**Exploring attitudes and understanding of global conservation practice among birders
and avitourists for enhanced conservation of birds**

Keywords: avitourism, ecotourism, important bird and biodiversity areas, protected areas,
funding

Rochelle Steven^{1*}, Clare Morrison² and J. Guy Castley¹

¹ Environmental Futures Research Institute, Griffith School of Environment, Griffith
University, Gold Coast campus, Queensland, 4222

² Griffith School of Environment, Griffith University, Gold Coast campus, Queensland, 4222

*Corresponding author: Rochelle Steven – rochelle.steven@griffithuni.edu.au

Summary

Birders are generally nature-oriented; however, their understanding of key bird conservation issues remains under-examined. We surveyed English-speaking birders online and face-to-face asking questions related to their views on conservation, conservation funding and their understanding of a global bird conservation program (BirdLife International's Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas [IBAs]). Most birders that responded to the survey were from Australia, the United Kingdom, South Africa and the United States of America. Birders tend to value bird conservation in an ecocentric way, often citing the overarching importance of general biodiversity. The ecological roles birds play was also highlighted, but this varied across socio-demographic groups. Despite their positive support for conservation, less than half of all birders surveyed are familiar with the IBA program. Familiarity with IBAs was driven by socio-demographic factors, with males more familiar than females and South African birders more familiar than birders from Australia and the United Kingdom. Most birders are willing to make contributions to bird conservation when visiting key birding sites, however they also feel governments should remain the main funders of conservation. Opportunities to enhance engagement between birders and bird conservation groups exist with most indicating a desire to learn more about bird conservation at birding sites. Increasing access to relevant information and presenting opportunities to contribute to conservation at birding sites could provide tangible benefits for bird habitats, protected areas and bird conservation groups.

Introduction

Engaging the general public in nature conservation will be key to ensuring successful mitigation of further biodiversity declines (McKay 2007, Novacek 2008, Papworth et al. 2015). Support may be expressed as recreational use and visitation of public protected areas providing revenue for conservation (Buckley et al. 2012, Morrison et al. 2012, Steven et al. 2013, Balmford et al. 2015) but also through independent conservation action (e.g. private reserves) (Lamers et al. 2014, Pegas and Castley 2014). Birding is one of the most popular nature-based recreational activities in the Western world, especially in the United Kingdom (UK) and the United States of America (USA) (Moss 2005, Connell 2009, Steven et al. 2014). However, there is also growing interest from China and South Korea (Lee et al. 2010, Li et al. 2013, Chen and Chen 2015), South Africa (Biggs et al. 2011, Simango 2011) and India (Urfi 2012, Seshadri et al. 2013). There are few, if any, taxonomic groups in which people invest as much recreational time and energy in, as birds.

Conceptually, birders subscribe to a general conservation ethos and the environmental movement, but there is limited evidence supporting this. The level of environmental concern and tangible conservation benefit among North American birders is as variable as the population of birders themselves (Glowinski and Moore 2014, McFarlane and Boxall 1996). Correspondingly, there are some activities specific to birding and avitourism that can represent a threat to birds (e.g. using call playback, using flash photography or deliberately flushing birds to photograph them) (Şekercioğlu 2002, Green and Jones 2010, Biggs 2013). However, the relative threat that these activities pose are probably minimal compared to other human induced impacts such as habitat loss and introduced species (Steven and Castley 2013, Butchart et al. 2006).

Previous research has explored the potential links between birding and conservation (Hvenegaard and Dearden 1998a, 1998b, Hvenegaard 2002, Isaacs and Chi 2005, Green and Jones 2010, Biggs et al. 2011, Cooper et al. 2015), however, further examination of this relationship is warranted (Steven et al. 2014). Our study extends on previous research, presenting new findings related to birders and their stance on several conservation-related issues. Specifically, we address questions pertaining to: 1) birders' position on bird conservation, 2) birders' willingness to learn about bird conservation, 3) birders' feelings about conservation funding and 4) their knowledge of bird conservation initiatives. We examine birder awareness of conservation initiatives by asking about their familiarity with a global program implemented specifically to conserve birds, the BirdLife International Important Bird Area network (IBA) (now known as Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas). The IBA network was first implemented in Europe in the early 1980s (Osieck and Morzer 1981). Since then, it has grown to comprise more than 12,000 sites across 200 countries and territories (BirdLife International 2015). Our findings can inform bird conservation groups and practitioners where there are gaps in birders understanding of conservation issues. Addressing these gaps can lead to more targeted efforts in community engagement, fundraising and increasing membership subscriptions among bird enthusiasts.

Methods

To maximise representativeness of the sample, we collected data via two survey instruments (i.e. questionnaires) presented to birders both in person and online (Miller et al. 2014, Guimarães et al. 2015). The questionnaire delivered online was longer than that presented face-to-face. Both online and face-to-face surveys asked birders about their familiarity with IBAs. Questionnaire design and interpretability was tested by reviewers of different

disciplines (e.g. social scientist, geographer, ornithologist, tourism researchers etc.) prior to distribution. We obtained research ethics approvals prior to any survey instruments being used (Griffith University Ethics Committee: ENV_01_13_HREC; ENV_59_12_HREC).

The face-to-face questionnaire was delivered during 2013-2014 at various birding locations across Australia:

- 1) Lamington National Park (Scenic Rim IBA) - May 2013-November 2013
- 2) Wet Tropics World Heritage Area (Daintree, Atherton Tablelands, Wooroonooran and Coastal Wet Tropics IBAs) - October 2013
- 3) Fogg Dam Conservation Reserve (Adelaide and Mary River Floodplains IBA)
- Kakadu National Park (Kakadu Savanna IBA) - September 2014

Data were also collected at the British BirdFair at Rutland Water Reserve (Rutland Water IBA) in the United Kingdom (UK) (August 2013). We selected these sites as they are known to have high levels of birding activity.

We used purposive sampling methods and intercepted respondents at field sites in Australia using cues to determine whether or not they were participating in birding (Hvenegaard 2002), including being in possession of either a pair of binoculars or a camera appropriate for bird photography (i.e. SLR with zoom lens). We gained confirmation of their motives after they indicated they were interested in birding when engaged in a casual greeting. We then asked respondents if they would like to participate in a research project about birding. Most people attending the BirdFair were regular birders thus the request to participate in research about birding was generally met with agreeance and enthusiasm.

We also collected data via an online survey from February 2013 to December 2013. The questionnaire was distributed through approximately 30 portals including: birding forums,

birding emailing lists, social media pages for birding, direct emails to people in the birding or ornithological field and requests to magazine and newsletter editors for their assistance in sharing the web link to the survey and distributing the link to their mailing lists (Table S1 in online Supplementary Material). In addition to collecting primary demographic information of each respondent, we asked questions about specific aspects of bird conservation (Table 1).

We explored responses for the open-ended question regarding the importance of bird conservation using an online word cloud tool (www.wordle.net) and the top 50 words used were quantified. Common words (and, the, it, etc.) were removed as well as the key words from the question itself (bird, conservation and important). Full responses were subsequently coded for analysis. Categories used to code all responses were adapted from common definitions for natural resource valuation among the Western world, in the social and conservation literature (Table 2) (Byrne 1998, Wolch and Zhang 2004, Lindenmayer and Burgman 2005). Birders often gave responses that could not be assigned to only one value definition, and were thus given multiple counts to capture the myriad ways in which birders value bird conservation.

We examine the influence of sex, country of residence, age and education on awareness of the different conservation aspects. We conducted contingency analyses (with observed values compared to expected values as per standard chi square analysis) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22.

Results

General respondent summary

A total of 350 birders responded to the online questionnaire. Providing answers to questions was not mandatory, thus response rates to all questions varied (Table 1). The face-to-face questionnaire yielded 283 responses. For both face-to-face and online delivery methods, most respondents were male with 60% and 71% of the sample, respectively (65% combined). The average age of respondents was 56 for the face-to-face survey and 46 for the online survey. For both delivery methods, at least 70% of respondents had completed a tertiary degree. In the interests of retaining robust sample sizes, statistical analyses for the first research objective (i.e. how birders value bird conservation) were restricted to the four main countries where respondents reside (i.e. Australia, UK, USA and South Africa).

How birders value bird conservation

A total of 295 respondents provided an answer to the question “why do you think bird conservation is important?”. The five most frequently used words in their open-ended responses were; species ($n = 67$), ecosystem/s ($n = 63$), environment ($n = 61$), part (of) ($n = 59$), habitat ($n = 48$), health [ecosystem/environmental] ($n = 35$), natural ($n = 33$), world ($n = 30$), and biodiversity ($n = 29$).

After coding responses into categories and examining data accompanied by socio-demographics ($N = 210$), the top three categories were: general biodiversity ($n = 115$, 55%), ecological role of birds ($n = 84$, 40%) and the ability for birds to be indicators of changes in natural systems ($n = 69$, 33%) (Table 2). Birders often stated that while birds are deserving of conservation as species, their role in ecosystems and the importance of biodiversity was just as important. For example, some actual responses included the following; *‘It cannot be in isolation. Biodiversity needs to be protected’*, *‘Conserving birds means conserving habitat which directly helps with other species’* and *‘Because birds are an essential part of food webs*

and ecosystem - but it is about preserving habitats (on a landscape scale) and all of the wildlife within them rather than simply focusing on birds’. Some respondents identified the role humans have had in degrading the environment, and that society has a responsibility to minimise their interference with nature. The potential for birds to be flagship species or economic assets was not a common feature of responses to this question, compared to other qualities.

Males and females were largely consistent in their reasons for why bird conservation is important. However, females recognised the ecological role birds play more than males (Fisher’s exact test, $p = 0.012$) (Table 2). Additionally, females appeared to value birds for their aesthetic appeal more than males, though this was not statistically significant (Fisher’s exact test, $p = 0.126$) (Table 2, Table S2). The need for humans (as stewards of nature) to conserve birds was recognised more by males than females, but was also not significant (Fisher’s exact test, $p = 0.109$).

Age had an effect on the reasons given for the importance of bird conservation. The ecological roles played by birds was recognised by younger birders (≤ 30 years old) more than expected and less than expected by mature birders (aged 61 and over) ($\chi^2 = 7.574$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.023$). Conversely, the role birds play as indicator species was identified more than expected by mature birders (aged 61 and over) and less than expected among younger birders (≤ 30) ($\chi^2 = 8.951$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.011$). Younger birders identified bird conservation as important for future generations (i.e. bequest value) more than was expected ($\chi^2 = 8.995$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.011$).

Education and country of residence (as far as those surveyed here) had little effect on the ways birders value bird conservation. Exceptions include; the ecological role played by birds where Australian respondents appear to place more value on this role than respondents from

other countries ($\chi^2 = 12.310$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.031$) (Table 2, Table S2) and the importance of birds as indicators, where tertiary educated birders had higher than expected responses (Fisher's exact test, $p = 0.039$).

Interest in learning about bird conservation at birding sites

Most birders would like to learn more about the conservation of birds at birding sites (yes; $n = 125$, no; $n = 30$, uncertain; $n = 41$). Australian birders want to learn about bird conservation more than was expected, while birders from the USA were less interested in learning about conservation at birding sites ($\chi^2 = 19.526$, $df = 8$, $p = 0.012$). There was no significant difference between birders desire to learn more about conservation at birding sites with respect to age ($\chi^2 = 4.585$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.333$), sex ($\chi^2 = 3.658$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.161$) or education (Fisher's exact test $p = 0.504$).

Who should pay for bird conservation?

Generally, birders agree with the statement 'I believe that birders should make contributions to assist bird conservation when visiting key sites for birds', with a mean score of 3.98 on a scale of one to five, where five is the strongest level of agreement with the statement (Table 3). They also showed agreement with the statement 'I believe that government should be the main funders of bird conservation', with a mean score of 3.84.

There was no significant difference between males and females and education level with respect to either statement (Figure S1), nor did age affect the level of agreement with government being the main funders of bird conservation. However younger respondents ($\leq$

30 years old) were more inclined to agree that birders should make contributions to bird conservation ($F = 5.692$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.004$) (Figure S1).

UK birders showed a higher level of agreement that birders should contribute to bird conservation than both Australian and USA birders ($F = 3.271$, $df = 4$, $p = 0.012$) (Figure S1). Country of residence was not a good predictor of whether birders think governments should be the primary funders of bird conservation (Figure S1).

Awareness of BirdLife International's IBA Program

Almost 43% of the 534 birders responding to this question stated that they were familiar with the BirdLife International IBA program. A further 21% were uncertain if they were familiar with the program and 36% were unfamiliar with the IBA program (Table 4). More males were familiar with the IBA program than females ($\chi^2 = 20.276$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.01$), with similar proportions expressing uncertainty about their IBA awareness.

Birders in the age groups ≤ 30 and 31-60 had the highest rates of familiarity with the IBA program ($\chi^2 = 26.246$, $df = 4$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 4). Despite having higher rates of familiarity respondents in the ≤ 30 group also had high rates of uncertainty about their awareness of the IBA program. More respondents in the 61 and over age group stated that they were unfamiliar with the IBA program than those that were familiar.

Australian respondents had the least familiarity with the IBA program (as a proportion of the number of respondents for each country) ($\chi^2 = 70.257$, $df = 8$, $p < 0.01$) (Table 2) and most South African residents indicated they were familiar with the IBA program (familiar $n = 38$, expected $n = 21$). Respondents that reside in the UK and USA had similar results, having slightly more familiarity with the IBA program than being unfamiliar or uncertain about it.

Education appears to have a positive effect on the level of familiarity with the IBA program ($\chi^2 = 12.686$, $df = 6$, $p = 0.048$). Respondents with higher levels of education (both vocational and tertiary) tended to be more familiar with the IBA program (Table 4). Conversely, respondents with primary and secondary school level educations only responded more often that they were unfamiliar or uncertain about the IBA program.

Discussion

Values of bird conservation

Our paper has extended the current knowledge base by examining the relationship between birders from different socio-demographic groups and their attitudes and knowledge of bird conservation and management issues. In general, birders express a genuine concern for birds, as demonstrated by their largely ecocentric (i.e. non-anthropocentric values) (Thompson and Barton 1994) responses to why bird conservation is important. Understanding birder attitudes to conservation has previously been examined by presenting respondents with statements about conservation and then assessed their levels of agreement with those statements (Green and Jones 2010, Glowinski and Moore 2014). By asking birders about their attitude towards conservation in an open-ended manner we gained a broader insight into the ways in which people value birds and removed potential biases associated with the provision of set response options. More importantly it was able to detect that birders value conservation holistically, rather than just birds in isolation. For example, more than half of the birders, across all socio-demographic groups, framed their response to the open-ended question in the broader terms of general biodiversity conservation. The general biodiversity appreciation among birders

supports the recent move by BirdLife International to reframe IBAs as Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas. The role birds can play as flagships for conservation (Veríssimo et al. 2013) and their use as biological indicators of ecosystem health and function (Gregory et al. 2003) also provides justification for this shift.

Many birders also recognised birds' roles in ecosystems, demonstrating an appreciation of the complexity of the natural world and the need to conserve ecosystem function. Australian birders in particular recognised the ecological role that birds play, which complements the findings of a recent study finding Australians also place significant value on threatened birds (Zander et al. 2014). This could be attributed to the fact that birds are responsible for plant pollination and seed dispersal in Australia, more than any other continent (Ford et al. 1979, Low 2014). Younger birders and female birders were also more likely to recognise the ecological importance of birds in their responses, which is more challenging to explain. We could speculate that a deeper understanding of ecological processes is associated with advancements in education among these groups in recent times.

Anthropocentric values (e.g. economic, aesthetic and bequest values) as drivers for bird conservation were less prevalent among respondents. This is interesting given the economic argument is often used to promote the benefits of supporting the birding industry (Dickie et al. 2006, Lee et al. 2010, Simango 2011, Li et al. 2013). While the economic potential of the industry has been explored and well documented (Steven et al. 2014), we have found this is not a major factor in why birders want to conserve birds. As such, arguing for conservation based on economic grounds is unlikely to win more conservation support from the birding population.

There may be any number of factors that drive the value system to which individuals subscribe (Byrne 1998), but given the growth in bird tourism, the role of tourism companies

and operators may be important. For example, the role that bird tourism operators and their own conservation ethos plays in imparting information on to birders has been under examined. This aspect has been explored in other nature-based tourism sectors such as reef tourism (Biggs et al. 2012). A recent study has touched on the role of IBAs in avitourism itinerary advertising (Steven et al. 2015) which may shed some light on this relationship. However, further research is needed to understand the role of tourism operators' conservation ethos, their birding practices and their influence on their clients.

Funding and political support of bird conservation

Securing funding for conservation continues to challenge natural area managers, in both protected and unprotected landscapes (McCarthy et al. 2012, Balmford et al. 2015). Diversified funding sources may provide resilience against economic perturbations for conservation practitioners and alleviate some (but not all) pressures placed on governments (Emerton et al. 2006, Dudley et al. 2014, Eagles 2014). Our findings suggest that birders are in favour of multiple funding sources for bird conservation, including making contributions themselves. The debate around entrance fees to protected areas has been active for some time (Buckley 2003, Chung et al. 2011), however it has been demonstrated that tourism revenue does contribute to vertebrate conservation (Buckley et al. 2012, Morrison et al. 2012, Steven et al. 2013). Birders should, at the very least, be given the opportunity to contribute to conservation, or perhaps join bird conservation organisations when they visit birding sites. The logistics of this would need to be a collaborative effort between public and private protected area managers and local bird conservation organisations (e.g. BirdLife branches, RSPB [Royal Society for Protection of Birds, other conservation NGOs [non-government organisations]). Where bird conservation groups are the land-owners, (e.g. reserves in the UK

owned by the RSPB and The Wildlife Trusts), there are already entry or membership fees imposed to fund conservation works and further land acquisition. These reserves serve as a positive example of what is possible for other land-owners and conservation practitioners. Despite a willingness to make their own contributions, birders felt that government should remain the main funders of conservation. This could be an artefact of respondents having less faith in governments to fund the conservation requirements, or it could represent an underestimation by birders of the funding needed to sufficiently conserve birds (McCarthy et al. 2012, Butchart et al. 2015). This is cause for concern with the countries examined here, most (if not all) of which are signatories or parties to various international agreements regarding biodiversity conservation (e.g. Ramsar, Convention on Biological Diversity etc.).

Awareness of bird conservation practice and the global IBA network

The sequential uptake of the IBA program in different regions may explain the variation in familiarity among birders. South Africa and the USA had the highest levels of familiarity and these countries began establishing their IBAs in the mid to late 1990s (Barnes 1998, CEC 1999). Australia did not formally establish an IBA network until 2009 (Dutson et al. 2009), thus the lowest levels of familiarity among Australian birders could be explained by this time lag. Despite this, in recent years the advent of social media and information sharing through digital means has provided opportunities for environmental organisations to inform the public faster than ever before of conservation issues and actions. Many organisations use such portals for updating members and supporters on topical issues and rallying support for those issues.

Our data demonstrate that birders, by and large, want to learn more about the birds they watch at key sites. This is especially the case for Australian birders. Therefore, despite having the lowest levels of familiarity with the IBA program, this is exactly the type of issue that Australian birders want to know more about. Furthermore, birders may also be willing to pay for educational and interpretive services at birding sites (Green and Jones 2010, Kim et al. 2010, Lee et al. 2010). Signage at birding sites, provision of information on tourist information websites and topical social media campaigns by bird conservation groups are just two ways that this improved education could be initiated (McKay 2007). Birders from the USA were less enthusiastic in their desire to learn more about bird conservation. It is difficult to say why this was the case as the issue has been under examined to date. One might speculate there is already adequate availability of such information among American birders (e.g. community groups, magazines, newsletters etc.). Given the size of the birding population in the USA (i.e. up to 47 million) (Carver 2011), a deeper examination of this is warranted.

We have found that birders value birds in a more ecocentric way than for anthropocentric reasons. Despite this, it appears that there are opportunities to extend their concern for birds by increasing their knowledge and understanding of practical conservation measures. While some birders do contribute to conservation (e.g. monetary contributions, political support for conservation), they may not fully appreciate what their contributions are used for or where more investment is required. We suggest an increased dialogue between birders and the bodies promoting bird conservation. If birders are to be effective advocates of bird conservation, our findings suggest there is scope for improvement in engagement between them and bird conservation practitioners. Focusing transparent and effective communication efforts on an already nature-oriented group may yield greater benefits for all parties involved.

Acknowledgements

This research was co-funded by BirdLife Australia (Stuart Leslie Award), Wet Tropics Management Authority and Griffith School of Environment. We thank the following people for their guidance in the development of the survey instrument/s: J. Byrne, C. Symes, E. Anderson, A. Coghlan, R. Buckley, M. Davies, M. Le Pla, K. Lowe, M. Runkowski, D. Treby and Tamborine Mountain Natural History Association. The following people and organisations facilitated the data collection for this project: R. Lambert (University of Nottingham), T. Appleton and the organisers of the British BirdFair, Tourism NT, G. Brown (School of Biological Sciences, University of Sydney), Tasmania Tourism, Green Mountains Natural History Association, J. and P. Nott (Rose Gums Wilderness Retreat), P. and S. Gregory (Cassowary House), K. and L. Fisher (Kingfisher Park Birdwatcher's Lodge), O'Reilly's Rainforest Retreat, B. Davies (Gondwana Guides), M. Jervis (Experience the Wild), Queensland Department for Environment and Heritage Protection, Kakadu National Park.

Literature Cited

Balmford, A., Green, J. M. H., Anderson, M., Beresford, J., Huang, C., Naidoo, R., Walpole, M. and Manica, A. (2015) Walk on the wild side: estimating the global magnitude of visits to protected areas. *PLoS Biology* 13: e1002074.

Barnes, K. N. (1998) The Important Bird Areas of Southern Africa. Johannesburg, South Africa: BirdLife South Africa.

Biggs, D. (2013) Birding, sustainability and ecotourism. Pp. 394-403 in R. Ballantyne and J. Packer, eds. *International Handbook on Ecotourism*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

364 Biggs, D., Ban, N. C. and Hall, C. M. (2012) Lifestyle values, resilience, and nature-based
 365 tourism's contribution to conservation on Australia's Great Barrier Reef. *Environmental*
 366 *Conservation* 39: 370-379.

367 Biggs, D., Turpie, J., Fabricius, C. and Spenceley, A. (2011) The value of avitourism for
 368 conservation and job creation – An analysis from South Africa. *Conservation and Society* 9:
 369 80-90.

370 BirdLife International (2015) Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas IBAs. (Accessed online
 371 from www.birdlife.org/worldwide/programmes/important-bird-and-biodiversity-areas-ibas).

372 Buckley, R. (2003) Pay to play in parks: an Australian policy perspective on visitor fees in
 373 public protected areas. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 11: 56-73.

374 Buckley, R. C., Castley, J. G., Pegas, F. de V., Mossaz, A. C. and Steven, R. (2012) A
 375 population accounting approach to assess tourism contributions to conservation of IUCN-
 376 Redlisted mammal species. *PLoS ONE* 7: e44134.

377 Butchart, S. H. M., Stattersfield, A. J. and Collar, N. J. (2006) How many bird extinctions
 378 have we prevented? *Oryx* 40: 266-278.

379 Butchart, S. H. M., Clarke, M., Smith, R. J., Sykes, R. E., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Harfott, M.,
 380 Buchanan, G. M., Angulo, A., Balmford, A., Bertzky, B., Brooks, T. M., Carpenter, K.
 381 E.,Comeros-Raynal, M. T., Cornell, J., Ficetola, G. F., Fishpool, L. D. C., Fuller, R.A.,
 382 Geldmann, J., Harwell, H., Hilton-Taylor, C., Hoffmann, M., Joolia, A., Joppa, L., Kingston,
 383 N., May, I., Milam, A., Polidoro, B., Ralph, G., Richman, N., Rondinini, C., Segan, D. B.,
 384 Skolnik, B., Spalding, M. D., Stuart, S. N., Symes, A., Taylor, J., Visconti, P., Watson, J. E.
 385 M., Wood, L. and Burgess, N. D. (2015) Shortfalls and solutions for meeting national and
 386 global conservation area targets. *Conservation Letters* DOI: 10.1111/conl.12158

387 Byrne, J. (1998) What's it worth to me?: An examination of values in urban and regional
388 planning. Hons thesis. Perth, Australia: Curtin University.

389 Carver, E. (2011) Birding in the United States: a demographic and economic analysis. Report
390 2011-1. Washington DC, USA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

391 CEC (Commission for Environmental Cooperation) (1999) North American Important Bird
392 Areas A Directory of 150 Key Conservation Sites. Montreal, Canada: Communications and
393 Public Outreach Department of the CEC Secretariat.

394 Chen, L-J. and Chen, W-P. (2015) Push-pull factors in international birders' travel. *Tourism*
395 *Manage.* 48: 416-425.

396 Chung, J. Y., Kyle, G. T., Petrick, J. F. and Absher, J. D. (2011) Fairness of prices, user fee
397 policy and willingness to pay among visitors to a national forest. *Tourism Manage.* 3: 1038-
398 1046.

399 Cooper, C., Larson, L., Dayer, A., Stedman, R. and Decker, D. (2015) Are wildlife
400 recreationists conservationists? Linking hunting, birdwatching, and pro-environmental
401 behavior. *J. Wildlife Manage.* DOI: 10.1002/jwmg.855.

402 Connell, J. (2009) Birdwatching, twitching and tourism: towards an Australian perspective.
403 *Aust. Geogr.* 40: 203-217.

404 Dickie, I., Hughes, J. and Esteban, A. (2006) Watched like never before...the local economic
405 benefits of spectacular bird species. *Beds, UK: RSPB.*

406 Dudley, N., Groves, C., Redford, K. H. and Stolton, S. (2014) Where now for protected
407 areas? Setting the stage for the 2014 World Parks Congress. *Oryx* 48: 496-503

408 Dutson, G., Garnett, S. and Gole, C. (2009) Australia's Important Bird Areas: key sites for
 409 bird conservation. Birds Australia (RAOU) Conservation Statement No. 15. Australia: Birds
 410 Australia.

411 Eagles, P. J. F. (2014) Research priorities in park tourism. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 22: 528-549.

412 Emerton, L., Bishop, J. and Thomas, L. (2006) Sustainable financing of protected areas: a
 413 global review of challenges and options. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

414 Ford, H. A., Paton, D. C. and Forde, N. (1979) Birds as pollinators of Australian plants. *New.*
 415 *Zeal. J. of Bot.* 17: 509-519.

416 Glowinski, S. L. and Moore, F. R. (2014) The role of recreational motivation in the birding
 417 participation–environmental concern relationship. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 19: 219-
 418 233.

419 Green, R. and Jones, D. N. (2010) Practices, needs and attitudes of bird-watching tourists in
 420 Australia. CRC for Sustainable Tourism. Brisbane, Australia: Griffith University.

421 Gregory, R. D., Noble, D., Field, R., Marchant, J., Raven, M. and Gibbons, D. W. (2003)
 422 Using birds as indicators of biodiversity. *Ornis Hungarica* 12: 11-24.

423 Guimarães, M. H., Nunes, L. C., Madureira, L., Santos, J. L., Boski, T. and Dentinho, T.
 424 (2015) Measuring birdwatchers preferences: A case for using online networks and mixed-
 425 mode surveys. *Tourism Manage.* 46: 102-113.

426 Hvenegaard, G. T. and Dearden, P. (1998a) Ecotourism versus tourism in a Thai national
 427 park. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 25: 700-720.

428 Hvenegaard, G. T. and Dearden, P. (1998b) Linking ecotourism and biodiversity
 429 conservation: A case study of Doi Inthanon National Park, Thailand. *Singapore J. Trop. Geo.*
 430 19: 193-211.

431 Hvenegaard, G. T. (2002) Birder specialization differences in conservation involvement,
 432 demographics, and motivations. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 7: 21-36.

433 Isaacs, J. C. and Chi, Y. N. (2005) A travel-cost analysis of a birdwatching festival: The
 434 Grand Isle migratory bird celebration. Baton Rouge, USA: Louisiana Department of Wildlife
 435 and Fisheries.

436 Jacques, P. J., Dunlap, R. E. and Freeman, M. (2008) The organisation of denial:
 437 Conservative think tanks and environmental scepticism. *Environ. Polit.* 17: 349-385.

438 Kim, A. K., Keuning, J., Rovertson, J. and Kleindorfer, S. (2010) Understanding the
 439 birdwatching tourism market in Queensland, Australia. *Anatolia: An International Journal of*
 440 *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 21: 227-247.

441 Lamers, M., Nthiga, R., Van der Duim, V. R. and Van Wijk, J. (2014) Tourism-conservation
 442 enterprises as a land-use strategy in Kenya. *Tourism Geogr.* 16: 474-489.

443 Lee, C-K., Lee, J-H., Kim, T-K. and Mjelde, J. W. (2010) Preferences and willingness to pay
 444 for a bird-watching tour and interpretive services using a choice experiment. *J. Sustain.*
 445 *Tour.* 18: 695-708.

446 Li, F., Zhu, Q. & Yang, Z. (2013) Birding tourism development in Sichuan, China. *Tourism*
 447 *Econ.* 19: 257-273.

448 Lindenmayer, D. B. and Burgman, M. (2005) *Practical Conservation Biology*. Clayton,
 449 Australia: CSIRO Publishing.

450 Low, T. (2014) *Where song began*. Melbourne, Australia: Penguin Books.

451 McCarthy, D. P., Donald, P. F., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Buchanan, G. M., Balmford, A.,
 452 Green, J. M. H., Bennun, L. A., Burgess, N. D., Fishpool, L. D. C., Garnett, S. T., Leonard,
 453 D. L., Maloney, R. F., Morling, P., Schaefer, H. M., Symes, A., Wiedenfeld, D. A. and
 454 Butchart, S. H. M. (2012) Financial costs of meeting global biodiversity conservation targets:
 455 Current spending and unmet needs. *Science* 338: 946-949.

456 McFarlane, B. L. and Boxall, P. C. (1996) Participation in wildlife conservation by
 457 birdwatchers. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 1: 1-14.

458 McKay, L. (2007) Engaging the public in bird conservation: moving from science to behavior
 459 change. *Waterbirds* 30: 177-182.

460 Miller, Z. D., Hallo, J. C., Sharp, L., Powell, R. B. and Lanham, J. D. (2014) Birding by ear:
 461 a study of recreational specialization and soundscape preference. *Human Dimensions of*
 462 *Wildlife* 19: 498-511

463 Morrison, C., Simpkins, C., Castley, J. G. and Buckley, R. C. (2012) Tourism and the
 464 conservation of critically endangered frogs. *PLoS ONE* 7: e43757.

465 Moss, S. (2005) *A bird in the bush: A social history of birdwatching*. London, UK: Aurum
 466 Press.

467 Neumayer, E. (2004) The environment, left-wing political orientation and ecological
 468 economics. *Ecol. Econ.* 51: 167-175.

469 Novacek, M. J. (2008) Engaging the public in biodiversity issues. *PNAS* 105: 11571-11578.

470 Osieck, E. R. and Morzer Bruyns, M. F. (1981) *Important Bird Areas in the European*
 471 *community*. Cambridge, UK: International Council for Bird Preservation.

472 Papworth, S. K., Nghiem, T. P. L., Chimalakonda, D., Posa, M. R. C., Wijedasa, L. S.,
 473 Bickford, D. and Carrasco, L. R. (2015) Quantifying the role of online news in linking
 474 conservation research to Facebook and Twitter. *Conserv. Biol.* 29: 825-833.

475 Pegas, F. de. V. and Castley, J. G. (2014) Ecotourism as a conservation tool and its adoption
 476 by private protected areas in Brazil. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 22: 604-625

477 Şekercioğlu, Ç. (2002) Impacts of birdwatching on human and avian communities. *Environ.*
 478 *Conserv.* 29: 282-289.

479 Seshadri, K. S., Krishna, M. B., Shashank, B., Sunil K. M., Prabhakar, B. S., Nitin, R. A.,
 480 Kishan, S. B., Vinay, K. S., Gautham, G. S., Venkat, N., Sushant, P., Piyush, D. and Pawan,
 481 K. T. (2013) Ruining the ecology of Hesaraghatta Lake-the role of bird photographers.
 482 Conservation India. (Accessed from [www.conservationindia.org/wp-](http://www.conservationindia.org/wp-content/files_mf/small_Hesaraghatta-Photographers.pdf)
 483 [content/files_mf/small_Hesaraghatta-Photographers.pdf](http://www.conservationindia.org/wp-content/files_mf/small_Hesaraghatta-Photographers.pdf)).

484 Simango, S. S. (2011) The evolution, structure and market for birding tourism in South
 485 Africa. M.A. thesis. Johannesburg, South Africa: University of the Witwatersrand.

486 Steven, R. and Castley, J. G. (2013) Tourism as a threat to critically endangered and
 487 endangered birds: global patterns and trends in conservation hotspots. *Biodivers. Conserv.*
 488 22: 1063-1082.

489 Steven, R., Castley, J. G. and Buckley, R. (2013) Tourism revenue as a conservation tool for
 490 threatened birds in protected areas. *PLoS ONE* 8: (e62598).

491 Steven, R., Morrison, C. and Castley, J. G. (2014) Bird watching and avitourism: A global
 492 review of research into its participant markets, distribution and impacts, highlighting future
 493 research priorities to inform sustainable avitourism management. *J. Sustain. Tour.*
 494 DOI.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.924955

495 Steven, R., Morrison, C., Arthur, J. M. and Castley, J. G. (2015) Avitourism and Australian
 496 Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas. PLoS ONE 10: e0144445
 497 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144445>

498 Thompson, S.C. G., and Barton, M.A. (1994) Ecocentric and anthropocentric attitudes toward
 499 the environment. J. Env. Psychology. 14: 149-157.

500 Urfi, A. J. (2012) Birdwatchers, Middle Class and the 'Bharat-India' Divide Perspectives
 501 from Recent Bird Writings. Economic & Political Weekly 47: 27-29.

502 Veríssimo, D., Pongiluppi, T., Santos, M. C. M., Develey, P. F., Fraser, I., Smith, R. J. and
 503 MacMillan, D. C. (2013) Using a systematic approach to select flagship species for bird
 504 conservation. Conserv. Biol. 28: 269-277.

505 Wolch, J. and Zhang, J. (2004) Beach recreation, cultural diversity and attitudes toward
 506 nature. J. Leisure Res. 36: 414-443.

507 Zander, K. K., Ainsworth, G. B., Meyerhoff, J. and Garnett, S. T. (2014) Threatened Bird
 508 Valuation in Australia. PLoS ONE 9: e100411

Table 1 Specific questions asked of birders regarding bird conservation and their respective sample sizes.

Not all questions were answered and not all respondents gave their country of residence details, thus sample sizes do vary accordingly.

Survey Method	Online Survey	Face-to-Face Survey
Research Question 1 – Why do you think bird conservation is important? <i>This was an open-ended question where birders could respond by providing details about any area of bird conservation important to them.</i>		
Total response rate n = 295	n = 295	N/A
Responses per country	n = 235 Australia (n = 68) United States of America (n = 47) United Kingdom (n = 48) South Africa (n = 47) Other (n = 25) – omitted from subsequent analyses	N/A
Research Question 2 – Are you interested in learning more about bird conservation at this site? (N.B. Asked at Australian birding sites) <i>Birders were given the options; yes, no or uncertain to respond to this question</i>		
Total response rate n = 196	N/A	n = 196
Responses per country	N/A	n = 194 Australia (n = 119) United States of America (n = 32) United Kingdom (n = 19) Other (n = 24)
Research Question 3 – Should birders/government pay for conservation? <i>Birders were asked to respond using a five point Likert type scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree</i>		
Total response rate n = 271	N/A	n = 271
Responses per country	N/A	n = 271 Australia (n = 127) United States of America (n = 32) United Kingdom (n = 88) Other (n = 24)
Research Question 4 – Are you familiar with BirdLife International's Important Bird Area Program? <i>For this question birders were asked choose from the options – familiar, not familiar or uncertain</i>		
Total response rate n = 549	n = 266	n = 283
Responses per country	n = 258 Australia (n = 76) United States of America (n = 54)	n = 275 Australia (n = 128) United States of America (n = 32)

United Kingdom (n = 51)	United Kingdom (n = 90)
South Africa (n = 49)	Other (n = 26)
Other (n = 28) – omitted from subsequent analyses	

Table 2 Values assigned to the responses for the importance of bird conservation by country, age and sex of respondent ($N = 210$).
‘Other’ countries excluded here due to low sample size.

	Value definition	Pearson's Chi Square Results - Country	Pearson's Chi Square Results – Age Group (up to 30, 31-60, 61 and over)	Fisher’s Exact Test Results - Education	Fisher’s Exact Test Results - Sex
General biodiversity conservation ($n = 115$)	Bird conservation is/should be about biodiversity conservation in general	$\chi^2 = 5.120$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.401$	$\chi^2 = 3.017$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.221$	$p = 0.304$	$p = 0.468$
Ecological role ($n = 84$)	The role of birds in the ecosystem is recognised – birds are pollinators/dispersers, birds (e.g. raptors) aid in nutrient cycling etc	$\chi^2 = 12.310$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.031$	$\chi^2 = 7.574$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.023$	$p = 0.717$	$p = 0.012$
Indicator ($n = 69$)	Birds can be good indicators of change in the ecosystem as a whole	$\chi^2 = 5.391$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.370$	$\chi^2 = 8.951$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.011$	$p = 0.039$	$p = 0.484$
Aesthetic/personal wellbeing ($n = 51$)	Watching or hearing birds gives pleasure, birds are stunning/beautiful	$\chi^2 = 4.891$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.429$	$\chi^2 = 0.644$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.725$	$p = 0.270$	$p = 0.126$
Bequest ($n = 32$)	Birds should be conserved so future generations can enjoy them	$\chi^2 = 2.662$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.752$	$\chi^2 = 8.995$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.011$	$p = 0.776$	$p = 1.000$
Intrinsic ($n = 29$)	Birds have a right to exist independent of humans	$\chi^2 = 4.071$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.539$	$\chi^2 = 4.116$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.128$	$p = 1.000$	$p = 0.648$
Flagship ($n = 24$)	Birds can be figure-heads or icons of wider conservation issues	$\chi^2 = 3.632$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.604$	$\chi^2 = 2.350$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.309$	$p = 0.750$	$p = 0.786$
Stewardship ($n = 20$)	We have a responsibility to not damage the environment but protect it	$\chi^2 = 5.275$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.383$	$\chi^2 = 0.032$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.984$	$p = 0.212$	$p = 0.109$
Economic ($n = 10$)	Birds can provide economic benefits via tourism and recreation	$\chi^2 = 2.948$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.708$	$\chi^2 = 1.892$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.388$	$p = 0.357$	$p = 0.691$

Table 3 Birders' level of agreement with the two statements ($N = 271$); 'I believe that birders should make contributions to assist bird conservation when visiting key sites for birds' and 'I believe that government should be the main funders of bird conservation'. BP = Birders pay; GP = Governments pay. Mean calculated by assigning values: 1 to Strongly Disagree, 2 to Disagree, 3 to Not Sure, 4 Agree and 5 to Strongly Agree. The closer the mean is to five the higher the level of birder agreement with the statement.

Region	<i>n</i>	Mean Score		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Not Sure		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		BP	GP	BP (%)	GP (%)	BP (%)	GP (%)	BP (%)	GP (%)	BP (%)	GP (%)	BP (%)	GP (%)
Australia	127	3.86	3.87	1.6	2.4	6.3	7.1	15.0	11.8	59.1	58.3	18.1	20.5
UK	88	4.19	3.75	2.3	0.0	3.4	12.5	5.7	19.3	50.0	48.9	38.6	19.3
USA	32	3.69	3.69	6.3	3.1	3.1	15.6	21.9	15.6	53.1	40.6	15.6	25.0
Other	24	4.21	4.21	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	25.0	12.5	29.2	29.2	45.8	50.0
All respondents		3.98	3.84	2.2%	1.5%	4.4%	10%	13.7%	14.8%	52.8%	50.6%	26.9%	23.2%

Table 4 Level of birder familiarity with BirdLife International's IBA* program.

IBA Familiarity	Yes <i>n</i> (%)	No <i>n</i> (%)	Uncertain <i>n</i> (%)	Pearson's Chi Square Results
All (<i>n</i> = 534)	229 (42.9%)	193 (36.1%)	112 (21%)	
Sex	obs/exp	obs/exp	obs/exp	$\chi^2 = 20.28$, df = 2, $p < 0.01$
Male (<i>n</i> = 351)	174/151	107/127	70/74	
Female (<i>n</i> = 183)	55/79	86/66	42/38	
Age group	obs/exp	obs/exp	obs/exp	$\chi^2 = 26.25$, df = 4, $p < 0.01$
up to 30 (<i>n</i> = 79)	34/34	19/29	26/17	
31-60 (<i>n</i> = 270)	129/116	83/98	58/57	
61 and over (<i>n</i> = 185)	66/79	91/67	28/39	
Country of residence	obs/exp	obs/exp	obs/exp	$\chi^2 = 70.26$ df = 8, $p < 0.01$
Australia (<i>n</i> = 204)	58/88	109/74	37/43	
United Kingdom (<i>n</i> = 141)	57/61	46/52	41/30	
United States (<i>n</i> = 86)	41/37	25/31	20/18	
South Africa (<i>n</i> = 49)	38/21	4/18	7/10	
Other (<i>n</i> = 54)	35/22	10/19	9/11	
Highest level of education completed	obs/exp	obs/exp	obs/exp	$\chi^2 = 12.69$, df = 6, $p = 0.048$
Primary (<i>n</i> = 18)	3/8	11/7	4/4	
Secondary (<i>n</i> = 60)	22/26	29/22	9/13	
Technical/Vocational (<i>n</i> = 46)	19/20	14/17	13/10	
Tertiary (<i>n</i> = 410)	185/176	139/148	86/86	

* IBA = Important Bird and Biodiversity Area