

---

# LINK ONLINE

Short webinars for environmental policy-makers and practitioners

## Attitudes and Beliefs about the aerial use of 1080 in New Zealand

The following questions were asked during our live webinar with Geoff Kaine but due to time restrictions, we were unable to answer these in the session.

### **Why didn't the survey include Northland - further than Auckland?**

We did not have the budget to do all the areas across New Zealand we wanted cover (including Northland) so OSPRI and DOC had to choose a spread across the North and South Islands and across city and country.

### **The 3rd bullet is not quite right in that the opposed was only 12 not really a third of respondents. The approximate address that, but the opposed was actually lower wasn't it?**

The 12 per cent were in quadrant 3 only. If you add up the red circles (the opposed) in all four quadrants its nearly 30 per cent.

### **Did you ask the respondents' if those proposed actions you suggested would actually change their view on the policy/outcome?**

No, we were unable to ask that in the survey as we needed the results first before we could propose actions

### **How do you address misinformation being spread? Or counter unfavourable respondents branding valid science as 'fake news'?**

That is beyond my expertise as I am not a marketer, but our results suggest that misinformation is unlikely to change the views of most respondents in quadrants 2,3 and 4.

### **I think you mentioned that you found some variation in responses as a function of respondents ages. Could you please tell us more about that?**

Older people were slightly, but only slightly, more likely to express a favourable attitude towards using 1080.

### **How do survey results from farmers vary to the rest of the survey population?**

We did not ask respondents about their occupations so I cannot answer your question. Respondents from Wellington and Auckland were more likely to be unsure about 1080 compared to respondents

from provincial towns and rural areas. Respondents from the West Coast were slightly more likely than respondents from other areas to express an unfavourable attitude towards 1080.

**Do you have a breakdown, or can you comment on the number of responses and what the responses were to each region?**

We had 920 responses. Approximately 150 in each of the six regions.

**Reducing possum numbers is an intermediate outcome. Final outcomes of interest are protecting native wildlife and/or eliminating TB. If people believe reducing possum numbers does not achieve that then they may be opposed because of reasons you have not modelled. Can you address that with your data?**

Yes, we asked respondents whether they thought reducing possum numbers would help conserve native wildlife and reduce TB. Nearly all respondents agreed that this was the case (though respondents were less sure about TB).

**OSPRI's role is to reduce TB, DOC's role is to reduce possums?**

Correct

**What is the breakdown of urban v rural respondents?**

Approximately 50:50

**I thought that telling people "facts" was shown in previous research (Edy) to be not very useful?**

It depends on how 'involved' people are with the topic. Our results indicate that people in quadrant 3 in particular will want facts (though the facts would have to be framed in a suitable context such as saving native wildlife). In contrast, people in quadrant 1, in particular, will not respond to facts.

**Did your data reveal that it's more about value-based approach rather than responding to evidence?**

Our results suggest that people in quadrant 3 will respond to factual information, though it needs to be placed in context. We did not ask about values I am afraid so I can't really answer your question but values, one way or another, underpin everyone's responses.

**Why do you express the outcome as reducing possum numbers rather than reducing tb in livestock?**

Because reducing Tb in livestock was OSPRI's objective but it is not the primary objective for DOC. Also, everyone understands what reducing possum numbers means, whereas we expected at least some respondents from the city will not know about TB in livestock.

**What is the psychology behind the word 'baiting' as opposed to using the more accurate term, 'poisoning'? IE, baiting means trapping not poisoning.**

Baiting is the term that is generally used to refer to distributing 1080 in baits, whether baits are placed in traps on the ground or distributed from the air. Some statements about 1080 in the survey did include the word 'poison'.

### **Did you ask about the effect of 1080 on rats and stoats, as well as possums?**

We did ask respondents about using 1080 in relation to rats, and in ground baiting. The results were largely the same.

### **What research has been done into safer alternatives to 1080?**

I cannot answer this question as it is outside the scope of the study and is not my area of expertise. You can find some information here from DOC here: <https://www.doc.govt.nz/nature/pests-and-threats/methods-of-control/1080/>

### **Do you have evidence that your participants were demographically equal to the NZ population?**

We did not seek to get a statistically representative sample of NZ. However, the age and education profile of our sample was like the age and education profile for all NZ. For our sample of almost 1000 households in six regions, we found the association between attitudes towards 1080 and demographics was weak.