

***WESTERN AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNITY ATTITUDES  
TOWARDS MARINE SANCTUARIES***

***PATTERSON CONTACT: KEITH PATTERSON***

***DATE: APRIL 2011***

## **ISO 20252: MARKET, OPINION AND SOCIAL RESEARCH**

Patterson Market Research operates using systems that have been developed in compliance with the ISO 20252 Standard for Market, Opinion and Social Research

In accordance with our Quality Assurance System, this report has been reviewed and approved by:

NAME: KEITH PATTERSON

POSITION: SENIOR CONSULTANT OF PATTERSON MARKET RESEARCH

DATE: 11/4/11

DOCUMENT VERSION: FINAL REPORT

---

## ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

1.0	SNAPSHOT .....	1
2.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
2.1	GENERAL SENTIMENT .....	1
2.2	SOURCES OF INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT POLICY .....	2
2.3	SCOPE OF MARINE SANCTUARIES.....	2
2.3.1	AREAS IN WHICH MARINE SANCTUARIES ARE ACCEPTABLE .....	2
2.4	EXTENT OF FISHING ACTIVITY .....	2
2.5	OVERVIEW.....	3
3.0	RESEARCH APPROACH .....	4
3.1	OBJECTIVES .....	4
3.2	METHOD .....	4
3.2.1	FIELDWORK DETAILS .....	4
3.3	QUESTIONNAIRE .....	4
3.4	LIMITATIONS.....	4
3.4.1	SURVEY PRECISION.....	4
3.4.1.1	EXPLANATION OF MARINE SANCTUARIES .....	5
3.4.2	RESPONSE RATE .....	6
3.5	DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS .....	6
4.0	DETAILED FINDINGS .....	7
4.1	PERCEPTION OF THE MARINE LIFE OFF WA’S COAST.....	7
4.2	IS IT IMPORTANT THAT GOVERNMENT PROTECTS WA’S MARINE LIFE?.....	9
4.3	THE INTENTION TO PROTECT MARINE LIFE IN THE KIMBERLEY .....	10
4.4	MARINE SANCTUARIES? .....	11
4.5	INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT .....	13
4.6	HOW MUCH OF WA’S MARINE WATERS IS REASONABLE TO BE SET ASIDE IN SANCTUARIES? .....	15

---

4.7	SUPPORT FOR 30% SANCTUARIES IN REGIONS OFF THE WA COAST .....	17
4.7.1	ACCEPTABILITY OF SANCTUARIES MORE THAN 5 KILOMETRES OFF THE COAST (AND ISLANDS) OF METROPOLITAN PERTH.....	18
4.7.2	THE WATERS FROM PERTH TO GERALDTON .....	20
4.7.3	THE KIMBERLEY COAST.....	21
4.7.4	FROM PERTH TO BUSSELTON .....	22
4.7.5	BUSSELTON TO AUGUSTA.....	23
4.7.6	THE SOUTH COAST EAST OF AUGUSTA .....	24
4.8	EXTENT OF FISHING ACTIVITY AMONGST THE WA COMMUNITY.....	25

Appendix A – Questionnaire

Appendix B – Data Analysis Tables

## **1.0 SNAPSHOT**

This document reports on a quota controlled random dial survey of adult Western Australians. The sample of 604 was divided between metropolitan and country adults in approximately the proportions of the population distribution – 451 in metropolitan Perth and 153 in country WA.

The data was weighted to replicate the adult profile for Western Australia, using the same format as Patterson Market Research’s regular opinion polling programme (published as WestPoll for over 20 years). The survey is a reliable assessment of community attitudes and opinions about the health and importance of the marine environment off the WA coast. See section 3.4.1 for survey error estimations.

## **2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **2.1 GENERAL SENTIMENT**

The survey has found that almost two thirds (63%) of respondents believe that marine life off the WA coast is at least “probably in decline”. Fifteen percent believe it is in serious decline and a further 18% believe that it is “in decline” but not serious. A further 3 out of 10 believe that it is “probably declining”.

In essence, there is a widespread sentiment that the health of the marine life off the WA coast is deteriorating at least to some extent. Whilst frequent fishers (people who fish 12 or more times over the last twelve months) are slightly less likely to believe that marine life is in decline (53% believe it is declining), only a third (31%) believe it is either recovering or in “pristine condition”.

Moreover, 9 out of 10 (92%) believe that it is at least “quite important” that the Government acts to protect WA’s marine life. This sentiment was effectively equally shared for metropolitan and country respondents (at 93% and 90% respectively) and amongst frequent fishers (90%).

Over 8 out of 10 (85%) approve of the Premier’s announcement that he intends to take action to protect the marine life of the Kimberley. Fifty nine percent “definitely approve” of this proposal, and a further 1 in 4 (26%) “tend to approve”. Overall, 83% of ALP voters, 87% of Liberal or National voters and 92% of Green voters approve of the Premier’s intention on this issue.

Eight out of ten respondents (81%) support the proposition that the WA Government should work with the Federal Government to create a series of marine sanctuaries in Federal waters off the WA coast. This support was reflected amongst 81% of Labor voters, 79% of Liberal/National voters and 95% of Green voters.

## 2.2 SOURCES OF INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT POLICY

Eight of ten (79%) respondents believe that marine scientists should have a high level of influence on Government policy to protect marine life. This was followed by 65% believing that conservation organisations should have a high influence; 42% believe that recreational and commercial fishing organisations should have a high influence and 20% believe that the offshore mining sector should have a high level of influence on Government policy development for the protection of marine life.

## 2.3 SCOPE OF MARINE SANCTUARIES

Slightly over 1 in 4 (27%) respondents believe that **at least 50%** of the waters off the WA coast should be placed in sanctuaries. This proportion ranged from 22% amongst Liberal and National party voters to 31% amongst Labor voters and 45% amongst Green voters. As Table T4.6 in the main body of the report indicates, two thirds (64%) believe that **at least 30%** of the waters should be placed in sanctuaries. As indicated below, this support for at least 30% protection in sanctuaries increases to an average of 71% of respondents when they are described as being in Federal waters.

### *2.3.1 AREAS IN WHICH MARINE SANCTUARIES ARE ACCEPTABLE*

Respondents were told that the science indicates about 30% of the marine environment should be put into marine sanctuaries to be effective in protecting marine life. The proportion believing it would be acceptable for up to 30% of waters off the coast in various areas to be placed into marine sanctuaries were:

- 73% in the Kimberley
- 72% in the Busselton/Augusta zone
- 72% the area along the South Coast east of Augusta
- 70% Perth to Geraldton
- 69% Perth to Busselton; and
- 67% metropolitan Perth.

It is important to recognise that the proposition in each case was for up to 30% of waters more than 5 kilometres off the coast in each of these zones may be put into marine sanctuaries. The figures quoted above reflect the proportions that would find it acceptable for such sanctuaries to be created at that level.

## 2.4 EXTENT OF FISHING ACTIVITY

About 44% of respondents indicated that they had done at least some fishing in the last twelve months. Thirty one percent of all respondents indicated that they had fished from the beach; rocks or other land based promontory, 22% had fished from a boat in State waters (up to 3 nautical miles off the Coast) and 7% overall reported that they had fished

from a boat in Federal waters. These figures add beyond 100% due to fishers undertaking more than one form of fishing over the 12 month period.

To aid in our understanding of attitudes towards the proposed sanctuaries, we categorised respondents into four categories of fishing activity. There were 56% who had done no fishing in the 12 months prior to the survey. A further 13% had fished from 1 – 4 times over that period (categorised as “rare” fishers). A further 11% had fished from 5 – 12 times over the year (“regular fishers”), and 10% had fished more than 12 times in the last year (“frequent fishers”).

## **2.5 OVERVIEW**

The data shows that Western Australians believe it is important that the Government acts to protect marine life off the WA coast. There is a general sentiment that the quality of marine life is declining , and once the prospect of marine sanctuaries is described as being “in Federal waters” (more than 5 kilometres or 3 nautical miles off the WA coast), there is strong support (average 71%) for the creation of marine sanctuaries for up to 30% of each of the six areas identified. It is probable that the high level of support is partly explained by the low level of fishing activity undertaken by the general population in Federal waters (only 7% of respondents report having fished in Federal waters in the last twelve months).

## **3.0 RESEARCH APPROACH**

### **3.1 OBJECTIVES**

The survey objective was to establish a reliable estimate of the WA community's attitudes towards the notion of marine sanctuaries to safeguard the marine environment for the future.

### **3.2 METHOD**

The research was carried out as a telephone survey of Western Australian adults.

The fieldwork was carried out by our related fieldwork company West Coast Field Services from their dedicated telephone room based in Applecross, WA.

All calls were made using WCFS dedicated Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing software; SurveyCraft. All interviewers were fully brief as to the nature of the project and the questionnaire-specific instructions prior to commencing data collection.

#### *3.2.1 FIELDWORK DETAILS*

The research was carried out amongst a representative sample of Western Australian adults aged 18 yrs and over. For a final copy of the questionnaire the reader is referred to Appendix A.

The fieldwork was carried out from April 6 – 10 2011.

Upon the conclusion of data collection, the average interview length is calculated to be just over 8 minutes.

### **3.3 QUESTIONNAIRE**

The questionnaire used for the research was designed by Patterson Market Research personnel, in consultation with client representatives. A copy of the final questionnaire, as used for the data collection has been provided in Appendix A.

### **3.4 LIMITATIONS**

#### *3.4.1 SURVEY PRECISION*

The survey of 604 people produces a theoretical survey error of +/- 4% at the 95% confidence level. The survey error reduces as the survey estimate moves away from the "worst case" estimate of 50%.



The survey results have quoted sample sizes in each of the tables and figures to provide a guide on the accuracy or the reliability of the data. Survey accuracy is a function of both the sample size and the distance that the survey result is from 50% (broadly, the further a survey estimate is from 50%, the more accurate it will be). Hence, while the exact confidence limits will vary according to the survey result itself, some broad tolerance limit guidelines have been quoted to provide a guide as to the accuracy of the survey results. The survey sample of 600 adults produces a survey error of  $\pm$  about 4% at the 95% confidence level. The survey error grid below shows the extent to which survey error varies from the "worst case" of a 50% estimate, to the "most confident" assessment of 10% of the sample (or 90%) expressing a particular view.

SURVEY PRECISION TABLE -	SURVEY PRECISION at 95% level of confidence	
	- Sample of 600	Population of >10,000
50/50	$\pm$ 4 %	
60/40	$\pm$ 3.9 %	
70/30	$\pm$ 3.7 %	
80/20	$\pm$ 3.2 %	
90/10	$\pm$ 2.4 %	

#### 3.4.1.1 *Explanation of Marine Sanctuaries*

It is unknown how widely the concept of marine sanctuaries is understood in the broad community. In the preamble to question of support or opposition to marine sanctuaries, the questionnaire described the marine sanctuary as:

"Marine sanctuaries are areas of our marine waters in which the plants and animals are protected. Sanctuaries do not allow fishing, mining or other extractive activities, but do allow passive recreations such as swimming, diving, surfing and boating."

We took the view that it was better to ensure that respondents were provided with an understanding of the concept than it was to establish the level of community support/opposition based on their current understanding (and probable vague knowledge of the meaning of a marine sanctuary). The survey outcomes are therefore based on the findings that would arise if the whole community understood the term "marine sanctuary" as it has been described here.

It is also important to recognise that the level of community support for marine sanctuaries reported in this survey is based on an acceptance of scientific assessments of the need for

protection of marine life, and the provision of evidence based assessments that the proposed sanctuaries would ensure that the health of marine life into the future.

### 3.4.2 RESPONSE RATE

The response rate is calculated as the number of interviews as a proportion of the calls made:

The response rate is shown in the table below:

<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>N=604</b>
Interviews	603
Refusals	2825
Answer machine	312
Call back	34
No reply/engaged (after 6 call attempts)	1251
Termination	0
Total numbers called	5025
<b>Overall Response Rate:</b>	<b>12%</b>

Response rates of 12 – 15% are typical for random dial surveys.

## 3.5 DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

As a means of ensuring the highest quality of data, WCFS routinely validate a proportion of all data. Effectively this means a random selection of respondents are re-contacted and their recorded responses are checked to ensure the most accurate recording of data is upheld by the field team at all times.

Post data collection, the data was weighted according to the latest census data available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Patterson Market Research routinely weights data to ensure that the sample profile most closely represents to true profile of the Western Australian adult profiles.

The final data set was analysed using Patterson Market Research’s dedicated survey analysis software; SurveyCraft, the result of which are quantitative data tables. The data tables form the basis of this report and have been included in Appendix B.

## **4.0 DETAILED FINDINGS**

We are confident that the survey accurately reflects the WA adult community's attitudes and opinions about marine life and the notion of the creation of marine sanctuaries off the WA coast.

The extent of interaction with the marine environment varied materially amongst the survey sample. The survey found that about 56% of adult Western Australians have not fished in the last 12 months. Forty four percent of respondents indicated that they had fished at least once in the last twelve months. This varied from 39% amongst metropolitan respondents to 57% amongst country respondents. Slightly over one in five (22%) of respondents have fished in state waters (within 5 kilometres of the coastline and its associated "nearby islands"), 31% have fished from beaches or rocks or other land based outcrops, and just 7% reported that they have fished in Federal waters at some stage in the last twelve months.

### **4.1 PERCEPTION OF THE MARINE LIFE OFF WA'S COAST**

Respondents were asked to indicate:

"From what you know or have heard, in your opinion would you say that WA's marine life is:

- In serious decline
- Declining but not seriously
- Probably declining
- Stable – neither declining nor recovering
- Probably recovering
- Definitely recovering
- In pristine condition.

As Table T4.1 below indicates, a net of almost two thirds (63%) of respondents believe that WA's marine life is in some form of decline. Fifteen percent believe it is "in serious decline", 18% believe that it is "declining but not seriously" and 31% believe that it is "probably declining".

Table T4.1 Perception of state of WA marine life

Table T4.1	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
In serious decline	15	16	11	21	10	26	15	18	10	11
Declining but not serious	18	17	18	19	17	16	14	19	23	30
Probably declining	31	32	29	30	31	39	33	36	28	11
Stable – neither declining or recovering	21	20	23	16	26	9	22	18	22	15
Probably recovering	6	5	8	5	5	3	5	5	6	14
Definitely recovering	4	3	6	5	5	3	3	1	8	13
In pristine condition	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	4
Don't know	4	4	4	2	4	3	6	1	-	1
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET DECLINING</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>STABLE</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>NET RECOVERING/ PRISTINE</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Note from the above that 73% of “rare” fishers (people who have fished up to four times in the last twelve months) believe that marine life is in some form of decline. Sixty one percent of regular fishers (fish from 5 to 12 times over the 12 month period) and 53% of frequent fishers (more than 12 times in the last 12 months) expressed the view that the marine life of WA’s coast is in decline. Note also that only 3% of respondents overall believe that the marine life of WA’s coast is in pristine condition.

## 4.2 IS IT IMPORTANT THAT GOVERNMENT PROTECTS WA'S MARINE LIFE?

Respondents were asked to indicate:

"How important is it to you that Government act to protect WA's marine life?"

Would you say that it is:

- Not at all important
- Not very important
- Neither one nor the other
- Quite important
- Very important.

It may be anticipated that very few respondents would regard it as being unimportant (indeed 3% believe it is either "not at all important" at all or "not very important"), but the interesting point in the Table T4.2 below is that almost two thirds (61%) rate it as being a "very important" issue for them.

Table T4.2 Importance that Government acts to protect marine life

T4.2	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Not at all important	1	2	-	1	1	-	2	1	-	1
Not very important	1	1	2	1	2	-	1	-	2	7
Neither one nor the other	5	4	7	5	7	-	4	6	11	1
Quite important	32	33	28	30	36	13	35	26	42	13
Very important	61	60	63	63	54	87	58	67	45	78
Don't know	0	0	0	1	0	-	0	-	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>LOW IMPORTANCE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>NET HIGH IMPORTANCE</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

It is interesting that the propensity to rate the Government acting to protect marine life as “very important”, is heightened among frequent fishers (78% of those who fished 12 or more times a year). This trend is offset to some extent by the relatively low proportion of “regular” fishers who believe it is very important (45%), but we nonetheless find that effectively 9 out of 10 of all respondents believe it is at least “quite important” that the Government acts to protect marine life, and approximately 6 out of 10 believe it is “very important”.

It is also of some interest that 54% of people who intend to vote Liberal or National (“should an election be held “this week”) believe it is “very important” and 90% of them believe it is at least “quite important”.

### **4.3 THE INTENTION TO PROTECT MARINE LIFE IN THE KIMBERLEY**

Respondents were asked to indicate if they approve or disapprove of Premier Colin Barnett indicating he would take action to protect the marine life for the Kimberley. Respondents were asked if they:

- Definitely disapproved
- Tend to disapprove
- Were neutral
- Tend to approve
- Definitely approve

of the Premier taking this action (to protect marine life in the Kimberley). As Table T4.3 overleaf indicates, almost 6 out of 10 indicated that they definitely approve (59%) and a further 1 in 4 (26%) tend to approve of this action, resulting in a net of 85% approving of the action and just 5% disapproving.

Note from Table T4.3 below that effectively 6 out of 10 Labor and Liberal / National voters “definitely approve” of this stance, and as may be anticipated, 7 out of 10 (72%) of Green voters “definitely approve” of the Premier’s announcement to take action to protect the marine life of the Kimberley.

**Table T4.3 Approve/disapprove Premier’s announcement to protect Kimberley marine life**

	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Definitely disapprove	3	3	1	5	1	4	1	7	4	3
Tend to disapprove	2	3	1	3	2	1	2	1	3	4
Neutral	8	8	11	7	9	3	8	7	13	9
Tend to approve	26	24	32	23	29	20	27	27	23	27
Definitely approve	59	61	54	60	58	72	61	58	55	57
Don’t know	1	1	2	2	1	-	2	1	1	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET DISAPPROVE</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>NET APPROVE</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

In aggregate, over 8 out of 10 (85%) at least “tend to approve” of this announcement from the Premier, with a little variation across the demographic groups in the Table. Very low proportions of respondents in any category disapprove of this announcement.

#### 4.4 MARINE SANCTUARIES?

Respondents were told that:

“There is a proposal to create a series of marine sanctuaries to protect marine life off the WA coast. Marine sanctuaries are areas of our marine waters in which the plants and animals are protected. Sanctuaries do not allow fishing, mining or other extractive activities, but do allow passive recreations such as swimming, diving, surfing and boating.”

Within the next few months the Federal Government will begin public consultation on creating a series of marine sanctuaries in Federal waters off WA’s coast. Would you support or oppose the WA Government working with the Federal Government to establish these sanctuaries?”

Respondents were then asked to indicate if they:

- Definitely support
- Tend to support
- Were neutral
- Tend to oppose
- Definitely oppose

the State Government working with the Federal Government in this way.

As Table T4.4 below indicates, there is strong support for this proposition. Effectively 6 out of 10 (61%) indicate that they definitely support this proposition and a further 1 in 5 (20%) tended to support it, resulting in a net of 8 out of 10 (81%) supporting the proposition that the WA Government should work with the Federal Government to establish sanctuaries in Federal waters off the WA coast.

**Table T4.4 Support/Oppose WA Govt working with Feds to create marine sanctuaries in Federal waters?**

	TOTAL N=604 %	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO N=451 %	COUNTRY N=153 %	ALP N=142 %	LIBS/ NATS N=305 %	GREENS N=55 %	NONE N=368 %	RARE N=123 %	REGULAR N=63 %	FREQUENT N=50 %
		Definitely support	61	64	54	66	54	78	63	70
Tend to support	20	20	21	15	25	17	21	19	24	9
Neutral	8	6	13	9	8	-	6	5	7	24
Tend to oppose	4	4	6	3	6	-	3	2	14	4
Definitely oppose	6	6	6	7	6	4	5	3	7	15
Don't know	1	1	0	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET SUPPORT</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>NET OPPOSE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

It is interesting to note from the above the level of support for this proposition is negatively related to the frequency of fishing. Note that the "definite support" proportions are 63% who don't fish at all, 70% amongst "rare" fishers (fish up to 4 times a year) and 48% amongst regular and frequent fishers. Nonetheless, a majority of all subsets at least "tend to support" the proposition.

Interestingly, as Table 5 in the Appendix shows, 46% of respondents who fish in Federal waters "definitely" support this proposition and a further 22% "tend to support it". Whilst



the sample of respondents who fish in Federal waters is small (just 41 respondents), it would seem that a majority of these respondents support the proposition.

#### **4.5 INFLUENCE ON GOVERNMENT**

Respondents were told that:

“There is a range of opinions about the best way to protect WA’s marine life for the future. When considering the most appropriate actions to protect WA’s marine life, to what extent do you think the Government should be influenced by the opinions expressed by the following groups?”

Respondents were then read out in rotated order the options of:

- Recreational fishing groups
- The commercial fishing industry
- Marine scientific institutions and Universities
- The offshore mining industry; and
- Conservation organisations.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they believe that each of these groups should have a:

- Very low
- Quite low
- Neither high or low
- Quite high
- Very high

influence on the Government policy to protect the marine environment.

As Table T4.5 overleaf indicates, respondents believe that the greatest attention should be paid to the opinions expressed by Marine scientific institutions and Universities (79% believe that this group should have a high influence on Government policy).

**Table T4.5 Amount of influence groups should have on Govt policy to protect the marine environment**

**T4.5**

	VERY LOW	QUITE LOW	NEITHER HIGH OR LOW	QUITE HIGH	VERY HIGH	DON'T KNOW	NET LOW	NEUTRAL	NET HIGH	TOTALS
	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %
Recreational	7	12	38	30	13	1	19	38	42	100
Commercial	9	14	33	29	13	1	23	33	42	100
Marine Science	2	4	15	35	44	-	6	15	79	100
Offshore	32	18	27	15	5	2	51	27	20	100
Conservation	5	5	24	35	30	0	11	24	65	100

Almost 8 out of 10 believe that Marine and scientific institutions and Universities should have a high influence on Government in formulating this policy. Two thirds (65%) believe that conservation organisations should have a high influence, 4 out of 10 believe that the recreational fishing groups (and the same proportion) that the commercial fishing industry should have a high influence on Government policy. Only 1 in 5 believe that the offshore mining industry should have a high influence on Government policy.

As may be anticipated, regular fishers were more likely than non fishers to indicate that recreational fishing groups should have a higher influence (61% of frequent fishers believe that recreational fishing groups should have a high influence compared to 35% of non fishers). See Table 7 in the Appendix for details. However, 74% of frequent fishers believe that the Marine scientific institutions and Universities should have a high influence. In other words, whilst their support for recreational fishing groups is greater than the general population, they are even more likely to support the notion that marine science should influence Government than recreational fishing groups. It would seem that the regular and frequent fishers are more likely to want Government policy driven by marine science than the opinions of the recreational fishing groups.

For details about the relative importance placed on the input from each of the five groups canvassed in the question, see Tables 7 to 11 in the Appendix.

## 4.6 HOW MUCH OF WA'S MARINE WATERS IS REASONABLE TO BE SET ASIDE IN SANCTUARIES?

Respondents were asked to indicate:

"If the Govt decides to create marine sanctuaries in the waters off the WA coast, how much of our marine waters do you think is reasonable to be set aside in such sanctuaries?"

They were then read out a scale in rotated order (from high to low and then low to high) of a range of:

- None at all
- Less than 10%
- At least 10%
- At least 20%
- At least 30%
- At least 40%
- At least 50%.

As Table T4.6 below indicates, slightly over 1 in 4 believe at least 50% of the waters off the WA coast should be placed in sanctuaries.

Table T4.6 Proportion of waters should be in sanctuaries

T4.6	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
	N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %	N=50 %
None at all	1	1	2	1	1	-	1	-	5	-
Less than 10%	2	3	2	1	3	-	2	2	5	1
At least 10%	11	11	12	14	12	1	9	11	13	24
At least 20%	15	15	15	15	17	6	15	10	25	13
At least 30%	24	24	26	19	27	26	26	27	17	18
At least 40%	13	14	11	15	11	15	13	16	7	11
At least 50%	27	27	26	31	22	45	25	30	23	32
Don't know	7	7	7	6	6	7	9	4	6	-
<b>NET 30% OR MORE</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Indeed, 13% believe that at least 40% should be in sanctuaries and 24% at least 30%. In aggregate, some 64% believe that 30% or more of the waters off the WA coast should be put into marine sanctuaries.

It is interesting to note that the support for 30% or more to be put into marine sanctuaries is heightened for Green voters (as may be anticipated) and for "rare" (1 -4 times a year) fishers. Only the "regular" fishing group (who fish from 5 to 12 times a year) show less than 50% in support of at least 30% of the marine waters to be placed into marine sanctuaries. Note that 61% of frequent fishers support the notion that 30% or more be put into sanctuaries, as do 57% of those who had fished in Federal waters in the least 12 months (see table 12 in the appendix). There is a clear majority of all other sub groups in support of at least 30% into sanctuaries.

Note also that there is a very small proportion of respondents that believe that less than 10% of the waters off the WA coast should be placed into marine sanctuaries. Just 1% believe that no sanctuaries should be created at all, and 2% believe that up to 10% should be available for placement into marine sanctuaries.

#### **4.7 SUPPORT FOR 30% SANCTUARIES IN REGIONS OFF THE WA COAST**

Respondents were told that:

“The science indicates that about 30% of the marine environment should be put into such sanctuaries to be effective in protecting marine life. The best places to create marine sanctuaries will be determined by scientific analysis of the marine environment. For each region I read out can you please tell me if it would be:

- Completely unacceptable
- Quite unacceptable
- Neither one nor the other
- Quite acceptable; or
- Completely acceptable

to you if up to 30% of each of the following areas was put into marine sanctuaries.

In each instance, respondents were asked to rate how acceptable it would be if “up to 30% of each area was put into marine sanctuaries”. The areas discussed where:

- Metropolitan Perth
- Perth to Geraldton
- Kimberley
- Perth to Busselton
- Busselton to Augusta
- East of Augusta

In other words, the notion of the area of up to 30%, and being more than 5 kilometres off the coast was repeated for each of the six zones under consideration.

Importantly, the order of presentation of the six zones was randomly rotated to ensure that there was no sequence effect in the respondents’ assessments. As the data indicates, almost 7 out of 10 respondents regard each of the propositions to be acceptable.

As Table T4.7 below indicates, the “net acceptable” proportions approximate 70% for each of the zones, with relatively small proportions (about one in six or less) regarding the creation of such sanctuaries as being unacceptable.

**Table T4.7 Acceptability of 30% of marine sanctuaries in regions off the WA coast**

Up to 30% of waters more than 5kms off the coast of:	Net Unacceptable	Neutral	Net Acceptable	Don't know	Total
	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %	N=604 %
	Metro Perth	17	14	67	2
Perth – Geraldton	14	13	70	2	100
Kimberley	11	13	73	3	100
Perth – Busselton	15	14	69	3	100
Busselton – Augusta	13	12	72	2	100
East of Augusta	11	14	72	3	100

The Table above shows the proportion that regard each of these propositions to be either net unacceptable (“completely unacceptable” or “quite unacceptable”), respondents who are “neutral”, and those who find the proposition “net acceptable” (“completely acceptable” and “quite acceptable”). “Don’t know” responses are also shown.

It is also interesting to look at the reaction to each of these propositions in greater detail.

#### *4.7.1 ACCEPTABILITY OF SANCTUARIES MORE THAN 5 KILOMETRES OFF THE COAST (AND ISLANDS) OF METROPOLITAN PERTH*

When the acceptability of sanctuaries off metropolitan Perth is considered in greater detail, we find from Table T4.7.1 that it appears to be acceptable to the majority of all sub groups examined, and it is interesting that even amongst frequent fishers (12 or more times a year) over 1 in 4 (28%) regard it as being “completely acceptable”, with a further 32% regarding it as being “quite acceptable” resulting in a net of 60% believing that such sanctuaries off metropolitan Perth of up to 30% of Federal waters would be acceptable.

As Table T4.7.1 indicates, the proposition is most acceptable to Green Voters (84%), but acceptable to two thirds of ALP and Liberals/National voters alike (respectively 67% and 65% would find this proposition acceptable).

Nonetheless, it must be recognised that slightly over 1 in 6 (17%) find the proposition to be unacceptable to them, and this proportion is heightened amongst fishers (20%; 24% and 21% respectively of “rare”; “regular” and “frequent” fishers find the proposition to be unacceptable).

Table T4.7.1 Acceptability of Sanctuaries off Perth

**T4.7.1**

	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
	N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %	N=50 %
Completely unacceptable	5	5	4	8	4	4	4	4	5	11
Quite unacceptable	12	11	14	10	14	5	9	15	19	10
Neither one nor the other	14	13	17	13	14	5	14	13	14	20
Quite acceptable	46	45	48	45	47	50	49	40	49	32
Completely acceptable	21	24	14	23	18	34	19	27	12	28
Don't know	2	3	2	2	3	1	4	-	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

#### 4.7.2 THE WATERS FROM PERTH TO GERALDTON

As Table T4.7.2 below indicates, 70% overall find it acceptable that up to 30% of the waters from Perth to Geraldton would be placed in a marine sanctuary. As Table T4.7.2 below indicates, 8 out of 10 of Green voters find it acceptable (86% compared to 67% of Liberal/National voters and 75% of ALP voters). Metropolitan voters are also more likely than their country counterparts to find it to be acceptable (72% compared to 66%) but it is clear that the majority of all subsets would find it acceptable for 30% of the waters from Perth to Geraldton to be placed into a marine sanctuary.

Table T4.7.2 Acceptability of sanctuaries in waters Perth to Geraldton

T4.7.2	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Completely unacceptable	3	4	1	6	3	2	2	3	3	6
Quite unacceptable	11	10	14	8	13	4	10	8	19	16
Neither one nor the other	13	12	17	11	15	4	12	13	21	16
Quite acceptable	48	47	51	49	49	50	52	42	48	42
Completely acceptable	22	25	15	25	18	35	21	32	9	20
Don't know	2	2	2	1	2	4	4	1	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>



#### 4.7.3 THE KIMBERLEY COAST

Almost 3 out of 4 (73%) respondents indicated that they would find it acceptable for up to 30% of the Kimberley coast to be placed into a marine sanctuary. As Table T4.7.3 below indicates, this proposition is accepted very strongly across all of the demographic groups examined, including the most frequent fishers. As we have seen before however, the “regular” fishers (8 to 12 times per annum) have slightly less enthusiasm for the notion of marine sanctuaries in the Kimberley (or indeed anywhere else). Nonetheless, the majority of all groups support the proposition.

Table T4.7.3 Acceptability of sanctuary off Kimberley coast

T4.7.3	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Completely unacceptable	3	3	1	4	2	2	3	3	2	1
Quite unacceptable	8	7	11	6	11	1	6	7	18	11
Neither one nor the other	13	11	20	13	12	4	11	16	17	16
Quite acceptable	42	41	46	40	43	50	45	35	45	37
Completely acceptable	31	35	20	35	28	41	30	39	18	33
Don't know	3	3	2	2	3	1	4	1	-	2
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

As we noticed in other areas, about 1 in 10 (11% in this instance) find the notion of a marine sanctuary to be unacceptable in the Kimberley coast.

#### 4.7.4 FROM PERTH TO BUSSELTON

Almost 7 out of 10 (69%) find it acceptable for marine sanctuaries to be created in the waters between Perth and Busselton, though the proportion of frequent fishers in support falls marginally below 6 out of 10 (59%).

Table T4.7.4 Acceptability of sanctuaries in waters Perth to Busselton

T4.7.4	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Completely unacceptable	5	6	4	9	5	4	4	5	9	9
Quite unacceptable	9	8	14	5	11	10	8	9	12	16
Neither one nor the other	14	13	17	14	15	6	14	13	19	16
Quite acceptable	47	48	46	50	48	41	48	46	54	36
Completely acceptable	21	23	18	21	18	37	22	26	7	23
Don't know	3	3	2	1	3	3	4	1	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

It is interesting to note from the above that support amongst country respondents is lower than that amongst metropolitan respondents (63% compared to 70% find the proposition acceptable), but as we have found in other regions, a clear majority of all groups examined support the proposition, with about 1 in 6 (15%) finding the proposition unacceptable. This "unacceptable" proportion grows to 18% in the country, and up to 25% amongst frequent fishers.

4.7.5 BUSSELTON TO AUGUSTA

Slightly over 7 out of 10 (72%) would find it acceptable for the waters from Busselton to Augusta to have marine sanctuaries occupying up to 30% of the Federal waters off the coast. See Table T4.7.5 below which shows the quite strong support for this proposition across all demographic groups.

Table T4.7.5 Acceptability of sanctuaries in waters Busselton to Augusta

T4.7.5	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
	N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %	N=50 %
Completely unacceptable	3	3	3	5	4	2	2	3	8	5
Quite unacceptable	10	9	13	9	10	3	10	7	11	16
Neither one nor the other	12	10	18	13	12	6	10	14	20	10
Quite acceptable	49	51	45	50	51	43	50	47	52	44
Completely acceptable	23	25	19	23	20	43	24	28	91	24
Don't know	2	3	2	-	3	3	4	1	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

It is interesting to note from the above that the “regular” and “frequent” fishers are most likely to oppose this proposition, with respectively 19% and 22% indicating that this notion would be unacceptable to them. This is more than offset however by the respectively 61% and 68% of these groups who would find it acceptable.

#### 4.7.6 THE SOUTH COAST EAST OF AUGUSTA

As Table T4.7.6 below indicates, slightly over 7 out of 10 (72%) would find it acceptable for 30% of the Federal waters off the South Coast East of Augusta to be placed into marine sanctuaries. This proportion varies from 88% amongst Green voters down to 71% amongst Liberal/National voters. Note also that there is a lower proportion of country respondents (67%) than metropolitan respondents (74%) who would find this proposition acceptable. As we have seen in other precincts, the “regular” fishers (8 to 12 fishing trips per annum) are the least likely to support the proposition, but nonetheless two thirds of this group (66%) would find the notion acceptable.

Table T4.7.6 Availability of sanctuaries on South Coast East of Augusta

T4.7.6	TOTAL	LOCATION		STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS			
		METRO	COUNTRY	ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	NONE	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=604 %	N=451 %	N=153 %	N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=368 %	N=123 %	N=63 %
Completely unacceptable	3	3	1	6	2	2	3	3	3	3
Quite unacceptable	8	7	11	6	11	1	7	8	15	8
Neither one nor the other	14	13	17	15	12	5	13	15	16	14
Quite acceptable	48	48	48	48	49	55	51	40	53	46
Completely acceptable	24	26	19	25	23	33	23	32	12	30
Don't know	3	3	4	1	4	3	4	2	-	-
<b>SUMMARY</b>										
<b>NET UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>NEUTRAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>NET ACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

## 4.8 EXTENT OF FISHING ACTIVITY AMONGST THE WA COMMUNITY

As noted previously, 56% of our sample indicated that they had undertaken no fishing activity in the last twelve months. Table T4.8 below summarises this, and note that Table T4.8 adds beyond 100% due to some respondents undertaking multiple forms of fishing within the last twelve months.

Table T4.8 Extent of fishing activity in last twelve months

T4.8	TOTAL	AGE		GENDER		LOCATION	
		Up to 35 years	36 years plus	Male	Female	Metro	Country
		N=604 %	N=128 %	N=475 %	N=299 %	N=305 %	N=451 %
No fishing activity	56	41	63	46	67	61	43
Fished from boat in state waters (up to 3 nautical miles or just over 5kms off the coast – including Rotto)	22	26	20	30	13	22	22
Fished from a boat in Federal waters (beyond 3 nautical miles or just over 5kms – but beyond Rotto)	7	9	6	11	3	7	8
Fished from beach/ rocks/other land based	31	43	26	37	25	26	46
Other fishing activity	1	1	1	1	0	1	-
Total	117	121	116	125	109	117	119

*\* Note: Due to multiple responses, the above figures may not add up to 100%*

Table T4.8 Continued: Extent of fishing activity in last twelve months

T4.8	TOTAL	STATE VOTING INTENT			FREQ FISH IN LAST 12 MONTHS		
		ALP	LIBS/ NATS	GREENS	RARE	REGULAR	FREQUENT
		N=142 %	N=305 %	N=55 %	N=123 %	N=63 %	N=50 %
No fishing activity	56	54	57	59	-	-	-
Fished from boat in state waters (up to 3 nautical miles or just over 5kms off the coast – including Rotto)	22	23	23	14	36	71	57
Fished from a boat in Federal waters (beyond 3 nautical miles or just over 5kms – but beyond Rotto)	7	9	9	-	9	18	33
Fished from beach/ rocks/other land based	31	33	30	24	72	65	78
Other fishing activity	1	1	1	2	1	1	4
Total	117	120	120	100	118	154	172

*\* Note: Due to multiple responses, the above figures add beyond 100%*

It is interesting to note that 54% of males indicated that they had done some form of fishing in the last twelve months compared to 33% of females. Thirty nine percent of metropolitan respondents and 57% of country respondents report having undertaken some fishing activity in the last twelve months. There is very little difference between Labor Liberal/National and Green voters on this measure, with respectively 46%; 43% and 41% indicating that they had undertaken some form of fishing in the last twelve months.

It is interesting to note that a third (33%) of "frequent" fishers report having fished in Federal waters within the last twelve months compared to 18% of "regular" fishers and just 9% of "rare" fishers.

The most common form of fishing activity for both metropolitan and country respondents is to fish from a beach or rocks or other land. Twenty six percent of metropolitan respondents and 46% of country respondents report having fished in this way at some stage in the last twelve months.

Fishing also appears to be an age related activity. Note that 37% of respondents aged 36 years and over reported having fished at least once in the last twelve months compared to 59% of respondents aged 18 – 35 years.

Overall, 7% of respondents report having fished once only in the last twelve months, 16% had fished 2 to 4 times in that period; 9% from 5 to 8 times and 2% from 9 to 12 times. Ten percent of respondents reported that they had fished more than twelve times in the last twelve months. This varied from 7% of metropolitan respondents to 16% of country respondents. Fifteen percent of 18 – 35 year olds report having fished 12 or more times in the last twelve months compared to 7% of those aged 36 years and over. (For details see Table 21 in the Appendix).

## ***APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE***

## ***APPENDIX B – DATA ANALYSIS TABLES***