

PP - (21003) - RETHINKING THE AGENDA: A CASE FOR SYNTHESIZING ACROSS METHODOLOGIES AND BUILDING ON PAST RESEARCH

Everly Jazi¹

1 - University of British Columbia

Research or practical problem and objectives

For the past four decades, interdisciplinary researchers have studied the psychological and physical health benefits of time spent in nature. Almost 40 years since the key texts of Kaplan and Kaplan (1989) and Ulrich (1983), nature and health research is now prolific, building on the key theoretical and experimental texts to examine ideas with observational analysis, randomized control trials, intervention studies, as well as qualitative interviews looking at place attachments and specific attitudinal variables around nature and wellbeing (Frumkin et al., 2017). The scope of research has also expanded and includes different assessments of exposure (e.g., types of and features in green, blue, brown, and open spaces, frequency of exposure or dosage, type of activity) as well as different benefits or outcomes such as economics and urban space or architectural structures, psychophysiological or neural outcomes, pro-environmental relevance, and more (Frumkin et al., 2017). Despite the productive and diverse output, a lack of standardization in methods, variables, and other components of studies and reviews makes it difficult to synthesize results across papers to draw conclusions about mechanisms and causal pathways in the nature and health sphere.

Main results preview and importance (or main arguments in the case of critical reviews)

Since many authors have introduced synthesis as a goal and agenda of the field, the current research introduces a conceptual framework and plan building off previous agendas to clarify links in diverse methodological approaches. In doing so, the authors introduce two strategies that may allow for conclusions to be drawn between studies, and introduces other possibilities for strategies that future research may consider. Without addressing the difficulty of making claims across a diversity of methods and topics, policymakers, public health officials, and the people-environment field may act on non-empirical or spurious findings, unable to hone in on values for groups that would benefit otherwise, with recognized mechanism and interventions that work.

Palavras-chave : nature and health, methodology, agenda