1 Project Specifications
Methodology

Survey
A 10-question online study was conducted amongst members of a permission based panel.

After interviewing, data was weighted to the latest population estimates sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Sample Profile
The study was conducted among 1,122 Australians aged 18+.

Surveys were distributed throughout Australia including both capital city and non-capital city areas.

Please refer to the next page for further information on sample sizes

Project Brief
This study aimed to uncover people’s attitudes regarding the importance of national parks and conservation areas. Particular focus was paid to their management and funding, as well as perceptions of commercial usage of national parks.

Fieldwork
Fieldwork commenced on Wednesday 5th January and was completed on Sunday 9th January 2022.

Example Methodology Text for Media Releases:
The research was commissioned by National Parks Australia Council and conducted by Lonergan Research in accordance with the ISO 20252 standard. Lonergan Research surveyed 1,122 Australians aged 18+. Surveys were distributed throughout Australia including both capital city and non-capital city areas. The survey was conducted online amongst members of a permission-based panel, between 5 and 9 January 2022. After interviewing, data was weighted to the latest population estimates sourced from the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
Sample Breakdown / demographics

Gender

- Male (n= 550) 50%
- Female (n= 565) 49%
- Other (n= 7) <1%

Generation

- Gen Z (18-24) (n= 132) 28%
- Millennial (25-39) (n= 333) 30%
- Gen X (40-59) (n= 336) 30%
- Baby Boomer (60+) (n= 321) 30%

Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n= 1,122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample Size: 1,122
Sample Breakdown / demographics

Access to car
- Yes (n= 1,021)
- No (n= 101)

Education
- Below Year 12 (n= 133)
- Completed Year 12 (n= 202)
- TAFE or technical (n= 332)
- University (n= 331)
- Post-grad (n= 124)

Employment
- Employed (n= 683)
- Retired (n= 247)
- Homemaker (n= 79)
- Unemployed (n= 67)
- Studying (n= 41)
- On a career break (n= 5)

Voting preference
- Labor (n= 435)
- Liberal-National Coalition (n= 344)
- The Greens (n= 205)
- Independent (n= 28)
- One Nation (n= 23)
- United Australia Party (n= 11)
- Other (used in report) (n= 89)
- Don't know (n= 29)
- Won't /Can't vote (n= 20)

Other
- (n= 89)
- 7%
2 Key Insights
87% of Australians support Federal, State and Territory governments signing up to protect at least 30% of the planet’s land and sea by 2030

- 87% of Australians support Federal, State and Territory governments signing up to the pledge.
  - This increases to over 90% amongst The Greens (95%) and Labor (92%) supporters, however it also receives support from five in six (82%) Liberal-National voters (cf. Other 74%)
  - At least three in five The Greens (62%) and Labor (60%) supporters strongly support governments signing up to the pledge (cf. Lib-Nat 40%, Other 42%)
  - Support for the pledge is stable across the genders (women 88%, men 87%), and it receives slightly higher support amongst the younger generations (Gen Z 91%, Millennials 92%; cf. Gen X 86%, Baby Boomers 82%)
  - Millennials have the highest level of strong support amongst the generations (61%; cf. Gen Z 56%, Gen X 43%, Baby Boomers 47%)

“Over 70 countries have signed a pledge to protect at least 30% of the planet’s land and 30% of the planet’s sea by 2030 to prevent more extinctions and protect ecosystems.”

Q1. Do you support Australia’s Federal, State and territory governments signing up to the pledge? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
There is high agreement in the importance of national parks and conservation areas and the role they play in protecting nature in Australia.

- Around nine in ten Australians agree...  
  - National parks and conservation areas are desirable to protect nature from resource extraction including logging, mining and fishing (91%)  
    - This is felt most strongly in WA (95%; cf. NSW 91%, ACT 93%, VIC 89%, QLD 91%, SA 91%, TAS 93%, NT 80%*)  
  - National parks are one of the best ways to protect nature in Australia (89%)  
  - Protecting Australia’s native flora and fauna is a core responsibility of state and federal governments (88%)  
    - This increases to 93% amongst Baby Boomers, the highest of the generations (cf. Gen Z 84%, Millennials 89%, Gen X 84%)
- Four in five (80%) Australians say Australia should have more national parks and conservation areas.  
  - This increases to 92% amongst The Greens voters and 87% amongst Labor voters (cf. Lib-Nat 71%, Other 74%)

### Question 2: Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National parks and conservation areas are desirable to protect nature from resource extraction including logging, mining and fishing</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National parks are one of the best ways to protect nature in Australia</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Australia’s native flora and fauna is a core responsibility of state and federal governments</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia should have more national parks and conservation areas</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protected for future generations, and for the intrinsic value of nature and wildlife are the most important benefits of national parks and conservation areas to Australians

- Three in five (59%) Australians say one of the most important benefits of national parks and conservation areas is that nature and wildlife is protected for themselves or future generations to see, with a quarter (26%) of Australians rating it number one overall.
  - Two thirds (66%) of women say having nature and wildlife protected for them/future generations is one of the most important benefits (cf. men 52%)

- Half (51%) of Australians say one of the most important benefits of national parks and conservation areas is that nature and wildlife is protected for its intrinsic value, with a fifth (21%) of Australians rating it number one overall.
  - The Greens voters are the most likely to rank the intrinsic value of nature and wildlife as an important benefit of national parks and conservation areas as being important compared to other voters (60%; cf. Labor 46%, Lib-Nat 53%, Other 44%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Not in Top 3</th>
<th>Total Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature and wildlife to be protected for you/future generations to see</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature and wildlife to be protected for its intrinsic value</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting native forests</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting water catchments and rivers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting marine habitat</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon storage to reduce greenhouse gases</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic value through tourism</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating local jobs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Owner management</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Of the following, what are the most important benefits of national parks and conservation areas to you? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
Protection of nature, saving threatened species, and quiet enjoyment of nature top the list of importance for national parks and conservation areas to Australians.

- Seven in ten (71%) Australians say protection of nature is one of the most important uses of national parks and conservation areas, with nearly a third (32%) rating it the most important out of factors asked.
  - Recognition of the importance of national parks and conservation areas increases amongst the older generations to three in four (Baby Boomers 76%, Gen X 74%; cf. Millennials 68%, Gen Z 57%)

- 58% of Australians say saving threatened species is one of the most important uses of national parks and conservation areas, with a fifth (20%) rating it the most important out of factors asked.

- For more than half (55%) of Australians, an important use of national parks and conservation areas is low impact recreation and a quiet enjoyment of nature.
  - This increases to nearly two thirds (63%) amongst Baby Boomers (cf. Gen Z 49%, Millennials 49%, Gen X 56%)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of National Parks and Conservation Areas</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Not in Top 3</th>
<th>Total Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of nature</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving threatened species</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low impact recreation, and quiet enjoyment of...</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushwalking and low-cost recreation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to country</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping and low-cost holidays</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial tourism, outdoor adventure, and...</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New large-scale infrastructure (downhill bike)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale commercial development (like...)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Logging</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial fishing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Of the following, what are the most important uses of national parks and conservation areas to you? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
85% of Australians support an increase in government funding for national park management, and a similar number (83%) support an increase in government funding for staff and rangers for national park management.

- Across the political spectrum support is high for an increase in funding for national park management with nine in ten Labor (92%) and The Greens (91%) voters providing support, as well as four out of five (78%) Coalition voters supporting this, and 78% for Other voters.
- 90% of those who believe governments protecting Australia’s native flora and fauna is a key responsibility of state and federal government support an increase in funding for national park management.
- Support for an increase in government funding for staff and rangers is also high across the political divide (The Greens 91%, Labor 88%, Lib-Nat 77%, Other 73%).
- 93% of those saying a policy for better funding for management of national parks and conservation would make them more likely to vote for a political party at the next federal or state election support an increase in funding for staff and rangers for national park management.

**Bar Charts:**
- **Governments must increase funding for national park management:**
  - Strongly Support: 37%
  - Support: 48%
  - Oppose: 4%
  - Strongly Oppose: 9%
  - Don't Know: 1%
  - Total Support: 85%
  - Total Oppose: 6%

- **Governments must increase funding for staff and rangers for national park management:**
  - Strongly Support: 34%
  - Support: 49%
  - Oppose: 4%
  - Strongly Oppose: 11%
  - Don't Know: 2%
  - Total Support: 83%
  - Total Oppose: 6%
78% of Australians support not having development in parks and protected areas, and two thirds support development only in towns/areas adjacent to parks.

- Four in five (78%) Australians support not having development in parks and protected areas.
  - Millennials are the most likely to support this (82%), however it receives support amongst 78% of Gen X and Baby Boomers (cf. Gen Z 70%)
  - Politically this also has high support, with at around four in five supporting The Greens (85%), Labor (81%), and Other (78%) voters supporting this, and nearly three quarters (72%) of Coalition voters supporting it
  - This increases to 85% amongst those who would be more likely to vote for their local member of parliament if they actively prioritised or advocated for national parks

- Two thirds (66%) of Australians support development only in towns/areas adjacent to parks.

Q5. To what degree do you support or oppose the following statements? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
Less is more as Australians are more than twice as likely to visit a national park if it had low impact commercial tours compared to high-impact tours

- Over three quarters (77%) of Australians believe that low impact commercial public or private tours would make them more likely to visit a national park, while only 29% would be more likely to do so if it had high impact commercial tours.
  - 80% of Australians who support the statement “Over 70 countries have signed a pledge to protect at least 30% of the planet’s land and 30% of the planet’s sea by 2030 to prevent more extinctions and protect ecosystems” would be more likely to some degree to visit a national park if it had low impact commercial development

- Three in five (62%) Australians would be less likely to visit a national park if it had high impact commercial tours,
  - This is higher amongst Regional Australians (69%; cf. Capital City 59%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>More Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat more likely</th>
<th>Somewhat less likely</th>
<th>Less likely</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low impact commercial public or private tours</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High impact commercial tours (boating, horse riding,</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helicopter, temporary glamping structures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. Would the following types of development make you more or less likely to visit a national park? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
And nearly 4 times more likely to visit a national park if it had small scale development than large scale development

- Five in six (83%) Australians say they would be at least somewhat more likely to visit a national park if there was small scale development, compared to only 21% who would be more likely to visit if there was luxury, large scale development.
  - This is much more desirable to those who have access to a car at 18 percentage points higher (85%; cf. No 67%)
  - Regional Australians are 9 percentage points more likely to visit a national park that has small scale department (89%; cf. capital city 80%)
- Over half of Australians would be less likely to visit a national park if it had commercial infrastructure (55%) or luxury large scale private development (71%)
  - Over half (57%) of those who support the statement “Governments must increase funding for national park management” would be less likely to visit a national park if there is commercial infrastructure
  - Baby Boomers are the least likely to visit a park if there is luxury large scale developments (88%; cf. Gen Z 62%, Millennials 59%, Gen X 69%)

Q6. Would the following types of development make you more or less likely to visit a national park? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
38% of Australians feel camping and accommodation fees for stays and visits are too high

- Less than two in five (38%) Australians feel camping and accommodation fees for stays and visits are too high, while a similar number feel they are about right (37%), and a little more than one in five (21%) don’t know.
  - Australians in WA are the most likely to feel these fees are too high (45%; cf. NSW 36%, ACT 29%, VIC 37%, QLD 40%, SA 36%, TAS 41%, NT 56%*)
  - Gen Z are the generation most likely to feel these fees are too high (45%; cf. Millennials 38%, Gen X 40%, Baby Boomers 33%)

Q8. Do you think camping and accommodation fees for stays or visits are...? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
Active prioritisation and advocacy for national parks would make half of Australians more likely to vote for their local member of parliament

- Half (50%) of Australians say active prioritisation and advocacy for national parks would make them more likely to vote for their local member of parliament.
  - This is supported equally across the genders (women 50%, men 50%)
  - Increased likelihood to vote increases to 3 in 5 (61%) members amongst Gen Z (cf. Millennials 52%, Gen X 49%, Baby Boomers 43%)
  - 78% of those who would be more likely to vote for a political party at the next state or federal election if they had a policy for better funding for management of national parks and conservation also say they would be more likely likely to vote for their local member of parliament if they actively prioritised and advocated for national parks
  - Politically, this has the highest support amongst The Greens voters (60%), however Labor voters are two per cent behind (58%; cf. Lib-Nat 38%, Other 39%)
  - Regional Australians are five percentage points more likely to vote for their local member of parliament if they actively prioritised or advocated national parks.
    - However, they are also over 17x more likely than less likely to vote while those in the capital city are only 12x more likely (Regional more likely 53%, less likely 3%; cf. Capital City more likely 48%, less likely 4%)

Q9. Would active prioritisation and advocacy for national parks make you more or less likely to vote for your local member of parliament? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
Better funding for management of national parks would make more than half of Australians more likely to vote for a political party

- Nearly three in five (57%) Australians would be more likely to vote for a political party at the next federal or state election if they had a policy for better funding for management of national parks.
  - This increases to almost three quarters of Gen Z (73%; cf. Millennials 59%, Gen X 53%, Baby Boomers 51%)
  - And to around two thirds of The Greens voters (65%) and Labor voters (64%), however approximately half (49%) of Liberal-National Coalition voters also feel this way (cf. Other 42%)
  - Amongst the states and territories, this has the highest support in the ACT (69%; cf. NSW 53%, VIC 58%, QLD 61%, SA 53%, WA 58%, TAS 51%, NT 54%*)
  - 89% of those who would be more likely to vote for their local member of parliament if they actively prioritised and advocated for national parks also say they would be more likely likely to vote for a political party at the next state or federal election if they had a policy for better funding for management of national parks and conservation
  - Both Regional and Capital City Australians are 19x more likely to vote for a political party if there was a policy for better funding for management of national parks and conservation areas (Capital City more likely 56%, less likely 3%, 18.67x cf. Regional more likely 57%, less likely 3%, 19x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much more likely</th>
<th>Little more likely</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Little less likely</th>
<th>Much less likely</th>
<th>Don’t know / Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. Would a policy for better funding for management of national parks and conservation areas make you more or less likely to vote for a political party at the next federal or state election? Australians 18+ (n = 1122)
For any questions or comments, please get in touch:

- 02 9046 5600
- Level 3, 355 Kent Street, Sydney NSW 2000
- melanie@lonergan.team
- www.lonergan.team