

The Stakeholders of Gorongosa National Park: Intersecting Scientific and Information Literacies

by

Andrea M.-K. Bierema, Sara D. Miller, *and* Claudia E. Vergara
Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

Part I – Analysis

In this case study, we will look at an ecological crisis using two distinct information sources, an article and a video, each of which emphasizes distinct perspectives. As you read the article, focus on the abstract and conclusion sections and skim through the methods and argument.

Article:

Schuetze, C. (2015). Narrative fortresses: crisis narratives and conflict in the conservation of Mount Gorongosa, Mozambique. *Conservation and Society* 13(2): 141–53. DOI: 10.4103/0972-4923.164193. <<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26393193>>

Video:

Yu, J. (Producer & Director). (2013). The guide: a biologist in Gorongosa [video]. HHMI BioInteractive. Run time: 34:31 min. <<https://www.biointeractive.org/classroom-resources/guide-biologist-gorongosa>>

Questions

Comparing the Author/Director

1. Describe the author/director. Do not just list them unless the name has value to you. What information can you find about them from looking at this piece or searching online (e.g., their credentials, what they do for a living, history of publishing, etc.)?

Article:

Video:

2. After researching the author/director, which stakeholders do they represent? How do you know?

Article:

Video:

3. What do you think the author/director was trying to accomplish by writing and publishing this article/video? Who is paying for the resource to be published? What was their possible purpose?

Article:

Video:

4. What do you think motivated the author/director to write this article/produce the video? Why do you think they find the topic worth writing about?

Article:

Video:

Comparing the Information Sources

5. What are the claims or conclusions presented in the article/video? What do they lead you to believe? Are the claims supported in some way? If so, how? What is used for evidence?

Article:

Video:

6. How does the language used in the title or in the article/video itself contribute to the overall tone of the information presented?

Article:

Video:

7. Is there anything in the article/video that lends authority or credibility to its content? If so, what?

Article:

Video:

Comparing the Publications

8. In what type of publication does the story appear? Is it found on a news website, in a scientific journal, a magazine, etc.?

Article:

Video:

9. Do you think that this publication has an interest in providing a certain perspective on this study? Why or why not? How can you tell?

Article:

Video:

10. How are different stakeholders represented in the article or video?

Article:

Video:

11. Who are some stakeholders that are not being represented in this information source? Are any stakeholders being misrepresented?

Article:

Video:

Part II – Reflection

Answer the following questions, using specific information from the analysis you performed in Part I.

Questions

1. Based on the article and the video, list all the stakeholders that in some way (directly or indirectly) influence or are influenced by Gorongosa National Park. Note that the term “stakeholder” refers to a group of people. (Wildlife are part of the ecosystem and are impacted by the national park but are not a “stakeholder” group.)
2. Choose five stakeholders from your list above and explain why they are stakeholders and what their interest is in the park.
3. Stakeholders impact one another. Consider how the stakeholders are connected. Choose two stakeholders and describe both positive and negative connections that exist between these two stakeholders.
4. Most stakeholders are connected to each other, and these connections often lead to more intersections between stakeholders. Draw a web showing the connections that exemplify relationships between stakeholders, by following these instructions:
 - a. Work individually on the stakeholder web (we will make comparisons later).
 - b. Write out the stakeholder group names (note that individuals are most often representatives of a stakeholder group, not the stakeholder “group” itself; e.g., an individual scientist may be a representative of the “scientists” stakeholder group). Include at least five stakeholders.
 - c. Draw arrows to show connections between stakeholder groups. Label each arrow with positive (+) and negative (-) symbols to indicate the nature of the relationships. For example, positive (+), such as between conservation groups and park employees, and negative (-), such as between logging companies and illegal harvesters of timber.
 - d. Next to each symbol (+ or -) explain your reasoning for the label.
 - e. Discuss your web with your team members. It is expected that they will all look different. Describe some of the differences, such as missed connections or connections identified differently (e.g., one labeled as positive and the other labeled as negative).
5. Create a “team” web; that is, resolve any discrepancies and incorporate connections from everyone in the team.
6. If you were to create a web just based on the Schuetze (2015) article and another web just based on the HHMI Biointeractive (2014) video, how would they compare? Describe some discrepancies between them regarding (a) which stakeholders are most represented and which are underrepresented through the available information, and (b) which connections are positive in one source and negative in another source.