and (3) facilitation design — seating arrangements, vertical relationships, sociopetal vs. sociofugal space — is treated as pedagogically significant spatial choreography. See also: Robert Sommer (*Personal Space*, 1969) on sociofugal/sociopetal space; Larry Busbea (*Proxemics and the Architecture of Social Interaction*, 2020) on the architectural implications.

Goethean Science — Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's approach to natural observation, developed in *The Metamorphosis of Plants* (1790) and *Theory of Colours* (1810). The discipline of attentive, sequential observation before analysis. The idea that the observer is part of the phenomenon. Elaborated in the 20th century by Henri Bortoft (*The Wholeness of Nature*, 1996). The toolkit's insistence on sensation before interpretation, and its Ring 0 body-calibration practice, are direct applications of Goethe's *zarte Empirie* (delicate empiricism). In proxemic terms, Goethean observation requires that the observer remain in the intimate or personal zone with the phenomenon — close enough for all sensory channels to be active — long enough for the phenomenon to reveal its own structure.

Phenomenology — Edmund Husserl, Maurice Merleau-Ponty (*Phenomenology of Perception*, 1945), and more recently David Seamon (environmental phenomenology, "place-ballet"). The insistence that knowledge begins with pre-theoretical description of lived experience. Merleau-Ponty's radical claim — that the body is not an object in the world but the subject through which there is a world — grounds the toolkit's treatment of the body as a sensing instrument of equal dignity to electronic sensors. Hall's proxemics operationalizes Merleau-Ponty's insight: the body's sensory reach defines the boundaries of lived space, and these boundaries are culturally elaborated.

Bioregionalism — Peter Berg and Raymond Dasmann (the original bioregion concept, 1970s); Kirkpatrick Sale (*Dwellers in the Land*, 1985); Robert Thayer (*LifePlace*, 2003). The proposition that ecological and cultural regions — not administrative units — are the meaningful scale for sustainable

inhabitation. In proxemic terms, the bioregion represents the public zone of place-relationship: the scale at which only vision operates, where the territory can be seen but not touched, where belonging is cognitive rather than sensory. The challenge of bioregional education is to create felt connection at a scale that exceeds the body's sensory reach — a challenge the toolkit addresses through walking transects (bringing the body into proxemic contact with distant landscapes) and through the elder memory transect (where intimate sensory memories extend the proxemic field across decades).

Sense of Place / Genius Loci — Christian Norberg-Schulz (*Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*, 1979); Edward Relph (*Place and Placelessness*, 1976); Yi-Fu Tuan (*Space and Place*, 1977). The theoretical grounding of place as a fundamental dimension of human existence, not a mere backdrop. Tuan's distinction between "space" (abstract, geometric, indifferent) and "place" (experienced, valued, known) maps onto the proxemic gradient: space becomes place when it moves from the public zone into the personal and intimate — when it is not merely seen but touched, smelled, inhabited. The pattern-discovery process is, in this reading, a systematic practice of converting space into place by progressively engaging all proxemic sensory channels.

Citizen Science — Alan Irwin (*Citizen Science*, 1995); the contemporary platform ecology (iNaturalist, Zooniverse, senseBox/openSenseMap). The democratization of environmental monitoring and the epistemological implications of lay participation in knowledge production. The "sensor dialogue" central to this toolkit — placing human embodied perception alongside instrumental data — is a proxemic practice: the human senses a phenomenon at intimate distance while the sensor measures it from a fixed point. The conversation between these two forms of perception is a conversation between two proxemic positions.

Ubuntu Philosophy — The Southern African ethical principle of "I am because we are" (*umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*). The recognition that selfhood is constituted through relationship — extended in this toolkit to the relationship between humans and their ecological context. Ubuntu and proxemics share a fundamental insight: the self is not bounded at the skin. Hall demonstrated that the space surrounding a person is psychologically part of them — an extension of their being. Ubuntu extends this further: the community, the landscape, the soil are extensions of the self. The reciprocal token economy (Appendix B) is a structural expression of this principle.

Education for Sustainable Development (BNE) — The UNESCO framework and its national implementations (in Germany: Transfer 21, the BNE quality catalogs). The twelve sub-competencies of *Gestaltungskompetenz* provide a useful evaluative framework for the skills this toolkit develops. Proxemic awareness — the capacity to read spatial arrangements, understand cultural differences in spatial behavior, and design sociopetal environments for collaborative learning — is not listed among the twelve competencies but underlies many of them, particularly 4.1.1 (openness to new perspectives), 4.2.1 (collaborative planning and action), and 4.3.3 (empathy).

License & Attribution

This project uses the services of Claude and Anthropic PBC to inform our decisions and recommendations. This document and its translations were developed with assistance from Claude (Anthropic PBC). All strategic decisions, philosophical positions, and project commitments are those of the author.