



**Three Good Things in Nature: A Nature-Based Positive Psychological Intervention to Improve Mood and Well-Being for Depression and Anxiety**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Public Mental Health</i>
Manuscript ID	JPMH-02-2021-0029.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Keywords:	Depression, Anxiety, Three Good Things, Nature, Well-Being

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 Three Good Things in Nature: A Nature-Based Positive Psychological Intervention to  
4  
5 Improve Mood and Well-Being for Depression and Anxiety  
6  
7

8 **Abstract**  
9

10  
11 Purpose: Visiting and connecting with nature through psychological interventions improves  
12 well-being within the general population. However, few such interventions have been  
13 conducted in clinically relevant populations.  
14  
15

16  
17 Design: An experimental design utilising a noticing Three Good Things in Nature (*TGTiN*)  
18 task during a nature based or urban (control) walk was conducted with nature connectedness,  
19 well-being, positive and negative affect measured at baseline, post and six-week follow-up.  
20  
21 Individuals living with depression and/or anxiety ( $n = 50$ ; 39 having a diagnosis) were  
22 randomly allocated to 30 minutes walking in nature or urban environments for five  
23 consecutive days.  
24  
25

26  
27 Findings: An ANCOVA, with age as co-variate, showed a significant effect of time by  
28 condition on all variables: nature connectedness  $\eta p^2 = .34$ ; positive affect  $\eta p^2 = .42$ ; negative  
29 affect  $\eta p^2 = .66$ ; well-being  $\eta p^2 = .29$ . Post-hoc tests indicated a significant increase in nature  
30 connectedness and positive affect in the nature versus an urban walk at post and follow-up.  
31  
32 Negative affect decreased in the nature walk at post intervention while well-being was  
33 significantly greater in the nature walk at follow-up.  
34  
35

36  
37 Originality: The *TGTiN* intervention effectively improves positive affect, and well-being in  
38 clinically relevant populations, although replication with a larger sample is warranted.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 Keywords:

54  
55 Depression, Anxiety, Nature, Well-being, Three Good Things  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Current estimates suggest 50 percent of the global population reside in urban environments, rising to 70 percent by 2050 (Dye, 2008). Urban environments are correlated with increased mental illness including depression and usage of psychotropic medication (McKenzie, Murray and Booth, 2013). Bratman et al. (2015) propose a reduction in nature experiences may be partly responsible, with greenspaces associated with lower mental distress and better well-being (Logan and Selhub, 2012). Depression affects 350 million people worldwide and alongside anxiety, is related to wider health issues (WHO, 2004). While medication prescriptions are commonplace, a shortage of trained professionals makes accessing psychological therapies difficult (Grandes, et al., 2011).

The cost implications are severe, with the annual treatment of mental health costing €8.2 billion in the Republic of Ireland (Jones, 2019). Greenspace interventions offer a potential solution providing savings to society due to their cost effectiveness (Lovell, 2016). Access to greenspace has been linked to positive mental health (Lovell, 2016) and improved mood (Richardson et al., 2021). Outdoor walking increases happiness and positive affect (PA) with decreased negative affect (NA) (Brooks, et al., 2017) and reduced indicators of depression and anxiety (Bratman et al., 2015), with these benefits found in nature-based therapeutic interventions (Song et al., 2016).

Improvements in well-being through nature could be attributed solely to increased physical activity (Logan and Selhub, 2012), however, the mediating role of nature connectedness (NCx) on exposure to nature and mental well-being shows our relationship is important (Pritchard et al., 2020). Evidence indicates NCx and simple activities are the main significant factors in predicting good mental well-being (Richardson et al., 2021) over and above nature exposure and socio-demographics while also being linked to psychological healing (Pattel, 2007). Further, NCx has been linked to reduced trait and state anxiety

(Martyn and Brymer, 2014). Nature-based interventions have aided in recovery from stress-related mental disorders through facilitation of self as part of nature and improved psychological factors (Pálsdóttir, Grahn and Persson, 2014), with reduced self-reported healthcare service attendance (Wahrborg, ~~Pettersson, and Grahn et al., 2013~~2014); suggesting nature could be utilised to improve these outcomes through established psychological interventions.

The Three Good Things (*TGT*) intervention facilitates gratitude to reduce negative emotions while prolonging feelings of pleasure (Bryant, 2003). *TGT* asks individuals to think and write down *TGT* they have experienced, that increases well-being, ~~and There is reduced~~ depression up to six-months later (Seligman et al., 2005). When adapted to Three Good Things in Nature (*TGTiN*), NCx (Richardson and Sheffield, 2017), well-being and mental health are improved (McEwan et al., 2019). Here, the environment informs thoughts and feelings (Atchley, Strayer and Atchly, 2012) where NCx provides a more developed understanding of ‘self’ as part of nature and the good things it contains (McEwan et al., 2019). Further, the benefits of ‘being’ in nature extend beyond the encounter which has implications for prevention care, especially important given its use within clinical settings would be cost effective (Lovell, 2016).

However, little is known about nature’s effect on clinically relevant states including depression and anxiety (Brooks et al., 2017) therefore adapting and testing the effectiveness of a *TGTiN* intervention with this population is required. Given its previous efficacy in improving ~~mood~~wellbeing, and affect involved in the symptomology of anxiety and depression (McEwan et al., 2019), *TGTiN* was tested experimentally with the following hypotheses:

H<sup>1</sup>: There will be a significant increase in NCx scores from pre to post and follow-up after walking and noting three good things in nature when compared to the control group.

1  
2  
3 H<sup>2</sup>: There will be a significant increase in well-being scores from pre to post and follow-up in  
4 both conditions [\(due to the previously evidenced benefits of TGT interventions\)](#), with the nature  
5  
6  
7  
8 condition showing the biggest improvement.

9  
10 H<sup>3</sup>: There will be a significant increase in positive affect scores from pre to post and follow-up  
11  
12  
13 in both conditions [\(due to the previously evidenced benefits of TGT interventions\)](#), with the  
14  
15 nature condition showing the biggest improvement.

16  
17 H<sup>4</sup>: There will be a significant decrease in negative affect scores from pre to post and follow-  
18  
19  
20 up in both conditions [\(due to the previously evidenced benefits of TGT and TGTiN](#)  
21  
22 [interventions\)](#), with the nature condition showing the biggest improvement.

## 23 24 25 26 **Method**

### 27 28 *Design*

29  
30 An experimental design randomly assigned participants to an experimental group  
31  
32 (walking in nature) or a control (walking in an urban area). Measures were taken at baseline,  
33  
34 post and six-week follow-up.

### 35 36 37 38 *Participants and Procedure*

39  
40  
41 Participants were recruited through the Cavan, Monaghan, Donegal and Sligo Leitrim Mental  
42  
43 Health Service User Engagement Fora, consumer panels, and those involved in the  
44  
45 Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT) Recovery College. Invitations were also  
46  
47 circulated via social media, notice boards and GP surgeries. Potential participants were  
48  
49 forwarded all study information outlining the aim of investigating the impact of walking in  
50  
51 nature on those with experiences of depression and/or anxiety thereby reaching those  
52  
53 interested in walking activities. Thirty-nine participants had a formal diagnosis of depression  
54  
55 and/or anxiety, the others indicated that they experienced symptoms of depression and/or  
56  
57 anxiety but had not received a formal diagnosis. Further, 16 of the participants were  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 accessing community mental health services under the care of a psychiatrist with 10 also  
4  
5 receiving interventions from Occupational Therapy and recovery education. Of the remaining  
6  
7 participants, 20 had accessed mental health services and had been discharged but wished to  
8  
9 access well-being support. Fourteen were accessing primary care support such as their GP  
10  
11 and community-based supports such as men's sheds, crafts workshops, and education through  
12  
13 the Recovery College. Fifteen participants indicated that they were taking medication for  
14  
15 depression and/or anxiety.  
16  
17

18  
19 The sample comprised 30 females (males = 20), age ranging from 19 to 62 years  
20  
21 (mean = 40.34 years, 12.65 *SD*). Ten participants had lived with depression, 17 with anxiety  
22  
23 and 23 with both ([see table 1 for diagnosis percentages](#)). Forty-nine participants were in  
24  
25 recovery as defined by the Recovery Model (Davidson, 2005) whereby participants gain  
26  
27 resilience and control over challenges through a strengths-based approach. Sixteen of the  
28  
29 participants accessed community mental health support. The groups participated in a walk  
30  
31 guided by the researcher and at least 3 volunteers/colleagues, in groups of a maximum of ten.  
32  
33 Both conditions received the same briefing about the study and walked together in groups  
34  
35 with social interaction comparable between the two. Group membership was randomised with  
36  
37 severity of diagnosis not a deciding factor. The nature guided walks took place in a forest  
38  
39 park/natural area for a total of thirty-minutes for five consecutive days. The nature walks  
40  
41 were slightly different each day and undertaken in lakeside, beach, mountain, forest and bog  
42  
43 areas. The urban walks were of identical duration and followed different routes each day  
44  
45 through housing estates, town centres, a town park and main roads; the level of nature in the  
46  
47 urban walks was much less than those in nature. Following the study, participants were asked  
48  
49 if they continued to walk in nature following their completion of the post and follow-up  
50  
51 surveys. Those previously accessing other support continued to do so but also walked in  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 nature and completed the *TGTiN*. [This was the same for those in the \*TGT\* group who](#)  
4  
5 [continued to utilise other support while walking and still noting three good things.](#)  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 *Materials*

11  
12 The Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) (Tennant et al., 2007)  
13  
14 measures hedonic (positive emotion) and eudemonic (self-awareness) well-being. Responses  
15  
16 are rated on experiences over the past two-weeks on a 5-point scale from 1 (none of the time)  
17  
18 to 5 (all of the time), scores ranging from 14 to 70 with higher scores indicating higher well-  
19  
20 being.  
21  
22

23  
24 The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark, and Tellegen,  
25  
26 1988) consists of two 10-item mood scales that measure PA (e.g., alert, enthusiastic) and NA  
27  
28 (e.g., anger, nervousness) dimensions of affect. Participants indicated their mood during the  
29  
30 past seven days from 1 (almost never) to 7 (almost all the time) with a sum obtained for both  
31  
32 forms of affect. Cronbach's alphas ranged from 0.82 to 0.91 across measurements for both  
33  
34 dimensions.  
35  
36

37  
38 The state Connectedness to Nature Scale (CNS) (Mayer and Frantz, 2004) measured  
39  
40 participants' nature connection. The 13-item state scale uses a 5-point Likert Scale ranging  
41  
42 from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly) on statements such as "I often feel a sense of  
43  
44 oneness with the natural world around me". A mean score is obtained with a higher score  
45  
46 indicating a higher level of NCx. The authors report good item and scale characteristics  
47  
48 (Cronbach's Alpha = .85, Guttman's split half reliability = .84) with high internal consistency  
49  
50 and test-retest reliability.  
51  
52

53  
54 Demographic information was obtained. ~~with p~~Participants were provided with a  
55  
56 notebook to record their *TGTiN* each day. The lead author made adherence checks to ensure  
57  
58 participants were fully engaged.  
59  
60

### *Ethics*

The study was approved by De Montfort University's Ethics Committee. Further, the Head of Mental Health Services endorsed the study prior to a presentation to the Executive Clinical Directors and the Area Mental Health Management Teams, including service user, family member and carer representatives with approval received.

### *Analytic Strategy*

Comparisons at baseline were conducted using Fisher's Exact Test, for proportions, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), for continuous variables. Then Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to examine changes in all outcome measures over time in the two groups. Follow-up analyses were conducted by ANOVA (or Analysis of Co-Variance (ANCOVA) if there were baseline differences) and t-tests. Finally, ANCOVA was used to examine if group differences in well-being over time were explained by changes in CNS (calculated as difference between post and pre-intervention scores). IBM SPSS version 25.0 was used for analyses using an alpha value of .05.

### **Results**

Table 1 provides the frequencies for age, gender, diagnosis, diagnosis duration and number of walks in nature per week prior to participation. Similar proportions of men and women were recruited in the urban and rural conditions; Fisher's Exact Test,  $p=.77$ . However, there were differences in age between conditions,  $F(1,48) = 14.94, p=.001$ ; urban participants ( $x=46.44, SD=12.50$  years) were older than rural participants ( $x=34.24, SD=9.63$  years). Accordingly, age was included as a co-variate in all subsequent analyses.

Insert table I here

### *Changes over time*



1  
2  
3 Data was checked for normality with all variables indicating a normal distribution  
4 (Field, 2014). Box's tests of equality of covariance were performed for the MANCOVA and  
5 ANCOVAs, which were non-significant, indicating the covariance across group was  
6 normally distributed. MANCOVA was used to examine group differences (nature; urban) in  
7 changes over time (3 time points) of the outcome measures (NCx, PA, NA, WEMWBS), with  
8 age as a co-variate. It revealed significant multivariate effects of time ( $F(8,40) = 26.46, p <$   
9  $.001, \eta p^2 = .84$ ) and condition ( $F(4,44) = 45.84, p < .001, \eta p^2 = .81$ ), and a significant  
10 multivariate time x condition interaction ( $F(8,140) = 30.90, p = .01, \eta p^2 = .86$ ). Age was not a  
11 significant co-variate ( $p > .1$ ).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Univariate ANCOVAs revealed time x condition interactions for all outcome  
measures: NCx ( $F(2,94) = 23.73, p < .001, \eta p^2 = .34$ ); PA ( $F(2,94) = 34.42, p < .001, \eta p^2 =$   
 $.42$ ); NA ( $F(2,94) = 90.54, p < .001, \eta p^2 = .66$ ); and WEMWBS ( $F(2,94) = 19.46, p < .001,$   
 $\eta p^2 = .29$ ). Age was not a significant co-variate in ANCOVAs. Table 2 provides means and  
standard deviations (baseline. Post and follow-up) for WEMWBS, CNS, PA and NA by  
condition, along with t-test results. There were no differences in any measure at baseline, all  
 $t < 1$ . WEMWBS scores were greater in the rural condition at follow-up but not post-  
intervention. CNS scores were higher in the rural group than the urban group at post-  
intervention and follow-up. PA scores were also higher in the rural group than the urban  
group at post-intervention and follow-up. At post-intervention, NA scores were lower in the  
rural group than the urban group, where at follow-up NA scores were *higher* in the rural  
group than the urban group.

Insert table II here

Finally, ANCOVA examined if group differences in well-being over time remained  
after statistical adjusting for changes in CNS by including them as a co-variate. Changes in  
CNS were a significant co-variate ( $F(2,94) = 5.46, p < .01, \eta p^2 = .10$ , with the time x group

1  
2  
3 interaction increasing ( $F(2,94) = 32.33, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41$ ); there were group differences in  
4  
5 WEMWBS scores at follow-up but not at pre or post intervention.  
6  
7

## 8 **Discussion**

9  
10 The results indicate NCx and PA significantly increased at post and follow-up in the  
11 *TGTiN* condition [but did not significantly increase in the control](#). While there was a  
12  
13 significant decrease in NA at post in [this the \*TGTiN\* condition](#), this increased unexpectedly at  
14  
15 follow-up when compared to the control (although still below baseline). Further, while well-  
16  
17 being was not significantly different from baseline to post, the *TGTiN* condition showed  
18  
19 significantly higher well-being at follow-up [when compared to the control](#). The larger,  
20  
21 significant increase in NCx and PA at both post and follow-up in the nature walk [compared to](#)  
22  
23 [the control](#) supported H<sup>1</sup> and [partially supported](#) H<sup>3</sup>, respectively. While well-being scores  
24  
25 did differ at post, only scores at follow-up were significantly different in favour of the nature  
26  
27 walk when compared to the control, partially supporting H<sup>2</sup>. The larger decrease of NA at  
28  
29 post in the nature walk partially supported H<sup>4</sup> given the unexpected increase (although still  
30  
31 below baseline and non-significantly) at follow-up. [No significant change in NA was found](#)  
32  
33 [in the control](#).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The results support the *TGTiN* intervention as benefitting well-being and PA  
41  
42 (McEwan et al. 2019). Given the significant differences found for PA at post and follow-up,  
43  
44 and for well-being at follow-up only, practitioners interested in improving these outcomes in  
45  
46 clients could utilise *TGTiN* given this and previous results (Richardson and Sheffield, 2017).  
47  
48 While well-being (Richardson et al., 2021) and mental health (Martyn and Brymer, 2014)  
49  
50 benefits have been evidenced in the general population, this study extends the importance of  
51  
52 nature to a clinically relevant population (Brooks et al., 2017). Previous nature-based  
53  
54 interventions have aided recovery from stress related disorders while providing psychological  
55  
56 improvements (Pálsdóttir, et al., 2014). With such interventions linked to reductions in  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 healthcare service attendance (Wahrborg et al., ~~2013~~2014), the *TGTiN* intervention could  
4  
5 improve outcomes and reduce service use. Further, *TGTiN* could be promoted as an  
6  
7 additional well-being intervention for those receiving treatment for low-level depression  
8  
9 and/or anxiety, complementing existing interventions while acting in a preventative capacity  
10  
11 against developing more severe forms of these conditions. Therefore, the development and  
12  
13 use of nature-based activities shows promise, warranting further study. This is pertinent given  
14  
15 the financial (Jones, 2019) and personnel pressures (Grandes, et al., 2011) associated with  
16  
17 mental health provision, with nature offering a cost-effective method for reducing them  
18  
19 (Lovell, 2016).  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Atchley, et al. (2012) suggest the environment informs thoughts and feelings, thereby  
25  
26 affecting PA and NA with NCx, leading to increased feelings of self as part of nature that  
27  
28 improve well-being (Pritchard et al., 2020). The significant increase in PA and well-being for  
29  
30 the intervention group indicates writing in nature using a Positive Psychological Intervention  
31  
32 (PPI) may have created that sense of self and awareness. However, the use of a PPI could be  
33  
34 utilised further than just developing thinking about self by facilitating in-depth knowledge of  
35  
36 emerging feelings and their origins. While knowledge about feelings ~~are~~ is beneficial, the  
37  
38 slight but non-significant increase in NA for the intervention group at follow-up should be  
39  
40 considered and managed in clinical settings if *TGTiN* is utilised.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The increase in NCx and well-being within the intervention group indirectly supports  
46  
47 previous links between the two constructs (Richardson et al., 2021). While NCx change was a  
48  
49 significant covariate, only condition explained well-being change. While it is possible that  
50  
51 higher NCx increased the sensation of a meaningful existence and therefore higher well-being  
52  
53 as found in other work (Prtichard et al., 2020), the benefit was likely derived from the *TGTiN*  
54  
55 intervention. Further study using a mixed-methods design would be useful to understand the  
56  
57 effectiveness and role NCx has on well-being through noticing *TGTiN* within this population.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 This approach could also provide additional insight from restricted (such as inpatient settings)  
4  
5 or open (rehabilitation and recovery units) mental health settings. Exploring healthcare  
6  
7 worker and patient experiences within such settings would be useful, especially where  
8  
9 minimal access to nature is possible, to ascertain the effectiveness of *TGTiN* in different  
10  
11 clinical environments. Further control would also be useful to discount the possibility that  
12  
13 concurrent treatment was affecting the improvements found in this study particularly at  
14  
15 follow-up, while also providing insight on how *TGTiN* could compliment other forms of  
16  
17 treatment.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 The study utilised a rigorous approach to data collection to investigate the *TGTiN*  
23  
24 intervention within a clinically relevant population. While the inclusion of individuals with  
25  
26 diagnoses of depression and/or anxiety addressed a knowledge gap, identifying effective  
27  
28 nature-based interventions for specific diagnoses would be fruitful. Despite this study  
29  
30 sampling 39 clinically relevant participants in *TGTiN*, the small sample-size necessitates  
31  
32 further work to investigate clinical applications. While participant allocation was impartially  
33  
34 randomised, further work investigating the *TGTiN* intervention should utilise an impartial  
35  
36 walk leader (or participants directed via pre-made instruction) to discount researcher effects.  
37  
38 Alternatively, a Randomised Control Trial would be ideal. Further, severity of depression  
39  
40 and/or anxiety could be investigated to determine the effectiveness of *TGTiN* across the range  
41  
42 of experiences of such conditions.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 This study highlighted walking in and writing about *TGTiN* can improve well-being  
48  
49 for individuals with depression and/or anxiety that can be utilised to inform the development  
50  
51 of preventative and management interventions for that client group. It demonstrated that a  
52  
53 simple intervention such as *TGTiN* can create a space for reflection and positive thinking,  
54  
55 connecting people with nature and offering positive avenues for good mental health through a  
56  
57 potentially cost-effective intervention.  
58  
59  
60

## References

- Atchley, R.A., Strayer, D.L., and Atchley, P. (2012) Creativity in the wild: Improving creative reasoning through immersion in natural settings. *PloS one*, 7(12), e51474.
- Bratman, G.N., Hamilton, J.P., Hahn, K.S., Daily, G.C., and Gross, J.J. (2015) Nature experience reduces rumination and subgenual prefrontal cortex activation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(28), pp.8567-8572.
- Brooks, A. M., Ottley, K. M., Arbuthnott, K. D. and Sevingny, P. (2017) Nature-related mood effects: Season and type of nature contact. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 54, pp. 91-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2017.10.004>.
- Bryant, F. (2003) Savoring beliefs inventory (SBI): A scale for measuring beliefs about savouring. *Journal of Mental Health*, 12(2), pp.175-196.
- Davidson L. (2005) Recovery, self-management and the expert patient: Changing the culture of mental health from a UK Perspective. *J Ment Health* 14, pp.25-35.
- Dye, C. (2008) Health and urban living. *Science* 319, pp.766–769.
- Field, A. (2014) *Discovering Statistics in Psychology*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edn.UK: Sage Publications.
- Grandes, G., Montoya, I., Arietaleanizbeaskoa, M.S., Arce, V., Sanchez, A., and MAS Group. (2011) The burden of mental disorders in primary care. *European Psychiatry*, 26(7), pp.28-435.
- Jones, B. (2019). “Mental health issues cost State €8.2bn each year, says Harris” *Newspaper*, 29th August 2019, available at: <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/health/mental-health-issues-cost-state-8-2bn-each-year-says-harris-1.4001595> accessed 10/02/2021

- 1  
2  
3 Logan, A. C. and Selhub, E. M. (2012) Vis Medicatrix naturae: does nature “minister to the  
4 mind”? *BioPsychoSocial Medicine*, 6(1), pp.11. doi:10.1186/1751-0759-6-11  
5  
6 Lovell, R. (2016) Links between natural environments and mental health: evidence briefing  
7  
8 (EIN018). Natural England. Available at [http://](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5748047200387072?category=6159558569361408)  
9  
10 [publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5748047200387072?c](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5748047200387072?category=6159558569361408)  
11  
12 [ategory=6159558569361408](http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5748047200387072?category=6159558569361408)  
13  
14  
15  
16 Martyn, P. and Brymer, E. (2014) The relationship between nature relatedness and anxiety.  
17 *Journal of Health Psychology*, Advance online publication, pp.1-10. doi:  
18 10.1177/1359105314555169  
19  
20  
21 Mayer, F.S. and Frantz, C.M. (2004) The connectedness to nature scale: A measure of  
22 individuals’ feeling in community with nature. *Journal of environmental*  
23 *psychology*, 24(4), pp.503-515.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 McEwan, K., Richardson, M., Sheffield, D., Ferguson, F. J., and Brindley, P. (2019) A  
30 smartphone app for improving mental health through connecting with urban  
31 nature. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(18),  
32 3373.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39 McKenzie, K., Murray, A. and Booth, T. (2013) Do urban environments increase the risk of  
40 anxiety, depression and psychosis? An epidemiological study. *Journal of Affective*  
41 *Disorders*, 150(3), pp.1019-1024.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Pálsdóttir, A. M., Persson, D., Persson, B., Grahn, P., Arbetsterapi och aktivitetsvetenskap,  
48 Medicinska fakulteten, . . . Lund University. (2014) The journey of recovery and  
49 empowerment embraced by nature – clients’ perspectives on nature-based  
50 rehabilitation in relation to the role of the natural environment. *International Journal*  
51 *of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(7), pp.7094-7115.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Pattel, N., (2007) Aboriginal families, cultural context and therapy. *Counselling,*  
4  
5 *Psychotherapy, and Health*, 3(1), pp.1-24  
6  
7  
8  
9 Pritchard, A., Richardson, M., Sheffield, D., and McEwan, K. (2020) The relationship  
10  
11 between nature connectedness and eudaimonic well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal*  
12  
13 of Happiness Studies, 21, pp.1145- 1167. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00118-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00118-6)  
14  
15 [6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-019-00118-6)  
16  
17  
18 Richardson, M., Passmore, H-A., Lumber, R., Thomas, R. and Hunt, A. (2021) Moments, not  
19  
20 minutes: The nature—well-being relationship. *International Journal of Wellbeing,*  
21  
22 11(1), pp.8-33. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v11i1.1267>  
23  
24  
25  
26 Richardson, M., and Sheffield, D. (2017) Three good things in nature: Noticing nearby  
27  
28 nature brings sustained increases in connection with nature. *Psychology*, 8(1), pp.1-  
29  
30 32.  
31  
32  
33  
34 Seligman, M.E.P., Steen, T.A., Park, N. and Peterson, C. (2005) Positive psychology  
35  
36 progress. Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist*, 60, pp.410–  
37  
38 421.  
39  
40  
41 Song, C., Ikei, H. and Miyazaki, Y., (2016) Physiological effects of nature therapy: A review  
42  
43 of the research in Japan. *International journal of environmental research and public*  
44  
45 *health*, 13(8), pp.781  
46  
47  
48 Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., . . . Stewart-Brown, S.  
49  
50 (2007) The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS):  
51  
52 Development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5(1), pp.63-  
53  
54 63.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Währborg, P., Petersson, I.F. and Grahn, P., (2014) Nature-assisted rehabilitation for  
4  
5 reactions to severe stress and/or depression in a rehabilitation garden: Long-term  
6  
7 follow-up including comparisons with a matched population-based reference  
8  
9 cohort. *Journal of rehabilitation medicine*, 46(3), pp.271-276.  
10  
11

12  
13 Watson, D., Clark, L.A. and Tellegen, A. (1988) Development and validation of brief  
14  
15 measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality*  
16  
17 *and Social Psychology*, 54(6), pp.1063-1070.  
18  
19

20  
21 World Health Organisation, (2004) Promoting Mental Health concepts, emerging evidence,  
22  
23 practice, WHO, Geneva, Austria  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Table I: Frequency scores for Number of Walks per Week in Nature (During the Past Month), Age, Illness Type, Number of Walks per Week, Type of Walk, Type of Illness, and Duration of Illness (N=50)

Number of walks p/week in nature (%)		Age (%)		Illness Type (%)		Duration of illness (%)	
once a week	22	19-25	6	anxiety	10	less than a year	5
twice a week	16	26-35	8	depression	17	1-2 years	5
three times a week	4	36-45	11	both	23	3-5 years	16
every day	4	46-55	14			6-10 years	6
not at all	3	56-65	10			more than 10 years	18
n/a	1	65+	1				

Table II: Means and Standard Deviations for Well-Being, CNS, Positive and Negative Affect  
for the Urban and Nature Walking Activity at Baseline, Post and Follow-up (N=50).

Measure	Condition			
	Urban	Nature	Total	t-test
Well-Being	43.96 ( <i>SD</i> = 12.50)	44.80 ( <i>SD</i> = 11.77)	44.38	.25
Baseline			( <i>SD</i> = 12.03)	
Well-Being Post	49.80 ( <i>SD</i> = 10.65)	53.32	51.56	1.24
		( <i>SD</i> = 9.35)	( <i>SD</i> = 10.08)	
Well-Being Follow	42.68 ( <i>SD</i> = 3.65)	63.44 ( <i>SD</i> = 3.65)	53.06	13.31*
			( <i>SD</i> = 11.82)	
CNS Baseline	3.20 ( <i>SD</i> = .24)	3.12 ( <i>SD</i> = .33)	3.16	-.95
			( <i>SD</i> = .29)	
CNS Post	3.40 ( <i>SD</i> = .25)	3.86 ( <i>SD</i> = .28)	3.63	6.18*
			( <i>SD</i> = .35)	
CNS Follow	3.34 ( <i>SD</i> = .34)	4.05 ( <i>SD</i> = .21)	3.69	8.84*
			( <i>SD</i> = .45)	
Positive Affect	15.12 ( <i>SD</i> = 2.05)	15.68 ( <i>SD</i> = 2.23)	15.40	.93
Baseline			( <i>SD</i> = 2.14)	
Positive Affect	17.88 ( <i>SD</i> = 4.28)	30.40 ( <i>SD</i> = 4.01)	24.14	10.68*
Post			( <i>SD</i> = 7.54)	
Positive Affect	28.04 ( <i>SD</i> = 3.01)	36.88 ( <i>SD</i> = 2.14)	32.46	11.96*
Follow			( <i>SD</i> = 5.26)	
Negative Affect	43.76 ( <i>SD</i> = 4.49)	42.60 ( <i>SD</i> = 4.37)	43.18	-.93
Baseline			( <i>SD</i> = 4.42)	

1					
2					
3	Negative Affect	40.24 ( <i>SD</i> = 5.95)	29.68 ( <i>SD</i> = 5.66)	34.96	-6.43*
4					
5	Post			( <i>SD</i> = 7.84)	
6					
7	Negative Affect	20.84 ( <i>SD</i> = 4.03)	36.60 ( <i>SD</i> = 1.68)	28.72	18.01*
8					
9	Follow			( <i>SD</i> = 8.53)	
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					

---

\*  $p < .05$

## **Glossary of terms**

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Analysis of Co-Variance (ANCOVA)

Cooperation and Working Together (CAWT)

Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Multiple Analysis of Co-Variance (MANCOVA)

Nature Connectedness (NCx)

Negative Affect (NA)

Positive Affect (PA)

Positive Psychological Intervention (PPI)

The Connectedness to Nature Scale (CNS)

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

The Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS)

Three Good Things (TGT)

Three Good Things in Nature (*TGTiN*)