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Foreword

We are pleased to present this report, *Social Matters: Social Science and the Australian Seafood Industry: our past, our future*, which represents a significant resource for those interested in Australian fisheries research and governance, including researchers, managers and policy makers.

The aims of the overall project were:

1. To workshop and build upon the thematically documented FRDC audit of Social Science research (FRDC2009/317);

2. To workshop and thematically document current and ongoing research activities and drivers of participants. They key to this objective is the identification of research-setting processes, and the ways in which social scientists perceive gaps in knowledge and how this might be better aligned with the voices of industry; needs of public management and public interest;

3. Updated themes, key gaps and emerging issues (from 2009/317) that can be drawn upon by RACs in the immediate future;

4. Sharing of knowledge regarding emerging methodologies to maximise contributions of the social scientists to the investigations of identified challenges and research pathways;

5. Improved connections between social scientists and a fostering of a coherent voice for social science research in Australia that can be drawn upon to respond collectively to the industry's needs to address emerging issues.

This project addresses the FRDC Human Dimensions Research, Development and Extension Plan 2017 – 2020 goals, particularly the fourth and fifth:

4. Effective engagement to achieve socially-supported fisheries and aquaculture.

5. Enhancing human dimensions RD&E.
The project collated references to social science research from the past ten years, increasing the 2009 database from 163 to over 300 entries (both academic and grey literature). The data has been added to an online Mendeley account (‘owned’ by Tanya King). The account acts as a living database and will grow as more publications are added. This resource is now freely available and represents a significant resource for Australian fisheries governance, and will be distributed to key fisheries governance stakeholders under the guidance of the FRDC HDR. The reference list is included (see Appendix 4) as at the time of report submission.

The key activity of the project was the inaugural dedicated meeting of Australian seafood industry social scientists. The workshop was organised as a two-day workshop at Deakin University, with 20 participants representing a range of universities, research and government organisations.

In addition to Australian scholars from all States, and the ACT, the project invited Ratana Chuenpagdee, who leads the international network of small scale fisheries, ‘Too Big To Ignore’ which is based out of Memorial University, New Foundland CA. Insights from Professor Chuenpagdee significantly enhanced the discussion and helped to position the network within the global framework. The key contribution from Professor Chuenpagdee related to the challenges and opportunities presented when establishing a network. These included, ensuring a clear agenda for a network (rather than a discreet project which is seen as closed ended) with articulated values that have commonalities across groups. Social Network Analysis (SNA) and Discourse analysis can be useful to understand the properties of the networks, the actors involved and their concerns, and in so doing understand how practicing social scientists can better utilise these networks and build social capital. Such a network would provide an important basis upon which to support this community of practice, and build and maintain conversations to generate a common voice, required to gain further political and financial support.
Outcomes of the workshop:

- Recognition that many arrive at fisheries social science by circuitous routes, bringing a breadth of alternative skills and perspectives;

- Following on from the previous point, the group has the capacity to identify gaps in research from a diverse range of perspectives and angles, enhancing the capacity of connected RACs to be alerted to relevant and impactful domains of future research (see appendix 1-3);

- Participants agreed that the network should continue in some form, with the temporary name, Social Matters Initiative (SMI);

- Creation of a shared contact list, including research interest biographies;

- Agreement on the need for enhanced ‘visibility’ of seafood industry social scientists, to each other, to policy makers, managers, industry and research funders (beyond the FRDC);

- Recognition that social scientists are often unable or reluctant to take ‘leadership’ roles, and that this must change;

- Agreement on a number of guiding principles that unite the group -‘justice’; ‘enhanced management outcomes’ - without being exclusive of others, including those from other disciplines;

- Establishment of a Steering Committee from all States and the ACT, to develop the goals of the SMI, including:
  - Drafting a journal article;
  - Exploring the feasibility of an edited book;
- Exploring the establishment of a multi-platform digital presence, grounded in a web-site with social media satellites;

- Exploring the potential for future meetings of SMI to be timed to coincide with major Australian and international meetings of fisheries researchers and managers, such as the World Fisheries Congress 2020 in Adelaide.

- Exploring business models for establishing and maintaining a formal network.

A timeline was set for the middle of 2018 for the Steering Committee to report back to the group on their element of responsibility, and on that basis to re-evaluate the feasibility of moving forward and, if so, in which direction. In light of competing commitments this date has been revised back to late 2018 (coinciding with the end of the teaching year).
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Executive Summary

The project brought together Australian seafood industry social scientists for the first time ever in a specific and dedicated meeting, to discuss our identity, our role in governance, our past and our future. The Social Matters workshop ran over two days and involved 20 scholars, researchers and practitioners from around the country. The workshop also included one prominent international network actor and scholar who provided expert global perspective and strategic network-building advice.

The objectives outlined in the project application were as follows:

1. To workshop and build upon the thematically documented FRDC audit of Social Science research (FRDC2009/317);

2. To workshop and thematically document current and ongoing research activities and drivers of participants. They key to this objective is the identification of research-setting processes, and the ways in which social scientists perceive gaps in knowledge and how this might be better aligned with the voices of industry;

3. Updated themes, key gaps and emerging issues (from 2009/317) that can be drawn upon by RACs in the immediate future;
4. Sharing of knowledge regarding emerging methodologies to maximise contributions of the social scientists to the investigations of identified challenges and research pathways;

5. Improved connections between social scientists and a fostering of a coherent voice for social science research in Australia which can be drawn upon to respond collectively to the industry's needs to address emerging issues.

**Results/key findings**

**Shared vision:**
The workshop produced agreement on the shared goal to grow the visibility and influence of seafood industry social science in Australia through more structured collaborative efforts. While the exact form and label of the network was not settled upon, there was agreement to continue the discussions under the ‘place-holder’ title of the Social Matters Initiative (SMI).

**Mendeley library:**
The project collated references to social science research from the past ten years, increasing the 2009 database from 163 to 315 (both academic and grey literature). The reference list is included in Appendix 4 as at the time of report submission.

**DropBox:**
A group DropBox was created for the sharing of researcher information and contact details, relevant literature (particularly grey literature), conference information (who is attending what, where and when?), and group activities (see below).
Steering Committee:
A Steering Committee was established to develop several key initiatives of the SMI (see below), with plans to reconvene towards the end of 2018 (after the teaching year).

Research gaps:
A number of attempts were made to identify key themes and gaps in current and future social science research. Given the diversity of the group – a strength – this was a challenging process. See Appendix’s 1-3 for some insight into the kinds of issues discussed. It should be noted that a more ‘conversational’ approach could be implemented, through (for example), an annual meeting of RACs and attending researchers (and industry members), at each Seafood Directions conference.

Implications for relevant stakeholders
The implications of the workshop include:
1. Access for industry, including RACs and FRDC HDR, other researchers and managers to a list of key Australian seafood industry social scientists, their contact details, publications and reports, and current research focus;

2. More fluid sharing of information and resources among social scientists, including methodological developments and insights into enhancing the incorporation of findings into governance structures. The building of these information sharing channels facilitates a more agile and responsive research community who can build on (rather than replicate) each others’ work, to the benefit of the industry and the FRDC Human Dimensions RD&E goals;

3. A focus on raising the profile of social sciences input at the front end of decision making and the need to identify a number of champions across the country who are well placed to speak on behalf the discipline/s and connect industry/government with research and researchers.
Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the actions identified in Table 1 (see below) be progressed through identified working groups of the Social Matters Initiative, with relevant assistance from the FRDC Human Dimensions subprogram.

2. A small grant from FRDC sought to complete a comprehensive update of the Australian social science literature (including summaries), in line with the original Clarke report, which will assist with production of a journal article that comprehensively captures the Australian sector.

3. The SMI seeks the support of FRDC in establishing a social sciences session to be included in the forthcoming Seafood Directions 2019 in Melbourne, with a focus on the attendance of RAC members and the progression of effective communication both among researchers, and between researchers and industry stakeholders. Developing better communication between RACs and researchers via an annual meeting (at Seafood Directions) could build the capacity of the research community to identify and deliver research relevant to the RACs.

4. It is also recommended that FRDC be consulted on the options for hosting a website of the Social Matters Initiative, with the objective of creating a platform to share research papers, bibliographic data and research challenges facing the industry for forum discussion.

Keywords

Social science; visibility; network; Social Matters Initiative; industry viability; governance.
Social science research into the seafood industry has a history of around 60 years in much of the developed world (Acheson 1981; Barth 1966). These studies draw attention to the way that socially-embedded—human—decision making can influence catch-and-effort patterns. There has been a growing recognition of the role of social science in understanding what people do, from why fishers choose to remain in a fishery when it makes economic sense to leave, to how public perception and 'social licence' impacts on fisheries policy, to the challenges of negotiating access rights among diverse stakeholders. While economics as one of the social sciences disciplines has a profile in the management of fisheries, sociologists, anthropologists, historians, human geographers and political ecologists (among others), have also made significant contributions to the recognition of the fact that the only way humans can hope to influence the sustainability of the seafood industry and the marine environment as a seafood
habitat, (and by association, fish stocks, markets, consumption patterns, procurement methods and rates) is by regulating the actions of other humans.

In the past, there has been a tendency for social science to be reactive to issues in fisheries governance, to autopsy a crisis after it has happened, or to be invited to make sense of a problem after it has emerged. One of the key gaps in the design of social science research is the capacity to anticipate issues and design responses that can enhance the adaptability of the industry, both socially and economically. In order to do so practitioners within the discipline needs to be communicating effectively with each other in regards to best-practice methodologies, both for working effectively with industry and particularly with fisheries managers and policy makers.

There is a need for social scientists to increase their visibility in governance contexts and to play a more active role in up front decision-making, rather than a post facto explanatory role. This is necessary both in order to avoid preventable problems before they occur as well as to enhance the industry’s resilience through the application of innovative and socially appropriate governance strategies.

There is also a need to situate Australian research within a global context that anticipates and speaks to international imperatives, challenges and frameworks (e.g. FAO Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication). In the Australian context, the issues that the workshop aimed to engage with included; sharing the fish (resource sharing, property rights, global food security);
adaptability (fishing as livelihood, practice, culture, in a climate of rapid change and need for adaptation and innovation); research practice, data and decision support (how can social dimensions be monitored and incorporated more formally into decision making?; what innovations in social science practice are needed?).

Aims

The key aim of the project was to initiate a network of information-sharing and support for Australian fisheries social scientists. As a component of this objective, the Social Matters workshop aimed to, first, articulate and, then, identify strategies to raise the profile of social scientists. Increasing the visibility and credibility of social science through a more unified, or networked, presentation, was agreed as necessary in being able to increase the value proposition of the social sciences in fisheries governance planning, and ultimately more ‘just’ outcomes for stakeholders.

2009 Research Audit

In 2009, the Social Research Coordination Program (SSRCP) of the FRDC funded a project, Research audit of social sciences fisheries research (Clarke 2010), led by Dr Beverley Clarke. The project audited all social science research conducted on Australian fisheries and aquaculture between 1995 and 2009. The objectives of this project were (Clarke 2010:i):

1. To improve understanding, by way of a research audit, about the research that has been conducted into the social aspects of NRM with regard to fishing and aquaculture industries.
2. To assist in the development of targeted future research effort.

The SSRCP identified five research themes to help organise the audit (Clarke 2010:2):

1. Integrated decision making (integration of both the economic realities and social values in the context of ecological drivers to provide a triple bottom line basis for management decisions)

2. Social carrying capacity (capacity of civil society to accept and incorporate greater levels of fishery activity - both aquaculture and wild-catch. How is this assessed and can it be increased?)

3. Adoption and Adaptation identification and support of the ability to adapt to new circumstances and adopt innovations, technologies, business frameworks.

4. Identifying and translating social values: identifying and articulating the social values and impacts around fishing and interpreting these in the context of fisheries management and policy.

5. Industry characteristics: characteristics of both sectors of the industry and the supporting regional communities are articulated and explored for strengths and weaknesses.

For the period 1995-2009 the audit identified 163 items, broken down as follows (Clarke 2010:6):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of items published</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-1999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical spread</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Southern Australia’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Southeast Australia’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Eastern Australia’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Northern Australia’</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine planning regions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East marine planning region</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern marine region</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South east marine region</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South west marine region</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual (theory and model making)</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical (case studies, focus groups, qualitative and quantitative surveys)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied (evaluation, risk assessment, models)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frameworks/toolkits/guides</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous focus</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency research or agency supported research</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five research themes identified yielded the following results in the audit, and elicited a number of sub-themes in two of the original categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Research items</th>
<th>Identified sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated decision making</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social carrying capacity</td>
<td>3¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Clarke (2010:11) includes three papers as an indication of the kinds of work being done in the general field of social carrying capacity, noting that there were no resources that directly addressed the issue.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adoption and Adaptation</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>Frameworks to support the ability to adapt to new circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance, Strategic Policies and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Strategic Policies and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tools/Models/Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Instructive print information (maps, report cards, handbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Environmental Management Systems (EMS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) Incentive instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and translating social values</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Understanding importance of social values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Perceptions of Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Impact Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognising local values in research and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry characteristics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Recreational Fishing Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Characterising and assessing indigenous fishing effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis and assessment of the socio-economic situation of commercial enterprises and their associated communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several key gaps were identified within the audit, particularly in relation to the first two themes, and a range of suggestions made for future research.

Since 2009, the contributions of social scientists to the pool of research have increased significantly. The reasons for this are numerous, intersecting, and complex. Potentially the most significant of these is that the FRDC now has a dedicated Human Dimensions research subprogram which focuses on concerns around the people of the industry, and understanding their challenges, strengths and opportunities in the context of industry management and environmental pressures. More PhD candidates have graduated and some scholars relocated to Australia, resulting in some growth in the sector. Shifts in public and political sentiment, as well as key events, have also brought the relevance of social science perspectives on the seafood industry into sharper focus.

Take, for example, the public, political and legal events surrounding the attempt to introduce the so-called ‘super trawler’ the FV Margiris to Australian waters to fish in an output-controlled fishery. While compliant with the legal interpretation of statues and policies on fisheries management, the arrival of the Margiris was met with vocal opposition from significant sections of the Australian public. Indeed, such was the subjective, social disapproval of the super trawler and the public campaigning against its use in Australian waters that the legal framework had to be changed in order to prevent its legal operation. This case demonstrates that social matters matter, and that they matter to businesses, managers, the environment, communities and to the
legal basis of Australian seafood industry governance. Further to this, there is also increasing recognition through efforts in the area of EBFM and triple bottom line governance that the environment, or an industry cannot be managed in isolation of their economic and social impacts, values and benefits. New South Wales with its ambitious whole of Marine Estate Management plan is an example of efforts to move in a direction of proactive holistic management. These are examples whereby the integration of social sciences disciplines early in these planning, discovery and implementation process can be proactive and positive in identifying, understanding and heading-off potential conflicts and challenges, ultimately smoothing governance and implementation processes through increased efficiencies in the long term.

Given the growing importance of social science research in the marine management and Australian seafood industry—or, more accurately, broader recognition of its relevance—there’s a need to consolidate what we have done in the past, to consider the current situation, and to look to the future. With that broad framework in mind, the need was identified for a gathering of key Australian maritime social scientists, an event that forms the central activity of this project.

**Objectives**

The aims of the project were:

1. To workshop and build upon the thematically documented FRDC audit of Social Science research (FRDC2009/317);

2. To workshop and thematically document current and ongoing research activities and drivers of participants. They key to this objective is the identification of research-setting processes, and the ways in which social scientists perceive gaps in knowledge and how this might be better aligned with the voices of industry;
3. Updated themes, key gaps and emerging issues (from 2009/317) that can be drawn upon by RACs in the immediate future;

4. Sharing of knowledge regarding emerging methodologies to maximise contributions of the social scientists to the investigations of identified challenges and research pathways;

5. Improved connections between social scientists and a fostering of a coherent voice for social science research in Australia which can be drawn upon to respond collectively to the industry's needs to address emerging issues.

**Method**

The method used in this project centred on a two day workshop of key social scientists investigating the Australian seafood sector in Australia. The workshop was held at Deakin Downtown, the Deakin University corporate meeting venue, in central Melbourne, on the 19th and 20th February, 2018.

The project was organised by the project investigators, with Brooks taking on a paid administrative role in the planning stages of the project. Emily Ogier of FRDC’s HDR Subprogram was crucial to the design of the workshop invite-list and agenda. Deakin University provided the venue and other in-kind contributions (e.g. travel bookings), in order to facilitate the event.

**Determining the invite list**

The aim was to host a workshop of around 20 people, as this was the number felt to be both large enough to generate adequate discussion and provide a breadth of perspectives, while not being too many to convene and moderate.
As the core of the funding for the project was to be spent on facilitating attendance at the workshop—economy airfares and accommodation for one night—keeping the attendance list to around 20 was also necessary for budgeting purposes. Those invited had both:

- a strong track record in Australian fisheries research or research relevant to Australian fisheries, and

- an intention to continue researching on Australian fisheries into the foreseeable future.

Invitees were determined by Brooks, King and Ogier, based on their broad knowledge of the social science seafood community, with oversight and input from the FRDC HDR program. An effort was made to include participants from a range of institutions and organisations, as well as to achieve national coverage.

It was lamented that there was not enough scope to invite emerging scholars and practitioners (e.g. those still undergoing doctoral studies). However, it should be noted that the development of the entire maritime social science sector was—and remains—front-of-mind in the design of this project as a long-term endeavour; it is anticipated that this project will be a springboard from which broader and more expansive discussions about the field will emerge and progress.

The classification of economics as a social science was considered during the development of the invite-list. Indeed, the role of economics as a social science in fisheries management emerged as a key theme in discussions during the workshop, and will be described, below. It is suffice to note that economics has a well-established history of significant influence in fisheries governance, both in Australia and globally. The anthropologist, James McGoodwin (1990:73), describes the happy marriage between economics and fisheries management:

> When fisheries managers extended their attention beyond the biological aspects of managing the fisheries, it was natural that the discipline of economics captured their
attention. After all, Maiolo and Orbach note, ‘Economics has a language, a method and, for many, a track record that are more impressive to the nonsocial scientist than sociology, anthropology or other social science disciplines’.

In light of Objective 4 of the Social Matters project—to enhance the contribution of social sciences to relevant fisheries issues—it is fair to say that the goal of the workshop was to raise the profile and influence of social sciences beyond that of economics. As such, the decision was made to invite only those economists whose work encompassed a focus on understanding social quandaries, in preference or addition to enhancing biological insights into fisheries management.

**International perspective**

As part of the workshop, an invitation was extended to Professor Ratana Chuenpagdee, leader of the large international small-scale fisheries project, *Too Big To Ignore*, and Canada Research Chair in Natural Resource Sustainability and Community Development, Memorial University, Newfoundland. Given Professor Chuenpagdee’s position at the core of an international network of social scientists (among others) involved in fisheries research, she was invited to help situate Australian issues and concerns in a global context, as well as to strengthen connections between the international network and the Australian cohort. Further, the model of the *Too Big To Ignore* project offered a model of network, capacity and profile building that was seen to be of benefit to the burgeoning Australian network.

Participants in the workshop are in Appendix 5.
Agenda

The agenda for the workshop shifted significantly in response to discussion, particularly on day 2 of the workshop. The original agenda is provided in Appendix 6. Overall, the agenda served to provide a platform to introduce and establish areas of common interest and values in research and approaches, given that while these researchers were all aware of each other, most had not ever had the opportunity to meet face to face. As the basis of this, day one was focussed on reviewing a coming to a common understanding of what had been achieved through the contributions of social sciences in the last 20 years, and the current and future focus and governance arrangements of the FRDC HDR as one of the sectors key protagonists of fisheries social sciences research.

While the second day of the workshop had originally been envisaged to be one of a focus on emerging issues, the challenges faced both individually and collectively, of social scientists attempting to move the potential contribution of social sciences up the governance agenda, and that of collaborating across such divergent mind sets as represented by the span of social sciences disciplines, dominated Day 2 of the agenda. While these were originally envisaged as a component of the issues preventing a fulsome contribution of the discipline to marine and fisheries management, the calibre of the challenges was soon realised, and hence took much of the second day’s agenda, which was managed accordingly.

Facilitation

Tanya King introduced the workshop, Emily Ogier and Kate Brooks led a number of sessions on day one, and Professor Chuenpagdee delivered a session on day one. Facilitation on day two was undertaken by Kate Brooks.
Results

Resources update

The process of updating the 2009 Social Sciences audit has been initiated with the creation of a shared, online Mendeley library that can be accessed, edited, downloaded and updated by participants. It is anticipated that this library will persist as a ‘living’ document to be updated by stakeholders as new research emerges. At the time of submitting this report the number of references in the library was over 300.

A Dropbox folder has also been created to deposit—particularly—grey literature (reports and unpublished material) that may be difficult to access via library databases.

Working Group

A Working Group was established to progress a number of initiatives raised at the workshop (and outlined further, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group name</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>Andrew Song</td>
<td>Draft an article about Australian seafood industry social science, with the intention of input from the rest of the group, and drawing inspiration from a number of documents (refs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah Burns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Fabinyi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Edited book | Jacki Schirmer  
| Kate Brooks | Explore the market for an edited book. |
| Web presence | Tanya King | Explore the possibilities for hosting an online presence for the Social Matters Initiative, with a range of related components such as Twitter and Instagram, a document housing component, etc. |
| Business models | Social Sciences Network like AMSA - joining into their group as a subset? | Explore options for funding the group into the future. |
| Conference participation | AMSA  
*Seafood Directions* with a specific session devoted to the latest research and outcomes of SS research starting from 2019 | Emily Ogier to raise possibility. |
Themes and issues raised and discussed during workshop

Recognition that many arrive at fisheries social science by circuitous routes, bringing a breadth of alternative skills and perspectives;

At the beginning of the workshop participants were invited to reflect on their research agenda-setting process, or how they arrived at their particular research interest. What became apparent in that discussion that Australian seafood industry social scientists arrive at their research via a range of professional and personal paths. This means that within the community are a range of skill-sets and perspectives beyond that developed during a social science education. Andrew Song, for example, is a trained engineer. Kate Barclay studied Japanese, which is partially what let her to work in Asian fisheries. Michelle Voyer was trained as a biological scientist and used to be “one of those people who was yelled at a lot by industry” (a fisheries manager), before making the move to social science. Kate Brooks had a long career as a marketing executive before turning her attention to sociology research and fisheries in particular.

One of the drawbacks of such circuitous routes to social science was the potential for researchers to feel underqualified, or even fraudulent in their claims to social science expertise, rather than focus on their ability to enhance their social sciences experience with other disciplinary insights. This reluctance to step forward with confidence in their research was felt to undermine social scientists’ willingness to take leadership roles in relation to fisheries governance.

Overall, however, rather than being a negative feature, participants commented on the breadth of insight generated by such diverse backgrounds, and the extended networks that could be accessed via their integration into social science activity. It was agreed that future articulations of social science should champion the diversity of the sector as a strength, rather than ignore it, perceiving it as a weakness.
Participants agreed that the network should continue in some form, with the temporary name, Social Matters Initiative (SMI);

It was agreed that improving the ways in which social scientists are recognised was a valuable endeavour and should be progressed. It was decided to reflect the title of the workshop and to continue activities of the group under the title, Social Matters Initiative, with the proviso that the term is only a ‘place-holder’ term for further discussion, rather than a clearly defined group to emerge from the workshop.

Creation of a shared contact list, including research interest biographies;

See Appendix 5 for a list of workshop participants, contact email, twitter handle, and biography. No participant did not wish to be involved in the discussions moving forward.

Invited social scientists who were not able to attend the workshop expressed their desire to be involved in these discussions also. After the workshop, this list—contained in Dropbox—will be made available more widely in order to expand the network, and social scientists will be encouraged to add their details to the database.

Agreement on the need for enhanced ‘visibility’ of seafood industry social scientists, to each other; to policy makers; managers; industry, and research funders (beyond the FRDC);

A considerable amount of discussion was dedicated to the goal of the workshop and the need for enhanced ‘visibility’. Social scientists, by their nature, tend to have strong connections to industry members and communities. There was a comment lament, however, that social science tended to be relatively invisible at the policy-making, political and management level. Social science ‘components’ tended to be ‘tacked on’ to other ‘more serious’ or ‘more weighty’ projects focussing on biological science (for example). As such, social science insights tended
to be framed by the paradigms of other disciplines, undermining their potency, visibility and uptake.

Part of the issue was that social scientists and biological scientists and managers tended to work from a set of assumptions, and with a language, that was at odds. Comment was made that while the recent push for enhanced ‘science communication’ targeted the need for ‘hard’ sciences to present their findings in an accessible manner, social scientists tended not to see their presentation-style as potentially in need of such attention. It was noted that if social scientists feel they are not being ‘heard’ or ‘seen’, then it may be necessary to look at modifying our communication to better suit our desired audience (governance personnel as well as industry).

On this point it was noted that much could be learned from the economics branch of social science, which has a language much more suited to fisheries management than other social sciences (see McGoodwin 1990, above). The outcomes of economic research are, by nature, quantifiable, and therefore speak to a style of management in which measurement is central.

**Recognition that social scientists are often unable or reluctant to take ‘leadership’ roles, and that this must change;**

One of the points discussed was the reluctance of many social scientists to take up leadership roles, either on grant applications, boards, or other governance committees. This was partly attributed to systemic issues, and partly to social scientists’ awareness of their alignment either with either industry (as opposed to management) or as neutral observers (rather than as active stakeholders in favour of any one perspective), or a combination of both. There was a general agreement that social scientists needed to be able to become comfortable with bringing either disclosure or objectivity to these roles and ‘stepping up’ to the plate, to nominate and agitate
for such positions of influence. Further discussion within the discipline is required to assist social scientists in navigating these ideological dilemmas and challenges.

This challenge was faced by social scientists in the United States in the 1990s, and Australian scholars could benefit from lessons learned by key social science practitioners who managed to make a significant place for their ideas within management. Hosting someone with demonstrated expertise in bridging the divide between social science and policy decision-making (for example, at a Seafood Directions conference) would benefit Australian practitioners seeking to do the same.

**Build the field;**

There was recognition from the group that in order to achieve management recognition and involvement, we must demonstrate our capacity for high quality research, build our profile and become more ‘visible’. We must do so in a way that is understandable to the existing management framework and the communities with whom we work, without losing the disciplinary insights, frameworks and approaches that connect us to.

**Diversify funding models;**

FRDC is a key source of funding for many social scientists, along with others working with the seafood industry. There was recognition that in order to enhance the profile of social sciences, undertake research with a broad range of purposes and outcomes, and to increase the profile of our research both within the seafood sector and beyond, additional sources of funding should be sought. Targeting funders such as the Australian Research Council (ARC) was discussed, however further focussed discussion is required to develop and progress an approach to address this.
Champions;

There was recognition that social scientists are not occupying many leadership roles, particularly in large and cross-disciplinary research projects and programs. Leaders and opportunities for leadership are emerging, however, but it was recognised that as a community of practitioners within this discipline, we need to identify how we can capitalise on, grow and celebrate leadership actions by individuals within the system. This is in order to maximise social science research’s contribution to the industry. It is important to understand the journey of emerging leaders and what can we learn from them about what we need to do to make the next step to leadership.

There is a marked need for social science to play a greater role in the anticipation of challenges and opportunities in the seafood sector;

It is often recognised that social science can contribute to management decisions impacting the industry before they present a point of ‘crisis’. However, while the role of social science has, in the past, been characterised as being ‘post-facto’ social science (that ‘autopsies’ of events), it was recognised that there is a need for leaders in this space. Specifically this concerned social scientists having a seat at the decision making table, early in processes to assist in identifying the full complexity of industry challenges and hence research questions, in advance of a crises. This workshop represented a move towards the development of more professional and more visible Australian seafood industry social science community, that can engender confidence in calling social sciences to participate in early problem analysis and research decision making. While social scientists are relegated to a post nominal role in problem analysis and investigation they will continue to be forced into generating post facto analysis, and minimal contributions
to the avoidance of issues or optimisation of the health, resilience and sustainability of the seafood industry.

A key realisation to emerge from the workshop was that the group is characterised by diversity; diversity of motivation, identity, capacity and focus. Social scientists work with a range of different people and communities, and in dynamic social, economic and environmental contexts, so it should come as no surprise that it is challenging to define ‘who we are and what we do’. It is not impossible, of course, and the following themes or terms repeatedly emerged throughout the workshop, around which many in the group, could generally cohere.

Agreement on a number of guiding principles that unite the group without being exclusive of others, including those from other disciplines;

Justice

The term ‘justice’ was mentioned repeatedly in relation to the outcomes researchers sought from their work. The term was used in a general sense and did not refer to a particular group or entity (e.g. ‘currently licenced commercial fishers’ or ‘the environment’), or to a specific outcome (e.g. ‘keep all currently licenced commercial fishers in business’ or ‘make the environment as pristine as possible’). Rather, as noted by those whose research specialises in understanding how notions of ‘fairness’ are determined (Blader and Tyler 2003; Sweeney and McFarlin 1993; Van den Bos et al. 1997), what is ‘just’ depends on a great range of factors and can change depending on a raft of mitigating events, considerations and circumstances. One suggestion from the workshop was that ‘transparency’ was the key component of justice.

Our objective is to help question where, what and why they are doing what they do; and identify who benefits and who doesn’t as a result. Including understanding whose values are driving decisions? Why? And what are the consequences of that for different groups?
**Better outcomes**

One recognition made by the group was that many of the problems faced by the seafood industry emerge from social issues, including environmental failures. A key goal for those at the workshop was to improve the social outcomes for seafood industry stakeholders (without compromising environmental standards). This principle was related to the sense that social scientists tended to be engaged (by managers, policymakers and industry) only when there was a crisis or a problem to be solved. Workshop participants felt that if social science insights were incorporated into the planning phases of decision-making—rather than being ‘tacked on’ to the end, or in response to a resulting social crisis or failure—that such crises could be better anticipated and perhaps avoided, or at the least, effects mitigated to greater degrees than are currently achieved.

**To support environmental sustainability**

Our objectives are to identify how to encourage the behaviours, processes, governance (social behaviours and social systems) that are successful in achieving ecologically sustainable use.

**To support quality of life, wellbeing (understanding and managing social impacts during change)**

Our objectives are to increase understandings about how we ensure that engaging in freshwater and marine activities such as fishing is not detrimental to (and ideally supportive of) quality of life, health, wellbeing of all the people,
businesses/industry, and communities involved? How do we help people cope with change, build resilience to change, adapt successfully to change?

It is important to underline that this does not mean maintaining the status quo – and that hard decisions need to be made. Social Scientists can provide support for making appropriate decisions, without failing to support what is needed for long-term sustainability, due to potential short-term impacts (to give one example).

**Finding common values (understanding differences, challenging them)**

Social sciences are underpinned by understanding conflicting values, questioning differences, challenging, and finding commonalities that can aid identifying mediating pathways. Challenging received wisdom of all kinds, understanding the values underpinning it and unpacking that so people can find commonality is essential to robust social sciences. Including biophysical science.

**Progressing social science theory, methods, processes.**

Utilising our curiosity - that thing that makes us do what we do!

**Keeping conservationist messages ‘honest’**

While social scientists do not have a monopoly on truth, the benefit that the social sciences can bring is to clarify and explicate whose ‘truth’ is being used, and how it
relates to those of others to find common ground and the be able to open pathways to positive conversations and potential collaboration.

**What we don't do!!**

Unquestioningly support a questionable agenda (e.g. use social science to design propaganda aimed and encouraging unthinking acceptance of a particular practice).
Implications

Assessment of the impact of the outcomes on end users such as management, industry, consumers, etc. in Australia (where possible provide a statement of costs and benefits).

The workshop had the very beneficial effect of further clarifying and reinforcing in all attendee’s minds of the contributions that social sciences can make to the seafood industry.

The discussions undertaken, identified the prescient need for increased collaboration between social scientists (of all disciplines) to share knowledge and networks and collaborate in raising the profile of the potential that social scientists offer in identifying and clarifying research issues of future concern to the industry and government.

Several actions are required to both equip and facilitate social scientists working in the field of fisheries industry and management, to be able to position their capacity, and to step up and demand a seat at decision making tables in order to optimise the benefits that the industry can gain from the social sciences. These actions include:

Table 1: Implication Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Benefit achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment of an ongoing network of communication</td>
<td>Increased knowledge and awareness of work, resources and opportunities to position social sciences to benefit the seafood industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify potential research themes for cross collaboration (See Appendix 1)</td>
<td>Broad themes aligned with the objectives of funding bodies such as FRDC facilitate greater understanding and focus of key areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify emerging research questions of future benefit to the industry and its management (See Appendix 2)</td>
<td>Social scientists adopt a proactive rather than reactive position in relation to research calls; Clarity provided to research organisations such as FRDC as to the insights to specific industry related problems that SS can generate; Social Scientists can respond collectively to the industry’s needs to address emerging issues, and increasing the pool of resources available to the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Generate Social network and discourse analysis to understand who we as social scientists need to be talking to gain engagement and places at the decision-making tables.</td>
<td>Greater clarity as to the social capital gaps in the Social sciences network that can be filled to position social sciences better to make a positive contribution to the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify emerging mega trends in the industry where social sciences can contribute (See Appendix 3)</td>
<td>Highlight for industry issues that will need attention and work in advance of crises or issues being realised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Establish a session at Seafood Directions focussed on the use of social sciences in the seafood industry.</strong></td>
<td>This will allow sharing of new approaches and research amongst researchers to leverage knowledge. It will provide the opportunity for those non-social scientists interested to learn more to do. It will get social scientists to Seafood Directions and provide the networking opportunities to build their social capital with the industry, and increase the exposure of them and what they have to offer to decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Explore the feasibility of establishing an association of Social Scientists in the fisheries industry (i.e. wild catch and aquaculture)</strong></td>
<td>• Raise profile to go to for expert/disciplinary advice • Create community of practice – bring people together, encourage dialogue and practice • Interdisciplinary, not discipline specific • Improve quality of practice – reduce the incidence of bad social science and increase incidence of good social science • Eligibility for membership • Foster collaborative endeavour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

1. It is recommended that the actions identified in Table 1 (see below) be progressed through identified working groups of the Social Matters Initiative, with relevant assistance from the FRDC Human Dimensions subprogram.

2. A small grant from FRDC sought to complete a comprehensive update of the Australian social science literature (including summaries), in line with the original Clarke report, which will assist with production of a journal article that comprehensively captures the Australian sector.

3. The SMI seeks the support of FRDC in establishing a social sciences session to be included in the forthcoming Seafood Directions 2019 in Melbourne, with a focus on the attendance of RAC members and the progression of effective communication both among researchers, and between researchers and industry stakeholders. Developing better communication between RACs and researchers via an annual meeting (at Seafood Directions) could build the capacity of the research community to identify and deliver research relevant to the RACs.

4. It is also recommended that FRDC be consulted on the options for hosting a website of the Social Matters Initiative, with the objective of creating a platform to share research papers, bibliographic data and research challenges facing the industry for forum discussion.
Conclusion

The future for fisheries social science in Australia is promising, though various challenges stand in the way of researchers, industry and other stakeholders capitalising on this potential. While there is a large amount of talent in the sector, greater communication and collaboration could enhance the identification of key gaps, and refine and improve research design. Communication between researchers themselves would be an advantage, and a significant step has been made in this direction via the Social Matters Initiative workshop, but more can be done to facilitate communication between researchers and industry stakeholders, including members of RACs and government decision makers. Improving the confidence of those in the field to contribute meaningfully and demonstrably to policy formulation and implementation would improve the willingness of social scientists to engage more vocally in such discussions, and increase their capacity to lead – not just contribute to – interdisciplinary fisheries RD&E initiatives.

Further development

This project has initiated the creation of a number of shared network tools, namely the online Mendeley library and prior to a permanent platform being established, the shared Dropbox for the transferring of information, documents and other data.

Such sharing platforms necessarily require management, and therefore further work is required on the future of the Social Matters Initiative to establish the most appropriate location for such a platform and how it would be resourced.
Extension and Adoption

The project report has been shared with all attendees of the workshop for further input and correction, with a two-week period for comment, to ensure all thoughts generated by the workshop have been captured.

Subsequent to finalisation it will be shared with not only the attendees of the workshop, but also those social scientists unable to attend the workshop, and emerging social scientists in the field of fisheries social sciences research.

As part of the workshop, it was also agreed that a journal paper be generated to discuss the progress of social sciences in Australia to date, and future opportunities for development and more effective contributions to the industry into the future. It was further proposed that this be presented at an appropriate international conference with a view to generating discussion and cross fertilisation of ideas regarding, increasing the profile of social sciences amongst decision makers and generating earlier engagement with the sector by mangers and industry, to optimise contributions of the social sciences disciplines.

As noted earlier a key element of extending these ideas to industry was the proposal to include a session on the contribution of social sciences at the next Seafood Directions conference to be held in Melbourne in 2019.

It was also muted that this initiative could seek a profile within, for example, the Environment and Society theme of The Australian Sociological Association, and the suggestion will be pursued in connection with the annual conference of TASA in December 2018.

The final report will be circulated widely, with particular focus on the RACs, where the identification of key themes and gaps in research will be relevant to upcoming funding discussions. It should be noted, however, that we suggest a more ‘conversational’ approach to
identifying relevant research gaps in the future, with one possibility being the establishment of an annual meeting of RACs and attending researchers at the Seafood Directions conference.

**Project coverage**

No media or external coverage was sought for this project as it was not considered appropriate.

Email distribution lists have been collated.
Project materials developed

An updated list of research papers in fisheries social sciences has been generated by the project, which builds on the work undertaken by the FRDC and Beverly Clarke (FRDC 2009/317). See Appendix 4.

No other project materials have been generated from the workshop at this time.
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Research Gaps

A significant amount of time was spent attempting to ‘capture’ the enormous range of issues of interest to the group. Doing so is a challenging, and ongoing, process. The following three appendixes are based on sketches, notes etc., generated during such attempts, and not group consensus about the most important aspects or challenges of maritime social science. For the sake of clarity and transparency we include these ‘notes’, but make a distinction with what is provided, above, in ‘findings’.

APPENDIX 1: Suggested research themes

Strengthening the Base:
What options exist for improving economic viability of the seafood industry and increasing their resilience to processes of change?

Broadening the Scope:
What needs to be accounted for and emphasized in order to increase awareness of benefits and impacts of unintended consequences of fisheries and management decisions?

Enhancing the Stewardship:
What behaviours and incentives play into alternatives for fostering stewardship within fisheries?

Sharing the Beach & the Fish:
What mechanisms, behaviours and processes are required to secure livelihoods, physical space and rights to fish?

Governing the Governance:
What institutions and principles are suitable for the governance of fisheries?

Aquaculture:
How to obtain and maintain a social licence for inshore aquaculture?

2. What are the safety and social implications of working on deep sea offshore fish farms?

**APPENDIX 2 - Potential social sciences research questions of future benefit to industry:**

1. Visibility of fishing industry

   - What does the sector need to do to be prepared to engage in the Blue Economy?
   - How can the sector increase visibility among the public?
   - How can we build the capacity of women within the sector, and improve their visibility, give them due recognition?

2. How can the viability and values of fisheries and aquaculture be maintained?

3. How can fisheries producers best take advantage of new and emerging markets (e.g. Asia). Seafood CRC used to have that role so there is a gap there.

4. Why don’t production and marketing cooperatives work as well in Australia?

5. Marine spatial planning – how to manage this process? How to maintain a critical eye also towards this with regard to e.g. the impacts of MSP, the fact that some fishers not keen to do this.

6. Can visibility of fishers be used as a ‘nudge’ for compliance and enforcement, e.g. the default option is that everything is observed.

7. The scale and pace of technological change – e.g. unmanned vessels, robots etc. Can the industry adapt and are they tuned in to this?
APPENDIX 3: Emerging Mega Trends

- Increasing scarcity of resources
  - Reduced demand for work - therefore increased demand on marine resources for amenity demand
  - Increased interactions with mega fauna - whales
  - Technological innovations - how enduring are community fisheries and bespoke fisheries going to be in this changing environment.
  - Changes in governance and transnational corporations and the distribution of trust. New governance models

- What is the notion of community? What will be and how will that affect these future changes - how will this affect the interpretation of values.

- Drivers of innovation - human rights/inequality and health trends and implications

- Seafood consumption - other products from the sea

- Population and migration - movement of people

- Chemical manufacture of food

- Will recreational amenity mean more or less resource pressure?

- Maritime transition - trends from capture fisheries into aquaculture and/or tourism

- Movement of global trade and maritime transport and increased risks of diseases.

- Communication and the role of social media - how does the feeding of pre-determined information affect outcomes which narrows people’s perspective (distributed trust)
• Ecological knowledge - embedded within a number of things - but changing how people are collecting and disseminating knowledge in relation to performance and visibility.

• Increased emphasis on spatial boundaries - marine spatial planning and increased securitisation of the ocean.

• Food security in the blue economy.

• What changes in terms of who has stakes (public/private) and how will the actors be.

• Implications of changes in legal and other interpretations of the recognition of the nature as a stakeholder.

What’s emerging in the scope of themes

• Moral and ethical considerations of the environment and resource. - inequity and power dynamics (power/knowledge)

• Stewardship in relation to fishing rights; demonstrating and measuring stewardship; what are the fundamental values inform this.

• Animal welfare and the moral consideration of ‘non-human’ nature. Comparing ideas about caring for the environment

• Gender and the framing of masculinity and identity.

• Concerns over the use of bycatch to maximise use of marine resources.

Social Benefits and impacts:

• Equity and distributions:

• Understand values, behaviours & characteristics.

• Governance and participants approaches
• Co-management of fisheries with government is the current - rather what would the co-management model be that will actually work in terms of how much information and delegation of responsibility and power can or needs to be devolved.

Social Acceptability:

• Production and marketing cooperatives in Australia compared to other countries and factors that influence success

• Marine spatial planning - how best to implement/adapt/monitor/manage and meditate negative effects/engaging fishers in marine spatial planning.

• Visibility - use to as a nudge policy option - re compliance; scale and pace of change in the fishery sector (e.g. unmanned fishery vessels at sea) is the industry currently conceptualising or dealing with this?
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<td>Western Australian Marine Science Institution (WAMSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Barclay (Day 1)</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>KAL Analysis Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Abernethy (Day 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgette Leah Burns</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Nursey-Bray</td>
<td>University of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Voyer</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Fabinyi</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicki Mazur</td>
<td>EnVision Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyree Stenekes</td>
<td>ABARES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratana Chuanpagdee</td>
<td>Memorial University, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Jennings</td>
<td>IMAS; UTAS; FRDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevaly Sen</td>
<td>Oceanomics Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Foale (Day 2)</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya King</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brian  | Coffey      | RMIT               | brian.coffey@rmit.edu.au | theoretical starting point of the interactive governance perspective, while methodologically he is interested in the design of survey instruments for measuring stakeholders’ underlying notions such as value, principle and trust using the techniques of pile sort and psychometric scale.  
Background in engineering. Conceptualising values and how to measure values.  

Brian has a PhD in Policy Studies (2010), and his research interests centre on the policy and governance dimensions of sustainability (in particular how the environment is conceptualised in policy and the implications this has for how it is governed) and science-policy relations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Ogier</td>
<td>IMAS; UTAS; FRDC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Emily.Ogier@utas.edu.au">Emily.Ogier@utas.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Geographer ‘by trade’ but now a ‘social scientist’ at IMAS. Merged into environmental studies and did PhD in marine and coastal resources impacts of management - multi actor governance and conflict over natural resources. Discovered fisheries on the Abrolhos Islands - common pool dilemma of fisheries is what fascinates her. As a ‘fish-wife’ lives and breathes the issues of fishing. Witnessing a demographic cohort livelihood shift. Worked in TSIC for a while and then jumped back into the research field and in an interdisciplinary context. Common pool resources and public interest are the key elements that drives her research interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacki</td>
<td>Schirmer</td>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jacki.Schirmer@canberra.edu.au">Jacki.Schirmer@canberra.edu.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jenny.SHAW@dmirs.wa.gov.au">Jenny.SHAW@dmirs.wa.gov.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Geoscience area currently but looking to go back into working with the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Barclay University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kate.Barclay@uts.edu.au">Kate.Barclay@uts.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Arts/Japanese language/international development. PhD looked at Japanese tuna fishing and canning company operating in the Solomon Islands. Finished PhD in 2001 and continued in Tuna fisheries - contract research. Previously saw herself as an Asian studies scholar - up until 2013 when she went to MARE and IFET made her realise that focussed on environmental sociologist was more in line with her interests. Evaluating the wellbeing approach of fisheries and also an interactive governance approach to fisheries management. More recently looking at gender and fisheries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Brooks KAL Analysis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kate@kalanalysis.com.au">kate@kalanalysis.com.au</a></td>
<td>As a social scientist who began her career in strategic marketing and corporate affairs, Kate now operates as an independent consulting sociologist, managing a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variety of research and strategy projects in service delivery, agriculture and rural industries. Her experience incorporates board and advisory panel membership and advice, community consultations, community profiling, social impact assessments; program, policy and social monitoring and evaluation.

Kate’s particular areas of expertise are social capital to improve industry and community cohesion and success, and developing new frameworks and approaches to address challenges in changing environments. An Adjunct Senior Fellowship with ANU and Deakin University, and Fellow of the Australian Rural Leadership Foundation.

| Kirsten Abernethy | kirsten.abernethy@gmail.com | @_SeaWomen | Kirsten Abernethy is a fisheries social scientist and has worked for over 10 years in fishing communities as a researcher, practitioner and advocate. Kirsten has worked in the UK, Solomon Islands and Timor Leste |
Georgette Leah Burns Griffith University leah.burns@griffith.edu.au

(University of East Anglia, University of Exeter, WorldFish) in areas including health and wellbeing of fishing families, behaviour and decision making in fishing businesses, social-ecological innovation, and fisheries governance. Since 2015, she has worked in Victorian wild-catch fisheries. After two years working at Seafood Industry Victoria, she is now an independent consultant. Current Australian projects include topics of: health in fishing families; the contribution of fishing and aquaculture industries to communities, and determinates of socially-supported fisheries and aquaculture. In 2017 Kirsten was the Victorian Agrifutures Rural Women Award winner and is interested in greater recognition and opportunities for women in the seafood industry.

Environmental Anthropologist. Griffith Uni - Environmental faculty. Looks at angler and rec fishers
and how they interact with fish and seals. Has experience in Iceland. How do we influence the stakeholders to create change. Focus on what is fun and fight for funding to do it.

| Melissa Nursey-Bray | University of Adelaide | melissa.nursey-bray@adelaide.edu.au | Dr Melissa Nursey-Bray is an Associate Professor and currently Head of Department in Geography, Environment and Population (GEP), and the Coordinator of the GEP Masters Dissertation Program. She also teaches the research methods, community engagement and EIA subjects within it as well as undergraduates subjects in ethics, Indigenous resource management, coastal management and EIA. She is currently co-theme leader for the Indigenous theme of the Social Economic and Institutional Climate Adaptation Research Network and is leading projects in fisheries management in partnership with SARDI and FRDC. |
University of Wollongong. Was a biological scientist who ended up in planning. Looking at how do we look at the social - told just through the economic impact. Fisheries/commercial/ recreational - social science and policy and how social science can influence policy. Michelle is a Vice Chancellors Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with the Australian Centre for Ocean Resources and Security (ANCORS) at the University of Wollongong. Before joining ANCORS she had worked with the University of Technology Sydney on research into the social and economic contributions of commercial fishing to NSW communities. She has worked on marine conservation issues for over 15 years firstly in NSW and Queensland State Government Departments, where she was employed in a number of
roles relating to protected area and threatened species management as well as coastal planning and assessment. In 2014 she completed her PhD examining the social acceptability of marine protected areas, with a focus on two NSW marine parks. Since then she has been engaged in a range of projects investigating the human dimensions of marine conservation and resource management, including commercial and recreational fisheries. Her current research with ANCORS is a cross disciplinary investigation into social equity considerations in the Blue Economy.

Mike Fabinyi
University of Technology Sydney
Michael.Fabinyi@uts.edu.au

Anthropologist based at UTS. Interested in the social, political and economic forces affecting livelihoods; mostly in developing countries. PhD work in Philippines, has worked also in the Pacific, China and Indonesia. Recent research has examined the role of China in global fisheries and seafood issues, currently
Working on a report examining Australian seafood exports to China. Other current projects include work on the Blue Economy in China and Philippines, sea cucumber and gender in Vietnam and Philippines, and governance of tuna fisheries in Indonesia and Solomon Islands.

| Nicki Mazur | nickimazur@grapevine.net.au | Independent Consultant and casual lecturer Nicki is dedicated to helping achieve sustainable natural resource and social policy solutions that take into account the complex needs and concerns of individuals and communities. Also interested in the human dynamics of other public policy areas, Nicole is highly regarded for her interpersonal skills and ability to create engagement spaces in which people feel comfortable about discussing the issues affecting them. |
As the Principal Consultant for EEC, Nicole has developed a reputation for formulating responsive, flexible, tailored project management and social research services. She is equipped with excellent research, project management and client liaison skills, and possesses a detailed understanding of the challenging operational environment occupied by policy makers.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyree Stenekes</td>
<td>ABARES</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nyree.stenekes@abares.gov.au">nyree.stenekes@abares.gov.au</a></td>
<td>ABARES. Anthropology and government studies followed by a civil and environmental engineering degree. Came to the idea that it is all really about managing and understanding how people interact with and use technology rather than the technology itself. PhD into community risk perceptions of recycled water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- looking at the interaction of the people with the technology and government agencies. Current research agenda is driven by the needs of the Department, Agriculture and Water resources and associated stakeholders, e.g. industry or other NRM agencies departmental interests and needs and election cycles. Relevant fisheries research includes: Recreational fishing audit; social dimensions of recreational fishing; biosecurity and invasive species management, e.g. Recreational boat biofouling management behaviour risk assessments (marine pests) - behavioural study and Marine Pest Social Network Analysis; and the marine reserve social impact assessment work.

| Ratana Chuanpagde | Memorial University, Canada | ratanac@mun.ca | Marine scientist who got into disciplinary work (worked with Daniel Pauly and an economist) looking at how to understand values from a non-monetary perspective but based on water issues. Looking for a |
framework and came into ‘FishGovNet’ network which was funded by EU to research fisheries governance. But were criticised for not having a natural scientist; women or people from developing country - hence Ratana was invited to join the group.

| Sarah Jennings | IMAS; UTAS; FRDC | sarah.jennings@utas.edu.au | Economist UTAS undergrad in hydrology and economics. Did honours in economics with a focus on NRM. Standard teaching profile, but was nagged by fisheries biologists and found fisheries very open to economics. Led the FRDC economics development program which has now morphed into the human dimensions research program |

| Sevaly Sen | | sevaly.sen@gmail.com | Independent Consulting providing, social, economic, policy and strategic analysis, advice and research on fisheries and aquaculture management to governments, international development agencies, financial |
institutions, private companies and non-government organisations.

<p>| Simon Foale | James Cook University | <a href="mailto:simon.foale@jcu.edu.au">simon.foale@jcu.edu.au</a> | Interests in the relationship between Western science and environmental knowledge in other cultures, and now continues to research the interface between different knowledges and resource management, while teaching anthropology. Also has interests in the relationship between power, science and transnational conservation projects, and increasingly interested in the use of secrecy jurisdictions by transnational resource extracting corporations, and the extent to which this facilitates further power imbalances. <a href="https://research.jcu.edu.au/portfolio/simon.foale/">https://research.jcu.edu.au/portfolio/simon.foale/</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanya King</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanya.king@deakin.edu.au">tanya.king@deakin.edu.au</a></td>
<td>@cultureaqua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Started studying science (chemistry) but decided social interaction was more complex and had a greater influence on environmental and human outcomes than molecular composition. Studied anthropology, focus on women in agriculture, drawing on farming background. PhD on shark fishery, but seasickness compelled a focus on the move to quota in early 2000s. Mental health implications of management change emerged in this context. Other research has addressed gender, water distribution policy and community attitudes, and approaches to tertiary pedagogy. Mental health as a key issue for the seafood industry remains a central focus, with an emphasis on promoting practical strategies and solutions for ecological and social justice.
Appendix 5: Original Agenda:

Day One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Outcome/output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10am-10:45am</td>
<td>Introductions – 5 minutes each (max) to outline key research areas, current and future research agenda and any general observations about the sector. HOW did you set your research agenda?</td>
<td>Tanya King</td>
<td>Short bio’s of all participants, to be collated in outcomes of workshop, and beyond. How research agendas set in past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45am-11:00am</td>
<td>Overview of work undertaken by FRDC (Social Sciences Audit (2009/317))</td>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>Collective understanding of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• audit themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• identified gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• update plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am-11:30am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am-12:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop:</td>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>Documented appraisal of relevance of 2009/317 themes and identified gaps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Are the audit themes still appropriate?
- Have the gaps been filled?
- If yes, provide reference
- Are themes still relevant/key?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td>Overview of FRDC HDR objectives</td>
<td>Emily Ogier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30pm-1:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30pm-3:00pm</td>
<td>An international focus – This is the part of the day where Professor Chuenpagdee can comment on her observations of trends and issues and themes emerging in the international context, both those impacting all SSF, to those relevant to particular fisheries. We envisage this session to be somewhat interactive, with workshop participants reflecting on the relevance of issues to the Australian context.</td>
<td>Ratana Chuenpagdee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm-3:30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm-5:00pm</td>
<td>Workshop:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emerging issues facing sector (eg. new management systems, automation, seafood consumption patterns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Theme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gaps in research (eg. summary of all relevant changes in X fishery, drivers of technology innovation, economic cost-benefit-analyses of value-adding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacities and resources (eg. Existing datasets and profiles, curated collections, ABARES data???)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Challenges (eg. synthesising immense detail, overcoming fisher reticence to share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Ogier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documented account of emerging issues (organised thematically), gaps in research and existing capacities (10 max.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knowledge [the “IP” issue], confidentiality).

Day Two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00am-9:30am</td>
<td>Functions of social science – what is our understanding of the role of social science in the seafood industry, both in effect and in an ‘ideal world’? Pre-emptive/adaptive/visioning. What are the facilitators and barriers?</td>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>Broad reflections, a chance to articulate some general principles or collective frustrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30am-10:30am</td>
<td>Revisiting of ‘emerging issues’ from Day One. Additions? Clarifications?</td>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am-11:00am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am-12:00pm</td>
<td>Identification of emerging methodologies. Academic versus ‘applied’ tension in project funding.</td>
<td>Kate Brooks</td>
<td>Overview of key methodologies used by Australian researchers, as well as those used in other contexts, and interdisciplinary approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30pm</td>
<td>Ratana – what do we need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-3:00pm</td>
<td>Workshopping (small group) – Identification of commonalities in ongoing work, opportunities for collaboration.</td>
<td>Tanya King</td>
<td>List possible research Need; theme; project; output; team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00pm</td>
<td>Options for ongoing social sciences platform in regard to research vision/ issues and methodologies.</td>
<td>Tanya King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>