

**The Application of Reflexivity for Conservation Science**

JACALYN M. BECK (corresponding author), Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, 480 Wilson Road, Natural Resources Building, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA, beckjaca@msu.edu

KEVIN C. ELLIOTT, Lyman Briggs College, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, and Department of Philosophy, Michigan State University, kce@msu.edu

CHARLIE R. BOOHER, W. A. Franke College of Forestry and Conservation, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812, USA, charles.boohar@umconnect.umt.edu

KRISTEN A. RENN, Department of Educational Administration, 620 Farm Lane, Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA, renn@msu.edu

ROBERT A. MONTGOMERY, Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, The Recanati-Kaplan Centre, Tubney House, Abingdon Road, Tubney, Oxon OX13 5QL, U.K. robert.montgomery@zoo.ox.ac.uk

*Running title:* Reflexivity for conservation science

Submitted for consideration as a *Perspective Article*.

Number of words in abstract: 144

Number of words in entire manuscript: 11941

Number of words in main text: 6948

Number of references: 183

Number of figures and tables: 2

Corresponding author: Jacalyn M. Beck, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, 480 Wilson Road, Room 13 Natural Resources Building, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA, beckjaca@msu.edu. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9095-5465>

## ABSTRACT

In recent years, conservationists have been taking an increasingly holistic, interdisciplinary approach to conservation science, utilizing many methodologies and techniques from the social sciences. Reflexivity is one social science technique that holds great potential to aid in the continued advancement of conservation science but is not yet commonly recognized or applied by conservationists. Here we establish a systems-based framework for conservation science and couple it with a discipline-specific definition of reflexivity to enable the integration of reflexivity into future conservation projects. We outline the four major tenets of reflexivity for conservation science, declaring that conservation science *i)* is informed by personal values, *ii)* requires true partnership, *iii)* must contend with its own history, and *iv)* demands progress. We present practical reflexive techniques that conservationists can use to adhere to these tenets and to foster research-informed conservation efforts that are more collaborative, resilient, and diverse.

**Keywords:** Reflexivity, conservation, social science, research design, complex adaptive system

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank C. F. Hoffmann for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program and Michigan State University. All authors hereby declare no direct or indirect conflicts of interest.

## Introduction

Conservation science is in the midst of a paradigm shift, away from purely biodiversity-centered approaches towards a more culturally-conscious, socially-just, ‘human heritage-centered’ discipline (Huntley 2014, Vucetich et al. 2018, Montgomery et al. 2020, Wyborn et al. 2021). Although the conservation science community has traditionally leaned heavily on the natural and biological sciences, recent efforts have been made to become more interdisciplinary particularly via an increased use of, and engagement with, the social sciences (Mascia et al. 2003, Newing 2010, Matulis and Moyer 2017, Schlüter et al. 2017, Echeverri et al. 2018). Many established frameworks now exist for integrating social science techniques and methodologies into conservation science (Evely et al. 2008, White et al. 2009, Moon and Blackman 2014, Rust et al. 2017). One concept from the social sciences that has great potential to aid in the continued progression of conservation science, but is yet to be widely utilized, is reflexivity (Moon et al. 2016, Brittain et al. 2020). Recent calls have been made to increase reflexivity in scientific efforts related to community conservation (Koot et al. 2020), land restoration (Swart et al. 2018), conflict management (Arpin 2019), fossil fuel extraction (Davidson 2019), environmental governance (Borie et al. 2020), socio-ecological systems modeling (Iwanaga et al. 2021), and conservation volunteerism (Gray et al. 2017), yet specific guiding principles for reflexive practice across conservation fields are lacking (Montana et al. 2020).

Rooted in the disciplines of philosophy, anthropology, and sociology (Mauthner and Doucet 2003), reflexivity began as a theoretical concept offering scientists various pathways for structured introspection (Schwandt 2011, Berger 2015). More recently, reflexivity has been adapted and integrated into the fields of human health and medicine, economics, education, and law, and has made similar inroads across numerous multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary

research efforts (Freshwater and Rolfe 2001, Alvesson et al. 2008, Sandri 2009). Due to this rapid growth, the definitions of reflexivity and the associated descriptions of reflexive techniques can be ambiguous (Lynch 2000, Finlay 2002, Stronach et al. 2007). In tourism research, for example, reflexivity has been described as “an acknowledgement of the agency of researchers, the researched, academic audiences, students, and others. Being reflexive means... [to] recognize the macro and micro forces which underpin the production of tourism knowledge, and acknowledge our interaction with and responsibilities to the 'researched'” (Ateljevic et al. 2005, p. 10). Conservationists, a term which we use here to be inclusive of the wide range of researchers, practitioners, academics, consultants, technicians, agents of government, and others working to conduct science under the broad umbrella of natural resource conservation, may find that this definition fails to consider at what points reflexivity ought to be used or to what ends reflexive techniques should even be undertaken. The SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry explains that reflexivity can “refer to the process of critical self-reflection on one's biases, theoretical predispositions, preferences, and so forth... [and] can point to the fact that the inquirer is part of the setting, context, and social phenomenon he or she seeks to understand. Hence, reflexivity can be a means for critically inspecting the entire research process” (Schwandt 2011, p. 261). While this definition provides more detail about when and how to use reflexivity, it does not explain in what ways reflexivity could apply to quantitative research projects or how these techniques might improve the production and application of knowledge.

In addition to the potentially confusing definitions of reflexivity, its implementation has also been hindered by its general repudiation across the natural sciences. In these fields, the influence of the researcher has historically been under-recognized or even purposefully avoided in pursuit of scientific objectivity. This omission has recently been labeled a ‘reflexive gap’ in

conservation science (Pooley et al. 2014, Pasgaard et al. 2017), one which could have extensive adverse consequences for the efficacy of conservation practice. For example, research-informed conservation efforts that lack reflexive techniques can inhibit conservationists' capacity to cope with complexities in the field, facilitate institutional change, drive innovation, work effectively in teams, learn from past events, or benefit from the experiences of other scientists (Lawrence and Molteno 2012, Cooke et al. 2015, Pasgaard et al. 2017). To avoid these pitfalls and further advance new socially-conscious conservation paradigms (see Montgomery et al. 2020), conservationists need a foundational, discipline-specific approach to reflexivity.

Here, we assert that a conservation-specific definition of reflexivity ought to: *i*) be applicable to all research-informed conservation modalities (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods inquires), *ii*) establish reflexivity as a practice that can be constantly applied and continue to evolve over time, and *iii*) explicitly improve the practice of conservation science and its impacts. Within this context, we define reflexivity for conservation science as a continuous and intentional assessment of a conservationist's influence on the scientific process and the broader socio-ecological system as a means to foster transparency and collaboration, in support of conservation efforts that are ethical, adaptable, and diverse. We expand on this definition by presenting a conceptual framework that positions conservationists as central actors in these complex systems. We describe four essential tenets of reflexivity for conservation science, and explain how conservationists can pragmatically follow each with specific reflexive techniques. Finally, we summarize the important benefits that the implementation of reflexive techniques may bring to conservation science and the conservationists themselves. Although reflexivity is most traditionally applied to projects involving human subjects, the intent of our framework is to illustrate the applicability of reflexivity for all portions of conservation science, regardless of the

topic of focus, research methodology, or data collection techniques. Thus, while we take a structured approach to its explanation, reflexivity is personal for each individual who engages in it and will ultimately be expressed differently across contexts. Our hope is that the guidelines we offer here can be used as ‘stepping stones’ into more habitual, personalized reflexive techniques for all conservationists.

### **A Framework for Complexity**

Conservation scientists have increasingly adopted the concept of complex adaptive systems (CAS), from micro scales (e.g., insect colonies, immune systems) to macro scales (e.g., ecosystems, coupled human and natural systems), with clear benefits for both applied and theoretical research (Levin 1998, Berkes 2004, Messier et al. 2015). Complex adaptive systems are comprised of many interconnected actors who learn and adapt over time, nonlinear processes, and multidirectional feedback loops (Holland 1992, 2006). For example, in coupled human and natural systems, the ecological and socio-cultural elements inherent to this system are intricately linked with one another, and a change in one element of the system can have unexpected impacts on the other (Liu et al. 2007). In a similar way, the scientific and methodological elements of conservation projects cannot be separated from the personal and interpersonal elements of the individuals living and working within the broader system. Thus, each conservation project can be seen as a CAS which includes many distinct actors (e.g., academic, government, and non-governmental organizations, funding sources, local stakeholders) and processes (e.g., ethical procedures, methodological decisions, knowledge generation), all of which interact with one another and with the scientific process itself. Thus, every conservation project can be characterized by its own distinct, ever-evolving CAS (Preiser et al. 2018, de Vos et al. 2019).

One basic CAS, for instance, may include a nonlinear scientific process, networks of key actors, and interactions within networks and between actors and the scientific process (Fig. 1). Viewing conservation science as a CAS can help conservationists recognize the critical nature of broader societal contexts and agendas in developing conservation efforts (Cairney 2019). Adopting a CAS framework can also aid in some of the current shifts already taking place in conservation science, such as the move away from reductionism to a *systems* view of the world (Berkes 2004, Fabricius et al. 2006, Audouin et al. 2013). Through a systems approach, it also becomes clear that the conservationist is a fundamental component of the CAS (Norberg and Cumming 2008, Cilliers et al. 2013, Rogers et al. 2013). Therefore, full comprehension of the system requires critical and strategic examination of the role of the conservationist within it. Via reflexive techniques, conservationists can develop their ability to recognize and manage their peculiar role (Finlay 2002, Berger 2015).

The definition and tenets we describe here present reflexivity not as an abstract concept of self-awareness but as a practical and powerful tool for conservation scientists. Our four discipline-specific tenets form a framework that can guide conservationists to look *inward* (to their own values, purposes, and influences), *outward* (to their relationships with and understandings of others), *backward* (to lessons from the past), and *forward* (to future impacts). As we discuss below, these tenets are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive, but together they provide a broad conceptualization of reflexivity for the field of conservation. Individual conservationists could address a variety of topics through reflexivity, which will vary based on their unique CAS and the actors involved. Therefore, we offer a heuristic tool for each tenet (Supplementary Material 1) to help conservationists gauge and expand their capacity for reflexivity, and to determine topics of significance and areas of their work where reflexivity

could be most advantageous. These tools and techniques are not prescriptive but rather provide some key examples and offer individuals an opportunity to practice ‘doing’ reflexivity on their own terms, in their own time, and with their own teams.

## **The Tenets of Reflexivity for Conservation Science**

### ***1. Looking inward: conservation is informed by personal values***

Rooted in the functional and normative postulates of conservation science, conservation research has always been an action-driven, ‘mission-oriented’ enterprise (Soulé 1985). Although the guiding principles have shifted over the years (Kareiva and Marvier 2012), conservation is still fundamentally motivated by certain human values surrounding the desired state of nature and often uniquely personal ‘missions’ to achieve those desired states (Takacs 2020). In this way, conservation research is, in theory, a type of action research, which aims to study a system and also to effect change in that system (Greenwood and Levin 2007). Decades of conservation scientists have now set out not only to study nature and our relationships with it, but *to do* something with the resulting knowledge (e.g., study human behaviors *to* mitigate wildlife conflict, study nutrient cycling *to* improve stream quality). A similar call for actionability has recently been sounded in the social science community (Watts 2017). Given that these intended actions are grounded in the particular values of the individual scientists, personal objectives and assumptions are a driving force in conservation science (Moon et al. 2018). Therefore, all conservation science mandates some degree of reflexivity to begin to account for the impact of the individual and to ensure that does not overcome effective and ethical science. Reflexive techniques assist conservationists in turning their awareness inward to the many ways they as individuals conceive and shape all aspects of the scientific process.



Philosophers of science have recently focused a great deal of attention on the ways that scientists' values can influence their work (e.g., Longino 2002, Keeney 2004, Douglas 2009, Elliott 2017, Brown 2020). They have shown that these values affect a wide array of judgments, including not only topics chosen and questions asked, but also problem-framing, project design, methodological and interpretive choices, evidential requirements, and terminology. In this way, the conservationist's preferences, perspectives, and ways of knowing unavoidably influence the orientation of each project (*sensu* the observer effect). While value influences are not necessarily a sign of bad science, these effects certainly have the potential to result in biases. Strictly speaking, a value is defined as a quality that is desirable or worthy of pursuit (McMullin 2000) whereas a bias is a systematic deviation from a standard (Danks and London 2017). Values can influence science without clearly or explicitly causing research to deviate from an established standard (Guillemin and Gillam 2004, Elliott and Resnik 2014). However, personal, cultural, and institutional values can scale up, resulting in biases at macro levels that may skew research to the point at which it no longer accurately represents the system under investigation. For example, preferences to study birds and mammals, particularly those that are charismatic or anthropomorphic, has resulted in research-informed conservation efforts that are inconsistent with the species' prevalence in nature and risk of extinction (Donaldson et al. 2016, Davies et al. 2018). This phenomenon has become widely known as 'taxonomic bias,' and has led to an extremely small proportion of animal species being drastically over-represented in scientific literature and popular writing (Wilson et al. 2007, Rosenthal et al. 2017). Similar issues exist across regions and ecosystems as well, with 'geographic bias' favoring research in forests and terrestrial landscapes in the US, UK, and Australia (Fazey et al. 2005, DiMarco et al. 2017). Such large-scale biases in research can threaten the conservation of lesser-studied species and

217 impede research progress on some of the world's greatest conservation problems, such as climate  
218 change and biodiversity loss (Stroud et al. 2014, Feeley et al. 2017). By employing reflexive  
219 techniques, conservationists are encouraged to identify unconscious values that could contribute  
220 to such biases and devise more novel and dynamic research goals which have the potential to  
221 address serious knowledge gaps.

222         When engaging in reflexivity, conservationists identify their own limitations, what they  
223 as individuals bring to the table that could substantially impact their work, and how aspects of  
224 their own identities uniquely shape the scientific process (Moon and Blackman 2014). This is a  
225 vital component of reflexivity because a conservationist's identity creates the foundation of their  
226 scientific perspective and consequently affects the nature and strength of interactions within the  
227 CAS. In turn, the research process itself affects the researcher. Reflexivity allows for the  
228 examination and explanation of this important feedback loop. For example, Moon et al. (2019)  
229 describe their experiences with private land conservation in Australia, highlighting how  
230 reflexivity allowed them to acknowledge multiple viewpoints outside their own, shift how they  
231 pursued their research questions, and enhance their understanding of the unknown (Moon et al.  
232 2019). The three authors' unique stories demonstrate the value of reflexivity and provide diverse,  
233 real-world examples of the critical thinking and personal growth that reflexive techniques can  
234 stimulate. As the main author explained, the "processes of reflexivity have provided me with  
235 exciting opportunities to develop and evolve" (Moon et al. 2019, p. 430).

236         One practical technique that conservationists can use to stimulate critical awareness of  
237 their values, preferences, motivations, and limitations, is via the practice of writing initial  
238 position statements. Kept as personal logs before starting new projects, initial position statements  
239 outline critical aspects of the conservationist's experience and the 'fore understandings' with

which they approach their work (Andrews et al. 1996, Cutcliffe 2003). Initial position statements provide an opportunity for conservationists to think about their current influences and any presuppositions they may have regarding a particular project. By doing this, conservationists can become explicitly aware of their motives for pursuing that project and assess their expectations and concerns. Additionally, these statements can act as benchmarks to measure change over time. Looking back over their logs, conservationists can see if their work had the impacts they initially hoped (i.e., if they achieved their conservation missions) or if they experienced any personal changes during the scientific process that may influence future conservation projects. This may be a particularly useful technique for conservationists engaging with the varied, and sometimes conflicting, values represented on multi-disciplinary teams (Pooley et al. 2014) and within the broader socio-ecological systems they study (Jones et al. 2016, Takacs 2020).

## ***2. Looking outward: conservation requires true partnerships***

Conservation science has a variety of ecological and social dimensions requiring collaboration across many disciplines (Mascia et al. 2003, Ban et al. 2013, Robinson et al. 2019b). It can be a multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, or even transdisciplinary endeavor, drawing on theories and methods and collaborating with experts from the fields of ecology, psychology, forestry, sociology, geography, history, political science, and, most recently, fine arts, media, communications, and humanities (Soulé 1985, Dieleman 2008, Pooley et al. 2016, Bennett et al. 2017, Brennan 2018). Nevertheless, discipline-specific science remains the norm (Fox et al. 2006, Brook and McLachlan 2008, Pooley et al. 2014, Montgomery et al. 2018a), and conservation science should continue to become more holistic and inclusive not only disciplinarily, but demographically, institutionally, philosophically, and epistemologically. In

recent years, calls have been made to diversify the conservation science community (Tallis and Lubchenco 2014, Green et al. 2015) and to embrace varied, if even conflicting, viewpoints (Matulis and Moyer 2017). To make this ambition a reality, conservationists should put in the hard work to establish, strengthen, and maintain partnerships with those unlike themselves both professionally and personally. Consequently, the second tenet of reflexivity for conservation science encourages conservationists to look outwards, towards their interactions and relationships with all actors in the CAS, and to work to appreciate the many unique perspectives and worldviews.

Collaborative partnerships are imperative to effective conservation outcomes. Many conservation problems today are known to be ‘wicked,’ in that they are extremely uncertain and complex, difficult to manage, have no single solution, and frequently involve a variety of stakeholders with often conflicting views of the situation (Game et al. 2014). One of the most reliable and effective methods to confront wicked problems is through the coproduction of knowledge, whereby scientists work together with non-scientist stakeholders and decision-makers before, during, and after the scientific process to create knowledge and solutions applicable to their unique situations (Cash et al. 2003, Nel et al. 2016, Beier et al. 2017). Coproducing knowledge requires that conservationists hone their ability to understand and engage with diverse stakeholders, including community members, natural resource managers, government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations, and to establish partnerships that are immersive and rooted in mutual trust and respect (Young et al. 2016, Domínguez and Luoma 2020). ‘Fly-by’ research in foreign nations (i.e. that without coproduction or other lasting in-country collaborations; known as parachute science) puts trust-building at risk and can lead to many lasting negative outcomes such as reduced research capacity and dependency on external

funding (Barber et al. 2014, Woodall et al. 2021). Parachute science has recently been detected in research on socio-ecological systems (de Vos et al. 2019), marine systems (Stefanoudis et al. 2021), wildlife conservation (Bauer et al. 2019), geoscience (North et al. 2020), plant sciences (Culley et al. 2021), and other environmental fields (Roldan-Hernandez et al. 2020). Conservationists from any area of expertise can learn to avoid these practices through reflexivity that enhances their empathy and collaborative skills.

Authentic, reflexive partnerships also increase the likelihood that conservationists will achieve their project goals and produce information relevant to solving wicked conservation problems (Balmford and Cowling 2006, Gray et al. 2019). Taking the time to understand other actors' distinct missions, values, philosophies, expectations, and assumptions through reflexive techniques prepares conservationists to build more trusting, effective, fruitful, and equitable partnerships. For example, Coreau (2016) describes how ecological researchers and environmental NGOs collaborating on Mediterranean biodiversity conservation implemented a unique 'reflexive strategic action' framework (including a combination of techniques such as stakeholder interviews, document analysis, and collaborative workshops) to ease tensions and operational difficulties among partners (Coreau 2016). Through the use of reflexive techniques, the diverse actors were able to establish a shared vocabulary, engage in open discussions about research methods and future opportunities, and to identify the potential risks that could threaten the partnership. This led to mutual understandings between organizations, the lack of which had previously hindered their ability to successfully achieve their joint conservation objectives (Coreau 2016).

Partnerships can be strengthened using techniques for collaborative reflexivity. Conservationists should take responsibility for generating open discussions within their teams

and with other actors across the CAS. Many tools and frameworks exist for helping to facilitate these sometimes difficult discussions (see O'Rourke and Crowley 2013, Cheruvilil et al. 2014). Conservationists can also use the tools provided here (Supplementary Materials 1) within a group setting to spark collaborative brainstorming sessions. Collaborative reflexive techniques can solidify team comprehension not only of personal values, ethical standings, and research philosophies, but also important concepts in the scientific process such as interpersonal expectations, communication norms, and academic vocabulary (Eigenbrode et al. 2007). This, in turn, allows the team to establish a common vision of success, minimize potential conflicts, and mutually learn from any trials they experience (Norris et al. 2016). Using techniques like these to foster a positive team climate has been shown to promote greater satisfaction among the members of environmental science teams (Settles et al. 2019). Another technique that conservationists can use to stimulate reflexivity is to create a visual representation of their own scientific CAS (see Fig. 1). Determining the major stages of their unique scientific process and identifying specific actors involved can help conservationists think strategically about their relationship with and impact on each. Taking the time to depict the CAS may also offer clarity about where and when they should plan to use other reflexive techniques in their conservation efforts.

### ***3. Looking back: conservation must contend with its own history***

History and context play critical roles in the functioning of every CAS (Holland 1992). Conservation science has a long and complex history which varies across countries and regions, but which often stems from colonial occupation and the theft and capitalization of land and natural resources (MacKenzie 1988, Singh and Van Houtum 2002, Barrett et al. 2013, Ross

2017a, Domínguez and Luoma 2020). Because of this, conservation policies and public attitudes toward protected areas and biodiversity are often implicitly rooted in histories of violence, extraction, and the exclusion of local communities from their native lands (West et al. 2006, Randeria 2007, Mkumbukwa 2008, Dowie 2011). Relationships between conservationists and other actors in the CAS also exist within these historical and political contexts. Conservationists should think critically about how the histories of these actors may influence current collaborations or research expectations. For example, many large environmental organizations that fund conservation research have also normalized and institutionalized unjust practices such as fortress conservation and green militarization (Duffy et al. 2019, Montgomery et al. 2020). Past events and the treatment, governance, and cultural perspectives of local community members cannot be separated from the influences conservationists hope to have with their work. Reflexivity can assist conservationists in recognizing and attempting to rectify historical inequities and power imbalances (Pasgaard et al. 2017, Trisos et al. 2021) and to ultimately devise more humane and socially-just conservation practices and research protocols. Reflexive techniques help conservationists to look backwards in time, towards the histories of the field and the hard truths of the past, in order to learn lessons needed to conduct high-quality, impactful science with honesty and humility.

Conservation science is often conducted by foreign research institutions (Wilson et al. 2016, Montgomery et al. 2018a, Gray et al. 2019, also see *parachute science*, above, in Tenet 2). Therefore, conservationists may frequently be considered ‘outsiders’ in the communities where they work, not only in terms of race and nationality, but also religion, culture, and language. By being reflexive about important differences between themselves and other critical actors in the CAS, conservationists not only acknowledge that differences exist but also that those differences

can have direct effects on their work. For example, a ‘Western’ scientific perspective may differ greatly from a diverse range of Indigenous perspectives in regards to values of nature and how human-environment relationships should be maintained (Peterson et al. 2010, Lynch et al. 2016, Milstein et al. 2019). Relationships between conservationists and community members can be challenging to navigate but inattention to the importance of these dialogues creates barriers to success and research implementation. Negative interactions may lead to research fatigue, feelings of abuse or exploitation (Tapela et al. 2007, Cochran et al. 2008), or even physical or economic harm (Clark 2008). The results of such interactions may subsequently devalue the potential impact of conservation science and adversely affect conservation efforts far into the future (Lynch 2017). This is particularly important when conservation projects involve human subjects (Brittain et al. 2020). By applying the tenets of reflexivity, conservationists recognize the impacts of institutional imbalances, become aware of the power dynamics between themselves and others, and rectify these power differences whenever possible (Drury et al. 2011, Muhammad et al. 2015, Trisos et al. 2021). When reflexive conservationists share the lessons they’ve learned over time, they can help to guide others through these sometimes tricky scenarios. For example, Mishra et al. (2017) provide a reflexive account of 20 years of community conservation experience with suggestions for improved practice (Mishra et al. 2017).

Conservationists who practice reflexivity take steps to learn about and incorporate aspects of history and culture into their work. For many, this requires engagement with decolonial practices that holistically center the needs and desires of local communities in conservation efforts (see Rodríguez and Inturias 2018, Gould et al. 2019, Larocco et al. 2019). Coloniality refers to enduring patterns of inequity “that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labor, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the



strict limits of colonial administrations... [which] is maintained alive in books, [and] in the criteria for academic performance" (Maldonado-Torres 2007, p. 243). Decolonial practice can be an 'unsettling process' in which individuals work to consciously disrupt the patterns of coloniality found in modern, apolitical, and ahistorical research paradigms (Adams et al. 2018, Singh et al. 2018), and to expose and eliminate enduring colonial mindsets and white supremacy (Garland 2008, Chaudhury and Colla 2021). Ross (2017b) provides an example of a decolonial conservation narrative in their analysis of the wilderness ideology perpetuated by conservationists in modern Tasmania. The author explains that incorporating reflexive techniques in their writing, "let me express my own humanity... and ultimately allowed me take a stance against the racism and oppression I encountered in Tasmania" (Ross 2017b, p. 8).

Conservationists can begin to engage with Tenet 4, and the broader notion of decoloniality, by identifying their own research philosophies and the research paradigms to which they subscribe. One practical technique to do this is the creation of positionality statements that clearly explain how personal aspects of the individual's education, background, and identity may have impacted the scientific process and the resulting data (Milner 2007, Syracuse 2016, Larocco et al. 2019). Positionality statements should be included in academic publications and conservation journals should encourage these statements or offer space for them as supplemental documents (for the authors' own example, see Supplementary Materials 2). Land acknowledgement statements should also be considered when appropriate, with the proper time and respect to ensure such acknowledgements are not performative (Robinson et al. 2019a, Wark 2021). Finally, conservationists should read the works of scholars from different backgrounds and with varying worldviews than themselves, and encourage their students to do the same. These include the works of Indigenous, feminist, neo-colonial, participatory action,

and critical research scholars both within and outside of the field of conservation. Reading diverse work can aid conservationists in seeing different histories through multiple cultural lenses and more effectively collaborate with scholars and professionals with varying histories. These types of collaborations can even enhance individual success, as scientists who train under mentors with disparate expertise achieve more successful academic careers than those whose work closely aligns with that of their mentors (Liénard et al. 2018).

#### ***4. Looking forward: conservation demands progress***

Conservation science has been criticized for failing to directly contribute to applied outcomes where they are needed and for using valuable resources for study rather than direct action (Knight et al. 2008, Laurance et al. 2012). This issue is prevalent and is often referred to as the ‘knowing-doing gap,’ or the ‘research-implementation gap’ (Knight et al. 2008, Gossa et al. 2015, Toomey et al. 2017, Gray et al. 2019). Conservation researchers, for example, may be wary of becoming advocates for a particular cause out of fear of biasing the research effort (Horton et al. 2016, Gray et al. 2019). In an evaluation of conservation biology however, Noss (1999) explains, “whenever one recommends, however cautiously or conservatively, one advocates” (Noss 1999, p. 117). Thus, conservationists are inherently advocates within the context of policymaking and management, even if they do not seek out or fully accept their role as brokers of information (Pielke Jr. 2007). This can lead to disconnects between conservationists and practitioners and a lack of research-informed conservation action on the ground (Arlettaz et al. 2010). Reflexive techniques help conservationists to consider the implications and feasibility of the messages they send and the recommendations they make, and are thus useful in attempts to reduce the research-implementation gap. Reflexivity is not simply a

retrospective assessment of past choices and circumstances, but also an opportunity to think critically about how current choices and circumstances bring about future ones. Practicing reflexivity encourages conservationists to look forward towards the positive impacts they wish to have and take the appropriate actions to explicitly link those impacts with the scientific process.

Improving the impact of conservation science may require some shifts in the way conservationists view data analysis, the knowledge they generate from those analytics, and the way they share the resultant information. First, conservationists should keep in mind that the outcomes of their conservation efforts are directly influenced by ontological and epistemological assumptions rooted in the particular methods of analysis they choose to use (Mauthner and Doucet 2003, Moon et al. 2018). Additionally, because conservation is a policy-relevant field, conservationists cannot avoid making choices that affect whether their results are more favorable to some social or political priorities as opposed to others. For example, methods of modeling animal observational data at an aggregate level might encourage different conservation or management decisions than if the data were assessed at an individual animal level (Montgomery et al. 2018b). It is important to make these decisions thoughtfully, to be transparent about them, and to gather input about them from other scientists and potentially affected communities (Elliott 2017). Finally, conservationists have a responsibility to appropriately guide their findings, including critically assessing the ways in which they frame their research, present their results, and to whom they make findings available (Guillemin and Gillam 2004, Audouin et al. 2013).

As illustrated in Fig. 1, conservationists disseminate their results to various actors, which may include academic peers, professionals from other fields, practitioners within conservation NGOs, or even a broader global audience and it is important for conservationists to consider the identities of these various actors. For example, many individuals may find academic jargon

difficult to interpret and put into action (Pullin et al. 2004), potentially engendering distrust in or disengagement with academic institutions. Conservationists can use reflexivity to gain a deeper awareness of personal aspects of their audiences, such as native language, formal education, ontology, and professional standing. By taking these factors into consideration when writing up and presenting their results, conservationists show empathy and effort, which can increase the likelihood that their recommendations are implemented by policy makers (Reed et al. 2014). Continuing to engaging in reflexivity following knowledge dissemination is also important. An excellent example of reflecting on the results and success of a collaborative conservation planning project can be found via a study of regional and national South African freshwater ecosystems. In this study, Nel et al. (2016) were able to identify and present a critical missing link. As the authors explained, “in hindsight, the project would have benefited from explicit representation of local government... from the outset” (Nel et al. 2016, p. 185). Rather than simply recommending in their publication that future conservation initiatives include local representation, the team took responsibility for the unforeseen exclusion of local stakeholders, a decision which subsequently stimulated enhanced cooperation. This application of reflexivity also increased the usability of their data, built capacity for multi-scale implementation beyond the initial project boundaries, and provided practical guidance for other conservationists seeking to increase the uptake of their own science (Nel et al. 2016).

One specific technique that conservationists can use to help increase the impact of their work is reflexive journaling. This technique consists of daily or weekly notes about project management, methodological decisions and rationale, and personal contemplation. It provides a place for conservationists to engage actively and personally in self-monitoring, to articulate in their own words how they interact with the data and the scientific process. This practice can

improve decision making and may help conservationists to understand and interpret results by adding context to the findings, in both quantitative and qualitative projects (Finlay 1998, Haas and Hoebbel 2018). A reflexive journal can even become data of its own (Schwandt 2011), providing conservationists with valuable new insights that have unique academic and practical value from which others may benefit. Additionally, making the data collection and analysis processes more transparent and accessible may open up opportunities to strategically scrutinize and improve these processes and may reveal new uncertainties and knowledge gaps. This could illuminate productive paths for future research-informed conservation work and potentially increase the actionability of that work (Ban et al. 2013, Pasgaard et al. 2017). Conservationists can also become more reflexive about the potential outcomes of their conservation efforts through experiences working with those who apply research findings. For example, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) offers Science and Technology Policy Fellowships which provide opportunities to collaborate with lawmakers, federal agencies, and environmental NGOs to see how, when, and why policy makers draw on scientific information (Jenkins et al. 2012). For those unable to pursue such intensive experiences, training programs and workshops may also be helpful. For example, the European Union offers a virtual workshop series aimed at creating links between scientists and policy makers at international scales (Commission 2020).

### **Integrating Reflexivity into Conservation Practice**

Solving conservation problems requires integrated and innovative approaches because of the complex interconnectedness of the socio-ecological systems in which these problems persist. Consequently, conservationists need tools to holistically understand and evaluate complex

systems (Berkes and Turner 2006). The CAS framework paired with reflexivity for conservation science, as defined and outlined above, fill this need by offering a structured approach for addressing critical issues relating to: *i*) conservationists' value judgements and positionality, *ii*) partnerships and trust building, *iii*) history and culture, and *iv*) decisions that lead to conservation impacts. The four tenets of reflexivity and their accompanying techniques are neither exhaustive nor discrete, and considering where their major themes intersect in practical settings can be a valuable reflexive technique of its own (see Fig. 2). Importantly, by linking and integrating the CAS framework and the four tenets of reflexivity for conservation science into their work, conservationists can practice in more ethical, adaptable, and diverse ways. We now describe how conservationists can productively blend and apply the four tenets in support of these aims and why this type of work is necessary for the betterment of conservation practice.

First, two major types of ethics in conservation science are procedural ethics and 'ethics in practice.' The former involves acquiring approval from relevant ethics committees and clearly stating how the research-informed conservation efforts intend to be conducted ethically. Conservation science has, at times, been unsuccessful in establishing or adhering to appropriate procedural ethics (Law et al. 2017). For example, nearly half of all conservation studies that involve human subjects do not include necessary ethics information regarding the treatment of those subjects (Ibbett and Brittain 2019). The second main type of ethics, refers to 'everyday ethical issues' that arise while in the field (Guillemin and Gillam 2004) which involve certain responsibilities on the part of the scientist, to act humanely, and to not exploit other actors in the CAS. While these types of ethics are challenging to quantify, there is evidence that conservation science may be among the fields guilty of harmful, invasive, and exploitive projects in the past (Schroeder et al. 2018). Recently, the establishment of new procedures to prevent unethical

research have become more prevalent (see for example, the South African San Institute's Code of Ethics for researchers (Schroeder et al. 2019) and the Climate and Traditional Knowledges Workgroup's guidelines for scientists and policy makers (Climate and Traditional Knowledges Workgroup 2014)). However, such procedures for ethics in practice are still relatively rare and conservationists should encourage community stakeholders to develop their own ethics codes or work to devise these codes collaboratively. Ultimately, the success of conservation efforts results from inclusion, equity, and the long-term development of trust with various stakeholders (Peterson et al. 2010, Young et al. 2016). Engaging with tenet 3 can help conservationists more fully understand and address issues relating to the treatment of community stakeholders and integrating tenets 2 and 4 can offer guidance for conservationists to build the type of fair and trusting relationships that enhance the credibility of their work. As the trustworthiness of science is increasingly being questioned, conservationists should operate under a high standard of ethical conduct to sustain the integrity of the conservation field into the future (Horton et al. 2016, Hopf et al. 2019).

Second, change is ever-present in the socio-ecological systems where conservation science is applied, as well as in each unique scientific CAS. To contend with uncertainty and change in the field, conservationists are increasingly utilizing collaborative learning-based methods, such as coproduction (described in tenet 2), co-management, adaptive management, and participatory action research (Olsson et al. 2004, Bacon et al. 2005, Knight et al. 2019). These approaches are seen as long-term, iterative, and circuitous processes rather than linear progressions of cause and effect (Redpath et al. 2013). And while they may hold a lot of promise, adaptive methods can be extremely difficult to implement in practice (Game et al. 2014). Additionally, to successfully participate in adaptive research and decision making, a thorough

and accurate understanding of stakeholder values is required, an ability that conservationists may not traditionally be trained to develop (Robinson et al. 2019b). Conceptualizing the scientific process as a CAS and adhering to the tenets of reflexivity for conservation science can foster the critical thinking, experiential learning, and social awareness needed to participate successfully in adaptive conservation efforts. It can also assist conservationists in managing uncertainty within their own systems (Quarshie et al. 2019), supporting the continued functioning and reorganization of the CAS during times of change (e.g., loss of funding, data collection failures, communication issues, new stakeholders). Specifically, tenet 4 can assist conservationists in explicitly addressing both success and failures and learning how to change course when necessary to achieve their goals. Blending tenets 1 and 2 in practice can support conservationists in recognizing their own values and those of others, and to hone important social skills that are often overlooked in natural science trainings. As conservationists increase their ability to anticipate changes and become more resilient to stressors, they also increase the potential for multifaceted, adaptive conservation strategies to be successful.

Finally, across various fields of science, teams are becoming larger and more diverse (Wuchty et al. 2007, National Science Foundation 2019). Some forms of diversity on teams can promote positive team climates and enable team members to solve complex problems more successfully (Whitfield 2008, Woolley et al. 2010). Engaging with diverse team members can also help conservationists recognize their own values and become more thoughtful about their choices (Longino 2002, Schuurbiers and Fisher 2009). However, a lack of understanding between diverse team members is a major challenge for interdisciplinary teams (Lélé and Norgaard 2005, Miller et al. 2008) and individuals who contribute disciplinary and demographic diversity to teams may have more negative experiences than their peers (Settles et al. 2019).



562 Additionally, while interdisciplinarity in natural and social sciences has been encouraged for  
563 decades (MacMynowski 2007), methods and concepts from the social sciences are still not being  
564 as productively integrated into conservation science as they might be (Bennett et al. 2016).  
565 Reflexive techniques can be combined with all other research methods and may offer  
566 conservationists accessible approaches to assess the functioning of their teams and to alleviate  
567 some of the challenges of working in disciplinarily- and demographically-diverse groups. For  
568 example, adhering to tenet 2 can help conservationists to establish deeper epistemological  
569 awareness and bolster communication between scientists from dissimilar backgrounds while the  
570 integration of tenets 1 and 3 may provide much-needed structure to understand themselves  
571 through the eyes of others. Ultimately, fostering an inclusive and diverse community will help  
572 conservationists to increase their collaborative impact and devise conservation efforts that are  
573 themselves more diverse, with the novelty and innovation needed to solve today's wicked  
574 environmental problems (Game et al. 2014, Green et al. 2015).

575         To achieve future conservation outcomes that are ethical, adaptable, and diverse,  
576 instruction in reflexive techniques should be added to course curricula at the graduate and  
577 undergraduate level of higher education institutions providing instruction in conservation  
578 science. The tenets and guidelines presented here can be adapted for use as training materials in  
579 conservation methods or environmental ethics workshops for both students and professionals. By  
580 learning to be reflexive throughout the scientific process, conservationists at all career levels can  
581 begin a continuous cycle of self-reflection, assessment, and improvement. Some of the major  
582 challenges to the implementation of reflexivity include the adherence to reductionist thinking  
583 (Rogers et al. 2013, Knight et al. 2019), enduring coloniality (Kearney 2019, Chaudhury and  
584 Colla 2021), and a lack of practical examples necessary to appreciate the influence of these

techniques (Chua et al. 2020). Our hope is that continued progress will be made in conservation science to confront these issues and push the boundaries of prevailing practice to embrace new, socially-just, and reflexive conservation paradigms. It is the responsibility of the conservationist to decide when to utilize reflexive techniques and how much of the resulting information to share with others. However, increased transparency and collaborative reflexivity will increase the conservation community's ability to solve the complex problems that blight the field, while also promoting personal and professional development in the broader conservation community. Recognizing the tenets of reflexivity will encourage conservation science that is socially and ethically responsible, inclusive of diverse ways of knowing, and attentive to the inherent complexities of social-ecological systems.

## **Supplementary Material 1**

## **Supplementary Material 2**

## **References**

- Adams, G., S. Estrada-villalta, and L. H. Gómez. 2018. The modernity / coloniality of being: hegemonic psychology as intercultural relations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 62:13–22.
- Alvesson, M., C. Hardy, and B. Harley. 2008. Reflecting on reflexivity: Reflexive textual practices in organization and management theory. *Journal of Management Studies* 45:480–501.

608 Andrews, M., P. Lyne, and E. Riley. 1996. Validity in qualitative health care research: An  
609 exploration of the impact of individual researcher perspectives within collaborative enquiry.  
610 *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 23:441–447.

611 Arlettaz, R., M. Schaub, J. Fournier, T. S. Reichlin, A. Sierro, J. E. M. Watson, and V.  
612 Braunisch. 2010. From publications to public actions: when conservation biologists bridge  
613 the gap between research and implementation. *BioScience* 60:835–842.

614 Arpin, I. 2019. The rise of planning in nature conservation and the practitioners' approach to  
615 conflicts. The inspiring case of the Northern French Alps nature reserves. *Journal for Nature*  
616 *Conservation* 48:54–60.

617 Ateljevic, I., C. Harris, E. Wilson, and F. L. Collins. 2005. Getting 'entangled': Reflexivity and  
618 the 'critical turn' in tourism studies. *Tourism Recreation Research* 30:9–21.

619 Audouin, M., R. Preiser, S. Nienaber, L. Downsborough, J. Lanz, and S. Mavengahama. 2013.  
620 Exploring the implications of critical complexity for the study of socialecological systems.  
621 *Ecology and Society* 18.

622 Bacon, C., E. Mendez, and M. Brown. 2005. Participatory action research and support for  
623 community development and conservation: examples from shade coffee landscapes in  
624 Nicaragua and El Salvador. UC Santa Cruz Research Briefs.

625 Balmford, A., and R. M. Cowling. 2006. Fusion or failure? The future of conservation biology.  
626 *Conservation Biology* 20:692–695.

627 Ban, N. C., M. Mills, J. Tam, C. C. Hicks, S. Klain, N. Stoeckl, M. C. Bottrill, J. Levine, R. L.  
628 Pressey, T. Satterfield, and K. M. A. Chan. 2013. A social-ecological approach to  
629 conservation planning: Embedding social considerations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*  
630 *Environment* 11:194–202.

631 Barber, P. H., M. C. A. Ablan-Lagman, A. Ambariyanto, R. G. S. Berlinck, D. Cahyani, E. D.  
 632 Crandall, R. Ravago-Gotanco, M. A. Juinio-Meñez, I. G. N. Mahardika, K. Shanker, C. J.  
 633 Starger, A. H. A. Toha, A. W. Anggoro, and D. A. Willette. 2014. Advancing biodiversity  
 634 research in developing countries: The need for changing paradigms. *Bulletin of Marine*  
 635 *Science* 90:187–210.

636 Barrett, G., S. Brooks, J. Josefsson, and N. Zulu. 2013. Starting the conversation: Land issues  
 637 and critical conservation studies in post-colonial Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African*  
 638 *Studies* 31:336–344.

639 Bauer, H., F. Gebresenbet, M. Kiki, L. Simpson, and C. Sillero-Zubiri. 2019. Race and gender  
 640 bias in the research community on African lions. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 7:1–4.

641 Beier, P., L. J. Hansen, L. Helbrecht, and D. Behar. 2017. A how-to guide for coproduction of  
 642 actionable science. *Conservation Letters* 10:288–296.

643 Bennett, N. J., R. Roth, S. C. Klain, K. Chan, P. Christie, D. A. Clark, G. Cullman, D. Curran, T.  
 644 J. Durbin, G. Epstein, A. Greenberg, M. P. Nelson, J. Sandlos, R. Stedman, T. L. Teel, R.  
 645 Thomas, D. Veríssimo, and C. Wyborn. 2017. Conservation social science: Understanding  
 646 and integrating human dimensions to improve conservation. *Biological Conservation*  
 647 205:93–108.

648 Bennett, N. J., R. Roth, S. C. Klain, K. M. A. Chan, D. A. Clark, G. Cullman, G. Epstein, M. P.  
 649 Nelson, R. Stedman, T. L. Teel, R. E. W. Thomas, C. Wyborn, D. Curran, A. Greenberg, J.  
 650 Sandlos, and D. Veríssimo. 2016. Mainstreaming the social sciences in conservation.  
 651 *Conservation Biology* 31:56–66.

652 Berger, R. 2015. Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative  
 653 research. *Qualitative Research* 15.

654 Berkes, F. 2004. Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology* 18:3–13.

655 Berkes, F., and N. J. Turner. 2006. Knowledge, learning and the evolution of conservation  
656 practice for social-ecological system resilience. *Human Ecology* 34:479–494.

657 Borie, M., K. M. Gustafsson, N. Obermeister, E. Turnhout, and P. Bridgewater. 2020.  
658 Institutionalising reflexivity? Transformative learning and the Intergovernmental science-  
659 policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). *Environmental Science  
660 and Policy* 110:71–76.

661 Brennan, R. E. 2018. Re-storying marine conservation: Integrating art and science to explore and  
662 articulate ideas, visions and expressions of marine space. *Ocean and Coastal Management*  
663 162:110–126.

664 Brittain, S., H. Ibbett, E. de Lange, L. Dorward, S. Hoyte, and A. Marino. 2020. Ethical  
665 considerations when conservation research involves people. *Conservation Biology*.

666 Brook, R. K., and S. M. McLachlan. 2008. Trends and prospects for local knowledge in  
667 ecological and conservation research and monitoring. *Biodiversity and Conservation*  
668 17:3501–3512.

669 Brown, M. J. 2020. *Science and Moral Imagination: A New Ideal for Values in Science*.  
670 University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

671 Cairney, P. 2019. *Understanding public policy*. Red Globe Press.

672 Cash, D. W., W. C. Clark, F. Alcock, N. M. Dickson, N. Eckley, D. H. Guston, J. Jäger, and R.  
673 B. Mitchell. 2003. Knowledge systems for sustainable development. *Proceedings of the  
674 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 100:8086–8091.

675 Chaudhury, A., and S. Colla. 2021. Next steps in dismantling discrimination: Lessons from  
676 ecology and conservation science. *Conservation Letters* 14:1–6.

677 Cheruvelil, K. S., P. A. Soranno, K. C. Weathers, P. C. Hanson, S. J. Goring, C. T. Filstrup, and  
678 E. K. Read. 2014. Creating and maintaining high-performing collaborative research teams:  
679 the importance of diversity and interpersonal skills. *Macrosystems Ecology* 12:31–38.

680 Chua, L., M. E. Harrison, H. Fair, S. Milne, A. Palmer, J. Rubis, P. Thung, S. Wich, B. Büscher,  
681 S. M. Cheyne, R. K. Puri, V. Schreer, A. Stępień, and E. Meijaard. 2020. Conservation and  
682 the social sciences: Beyond critique and co-optation. A case study from orangutan  
683 conservation. *People and Nature* 2:42–60.

684 Cilliers, P., H. C. Biggs, S. Blignaut, A. G. Choles, G. P. W. Jewitt, and D. J. Roux. 2013.  
685 Complexity, modeling, and natural resource management. *Ecology and Society* 18.

686 Clark, T. 2008. “We’re over-researched here!”: Exploring accounts of research fatigue within  
687 qualitative research engagements. *Sociology* 42:953–970.

688 Climate and Traditional Knowledges Workgroup. 2014. Guidelines for Considering Traditional  
689 Knowledges in Climate Change Initiatives. <https://climatetkw.wordpress.com>.

690 Cochran, P. A. L., C. A. Marshall, C. Garcia-Downing, E. Kendall, D. Cook, L. McCubbin, and  
691 R. M. S. Gover. 2008. Indigenous ways of knowing: Implications for participatory research  
692 and community. *American Journal of Public Health* 98:22–27.

693 Commission, E. 2020. Eco-systems of science for policy - Zooming in on particular science for  
694 policy element across EU. [https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/policy-ecosystems-in-europe/single-](https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/policy-ecosystems-in-europe/single-element-workshops)  
695 [element-workshops](https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/policy-ecosystems-in-europe/single-element-workshops).

696 Cooke, N. J., M. L. Hilton, B. Behavioral, S. Sciences, D. Behavioral, and S. Sciences. 2015.  
697 Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team Science. Page Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team  
698 Science. National Academies Press.

699 Coreau, A. 2016. Reflexive strategic action to consolidate a research-NGO partnership during

700 science-policy interactions. *Environmental Science and Policy*:1–9.

701 Culley, T. M., R. Tunison, J. M. B. Sanchez, A. Wafer, and R. Holdren. 2021. Research inequity  
702 in the plant sciences. *Applications in Plant Science* 9:2–5.

703 Cutcliffe, J. R. 2003. Reconsidering reflexivity: Introducing the case for intellectual  
704 entrepreneurship. *Qualitative Health Research* 13:136–148.

705 Danks, D., and A. J. London. 2017. Algorithmic bias in autonomous systems. *IJCAI*  
706 International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence 0:4691–4697.

707 Davidson, D. J. 2019. Emotion, reflexivity and social change in the era of extreme fossil fuels.  
708 *British Journal of Sociology* 70:442–462.

709 Davies, T., A. Cowley, J. Bennie, C. Leyshon, R. Inger, H. Carter, B. Robinson, J. Duffy, S.  
710 Casalegno, G. Lambert, and K. Gaston. 2018. Popular interest in vertebrates does not reflect  
711 extinction risk and is associated with bias in conservation investment. *PLoS ONE*.

712 Dieleman, H. 2008. Sustainability, art, and reflexivity: why artists and designers may become  
713 key change agents in sustainability. Pages 1–26 *Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts*  
714 and cultures.

715 Domínguez, L., and C. Luoma. 2020. Decolonising conservation policy: How colonial land and  
716 conservation ideologies persist and perpetuate indigenous injustices at the expense of the  
717 environment. *Land* 9:11–14.

718 Donaldson, M. R., N. J. Burnett, D. C. Braun, C. D. Suski, S. G. Hinch, S. J. Cooke, and J. T.  
719 Kerr. 2016. Taxonomic bias and international biodiversity conservation research. *Facets*  
720 1:105–113.

721 Douglas, H. 2009. *Science, Policy, and the Value-Free Ideal*. University of Pittsburgh Press,  
722 Pittsburgh.

723 Dowie, M. 2011. Conservation refugees: the hundred-year conflict between global conservation  
724 and native peoples. MIT Press.

725 Drury, R., K. Homewood, and S. Randall. 2011. Less is more: The potential of qualitative  
726 approaches in conservation research. *Animal Conservation* 14:18–24.

727 Duffy, R., F. Massé, E. Smidt, E. Marijnen, B. Büscher, J. Verweijen, M. Ramutsindela, T.  
728 Simlai, L. Joanny, and E. Lunstrum. 2019. Why we must question the militarisation of  
729 conservation. *Biological Conservation* 232:66–73.

730 Echeverri, A., D. S. Karp, R. Naidoo, J. Zhao, and K. M. A. Chan. 2018. Approaching human-  
731 animal relationships from multiple angles: A synthetic perspective. *Biological Conservation*  
732 224:50–62.

733 Eigenbrode, S. D., M. O. O’Rourke, D. M. Wulforth, C. S. Althoff, K. M. Goldberg, W. Morse,  
734 M. Nielsen-Pincus, J. Stephens, L. Winowiecki, and N. A. Bosque-Perez. 2007. Employing  
735 philosophical dialog in collaborative science. *BIOScience* 57.

736 Elliott, K. C. 2017. *A Tapestry of Values: An Introduction to Values in Science*. Page (O. U.  
737 Press, Ed.). New York.

738 Elliott, K. C., and D. B. Resnik. 2014. Science, policy, and the transparency of values.  
739 *Environmental Health Perspectives* 122:A291–A292.

740 Evelyn, A. C., I. Fazey, M. Pinard, and X. Lambin. 2008. The influence of philosophical  
741 perspectives in integrative research: A conservation case study in the Cairngorms National  
742 Park. *Ecology and Society* 13.

743 Fabricius, C., R. Scholes, and G. Cundill. 2006. Mobilizing knowledge for integrated ecosystem  
744 assessments. *Page Bridging Scales and Knowledge Systems : Concepts and Applications in*  
745 *Ecosystem Assessment*.



746 Feeley, K. J., J. T. Stroud, and T. M. Perez. 2017. Most ‘global’ reviews of species’ responses to  
 747 climate change are not truly global. *Diversity and Distributions* 23:231–234.

748 Finlay, L. 1998. Reflexivity: an essential component for all research? *British Journal of*  
 749 *Occupational Therapy* 61:453–456.

750 Finlay, L. 2002. “Outing” the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity.  
 751 *Qualitative Health Research* 12:531–545.

752 Fox, H. E., C. Christian, J. C. Nordby, O. R. W. Pergams, G. D. Peterson, and C. R. Pyke. 2006.  
 753 Perceived barriers to integrating social science and conservation. *Conservation Biology*  
 754 20:1817–1820.

755 Freshwater, D., and G. Rolfe. 2001. Critical reflexivity: a politically and ethically engaged  
 756 research method for nursing. *Journal of Research in Nursing* 6:526–537.

757 Game, E. T., E. Meijaard, D. Sheil, and E. McDonald-Madden. 2014. Conservation in a wicked  
 758 complex world; challenges and solutions. *Conservation Letters* 7:271–277.

759 Garland, E. 2008. The elephant in the room: confronting the colonial character of wildlife  
 760 conservation in Africa. *African Studies Review* 51:51–74.

761 Gossa, C., M. Fisher, and E. J. Milner-Gulland. 2015. The research-implementation gap: How  
 762 practitioners and researchers from developing countries perceive the role of peer-reviewed  
 763 literature in conservation science. *Oryx* 49:80–87.

764 Gould, R. K., M. Pai, B. Muraca, and K. M. A. Chan. 2019. He ‘ike ‘ana ia i ka pono (it is a  
 765 recognizing of the right thing): how one indigenous worldview informs relational values  
 766 and social values. *Sustainability Science* 14:1213–1232.

767 Gray, N. J., A. Meeker, S. Ravensberden, A. Kipp, and J. Faulkner. 2017. Producing science and  
 768 global citizenship? Volunteer tourism and conservation in Belize. *Tourism Recreation*

769        Research 42:199–211.

770    Gray, S. M., C. R. Booher, K. C. Elliott, D. B. Kramer, J. C. Waller, J. J. Millspaugh, B. M.

771        Kissui, and R. A. Montgomery. 2019. Research-implementation gap limits the actionability

772        of human-carnivore conflict studies in East Africa. *Animal Conservation*:1–11.

773    Green, S. J., J. Armstrong, M. Bogan, E. Darling, S. Kross, C. M. Rochman, A. Smyth, and D.

774        Veríssimo. 2015. Conservation needs diverse values, approaches, and practitioners.

775        *Conservation Letters* 8:385–387.

776    Greenwood, D. J., and M. Levin. 2007. Introduction to Action Research.

777    Guillemin, M., and L. Gillam. 2004. Ethics, reflexivity, and “Ethically important moments” in

778        research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10:261–280.

779    Haas, E. J., and C. L. Hoebbel. 2018. Filling in the “whys” of quantitative data: the roles of non-

780        research and reflexivity in applied safety climate research. SAGE Publications Ltd.

781    Holland, J. H. 1992. Complex adaptive systems. *Daedalus* 121:17–30.

782    Holland, J. H. 2006. Studying complex adaptive systems. *Journal of Systems Science and*

783        *Complexity* 19:1–8.

784    Hopf, H., A. Krief, G. Mehta, and S. A. Matlin. 2019. Fake science and the knowledge crisis:

785        Ignorance can be fatal. *Royal Society Open Science* 6.

786    Horton, C. C., T. R. Peterson, P. Banerjee, and M. J. Peterson. 2016. Credibility and advocacy in

787        conservation science. *Conservation Biology* 30:23–32.

788    Huntley, B. J. 2014. Good news from the South: Biodiversity mainstreaming - A paradigm shift

789        in conservation? *South African Journal of Science* 110:1–4.

790    Ibbett, H., and S. Brittain. 2019. Conservation publications and their provisions to protect

791        research participants. *Conservation Biology* 0:1–13.

792 Iwanaga, T., H. Wang, T. E. Koralewski, W. E. Grant, A. J. Jakeman, and J. C. Little. 2021.  
793       Toward a complete interdisciplinary treatment of scale: Reflexive lessons from  
794       socioenvironmental systems modeling. *Elementa*:1–28.

795 Jenkins, L. D., S. M. Maxwell, and E. Fisher. 2012. Increasing conservation impact and policy  
796       relevance of research through embedded experiences. *Conservation Biology* 26:740–742.

797 Jones, N. A., S. Shaw, H. Ross, K. Witt, and B. Pinner. 2016. The study of human values in  
798       understanding and managing social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 21.

799 Kareiva, P., and M. Marvier. 2012. What is conservation science? *BioScience* 62:962–969.

800 Kearney, A. 2019. Interculturalism and responsive reflexivity in a settler colonial context.  
801       *Religions* 10.

802 Keeney, R. L. 2004. Framing public policy decisions. *International Journal of Technology,*  
803       *Policy and Management* 4:95–115.

804 Knight, A. T., C. N. Cook, K. H. Redford, D. Biggs, C. Romero, A. Ortega-Argueta, C. D.  
805       Norman, B. Parsons, M. Reynolds, G. Eoyang, and M. Keene. 2019. Improving  
806       conservation practice with principles and tools from systems thinking and evaluation.  
807       *Sustainability Science* 14:1531–1548.

808 Knight, A. T., R. M. Cowling, M. Rouget, A. Balmford, A. T. Lombard, and B. M. Campbell.  
809       2008. Knowing but not doing: Selecting priority conservation areas and the research-  
810       implementation gap. *Conservation Biology* 22:610–617.

811 Koot, S., P. Hebinck, and S. Sullivan. 2020. Science for success—A conflict of interest?  
812       researcher position and reflexivity in socio-ecological research for CBNRM in Namibia.  
813       *Society and Natural Resources* 0:1–18.

814 Larocco, A. A., J. E. Shinn, and K. Madise. 2019. Reflections on positionalities in social science

815 fieldwork in Northern Botswana: A call for decolonizing research. *Politics and Gender*:1–  
816 29.

817 Laurance, W. F., H. Koster, M. Grooten, A. B. Anderson, P. A. Zuidema, S. Zwick, R. J. Zagt,  
818 A. J. Lynam, M. Linkie, and N. P. R. Anten. 2012. Making conservation research more  
819 relevant for conservation practitioners. *Biological Conservation* 153:164–168.

820 Law, E. A., N. J. Bennett, C. D. Ives, R. Friedman, K. J. Davis, C. Archibald, and K. A. Wilson.  
821 2017. Equity trade-offs in conservation decision making. *Conservation Biology* 32:294–  
822 303.

823 Lawrence, A., and S. Molteno. 2012. From rationalism to reflexivity? Reflections on change in  
824 the UK biodiversity action plan. *Reflexive Governance for Global Public Goods*:283–298.

825 Lélé, S., and R. B. Norgaard. 2005. Practicing interdisciplinarity. *BioScience* 55:967.

826 Levin, S. A. 1998. Ecosystems and the biosphere as complex adaptive systems. *Ecosystems*  
827 1:431–436.

828 Liénard, J. F., T. Achakulvisut, D. E. Acuna, and S. V. David. 2018. Intellectual synthesis in  
829 mentorship determines success in academic careers. *Nature Communications* 9:1–13.

830 Liu, J., T. Dietz, S. R. Carpenter, M. Alberti, C. Folke, E. Moran, A. N. Pell, P. Deadman, T.  
831 Kratz, J. Lubchenco, E. Ostrom, Z. Ouyang, W. Provencher, C. L. Redman, S. H.  
832 Schneider, and W. W. Taylor. 2007. Complexity of coupled human and natural systems.  
833 *Science* 317:1513–1516.

834 Longino, H. 2002. *The Fate of Knowledge*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

835 Lynch, A. J. J. 2017. Respect, reflect, and engage—enhancing biophysical research practices with  
836 Indigenous people, their land, and culture. *Australasian Journal of Environmental*  
837 *Management* 24:319–331.

838 Lynch, A. J. J., E. Kalumanga, and G. A. Ospina. 2016. Socio-ecological aspects of sustaining  
839 Ramsar wetlands in three biodiverse developing countries. *Marine and Freshwater Research*  
840 67:850–868.

841 Lynch, M. 2000. Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge.  
842 *Theory, Culture and Society* 17:26–54.

843 MacKenzie, J. M. 1988. *The Empire of Nature*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

844 MacMynowski, D. P. 2007. Pausing at the brink of interdisciplinarity: Power and knowledge at  
845 the meeting of social and biophysical science. *Ecology and Society* 12.

846 Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a  
847 concept. Pages 240–270 *Cultural Studies*.

848 Mascia, M. B., J. P. Brosius, T. A. Dobson, B. C. Forbes, M. A. Mckean, and N. J. Turner. 2003.  
849 Conservation and the social sciences. *Conservation Biology* 17:649–650.

850 Matulis, B. S., and J. R. Moyer. 2017. Beyond inclusive conservation: the value of pluralism, the  
851 need for agonism, and the case for social instrumentalism. *Conservation Letters* 10:279–  
852 287.

853 Mauthner, N. S., and A. Doucet. 2003. Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in  
854 qualitative data analysis. *Sociology* 37:413–431.

855 McMullin, E. 2000. Values in Science. Page *in* W. Newton-Smith, editor. *A Companion to the*  
856 *Philosophy of Science*. Blackwell Publishing Inc., Oxford.

857 Messier, C., K. Puettmann, R. Chazdon, K. P. Andersson, V. A. Angers, L. Brotons, E. Filotas,  
858 R. Tittler, L. Parrott, and S. A. Levin. 2015. From management to stewardship: viewing  
859 forests as complex adaptive systems in an uncertain world. *Conservation Letters* 8:368–377.

860 Miller, T. R., T. D. Baird, C. M. Littlefield, and G. Kofinas. 2008. Epistemological pluralism:

861 reorganizing interdisciplinary research. *Ecology and Society* 13.

862 Milner, H. R. 2007. Race, culture, and researcher positionality: working through dangers seen,  
863 unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher* 36:388–400.

864 Milstein, T., M. Thomas, and J. Hoffmann. 2019. Dams and flows: immersing in Western  
865 meaning systems in search of ecocultural reflexivity. *Environmental Communication*  
866 13:104–117.

867 Mishra, C., J. C. Young, M. Fiechter, B. Rutherford, and S. M. Redpath. 2017. Building  
868 partnerships with communities for biodiversity conservation: lessons from Asian mountains.  
869 *Journal of Applied Ecology* 54:1583–1591.

870 Mkumbukwa, A. R. 2008. The evolution of wildlife conservation policies in Tanzania during the  
871 colonial and post-independence periods. *Development Southern Africa* 25:589–600.

872 Montana, J., L. Elliott, M. Ryan, and C. Wyborn. 2020. The need for improved reflexivity in  
873 conservation science. *Environmental Conservation* 47:217–219.

874 Montgomery, R. A., K. Borona, H. Kasozi, T. Mudumba, and M. Ogada. 2020. Positioning  
875 human heritage at the center of conservation practice. *Conservation Biology*.

876 Montgomery, R. A., K. C. Elliott, M. W. Hayward, S. M. Gray, J. J. Millspaugh, S. J. Riley, B.  
877 M. Kissui, D. B. Kramer, R. J. Moll, T. Mudumba, E. D. Tans, A. B. Muneza, L. Abade, J.  
878 M. Beck, C. F. Hoffmann, C. R. Booher, and D. W. Macdonald. 2018a. Examining evident  
879 interdisciplinarity among prides of lion researchers. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*  
880 6:1–13.

881 Montgomery, R. A., K. M. Redilla, W. Ortiz-Calo, T. Smith, B. Keller, and J. J. Millspaugh.  
882 2018b. Evaluating the individuality of animal-habitat relationships. *Ecology and Evolution*  
883 8:10893–10901.

884 Moon, K., V. M. Adams, and B. Cooke. 2019. Shared personal reflections on the need to  
 885 broaden the scope of conservation social science. *People and Nature* 1:426–434.

886 Moon, K., and D. Blackman. 2014. A Guide to Understanding Social Science Research for  
 887 Natural Scientists. *Conservation Biology* 28:1167–1177.

888 Moon, K., D. A. Blackman, V. M. Adams, R. M. Colvin, F. Davila, M. C. Evans, S. R.  
 889 Januchowski-Hartley, N. J. Bennett, H. Dickinson, C. Sandbrook, K. Sherren, F. A. V. St.  
 890 John, L. van Kerkhoff, and C. Wyborn. 2018. Expanding the role of social science in  
 891 conservation through an engagement with philosophy, methodology, and methods. *Methods*  
 892 *in Ecology and Evolution* 10:294–302.

893 Moon, K., T. D. Brewer, S. R. Januchowski-Hartley, V. M. Adams, and D. A. Blackman. 2016.  
 894 A guideline to improve qualitative social science publishing in ecology and conservation  
 895 journals. *Ecology and Society* 21.

896 Muhammad, M., N. Wallerstein, A. L. Sussman, M. Avila, and B. Duran. 2015. Reflections on  
 897 researcher identity and power: The impact of positionality on community based  
 898 participatory research (CBPR ) processes and outcomes. *Critical Sociology* 41.

899 National Science Foundation, N. C. for S. and E. S. 2019. Women, minorities, and persons with  
 900 disabilities in science and engineering. Page Special Report NSF 19-304.

901 Nel, J. L., D. J. Roux, A. Driver, L. Hill, A. C. Maherry, K. Snaddon, C. R. Petersen, L. B.  
 902 Smith-Adao, H. Van Deventer, and B. Reyers. 2016. Knowledge co-production and  
 903 boundary work to promote implementation of conservation plans. *Conservation Biology*  
 904 30:176–188.

905 Newing, H. 2010. Interdisciplinary training in environmental conservation: Definitions, progress  
 906 and future directions. *Environmental Conservation* 37:410–418.

907 Norberg, J., and G. S. Cumming. 2008. Complexity Theory for a Sustainable Future. Columbia  
908 University Press.

909 Norris, P. E., M. O. O'Rourke, A. S. Mayer, and K. E. Halvorsen. 2016. Managing the wicked  
910 problem of transdisciplinary team formation in socio-ecological systems. *Landscape and*  
911 *Urban Planning* 154:115–122.

912 North, M. A., W. W. Hastie, and L. Hoyer. 2020. Out of Africa: The underrepresentation of  
913 African authors in high-impact geoscience literature. *Earth-Science Reviews* 208:103262.

914 Noss, R. 1999. Is there a special conservation biology ? *Conservation Biology*:113–122.

915 O'Rourke, M. O., and S. J. Crowley. 2013. Philosophical intervention and cross-disciplinary  
916 science: The story of the Toolbox Project. *Synthese* 190:1937–1954.

917 Olsson, P., C. Folke, and F. Berkes. 2004. Adaptive comanagement for building resilience in  
918 social-ecological systems. *Environmental Management* 34:75–90.

919 Pasgaard, M., N. Dawson, L. V. Rasmussen, M. Enghoff, and A. Jensen. 2017. The research and  
920 practice of integrating conservation and development: Self-reflections by researchers on  
921 methodologies, objectives and influence. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 9:50–60.

922 Peterson, R. B., D. Russell, P. West, and J. P. Brosius. 2010. Seeing (and doing) conservation  
923 through cultural lenses. *Environmental Management* 45:5–18.

924 Pielke Jr., R. A. 2007. The honest broker: making sense of science in policy and politics.  
925 Cambridge University Press.

926 Pooley, S., M. Barua, W. Beinart, A. J. Dickman, G. Holmes, J. Lorimer, A. J. Loveridge, D. W.  
927 Macdonald, G. Marvin, S. M. Redpath, C. Sillero-Zubiri, A. Zimmermann, and E. J.  
928 Milner-Gulland. 2016. An interdisciplinary review of current and future approaches to  
929 improving human–predator relations. *Conservation Biology* 31:513–523.



930 Pooley, S. P., J. A. Mendelsohn, and E. J. Milner-Gulland. 2014. Hunting down the chimera of  
 931 multiple disciplinarity in conservation science. *Conservation Biology* 28:22–32.

932 Preiser, R., R. Biggs, A. De Vos, and C. Folke. 2018. Social-ecological systems as complex  
 933 adaptive systems: Organizing principles for advancing research methods and approaches.  
 934 *Ecology and Society* 23.

935 Pullin, A. S., T. M. Knight, D. A. Stone, and K. Charman. 2004. Do conservation managers use  
 936 scientific evidence to support their decision-making? *Biological Conservation* 119:245–252.

937 Quarshie, A., A. Salmi, and Z. Wu. 2019. From equivocality to reflexivity in biodiversity  
 938 protection. *Organization and Environment*.

939 Randeria, S. 2007. Global Designs and Local Lifeworlds: Colonial Legacies of Conservation,  
 940 Disenfranchisement, and Environmental Givernance in Postcolonial India. *Interventions*  
 941 9:12–30.

942 Redpath, S. M., J. Young, A. Evely, W. M. Adams, W. J. Sutherland, A. Whitehouse, A. Amar,  
 943 R. A. Lambert, J. D. C. Linnell, A. Watt, and R. J. Gutiérrez. 2013. Understanding and  
 944 managing conservation conflicts. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 28:100–109.

945 Reed, M. S., L. C. Stringer, I. Fazey, A. C. Evely, and J. H. J. Kruijsen. 2014. Five principles for  
 946 the practice of knowledge exchange in environmental management. *Journal of*  
 947 *Environmental Management* 146:337–345.

948 Robinson, D., K. J. C. Hill, A. Garnet Ruffo, S. Couture, and L. C. Ravensbergen. 2019a.  
 949 Rethinking the practice and performance of indigenous land acknowledgement. *Canadian*  
 950 *Theatre Review* 177:20–30.

951 Robinson, K. F., A. K. Fuller, R. C. Stedman, W. F. Siemer, and D. J. Decker. 2019b. Integration  
 952 of social and ecological sciences for natural resource decision making: challenges and

953 opportunities. *Environmental Management* 63:565–573.

954 Rodríguez, I., and M. L. Inturias. 2018. Conflict transformation in indigenous peoples’  
 955 territories: doing environmental justice with a ‘decolonial turn.’ *Development Studies*  
 956 *Research* 5:90–105.

957 Rogers, K. H., R. Luton, H. Biggs, R. O. Biggs, S. Blignaut, A. G. Choles, C. G. Palmer, and P.  
 958 Tangwe. 2013. Fostering complexity thinking in action research for change in social-  
 959 ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 18.

960 Roldan-Hernandez, L., A. B. Boehm, and J. R. Mihelcic. 2020. Parachute environmental science  
 961 and engineering. *Environmental Science and Technology* 54.

962 Rosenthal, M. F., M. Gertler, A. D. Hamilton, S. Prasad, and M. C. B. Andrade. 2017.  
 963 Taxonomic bias in animal behaviour publications. *Animal Behaviour* 127:83–89.

964 Ross, C. 2017a. *Ecology and Power in the Age of Empire: Europe and the Transformation of the*  
 965 *Tropical World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

966 Ross, D. 2017b. Black country, white wilderness: conservation, colonialism, and conflict in  
 967 Tasmania. *Journal for Undergraduate Ethnography* 7:1–24.

968 Rust, N. A., A. Abrams, D. W. S. Challender, G. Chapron, A. Ghoddousi, J. A. Glikman, C. H.  
 969 Gowan, C. Hughes, A. Rastogi, A. Said, A. Sutton, N. Taylor, S. Thomas, H. Unnikrishnan,  
 970 A. D. Webber, G. Wordingham, and C. M. Hill. 2017. Quantity does not always mean  
 971 quality: the importance of qualitative social science in conservation research. *Society and*  
 972 *Natural Resources* 30:1304–1310.

973 Sandri, S. 2009. Reflexivity in Economics. *Page Reflexivity in Economics*.

974 Schlüter, M., A. Baeza, G. Dressler, K. Frank, J. Groeneveld, W. Jager, M. A. Janssen, R. R. J.  
 975 McAllister, B. Müller, K. Orach, N. Schwarz, and N. Wijermans. 2017. A framework for

976 mapping and comparing behavioural theories in models of social-ecological systems.  
 977 Ecological Economics 131:21–35.

978 Schroeder, D., K. Chatfield, M. Singh, R. Chennells, and P. Herissone-Kelly. 2019. The San  
 979 Code of Research Ethics. Page Equitable Research Partnerships: A Global Code of Conduct  
 980 to Counter Ethics Dumping.

981 Schroeder, D., J. Cook, F. Hirsch, and S. Fenet. 2018. Ethics Dumping Case Studies from North-  
 982 South Research. Springer International Publishing.

983 Schuurbiers, D., and E. Fisher. 2009. Lab-scale intervention. EMBO reports 10:424–427.

984 Schwandt, T. A. 2011. Reflexivity. Page The SAGE Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry By: SAGE  
 985 Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks, California.

986 Settles, I. H., S. T. Brassel, P. A. Soranno, K. S. Cheruvelil, G. M. Montgomery, and K. C.  
 987 Elliott. 2019. Team climate mediates the effect of diversity on environmental science team  
 988 satisfaction and data sharing. Plos One 14:e0219196.

989 Singh, J., and H. Van Houtum. 2002. Post-colonial nature conservation in Southern Africa: Same  
 990 emperors, new clothes? GeoJournal 58:253–263.

991 Singh, S., M. Granski, M. del P. Victoria, and S. Javdani. 2018. The praxis of decoloniality in  
 992 researcher training and community-based data collection. American Journal of Community  
 993 Psychology 62:385–395.

994 Soulé, M. E. 1985. What is conservation biology? BioScience 35:727–734.

995 Stefanoudis, P. V., W. Y. Licuanan, T. H. Morrison, S. Talma, J. Veitayaki, and L. C. Woodall.  
 996 2021. Turning the tide of parachute science. Current Biology 31:R184–R185.

997 Stronach, I., D. Garratt, C. Pearce, and H. Piper. 2007. Reflexivity, the picturing of selves, the  
 998 forging of method. Qualitative Inquiry 13:179–203.

999 Stroud, J. T., E. Rehm, M. Ladd, P. Olivas, and K. J. Feeley. 2014. Is conservation research  
 1000 money being spent wisely? Changing trends in conservation research priorities. *Journal for*  
 1001 *Nature Conservation* 22:471–473.

1002 Swart, J. A. A., J. Zevenberg, P. Ho, J. Cortina, M. Reed, M. Derak, S. Vella, H. Zhao, and H. J.  
 1003 van der Windt. 2018. Involving society in restoration and conservation. *Restoration Ecology*  
 1004 26:S3–S6.

1005 Syracuse, F. S. 2016. Reflexivity, positionality and participatory ethics: Negotiating fieldwork  
 1006 dilemmas in international research. *Acme*.

1007 Takacs, D. 2020. Whose voices count in biodiversity conservation? Ecological democracy in  
 1008 biodiversity offsetting, REDD+, and rewilding. *Journal of Environmental Policy and*  
 1009 *Planning* 22:43–58.

1010 Tallis, H., and J. Lubchenco. 2014. A call for inclusive conservation. *Nature* 515:27–28.

1011 Tapela, B. N., L. Maluleke, and C. Mavhunga. 2007. New architecture, old agendas:  
 1012 Perspectives on social research in rural communities neighbouring the Kruger National  
 1013 Park. *Conservation and Society* 5:60–87.

1014 Toomey, A. H., A. T. Knight, and J. Barlow. 2017. Navigating the space between research and  
 1015 implementation in conservation. *Conservation Letters* 10:619–625.

1016 Trisos, C. H., J. Auerbach, and M. Katti. 2021. Decoloniality and anti-oppressive practices for a  
 1017 more ethical ecology. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*.

1018 de Vos, A., R. Biggs, and R. Preiser. 2019. Methods for understanding social-ecological systems:  
 1019 A review of place-based studies. *Ecology and Society* 24:1–24.

1020 Vucetich, J. A., D. Burnham, E. A. Macdonald, J. T. Bruskotter, S. Marchini, A. Zimmermann,  
 1021 and D. W. Macdonald. 2018. Just conservation: What is it and should we pursue it?

1022 Biological Conservation 221:23–33.

1023 Wark, J. 2021. Land acknowledgements in the academy: Refusing the settler myth. *Curriculum*

1024 *Inquiry* 51:191–209.

1025 Watts, D. J. 2017. Should social science be more solution-oriented? *Nature Human Behaviour*.

1026 West, P., J. Igoe, and D. Brockington. 2006. Parks and peoples: the social impact of protected

1027 areas. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35.

1028 White, R. M., A. Fischer, K. Marshall, J. M. J. Travis, T. J. Webb, S. di Falco, S. M. Redpath,

1029 and R. van der Wal. 2009. Developing an integrated conceptual framework to understand

1030 biodiversity conflicts. *Land Use Policy* 26:242–253.

1031 Whitfield, J. 2008. Group Theory. *Nature* 455:1–10.

1032 Wilson, J. R. U., S. Proches, B. Braschler, E. S. Dixon, and D. M. Richardson. 2007. The (bio)

1033 diversity of science reflects the interests of society. *Frontiers in Ecology and the*

1034 *Environment* 5:409–414.

1035 Wilson, K. A., N. A. Auerbach, K. Sam, A. G. Magini, S. L. Moss, S. D. Langhans, S. Budiharta,

1036 D. Terzano, and E. Meijaard. 2016. Conservation research is not happening where it is most

1037 needed. *PLoS ONE* 14:1–5.

1038 Woodall, L. C., S. Talma, O. Steeds, P. Stefanoudis, and A. De Comarmond. 2021. Co-

1039 development, co-production, and co-dissemination of scientific research: a case study to

1040 demonstrate mutual benefits. *Biology Letters* 17.

1041 Woolley, A. W., C. F. Chabris, A. Pentland, N. Hashmi, and T. W. Malone. 2010. Evidence for a

1042 collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups. *Science* 330:686–688.

1043 Wuchty, S., B. F. Jones, and B. Uzzi. 2007. The increasing dominance of teams in production of

1044 knowledge. *Science* 316:1036–1039.

1045 Wyborn, C., J. Montana, N. Kalas, S. Clement, F. Davila, N. Knowles, E. Louder, M. Balan, J.  
1046 Chambers, L. Christel, T. Forsyth, G. Henderson, S. Izquierdo Tort, M. Lim, M. J.  
1047 Martinez-Harms, J. Merçon, E. Nuesiri, L. Pereira, V. Pilbeam, E. Turnhout, S. Wood, and  
1048 M. Ryan. 2021. An agenda for research and action toward diverse and just futures for life  
1049 on Earth. *Conservation Biology* 00:1–12.

1050 Young, J. C., K. Searle, A. Butler, P. Simmons, A. D. Watt, and A. Jordan. 2016. The role of  
1051 trust in the resolution of conservation conflicts. *Biological Conservation* 195:196–202.

1052