

Research Priorities for Conservation and Natural Resource Management in Oceania's Small Island Developing States

Weeks & Adams (2018)
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12964>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

conservation and natural resource management

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

For conservation science to effectively inform conservation action, research must focus on creating the scientific knowledge required to solve conservation problems, and researchers must effectively communicate that knowledge to practitioners (Arlettaz et al. 2010; Walsh et al. 2014). Participatory processes that involve both scientists and practitioners (individuals directly involved in conservation or resource management) in the identification of research priorities have been proposed as a way to develop research agendas that are more responsive to practitioners' information needs. Region-specific or national assessments are particularly important for the development of research and policy that are relevant to local context.

What was the objective?

to identify research questions that, if answered, would increase the effectiveness of conservation and natural resource management practice and policy within Oceania's small island developing states

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 38 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

survey

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: survey 1: participants were asked to suggest up to three questions that if answered could increase the effectiveness of conservation or management of natural resources in Oceania's SIDS within the next 10 years, 270 research questions suggested. Step 2: data processing: data cleaning, resulting in longlist of 115 questions within 11 thematic areas. Step 3: shortlisting questions: survey 2 asking participants to indicate which questions they considered to be high priority, secondary priority or not a priority and any for which they considered current knowledge or understanding to be sufficient, participants permitted to skip questions or thematic sections for which they felt their expertise was insufficient, resulting in shortlist of 38 high priority research questions

Which stakeholders took part?

Academia, government, nongovernment organizations. Survey 1: 105 participants: 41% of participants were from academic or research organizations, 25% from government agencies, 23% from NGOs, and 11% identified as independent / consultants. Survey 2: 38 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Purposive sample of three sectoral groups was used: academics, government agency employees, and representatives from NGOs.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.