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Introduction
Conservation social science research has been shown to improve conservation efforts, including research on or for conservation, but has continued to be under-practiced and underutilized (Bennett et al. 2016). We aim to see what kind of science is being done in the field and how significant the difference is in current literature. We examine trends in conservation literature conducted with field-based data collection to assess the proportion of social science completed and explore benefits of including social science research in fieldwork.

Methods
We reviewed articles from Conservation Biology, Biological Conservation, Conservation Science and Practice, and Conservation Letters published from 2007-2010 and 2017-2020, and only articles that contained in-person field research were included. We analyzed the type of science conducted (social, biological, or both) and the land ownership where research took place (public, private, or unknown).

Results
Currently, we have completed 130 full text reviews. From these reviews, 79% of studies were tagged as strictly biological science, 15% of studies were tagged as strictly social science, and 6% of studies had both social and biological science components.

Conclusions
Our preliminary data shows that significantly more biological science work is done in the field than social science. Despite the barriers, there are many benefits to field social science research, alone or in combination with field biological science. For example, engaging local communities could give insight into the target species, perceptions on target species, or even interactions between locals and the target species. Data also shows that the majority of social science field studies takes place on private land.
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