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Research context

- Sixth full round of research in social research series
- Survey conducted triennially since 1994
  - with interim survey in 2007: *Who Cares about Water and Climate Change?*
- Includes qualitative component each year (focus groups)
Why do we do it?

- Measure and track environmental knowledge, attitudes and behaviours....
  .... a point in time snapshot plus adding to our understanding of longer term changes

- Provide information for all sectors that helps in identifying priorities, developing, targeting and evaluating policy and programs

- Promote discussion and awareness of the social dimension of environmental protection and sustainability initiatives and the value of underpinning social research
Research design

Quantitative telephone survey
- 2,003 NSW residents aged 15yrs+; June-July 2009
- Geographically-stratified, random sample across NSW
  - quotas (and weighted) for age, gender and location
- Measure environmental knowledge, attitudes and behaviours

Focus group discussions (qualitative)
- 7 across metro and regional NSW; December 2009
- Recruited from survey sample
- Help explain survey results and understand community segments
Community context  June - July 2009

- Global financial crisis and economic concerns
- Continuing focus on hospital system
- Long drought 2003-07 had eased in parts of NSW, water restrictions began to be reduced in June 2008
- Garnaut report recommending an emissions trading scheme to combat climate change launched in Sept ’08
- Federal Govt. intention to have a CPRS announced early 2009
- Significant increases in electricity costs proposed by IPART in 2007, but first rises not until mid-2009 (time of survey), attention only just starting to focus on energy efficiency
- Ongoing debate about public transport issues – NSW Government announced inner city Metro in 2008
Demographics and Community Segments

The basis for analysis of differences
Demographic characteristics

- Gender
- Age
- Location by settlement type
- Location by region (LG regions, some combined)
- Education level
- Language spoken at home
- Employment status
- Parental status
- Dwelling type

Weighted and unweighted sample compared to NSW population (2006 census) - see main report, Appendix A
Regional data - local government regions

Sydney Inner, n = 420
Sydney Outer, n = 697
Sydney Surrounds, n = 132

Map source: Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet: www.dlg.nsw.gov.au
Inner and Outer Sydney regions

Surrounds = Gosford, Wyong, Hawkesbury, Blue Mountains, Wollondilly

Map source: Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet: www.dlg.nsw.gov.au
Regional data - local government regions

Hunter region, n = 195
Illawarra region, n = 120

Map source: Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet: www.dlg.nsw.gov.au
Regional data - local government regions

CW/SE = Central West and South Eastern,
\[ n = 113 \]

Mid North Coast
\[ n = 85 \]

Richmond-Tweed
\[ n = 69 \]

Map source: Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet: www.dlg.nsw.gov.au
Regional data: local government regions

Mu/Me = Murray/Murrumbidgee, n = 81
N/NW/FW = Northern/North Western/Far West, n = 91

Map source: Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet: www.dlg.nsw.gov.au
Community segments

Analysis: from the survey, segments were identified based on engagement in environmental behaviours

HOUSEHOLD BEHAVIOURS
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Also linked to environmental concern

Concern and behaviours

COMMITTEDS PRIVATES RELUCTANTS

Findings include differences between these segments as well as differences between demographic groups
Household and citizenship behaviours

**Household-based behaviours**
- Avoided heavily packaged products when shopping
- Re-used something instead of throwing it away
- Chose household products better for the environment
- Bought fewer items that you don’t really need

**Citizenship behaviours**
- Tried to get information on an environmental topic or issue
- Took part in a Landcare, Bushcare, tree planting or other restoration project
- Tried to encourage someone else to change an activity or practice
- Participated in local development or environmental issue
Behaviour segment profiles

Three segments identified based on engagement in environmental behaviours

Committeds (38%)
High on both household and citizenship behaviours
More likely to be:
• female
• university graduates
• live in rural areas

Privates (32%)
High on household but low on citizenship behaviours
More likely to be:
• female
• retired
• not completed Yr 12
• have children

Reluctants (21%)
Low on both household and citizenship behaviours
More likely to be:
• male
• aged 15-24
• live in Sydney
SURVEY FINDINGS

Priorities values and attitudes
Priorities for NSW Government

Environment remains in the top five issues for NSW government attention, now and in the future
What would you say are the two most important issues for attention by the State Government at present? (unprompted)
Two important issues for NSW Government at present – detail

Issues in the ‘environmental group’
Defining ‘environmental issues’ amongst other issues (Qs 1a and 1b)

Problem

- These were open-ended questions – people say many things in many different ways.
- Some clearly say ‘the environment’, and some mention an issue that is clearly environmental e.g. climate change or soil erosion.
- But some mention issues that may or may not be an environmental issue to them eg water – “always there when I turn on the tap” vs environmental flows for rivers.
- Issues increase and decline over time in prominence – must be more than 2% to be reported as a separate category – eg water was given a separate category in 2003 and 2006 through the drought.
- We need to accurately reflect and report what people are saying in a consistent way over time.
- We need to capture environmental issues without overclaiming those where the respondent may not have been thinking about the environment.
Solution adopted in *Who Cares?*

For Questions 1a and 1b

- The detailed chart shows show all categories separately:
  - *'the environment' and specific environmental issues* (issues mentioned at <2%)
  - other issues with >2% that have both environmental and non-environmental dimensions (*water, energy, planning and development*)

- The summary charts gather up the broader ‘environmental group of issues’. This group consists of *environment/specific environmental issues* and all mentions of water energy and planning that we know are considered environmental by *the respondent*

- How do we know? If a respondent mentions one of these issues in Q.1 and same issue in Q.2 (environmental issues), the response is counted in the environmental group of issues. Proportions counted are shown in the report (as in next slide).
Shown in the report as.... Q1a, Fig 1

- 10% of this group nominated planning and development as an environmental issue in Q2.
- 77% of this group nominated water as an environmental issue in Q2.
- 50% of this group nominated energy or climate change as an environmental issue in Q2.

Proportions counted in the environmental group.
Health is in similar position to 2003

Education declining since 2003 but N/NW/FW 36%

Public transport increasing since 1997

Financial issues spike in 2009

Most important issue for NSW Government at present – trends over time
Most important issue for NSW Government at present – trends over time

Public transport increasing since 1997
Domated by Sydney:
Inner Sydney 30%
Outer Sydney 29%
Minor issue in many regions: CW/SE 10%
N/NW/FW and Mu/Me 3%

Mu/Me 11%
Most important issue for NSW Government at present – trends over time

- Health system: Increased from 43 to 50
- Education: Increased from 15 to 23
- Public transport/railways: Increased from 12 to 21
- Roads and traffic: Increased from 11 to 15
- Unemployment: Increased from 4 to 6
- The environment/environmental issues: Increased from 8 to 11
- The economy/economic growth: Increased from 1 to 5
- State Budget and finances: Increased from 1 to 5
- Planning and development: Increased more than doubled
- Government performance: Remained constant at 5
- Water supply/water conservation/drought: Increased from 3 to 12
- Energy supply and management: Increased from 2 to 5

The environment category increased a little

Planning and development more than doubled

Accounts for decrease in ‘environmental group’ even though ‘environment’ has grown

But water declined dramatically 12% ➔ 3%, not in top 10
What do you think will be the two most important issues for attention by the State Government in ten years? (unprompted)
Present compared to future priority

The top current issues are less important in the future

All environmental issues seen as more important in future than present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>In 10 Yrs</th>
<th>Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health system</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport/railways</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and traffic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy/economic growth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State budget/finances</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/law &amp; order</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal financial issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation/drought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation/stamp duties/GST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy supply/management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageing population &amp; issues</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/not sure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment as current and future priority – in summary

- From 2006:

  ‘Environment’/specific environmental issues
  - as a current priority, 6 ➔ 8%
  - as a future priority, 10 ➔ 17%

  Environmental group of issues
  - as a current priority, 16 ➔ 11%
  - as a future priority, 24 ➔ 22%

- Reflects decline in water issues

- But still 5th as current, and 2nd as future, priority as in 2006

- All environmental issues seen as more important in future than present
Most important issues for attention by the NSW government - differences

- Committeds more likely to nominate an environmental issue now and for the future as a priority for the government
- Younger people/students more likely to nominate the environment as a current and future priority
Concern about environmental problems

Are you concerned?  
Yes 78%  
No 22%

How concerned?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
<th>A Fair Amount</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to 2006: 87% concerned
Concern about environmental problems

Are you concerned?  Yes:  women 84%, men 74%

How concerned?

Over 55s polarised at the two extremes: > 30% concerned a great deal, almost 30% not concerned

People with children concerned a great deal: 28% compared to 19% of those without children
Concern about environmental problems

How concerned?

Committeds 38%
Reluctants 6%

Reluctants
19% 39% = 58% little or no concern
Committeds 17%

2009
25
42
11
22

2006
34
43
9
13

A Great Deal  A Fair Amount  A little  No
Why concerned?

- Concern for future generations: 38% (35% in 2006)
- Maintaining ecosystems: 19% (15% in 2006)
- Long-term economic sustainability: 13% (10% in 2006)
- Health effects of pollution: 10% (11% in 2006)
- Availability of resources we consume: 10% (9% in 2006)
- Quality of life: 9% (18% in 2006)

% respondents concerned environmental problems

- 2009 n=1554
- 2006 n=1511

Prompted list - responses read out to respondent

Significant increases

Dramatic decline - halved
Why concerned?

- Concern for future generations: 38% (2009), 35% (2006)
- Maintaining ecosystems: 19% (2009), 15% (2006)
- Health effects of pollution: 10% (2009), 11% (2006)
- Availability of resources we consume: 10% (2009), 9% (2006)
- Quality of life: 9% (2009), 18% (2006)

% respondents concerned environmental problems

Parents 43% vs 29%
Committeds 24%
Non-parents 25%
Privates 13%
Reluctants 14%

Qualitative research:
Committeds think environment is precious and should be protected; concerned about own life and local area but also environment globally
Privates and Reluctants focus more narrowly on how environmental damage will impact them personally

Responses read out to respondent as part of a prompted list.
Reasons for lack of concern

Those not concerned asked: *Can you say why you are not concerned?* (unprompted)

“The problem is not as bad as they say”

2006 6% ↑ 24% in 2009 – quadrupled

…..replaced as top reason:

“Low priority compared to other issues”

2006 21% ↓ 12% in 2009 – almost halved

Other reasons that have declined:

• No impact on me personally
• The condition of the environment is good/well-managed, in my area or in general
There were no statistically significant regional differences from the average (for any region) on any of the concern questions
The most important environmental issues 2006 and 2009

Less concerned about water:
- 15-24s 30%
- Those speaking another language 33%

What would you say is the **single most important environmental** issue facing NSW today? (unprompted)

And the **second** most important issue?
The most important environmental issues 2006 and 2009

### Qualitative research:
WATER not any more necessarily an environmental issue:
- Water-saving behaviours normalised
- Uncontentious issue, clear benefits
- Not part of the ‘cult of the environment’

**Reluctants** focus on water restrictions
**Commiteds and Privates** more attuned to broader issues
The most important environmental issues 2006 and 2009

Climate change plus sub-themes in energy with climate change implications = 38%
The most important environmental issues 2006 and 2009

- **Water supply, conservation, management/drought**:
  - 2006: 42%
  - 2009: 57%

- **Climate change**:
  - 2006: 13%
  - 2009: 23%

- **Energy**:
  - 2006: 17%
  - 2009: 12%

- **Air pollution/air quality**:
  - 2006: 17%
  - 2009: 20%

- **Waste**:
  - 2006: 14%
  - 2009: 8%

- **Forest/bushland/biodiversity**:
  - 2006: 12%
  - 2009: 16%

- **Water pollution/water quality**:
  - 2006: 10%
  - 2009: 11%

- **Other pollution**:
  - 2006: 10%
  - 2009: 10%

- **Development and planning**:
  - 2006: 5%
  - 2009: 7%

- **Land degradation**:
  - 2006: 3%
  - 2009: 4%

- **Mining**:
  - 2006: 3%
  - 2009: 0%

**Air pollution** has dropped to 4th issue (from 2nd) for first time.

**Biodiversity issues** have dropped to 6th (from 3rd) for first time.

**Other language**

- 22% vs 16%
- 19% vs 13%

Bounced back to near pre-2006 levels.
The most important environmental issues 2006 and 2009

- **Waste**: Outer Sydney 18%
- **Forest/bushland/ biodiversity**: Sydney surrounds 13%
- **Water pollution/ water quality**: Mid north coast 9%
- **Other pollution**: Hunter 8%
- **Climate change**: more a Sydney issue 20%
- **Energy**: N/NW/FW 9%
- **Air pollution/air quality**: N/NW/FW 9%
- **Water supply, conservation, management/drought**: Mu/Me 62%
Most important environmental issues – trends over time

Increases in climate change and energy issues have mirrored a decrease in air quality issues.

Increase in water conservation issues has mirrored decrease in water quality issues.
What would you say is the single most important thing that the NSW Government could do to protect and look after the environment over the next few years?
Environmental initiatives for NSW Government

- Energy and greenhouse: 14
- Education: 4% increase
- Water supply, conservation & management: 19
- Regulation: 9
- Government strategies: 9
- Vegetation and biodiversity: 8
- Public transport: 5
- Waste: 5
- Air quality / air pollution: 5
- Development, population and planning: 3
- River management: 2
- Water quality / water pollution: 5

‘Traditional’ issues, air and water quality and waste declined further

2009

2006
Environmental initiatives for NSW Government

- Education 2009: 10, 2006: 6
- Water supply, conservation & management 2009: 10, 2006: 10
- Regulation 2009: 9, 2006: 8
- Vegetation and biodiversity 2009: 7, 2006: 8
- Public transport 2009: 5, 2006: 5
- Air quality / air pollution 2009: 4, 2006: 5
- Development, population and planning 2009: 3, 2006: 3
- River management 2009: 2, 2006: 2
- Water quality / water pollution 2009: 1, 2006: 5

- Men 18% vs 10% women
- Students 20%
- 55-64s 15%
- 15-24s 18%
Environmental initiatives for NSW Government

- Energy and greenhouse: 14% (2009), 9% (2006)
- Education: 10% (2009), 6% (2006)
- Water supply, conservation & management: 19% (2009), 10% (2006)
- Regulation: 9% (2009), 8% (2006)
- Government strategies: 8% (2009), 4% (2006)
- Vegetation and biodiversity: 8% (2009), 7% (2006)
- Public transport: 5% (2009), 5% (2006)
- Waste: 5% (2009), 4% (2006)
- Air quality / air pollution: 5% (2009), 4% (2006)
- Development, population and planning: 3% (2009), 3% (2006)
- River management: 2% (2009), 2% (2006)
- Water quality / water pollution: 1% (2009), 5% (2006)

Range: N/NW/FW and Mu/Me 7% compared to Sydney surrounds 17%, Inner Sydney 18%

Mu/Me highest 21%, compared to 4% Richmond-Tweed

N/NW/FW highest 15%, compared to 5% Mu/Me
Knowledge and views
Climate change - knowledge

- Half of NSW residents knew that greenhouse effect is not caused by a hole in the Earth’s atmosphere (F)
  - Men 57% vs women 45%, English only speakers 53% vs 43%
  - 25-34s 43%, Privates 45%

- 48% knew electricity generation in NSW is a bigger source of carbon pollution than transport (new question)
Climate change – beliefs

78% believe climate change is happening or will happen

- Students 91%
- 15-34 year olds 85-87%
- University graduates 83%
- Committeds 83% but Reluctants 71%

17% don’t believe climate change is happening or will happen

- People in rural areas 29%
- 65+ 27%

There has been a lot of discussion in the community recently about global warming and climate change. Do you believe climate change is happening or going to happen?
Climate change – beliefs (of those who think it will happen)

Impact

76% think it will have a great deal or a fair amount of impact on them or their children

Committeds 83% vs Reluctants 65%

23% think there will be little or no impact

Timing

46% think we are feeling impacts now or they will be felt in less than 5 years

Women 50%, men 42%  
CW/SE 62%

Committeds 51% vs Reluctants 36%

31% think impacts won’t be felt for at least 20 years
Climate change - belief about action
(whole sample)

69% agree NSW should take urgent action on climate change, regardless of current economic and social conditions
- Women 73%, men 66%
- Those speaking another language 75% (vs 67%)
- 15-34s 76-78%, students 79%
- Committeds 78%

27% disagreed
- Retirees 35%
- Those with trade/technical qualification 35%
- Reluctants 41%
Knowledge – other issues

39% knew industrial sites and sewerage treatment facilities cause less water/beach pollution than rainfall runoff (new)
   Men 45%, women 33%, 55-64s 47%
   English only 42% vs 29% other language
   University graduates 45%

35% knew more water is used for agriculture in NSW than domestic and manufacturing combined (no change since 2006)
   Men 41%, women 29%

32% knew recycling paper, cardboard and glass saves materials as well as water, energy and fuel (slight increase from 2006)
   Students 44%
Levels of knowledge - comparisons

On 5 knowledge questions, total average correct: 2.1

- Men answered more questions correctly: av. 2.3 compared to 1.8 for women
- Over 65s answered less questions correctly: av. 1.8
- Correct answers by segments:
  - Committeds 2.2
  - Reluctants 2.0
  - Privates lowest with 1.9
There were no statistically significant differences from the average (for any region) on any of the knowledge questions

But there was a range of correct answers:

For sources of water pollution (av correct 39%):
   29% Murray-Murrumbidgee to
   50% Northern/western/Far west and Mid-north coast

For electricity generation as source of carbon pollution (av: 48%)
   38% Northern/western/Far west and Mid-north coast to
   58% Illawarra

For use of water by agriculture (av 35%):
   24% Illawarra to
   42% Central West/Southeast and 45% Northern/western/Far west
Perceptions of changes in the environment

I’ll now read out a list of different environmental issues or situations. For each one can you tell me if you think that, over the last three years, things in NSW generally have become much better, a bit better, a bit worse, much worse or there has been little or no change?

- Views on 20 environmental issues were sought, 16 asked at least once previously, 4 new
- For 16 previously asked, none showed increase in 2009 (from 2006) in proportion of people saying it was deteriorating, unlike 2006 when more people were pessimistic on many issues
- The issues which the most people said had improved were:
  - Reducing water consumption (74% said it is better)
  - Cleanliness of beaches (51% said better)
  - Conserving Aboriginal cultural heritage (50% said better)

Ensuring enough water flowing in rivers – the only issue that more people thought had deteriorated (35%) than thought had improved (27%)
Increased optimism about changes in the environment

Proportion who said things better in last 3 years

Reducing electricity use 48% 20%
Reducing greenhouse gas emissions 40% 15%
Reducing water consumption 74% 9%
Encouraging alternatives to motor vehicles 34% 8%
Ensuring enough water flowing in rivers 27% 7%
Protecting and conserving Aboriginal cultural heritage 50% 6%
## Issues for which more say there is no change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Proportion who said little or no change in last 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quietness, control of noise</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the air</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecuting environmental offenders</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing clearing of native vegetation</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal planning and conservation</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing amount of waste community produces</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences in views

- Women were more likely than men to see improvement in issues
- 15-24s and students were more likely to see improvement in issues
- Over 65s / retirees were more likely to see deterioration in issues
- For many issues there were no differences by segment

For many issues there were no differences by segment, except:

- Committeds more likely to think reducing clearing of native vegetation and managing weeds and feral animals improving, Reluctants less likely see improvement, instead - no change
- Committeds more likely to see improvement in community participation in environmental management

- There were regional differences on about 2/3rds of the issues
Inland regions’ differences in views

North/Northwest/Far west (N/NW/FW) higher numbers said:

- Water quality worse - 49% (av 28%)
- environmental flows worse - 50% (av 35%)
- reducing waste the community produces worse – 36% (av 21%)
- reducing the amount of litter worse – 38% av (20%)
- protection and conservation of endangered plants/animals better – 56% (av 45%)

Murray/Murrumbidgee (MU/Me) higher numbers said:

- water quality worse - 47% (av 28%)
- environmental flows worse - 51% (av 35%)

Central West/southeast (CW/SE) higher numbers said:

- environmental flows worse - 53% (av 35%)
- managing weeds and feral animals worse - 30% (av 16%)
Coastal regions’ differences in views

• More from Inner Sydney said noise, air quality and waste and protecting marine environment worse (or less said better) but more said ‘don’t know’ on native vegetation clearing, weeds and water quality

• Outer Sydney less likely to say environmental flows worse

• Mid-north coast 5% thought reducing litter was getting worse (av 20%)

• Richmond-Tweed 17% said coastal planning and conservation much better (av. 6%)

• Illawarra 40% said air quality better (av: 25%) and 51% thought coastal planning and conservation better (av: 36%)
### Attitudes towards environmental regulations

Views on regulation vary according to the sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>About half think it is about right</th>
<th>About half think it is too lax</th>
<th>About a quarter think it is too strict</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property development/ construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and households</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming and agriculture</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and commercial fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The percentages are approximate and based on the image data.*
Views on environmental regulations - trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Too strict</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too lax</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational and commercial fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming and agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property development/construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trend to increased view that regulation is about right
Farming: people in rural areas 34% too strict

Manufacturing: about right 34% men vs 27% women

Mining: too lax - speaking only English 53% vs 43% other language

Tourism: people in rural areas about right 70%

Individuals - very few differences by demographics, by segments or by region
Segment differences

**Committeds** more likely to say regulation is too lax for 5 of 9 sectors:
- farming and agriculture, manufacturing, mining, forestry, and property development and construction

**Privates** more likely to say regulation is about right for farming and agriculture

**Reluctants**
- more likely to say regulation about right for mining
- less likely to say regulation is too lax for 6 of 9 sectors:
  - farming and agriculture, manufacturing, mining, retailing, property development/construction, individuals and households
Views on specific environmental propositions

70% supported greater involvement of Aboriginal people in the management and conservation of the environment in NSW

Women 74% vs men 66%,
15-24s 80%, students 84%
Those with another language 76%
Committeds 77%

24% disagree
Residents of large country towns 31%
Reluctants 34%
Inner Sydney 16%
Propositions with a trade-off

85% strongly agreed/agreed that some areas of the marine environment should be protected even if it means commercial and recreational fishing is excluded

- 25-34s 91%
- University graduates 90%
- Sydney residents 89%
- Committeds 89%

52% agreed that rivers and wetlands should get enough water to stay healthy, even if it means some country towns and farms dependent on irrigation will lose business

- with strongly agree 7% from 2006: 11% → 18%

- Men 57%, women 47%
- University graduates 59%, Committeds 61%

42% disagree

- Reluctants 56%
- Outer Sydney 48%, Mu/Me 46% (24% strongly, compared to av 12%)
I will now read out a list of people or organisations in the community who may provide us with information on issues relating to the environment. In general, how reliable do you think information on environmental issues from each of these sources would be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Very reliable</th>
<th>Fairly reliable</th>
<th>Fairly unreliable</th>
<th>Very unreliable</th>
<th>Hard to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National environment and conservation orgs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local environment and conservation groups</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists and technical specialists</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service groups</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local councils</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt depts or agencies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Very reliable
- Fairly reliable
- Fairly unreliable
- Very unreliable
- Hard to say
Reliability of environmental information sources – top 7

Conservation groups trusted by the most people

The most trusted group in 2003 – declined by 7%

Increase in very reliable since 2003
Reliability of sources of environmental information sources – next 4

Members of your family or friends
- 2009: 16 Very reliable, 48 Fairly reliable, 23 Fairly unreliable, 4 Very unreliable, 9 Hard to say
- 2003: 17 Very reliable, 54 Fairly reliable, 23 Fairly unreliable, 4 Very unreliable, 3 Hard to say

Religious leaders and churches
- 2009: 7 Very reliable, 32 Fairly reliable, 30 Fairly unreliable, 17 Very unreliable, 15 Hard to say
- 2003: 8 Very reliable, 41 Fairly reliable, 32 Fairly unreliable, 14 Very unreliable, 5 Hard to say

Media personalities
- 2009: 4 Very reliable, 32 Fairly reliable, 34 Fairly unreliable, 18 Very unreliable, 12 Hard to say
- 2003: 2 Very reliable, 34 Fairly reliable, 40 Fairly unreliable, 20 Very unreliable, 3 Hard to say

Business and industry
- 2009: 3 Very reliable, 32 Fairly reliable, 39 Fairly unreliable, 17 Very unreliable, 9 Hard to say
- 2003: 4 Very reliable, 32 Fairly reliable, 42 Fairly unreliable, 18 Very unreliable, 3 Hard to say

Percentage of respondents

Almost as trusted as government
Rated unreliable by more people than rated them reliable
Who believes these sources?

Scientists and technical specialists:
• More trusted by: women, university graduates, 15-24s, students

Government departments/agencies:
• More trusted by: students, university graduates
• Less trusted by: those in rural areas, retirees

Business and industry:
• More trusted by: 15-24s, those not completed secondary school, Privates

Media personalities:
• More trusted by: women, those with secondary education only

Local Councils:
• Less trusted by: large country towns, Sydney surrounds

Family and friends:
• Less trusted by: students, Reluctants, Inner Sydney
Demographic groups and segments – level of trust

- **Women** more likely to rate sources reliable and men more likely to find them unreliable.

- Except for family and friends, **15-24s** and **students** more likely to find many sources reliable.

- **Retirees** are less likely to find sources reliable, or more likely to find them unreliable, except for family and friends and religious leaders.

- **University graduates** had divergent opinions – more likely to trust scientist and government agencies, less likely to trust media personalities, business and industry and religious leaders.

- **Reluctants** less likely to think many of the sources are reliable and more likely to consider them unreliable.
Personal behaviour
Everyday environmental behaviours -
trends

Reduce energy consumption

Reduced water consumption

Reduced the amount of food the household throws out

Decided to re-use rather than throwing away

Avoided plastic bags to carry shopping home

Reduced fuel consumption / vehicle air pollution

Chosen better household products

Avoided products with excess packaging

Composted food and/or garden refuse or used a worm farm

Data from bottom to top bar: 2003, 2006, 2009

Peaked in 2006, now lower

Big jump in 2006 with higher fuel prices but has maintained

Upward trend
Everyday environmental behaviours - trends

- Reduce energy consumption: 82% (Often), 70% (2003), 70% (2006), 70% (2009)
- Reduced water consumption: 70% (Often), 75% (2003), 70% (2006), 65% (2009)
- Reduced the amount of food the household throws out: 63% (Often), 63% (2003), 61% (2006), 61% (2009)
- Decided to re-use rather than throwing away: 62% (Often), 63% (2003), 63% (2006), 61% (2009)
- Avoided plastic bags to carry shopping home: 54% (Often), 48% (2003), 48% (2006), 30% (2009)
- Reduced fuel consumption / vehicle air pollution: 49% (Often), 48% (2003), 48% (2006), 38% (2009)
- Chosen better household products: 52% (Often), 50% (2003), 49% (2006), 49% (2009)
- Avoided products with excess packaging: 40% (Often), 41% (2003), 40% (2006), 39% (2009)
- Composted food and/or garden refuse or used a worm farm: 47% (Often), 45% (2003), 40% (2006), 39% (2009)

Data from bottom to top bar: 2003, 2006, 2009

- Not changing through surveys
- Declining trend, 43% never done
Everyday environmental behaviours – differences

Av. = 5.5 of 10

- Uptake increases with age:
  - 15-24s av 4.3
  - 35-44s av 5.3
  - 55-64s av 6.3

- Women 5.8
- Men 5.1

- Small towns 6.0
- Rural areas 6.5

- Richmond-Tweed 6.3
- N/NW/FW 6.0
- Illawarra 5.4

Data from bottom to top bar: 2003, 2006, 2009
Everyday environmental behaviours - differences

- **Reduce energy consumption**: 82% (2009), 73% (2006), 70% (2003)
- **Reduced water consumption**: 70% (2009), 75% (2006), 65% (2003)
- **Reduced the amount of food the household throws out**: 63% (2009), 63% (2006), 62% (2003)
- **Decided to re-use rather than throwing away**: 61% (2009), 63% (2006), 62% (2003)
- **Avoided plastic bags to carry shopping home**: 54% (2009), 48% (2006), 48% (2003)
- **Reduced fuel consumption / vehicle air pollution**: 49% (2009), 49% (2006), 30% (2003)
- **Chosen better household products**: 49% (2009), 50% (2006), 52% (2003)
- **Avoided products with excess packaging**: 41% (2009), 40% (2006), 40% (2003)
- **Composted food and/or garden refuse or used a worm farm**: 39% (2009), 45% (2006), 47% (2003)

Composting - average 39% masks big differences:
- **Rural areas**: 64%
- **Small country towns**: 56%
- **N/NW/FW**: 57%
- **CW/SE**: 55%
- **Inner Sydney**: 30%

Data from bottom to top bar: 2003, 2006 2009
Drivers for environmental behaviours

- Reasons vary depending on activity
- Cost factors most common for:
  - reducing energy consumption, and fuel use
  - reducing amount of food household throws out
  - buying fewer unneeded items
- Other common reasons:
  - Environmental awareness/knowledge (avoiding heavy packaging)
  - Upbringing/habit (re-using items)
  - Education through media/ads (buying environmentally-friendly products)
  - It’s good for the garden (composting/worm farming)
  - Concern about dam levels/drought (reducing water consumption)
  - Lifestyle (choosing household products) especially in Richmond-Tweed

Cost less common for energy and fuel use than in 2006, while awareness/knowledge more common than in 2006. But cost reason for saving water in Hunter 32% (av 12%)
Barriers to environmental behaviours

- Also vary with the activity

- Personal factors (laziness, not having thought about it etc) most commonly cited reason overall
  - The most common reason for not reducing energy use (but not for other behaviours)

- Other common reasons:
  - Inconvenient (avoiding plastic bags)
  - Infrastructure not available (reducing fuel use and composting)
  - Perception activities don’t impact environment (water use)
  - Cost factors (environmentally-friendly products)
  - Lack of alternatives (heavily packaged products)
Occasional environmental behaviours

About a quarter are participating in local issues and a fifth in active restoration projects
Occasional environmental behaviours

- **Purchased an energy-efficient appliance**
  - 2009: 73%
  - 2006: 67%
  - 1994: 63%

- **Tried to encourage someone to change an activity or practice that was harmful to the environment**
  - 2009: 51%
  - 2006: 52%
  - 1994: 63%

- **Tried to get information on an environmental topic or issue**
  - 2009: 46%
  - 2006: 38%
  - 2000: 41%
  - 1997: 38%
  - 1994: 35%

- **Participated in local development or environmental issues**
  - 2009: 25%
  - 2006: 27%
  - 2000: 36%
  - 1997: 36%

- **Took part in a Landcare, Bushcare, tree planting or other restoration project**
  - 2009: 20%
  - 2006: 21%
  - 1994: 20%

---

**Qualitative research** suggests those active in the community:
- Are passionate about the issues
- Consider their involvement quite minor (just what they do)
- See helping the environment/community to be incentive enough
Occasional environmental behaviours

- **Purchased an energy-efficient appliance**
  - 2009: 73%
  - 2006: 67%
  - 2004: 36%
  - 2002: 25%
  - 2000: 41%

- **Tried to encourage someone to change an activity or practice that was harmful to the environment**
  - 2009: 51%
  - 2006: 52%
  - 1994: 63%

- **Tried to get information on an environmental topic or issue**
  - 2009: 46%
  - 2006: 38%
  - 2000: 41%
  - 1997: 38%
  - 1994: 35%

- **Participated in local development or environmental issues**
  - 2009: 25%
  - 2006: 27%
  - 2000: 36%
  - 1997: 36%

- **Took part in a Landcare, Bushcare, tree planting or other restoration project**
  - 2009: 20%
  - 2006: 21%
  - 1994: 20%

**Whole group average:** 2.2 out of 5

- University graduates: **2.4**
- People living in rural areas: **2.7**
- Richmond-Tweed: **2.6**
- CW/SE: 2.7, 20% did 5/5
- Outer Sydney: **2.0**, 30% did only 1
Occasional environmental behaviours - differences

- Purchased an energy-efficient appliance
  - 2009: 73%
  - 2006: 67%
  - Women 54%, men 48%
  - University graduates 56%

- Tried to encourage someone to change an activity or practice that was harmful to the environment
  - 2009: 51%
  - 2006: 52%
  - 1994: 63%

- Tried to get information on an environmental topic or issue
  - 2009: 46%
  - 2006: 38%
  - 2000: 41%
  - 1997: 38%
  - 1994: 35%

- Participated in local development or environmental issues
  - 2009: 25%
  - 2006: 27%
  - 2000: 36%
  - 1997: 36%

- Took part in a Landcare, Bushcare, tree planting or other restoration project
  - 2009: 20%
  - 2006: 21%
  - 1994: 20%
Information sources – top 8

Of those who said they sought out environmental information – they overwhelmingly used the internet

- Internet: 72%
  - First source tried: 59%
  - Other source tried: 13%
- Publicly available printed brochures and publications: 22%
- Newspapers / magazines: 18%
- State government department or local council: 9%
- Books: 6%
- Friends and family: 5%
- Courses / seminars / workshops: 3%
- TV (news or not further specified): 3%

Younger people use the internet first, older people more likely to use traditional printed material
Getting into the environment – national parks visitation

66% had visited a national park in the last year
from 59% in 2006

25-34s 73%
University and technical education graduates 72-74%
Committeds 76% Illawarra 77%
Reluctants more likely to have visited less frequently, incl. never

Qualitative research suggests:
• interaction with natural environment triggers concern
• regional participants tended to be more engaged / passionate
• Interest / concern stemmed from involvement in outdoor activities
Community segments and the qualitative research
Understandings of ‘the environment’?

from the qualitative research

Water

Air

Sustainability

Pollution

Global warming

Climate change

Fishing / farmers

Bushfire

Health

Energy

Ozone

Endangered species

National parks

ETS

Ecosystems

Biodiversity

Landscapes
Understanding of ‘the environment’

**Committeds**

“For me, ‘the environment’ has changed in the last 10 years because we can think about it in terms of every aspect of our lives and... our own effect on it. And I think that comes through a lot more with the media and discussions... I have with family and everybody.”

[Inner City, F30-34]

**Privates**

“Its everything really isn’t it - it’s all around us”

**Reluctants**

*I think it’s been used as a scare tactic... it’s been misused by people to serve their own ends. I’m old and my feeling’s the same as yours - that it was, the environment, was the natural surroundings more than anything else but it’s people who claim... it’s like a cult, a cult of the environment. Like we’ve got to do everything to save the environment. We’ve got to save the whales too I suppose!*

(Outer Sydney, M60+)
Segments’ environmental concerns

**Committeds**
- tend to think environment is precious and deserves to be protected; are concerned about own life and local area but also environment globally
- in survey were more likely to nominate an environmental issue as a current or future priority for government but qual. research suggests:
  - their concerns are not exclusively environmental
  - other issues sometimes seen as more urgent / important
  - environmental issues often resonate more on personal level

**Privates** and **Reluctants**
- have less specified concerns (lower awareness/knowledge)
- focus more narrowly on how environmental damage will impact them
- Some **Reluctants** knowledgeable but not concerned, others poorly informed so concern hazy at best. Some assume environmental concern is concern about climate change (equating the two) which they dismiss as untrue
Understanding and usage of ‘sustainability’

- 2003 research - concepts generally limited to working out meaning from word ‘sustain’
- 2006 *Who Cares?* – some understanding especially among Committeds
- Now:

  - **Committeds**
    - Understand broader concepts including integrated nature of sustainability and global context
  - **Privates**
    - Tend to view issues on a more micro level – their home and local area
  - **Reluctants**
    - Limited awareness of sustainability issues
    - Not necessarily seen as something to aspire to
    - Seen as criticism of current lifestyles
Encouraging environmental behaviours

Committeds
Would *be motivated* to do even more if there was a clear plan and they knew what to do and that it would pay off.
Could do even more if additional incentives/rebates were available.

Reluctants
Lack awareness of what can be done.
Need reasons for engaging in behaviours and being told it’s ‘good for the environment’ won’t do – more inclined to be a good citizen than an environmentalist.
Equity of participation very important.

Privates
Would benefit from more information on what they could do and the personal and environmental benefits.
Have you used the *Who Cares?* research in the past?

Can you see any applications to your work for this year’s research?
When do we use research?

Research and evaluation are used at every stage of project planning, implementation and future direction.
Using *Who Cares?* in planning

- As a model for researching specific communities and comparing to state-wide data
- To gauge community support and priorities - foundation for advocacy, policy and new initiatives
- To identify gaps in community knowledge, e.g. where there is a low ranking of an actual high threat issue or low adoption of important behaviours - provides foundation for education programs
- To determine views on specific issues to inform specific program design
- To assess demographic differences for targeting of appropriate programs
- To assist in targeting community segments e.g:
  - Committeds for a new issue
  - Privates and Reluctants to broaden adoption of a behaviour
Using *Who Cares?* in....

**design and implementation**

- To understand your target community – understanding segment and/or demographic differences carries into design and implementation

- Understanding barriers and drivers key to program design
  - for ten behaviours the 2006 and 2009 surveys found a different mix of motivators and barriers for each
  - Need to understand which tools (or mix of tools) to use for each environmental issue:
    - regulation
    - infrastructure
    - economic incentives
    - education
Using *Who Cares?* in…. evaluation

Repeat questions track issues and detect shifts in knowledge, views, behaviours – assess whether the policy settings or program delivery has been effective

  e.g. environmental regulation, knowledge about cause of the greenhouse effect

Look for establishment of new norms around key issues

  e.g. water conservation
To conclude...
Summary

- Environment remains in top five as current and future priority for NSW Government
- Water conservation and management issues have declined across a range of questions since 2006
- Climate change and energy issues have continued to increase as environmental issues and on preferred initiatives
- Concern about environmental problems declined from previous survey
- More people are more positive, compared to 2006, about a range of environmental issues
- More than ¾ believe climate change is happening or going to happen, 69% agree the NSW government should take urgent action
- People engage in a range of environmentally friendly behaviours:
  - energy conservation and avoiding plastic bags
  - water conservation and composting
- Behaviour and demographic segments show considerable community diversity
Summary – some key differences

**Gender:** Women were more likely to be concerned, to engage in environmental behaviours and think environmental issues are improving. More men answered knowledge questions correctly.

**Age:** 15-24s do least environmental behaviours but are more likely to think environmental issues have improved. Older people do the most but are more likely to think issues have deteriorated.

**Segment:** Committeds do most, and are the most likely to: mention environment as issue for government, be concerned (and for biodiversity/ecosystems reasons), visit national parks and think regulation is still too lax for a range of industries.

**Location:** people in rural areas are more likely to participate in community environmental activities. There are also substantial differences in views of the state of environmental issues according to where people live.
Making this research available

**Research products** coming to DECCW web:

- Main report (survey only)
- *Who Cares? at a Glance*
- *Who Cares?* - Qualitative report
- Demographic fact sheets
- Demographic and regional tables

This research has many applications

Explore and apply the findings to your issues

Encourage your staff, colleagues, and workplace to use the results