

# **What Role Does Knowledge of Wildlife Play in Providing Support for Species' Conservation?**

Clevo Wilson  
School of Economics and Finance  
Queensland University of Technology  
2 George Street, GPO Box 2434  
Brisbane QLD 4001 Australia  
Email: [clevo.wilson@qut.edu.au](mailto:clevo.wilson@qut.edu.au)

Clem Tisdell  
School of Economics  
The University of Queensland  
Brisbane, Qld, 4072, Australia  
Email: [c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au](mailto:c.tisdell@economics.uq.edu.au)

**Keywords:** Biodiversity, conservation, Australia's tropical wildlife, public knowledge,  
balanced information.

# **What Role Does Knowledge of Wildlife Play in Providing Support for Species' Conservation?**

## **Abstract**

Conservation of biodiversity is a complex issue. Apart from the creation of nature reserves, there is a plethora of other factors that are part of this complex web. One such factor is the public knowledge of species. Since public funding is imperative for the conservation of species and creation of reserves for them, it is important to determine the public's awareness of species and their knowledge about them. In the absence of such awareness and knowledge, it is possible that the public will misallocate their support. In other words, resources may be provided for species that do not need support urgently. We show how availability of balanced information about species helps the public to make rational decisions and to allocate support (e.g. monetary) to species that need it most. Other implications of a 'wildlife knowledgeable' public are also discussed.

## **Key words**

Biodiversity, conservation, Australia's tropical wildlife, public knowledge, balanced information.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The importance of creating protected areas for the conservation of biodiversity has been stressed in the literature [1]. In addition, many other factors can play a positive role in species' conservation and complement and even finance the creation of such protected areas. One such factor is the public's awareness and knowledge of species. The public can support the conservation of wildlife by financial and non-financial contributions. Furthermore, knowledge of wildlife can enhance the enjoyment of wildlife and this could increase memberships in Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and perhaps even influence government and NGO policy decision-making.

The public's knowledge of wildlife has other ramifications for species' conservation. When public knowledge is limited, common species are likely to be better known than rare and endangered ones. This is especially so if those species have a restricted distribution. Hence, when supporting wildlife conservation, financially and otherwise, the public are likely to provide larger support for species that are common than endangered species when in fact endangered species ought to receive most support. This involves not only an inefficient allocation of resources, but also a misallocation of resources and a market failure. Such misallocations not only further support species that are already doing well and perhaps even support species that are a pest from farmers' point of view.

In order to test some of these hypotheses, a survey questionnaire was designed, amongst other goals, to determine (1) whether the selected species are known to the public; (2) If so, what is the

level of their knowledge; (3) whether the participants favour their survival; and (4) to determine the allocation of a hypothetical sum of money between the species before and after provision of balanced information. Our goal is to utilise this information to show to what extent provision of balanced information leads to the public shifting their monetary allocations from common species to those species that are endangered. Samples *et al.* [2] using separate control groups show how individuals' willingness to pay for conservation is influenced by the availability of information. Our study is unique because it covers a range of tropical species to demonstrate the public's support for species' conservation before and after provision of balanced information.

## **METHODS**

### **Questionnaire survey**

The questionnaire survey was conducted among Brisbane residents during the period July-September 2002, to determine the Brisbane public's knowledge of 24 selected Australian tropical species and the values they place on each species in allocating a hypothetical sum of money for their conservation.

Considerable publicity was given about the survey by means of letter dropouts and local council newspapers. A large section of Brisbane suburbs with diverse socioeconomic backgrounds was covered. The main purpose of the survey was not revealed to avoid bias. Five sessions were conducted on weekdays and weekends to make the survey more attractive to participants. Obtaining the participation of 200 plus was the intended target and the responding participants

were selected on a first come first served basis according to the age distribution of the city of Brisbane. This was done so that the participants would be representative of Brisbane residents. This enabled us to obtain a sample that was quite diverse. Prior to this exercise the questionnaire was pre-tested among 20 undergraduates and their comments were sought. The selected Australian wildlife consisted of birds (10), mammals (9) and reptiles (5).

The questionnaire survey was conducted in two stages. The first hour was used to gather background information and the current knowledge about Australian wildlife and the monetary values they placed on conservation of species from a hypothetical allocation of money (Survey I). After a tea break, the second stage of the study was commenced. During this session, the participants were provided with Survey II, which consisted of similar questions to the first survey, together with a few additional questions. The authors also provided a colourful brochure to the participants, which contained information on current status, geographical range, photographs and other relevant information for each species. The current status of species was explained well although for some species it is not straightforward. For example, for the Dugong the information provided on current status was “Common but vulnerable in Australia. It is also found in other parts of the world where in most places it is endangered”. Table 1 is based on information provided in the brochure. Approximately the same amount of factual background information (approximately half a page) was provided for each species except for two common birds (Australian Magpie and Laughing Kookaburra) found in most Brisbane gardens/suburbs. The participants were instructed to fill out the second questionnaire once they got back home and return the completed survey forms within two weeks. For the next 45 minutes, we invited Dr Van Dyck, Curator of Mammals and Birds, Queensland Museum, to give a presentation on Australian

wildlife. His lecture was mostly on the Mahogany Glider, which he helped to re-discover. However, his talk included many of the tropical wildlife selected for the survey. Several skins of the selected species were also shown to the public. This was in addition to the information provided in the brochure.

## **RESULTS**

The questionnaire results provide us with an insight of the public's knowledge of Australia's Tropical wildlife. It shows that the majority of the public are aware of the existence of the common species but it is not so when it comes to those that have a restricted range, some which are endangered (Table 1).

(Table 1 about here)

What is interesting is that the existence of all the common species, irrespective of whether it is a mammal, bird or a reptile are well known to the public than those species that have a restricted habitat and those that are endangered. Analysis of the data (not reported) shows that the initial knowledge of the species is high only for common species than those species that are endangered. However, despite the level of knowledge, a large percentage of the participants were in favour of the species' existence. Only for a few species, that there was a slight decrease, but it was not significant.

Another significant result is that when it comes to allocating the hypothetical sum of money for their conservation, species that are common and better known to the public get a larger allocation in most cases than those species that are endangered and which need most attention. This is so for all taxa (Figures 1).

(Figures 1 about here)

However, once balanced information is provided, the public are willing to allocate a large sum of money to those species that need most attention. The money is redistributed taking it from species that are common which do not need urgent attention. This demonstrates the existence values the public place on species. This is confirmed by other questions in the survey. It must be pointed out that Figure 1 is an aggregate of the survey results of the participants' support before (Survey I) and after (Survey II) provision of information. However, for a small number of species such as the Northern Bettong (listed as endangered) the support after provision of information decreased while for the Dugong (listed as common) the supported increased by approximately 1% after provision of information. The Lumholtz Tree-kangaroo, Eastern Pebble-mound Mouse and the Brolga (listed as common in restricted area) received small increases in support in Survey II.

The survey results also confirms that when there is a lack of balanced information the public make their decisions based on their existing knowledge which does not necessary lead to efficient outcomes although the intentions of the public are genuine.

## **What Conservation Lessons Can Be Drawn From the Results?**

Several implications for conservation of wildlife flow from the results. The public clearly make their decisions to support wildlife based on the distribution of their current knowledge. For the majority of the public the information available is on common species. Hence, when support is provided a larger amount gets allocated to those species that are common which does not help the endangered species. However, once balanced information is provided the public are willing to change their allocations, giving more of the allocations to those species that are most in need, reversing the previous misallocations. The results show that the public are rational and place importance on existence values. This is confirmed by the change in allocations after balanced information is provided. The results highlight the need for public education, especially on species that have a restricted distribution and those that are endangered. Some of the few endangered species that were also quite well known to the public are those species that are displayed in zoos/theme parks. These species are also the subject of children's stories. Education of the public is important not only because the disappearance of species will not only go unnoticed by the large majority of the public, but also because the public are an important body whose support is needed to undertake conservation work. Public participation in conservation works in many ways. The public can potentially support (financially or otherwise) the creation of nature reserves and the recovery of endangered species. The creation of nature reserves is expensive [11] and funds for their purchase will eventually have to come from the public. Better knowledge and awareness can also increase memberships in NGOs devoted to wildlife



conservation and the public's volunteer involvement in conservation projects. Furthermore, public knowledge can influence government, NGO decision-making, and the urgency to take action. The results also demonstrate that species that require urgent attention can obtain the support of the public and in bigger amounts if it is conducted appropriately. The public are willing to shift allocations when such a need arises.

## **DISCUSSION**

The results show that the public's knowledge of the existence of some Australian tropical species is low. Most, if not all of these species that were not well known have a very restricted geographical range. Some of them are endangered. On the other hand, species that are common were better known. Despite the low knowledge of the existence of some species, the importance placed on their existence was high. This includes species that are dangerous, venomous and are agricultural pests. The results show that when participants were asked to make a hypothetical allocation (Survey I), the support provided was larger for most of the better-known and common species. On the other hand, those species that were poorly known (some are endangered) received lower allocations. The main reason for this behaviour is that in the absence of balanced information to make decisions, species for which information is available get higher allocations while those species that are poorly known get an average allocation which accords with Laplace's principle of 'insufficient reason' [12]. Although, this outcome is gloomy from a conservation point of view, the positive side is that the individuals were willing to change their allocations and redistribute them to species that need attention once balanced information was provided. The results demonstrate that if for instance there are two reserves to be protected, one

with species that are endangered and the other with species that are less endangered, and that there is a cash constraint to purchase all reserves, then it is likely that if the public have balanced information they will contribute to the purchase of the reserve with the higher number of endangered species than the one with no or fewer endangered species. On the other hand, in the absence of balanced information it is likely that the public will select the one with common species because most of the information they possess is on such species as shown. The results also show the need for public education and potentially they are a major source of funding conservation of species and reserves as demonstrated in Britain by the activities of societies such as the RSPB [13]. Public involvement in conservation such as through memberships can not only fund conservation but also influence government and NGO decision-making.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Australian Research Council and The University of Queensland, Australia supported this work.

Viet Ngu Hoang and Beryl Rajbhandari provided research assistance.

## REFERENCES

1. Rodrigues, A. L., Andelman, S.J., Bakarr, M. I., Boitani, L., Brooks, T. M., Cowling, R.M., Fishpool, L.D.C. et al. 2004. Effectiveness of the global protected area network in representing species diversity *Nature*, 428, 640-643
2. Samples, K. C., Dixon, J. A. & Gowen, M. M. 1986 Information disclosure and endangered species valuation *Land Econ.*, 62, 306-312
3. Morcombe, M. 2000. *Field Guide to Australian Birds*. Steve Parish Publishing, Archerfield, Qld, Australia
4. Pizzey, G. & Knight, F. 1998. *Field Guide to the Birds of Australia*. Harper Collins Publishers, Pymble, Sydney NSW
5. Reader's Digest 1997a. *Reader's Digest Complete Book of Australian Birds*. Published by Reader's Digest (Australia) Pty Ltd, Surrey Hills, NSW
6. Reader's Digest 1997b. *Reader's Digest Encyclopedia of Australian Wildlife*. Published by Reader's Digest (Australia) Pty Ltd, Surrey Hills, NSW
7. Strahan, R. ed. 2000. *The Mammals of Australia*. Revised Edition, Reed New Holland, Aquatic Drive Frenchs Forest, NSW, Australia
8. Marchant, S. & Higgins, P. J. 1990. Ratites and Ducks, Vol 1, *Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne
9. Marchant, S & Higgins, P. J. 1993. Raptors to Lapwings, Vol 2, *Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne
10. Higgins, P. J. 1999. Parrots to Dollarbird, Vol 4, *Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds*. Oxford University Press, Melbourne
11. James, A., Gaston, K. & Balmford, A. 2001. Can we afford to conserve biodiversity? *BioScience*, 51, 43-52
12. Laplace, P. S. 1951. *A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities* (F. W. Truscott and F. Emory, Trans). Dover, NY, original work published in 1814
13. Royal Society for the Protection of Birds 2003. About the RSPB, <http://www.rspb.org.uk/about/brief.asp> (accessed November 2004)


**Table 1** Responses to the question whether the species were known to the participants during Survey I

Species and Status	Birds			Species and Status	Mammals			Species and Status	Reptiles		
	Yes %	No %	No Response %		Yes %	No %	No Response %		Yes %	No %	No Response %
<b>Common</b>				<b>Common</b>				<b>Common</b>			
Laughing Kookaburra (E)	96	03	01	Red Kangaroo (E)	93.6	5.9	0.5	Saltwater Crocodile	96.1	3.4	0.5
Australian Magpie (E)	96	03	01	Dugong	89.7	10.3	00	Freshwater Crocodile (E)	95.1	4.9	00
Red-tailed Black Cockatoo (E)	80.5	19	0.5	<b>Common in restricted range</b>				Taipan Snake	82.4	17.6	00
<b>Common in restricted range</b>				Lumholtz-tree Kangaroo (E)	74	26.0	00	Northern Long-necked Turtle (E)	64.7	34.3	1.0
Palm Cockatoo	30.5	68	1.5	Koala (E)	98	1.5	0.5	<b>Common in restricted range</b>			
Eclectus Parrot	22.5	75	2.5	Northern Quoll (E)	55.9	43.1	1.0	-			
Brolga	80	19	01	Eastern Pebble-mound Mouse (E)	7.4	88.7	3.9	-			
Golden Bowerbird (E)	47.1	51	2.0	-				-			
<b>Endangered</b>				<b>Endangered</b>				<b>Endangered</b>			
Golden-shouldered Parrot (E)	27	71	2.0	Mahogany Glider (E)	50.5	48.5	1.0	Hawksbill Sea Turtle	41.7	58.3	00
Southern Cassowary (E)	87	12	01	Northern Bettong (E)	33.8	65.2	1.0	-			
Gouldian Finch (E)	44	55	01	Northern Hairy-nosed Wombat (E)	82.4	12.7	4.9	-			

Sources: Birds – [3]; [4]; [5] and [6].

Mammals – [7]; [6]; Reptiles – [6]. These sources were selected because they are more readily available to the public. The Handbook of Australian, New Zealand and Antarctic Birds (1990, 1993, 1999) was used to verify the endemism and distribution of some bird species in the Table but was not used for the preparation of the survey brochure. Note: E = The species or at least one subspecies is endemic to Australia. The Table is based on information provided in the brochure to the participants.

**Figure 1** Percentage allocation of a hypothetical sum of money by the participants before and after provision of information about each species



## LISTING OF DISCUSSION PAPERS - 2003

Valadkhani A, How Many Jobs Were Lost With the Collapse of Ansett? No 137, February 2003

Drew M E, Naughton T, & Veerarghavan M, Is Idiosyncratic Volatility Priced? Evidence from the Shanghai Stock Exchange, No 138, February 2003

Valadkhani, A, Does the Term Structure Predict Australia's Future Output Growth? No 139, February 2003

Worthington A, & Higgs H, A Multivariate GARCH Analysis of the Domestic Transmission of Energy Commodity Prices and Volatility: A Comparison of the Peak and Off-peak Periods in the Australian Electricity Spot Market, No 140, February 2003

Li S, The Estimation of Implied Volatility from the Black-Scholes Model: Some New Formulas and Their Applications, No 141, February 2003

Drew M E, & Stanford, J D, Principal and Agent Problems in Superannuation Funds, No 142, March 2003

Li S, A Single-Period Model and Some Empirical Evidences for Optimal Asset Allocation with Value-at-Risk Constraints, No 143, March 2003

Valadkhani A, An Empirical Analysis of the Black Market Exchange Rate in Iran, No 144, April 2003

Worthington A, Business Expectations and Preferences regarding the Introduction of Daylight Saving in Queensland, No 145, May 2003

Worthington A, Losing Sleep at the Market: An Empirical Note on the Daylight Saving Anomaly in Australia, No 146, May 2003

Robinson M, Tightening the Results/Funding Link in Performance Budgeting Systems, No 147, May 2003

Worthington A, & Higgs H, Risk, Return and Portfolio Diversification in Major Painting Marketing: The Application of Conventional Financial Analysis to Unconventional Investments, No 148, June 2003

Valadkhani A, Demand for M2 in Developing Countries: An Empirical Panel Investigation, No 149, July 2003

Worthington A, & Higgs H, Modelling the Intraday Return Volatility Process in the Australia Equity Market: An Examination of the Role of Information Arrival in S & PASX Stocks, No 150, July 2003

Lahiri R, Tax Distortions in a Neoclassical Monetary Economy in the Presence of Administration Costs, No 151 September 2003

Layton A, & Smith D, Duration Dependence in the US Business Cycle, No 152, August 2003

Valadkhani A, & Layton A, Quantifying the Effect of GST on Inflation in Australia's Capital Cities: An Intervention Analysis, No 153, September 2003

Worthington A, & Valadkhani A, Measuring the Impact of Natural Disasters on Capital Markets: An Empirical Application Using Intervention Analysis, No 154, September 2003

Robinson M, The Output Concept and Public Sector Services, No 155, September 2003

Worthington A, Brown K, Crawford M, & Pickernell D, Socio-Economic and Demographic Determinants of Household Gambling in Australia, No 156, September 2003

Worthington A, & Higgs H, Tests of Random Walks and Market Efficiency in Latin American Stock Markets: An Empirical Note, No 157, September 2003

**(Replacing Previous No 158)** Worthington A, & Higgs H, Systematic Features of High-Frequency Volatility in Australian Electricity

Markets: Intraday Patterns, Information Arrival and Calendar Effects, No 158, November 2003

Worthington A, & Higgs H, Weak-form Market Efficiency in European Emerging and Developed Stock Markets, No 159, September 2003

West T, & Worthington A, Macroeconomic Risk Factors in Australian Commercial Real Estate, Listed Property Trust and Property Sector Stock Returns: A Comparative Analysis using GARCH-M, No 160, October 2003

Lee B, Interstate Comparison of Output and Productivity in the Australian Agricultural Sector – 1991 – 1999, No 161, October 2003

McCarthy S, Hedging Versus not Hedging: Strategies for Managing Foreign Exchange Transaction Exposure, No 162, November 2003

Worthington A, Emergency Finance in Australian Households: An Empirical Analysis of Capacity and Sources, No 163, November 2003

Worthington C, Debt as a Source of Financial Stress in Australian Households, No 164, November 2003

Robinson M, The Australian Budgeting System: On the Cusp of Change, No 165, November 2003

Lahiri R, Cooperation v/s Non-cooperation in R&D Competition with Spillovers, No 166, December 2003

Wolff R, Yao Q, & Tong H, Statistical Tests for Lyapunov Exponents of Deterministic Systems, No 167, December 2003

Wolff R, Barnett A, A Time Domain Test for Some Types of Non-Linearity, No 168 December 2003

## **LISTING OF DISCUSSION PAPERS - 2004**

Drew M, Veeraraghavan M, Ye M, Do Momentum Strategies Work? - Australian Evidence, No 169, January 2004

Drew M, Mallin M, Naughton T, Veeraraghavan M, Equity Premium: - Does it Exist? – Evidence from Germany and United Kingdom, No 170, January 2004

Layton A, Valadkhani A, Measures of National Export Price Volatility Based on the Capital Asset Pricing Model, No 171, January 2004

Drew M, Marsden A, Veeraraghavan M, Small Firm Effect, Liquidity and Security Returns: Australian Evidence, No 172, February 2004

Drew M, Stanford J, Portability of Superannuation Balances, No 173, March 2004

Drew M, Naughton T, Veeraraghavan M Pricing of Equities in China: Evidence from the Shanghai Stock Exchange No 174, May 2004

Valadkhani A, Worthington A, Layton A, An Analysis of the Rising Cost of Education in Australia, No 175, April 2004

Li S, Worthington A, The Relationship Between The Adoption of Internet Banking and Electronic Connectivity: - An International Comparison, No 176, May 2004

Drew M, Marsden A, Veeraraghavan M, Does Idiosyncratic Volatility Matter? – New Zealand Evidence, No 177, May 2004

Guégan D, How Can We Define the Concept of Long Memory? - An Econometric Survey, No 178, April 2004

Clements A, Hurn S, White S, Discretised Non-Linear Filtering for Dynamic Latent Variable Models: with Application to Stochastic Volatility No 179, May 2004

McCarthy S, Ispriani A, An Operating/Economic Exposure Australian Case Study: Foster's Group Limited, No 180, May 2004

Lahiri R, On Skill Heterogeneity and Inflation, No 181, June 2004

Bianchi R, Drew M, Polichronis J, A Test of Momentum Trading Strategies in Foreign Exchange Markets: Evidence from the G7, No 182, June 2004

Jeisman S, Exchange Market Pressure in Australia, No 183, June 2004

Higgs H, Worthington A, Financial Returns and Price Determinants in the Australian Art Market - 1973-2003, No 184, July 2004

Worthington, A, The distribution of Financial Literacy in Australia, No 185, November 2004

Higgs H, Worthington A, Systematic Features of High-Frequency Volatility in Australian Electricity Markets: Intraday Patterns, Information Arrival and Calendar Effects, No 186, December 2004

#### **LISTING OF DISCUSSION PAPERS - 2005**

Behrens P, Economic Development Strategies: Examples from Europe and Australia, No 187, January 2005





Queensland University of Technology

**DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS,  
FINANCE AND INTERNATIONAL  
COMPETITIVENESS**

**What Role Does Knowledge of Wildlife  
Play in Providing Support for Species'  
Conservation?**

**Clevo Wilson  
&  
Clem Tisdell**

ISSN 1324-5910

**All correspondence to:**

Dr Steven Li  
Editor, *Discussion Papers in Economic, Finance and  
International Competitiveness*  
School of Economics and Finance  
Queensland University of Technology  
GPO Box 2434, BRISBANE QLD 4001, [Australia](#)

Telephone: 61 7 3864 2521  
Facsimile: 61 7 3864 1500  
Email: [s.li@qut.edu.au](mailto:s.li@qut.edu.au)

***Discussion Paper No 188, February 2005***

Series edited by  
Dr Steven Li

---

**School of Economics and Finance**