

## Summary of Results from the Rehabilitating Roe 8 Survey 2021 Tranche 2

### Methodology

Perth Market Research (PMR) was engaged to conduct the project development, data collection, analysis and reporting on surveys related to the Rehabilitating Roe 8 project. **This is the second in a series of annual surveys covering the same issues.** The following number of completed surveys was received across each of the key survey recipient sectors:

- |                                  |     |                         |
|----------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|
| • <b>Random community survey</b> | 201 | +/- 7% sampling error   |
| • <b>Mailing list survey</b>     | 109 | +/- 8.1% sampling error |
| • <b>Online Facebook survey</b>  | 137 | +/- 8.4% sampling error |

The results for the online Facebook survey approximated the results for the random community survey but are not quoted here, as they cannot be merged with the community survey due to methodological differences.

All statistics quoted are considered reliable within the quoted sampling errors at the 95% confidence level. The results quoted are considered to be satisfactory in terms of survey and reporting accuracy and reliability to meet required standards.

**The results from the random community survey most reliably describes the opinions of the broader community within the Perth metropolitan area, whereas the results from the mailing list survey most reliably describes the opinions of people actively connected to the Rehabilitating Roe 8 project via their mailing list.**

### Awareness

**Project awareness** – 45.8% of **community survey** respondents had not heard of the project before, compared to 32.3% who had. This compares with 99.1% of **mailing list** respondents who had heard of the project. Over half of all **community survey** respondents were 'at least' mostly correct in their understanding of the project (86.1%), compared to 91.7% of **mailing list** respondents.

**Logo awareness** - 72.1% of **community survey** respondents had not seen the Rehabilitating Roe 8 logo before being asked about it and 51.4% of **mailing list** respondents had seen the logo.

**Awareness of RMP objectives (mailing list only)** - The largest proportion of **mailing list** respondents were aware of the RMP objectives (38.2%), followed by those that were somewhat aware (34.5%), had a very limited awareness (20.0%) and those that were fully aware (7.3%). None of these respondents were not at all aware.

**Awareness of project objectives (mailing list only)** - The largest proportion of mailing list respondents advised that they were aware of the objective of ensuring the community has opportunities for hands-on involvement (56.4%), followed by ensuring the community has input into decision making (49.1%), involving the community in organised activities (47.3%) and recognition of Aboriginal heritage & continued connection to land (41.8%).

## Satisfaction

### **Satisfaction across project areas**

Approximately 2 out of every 3 **community survey** respondents across all response categories were unsure/unaware of a range of areas relating to the Rehabilitating Roe 8 project. Across all respondents who felt that they were able to assess their level of satisfaction with the project areas it was shown that satisfaction was marginally higher for provision of paths and trails in the area, sense of community ownership in the area and value of art or cultural experiences.

Satisfaction for **mailing list** respondents was the highest for sense of community ownership (70.6%) in the area, the overall project (63.5%) and cultural recognition of the Nyungar people (49.5%). Dissatisfaction was highest for signage in the area (36.7%), the value of art or cultural experiences (33.8%) and the presence of art or cultural experiences (32.1%).

## Involvement

**Project involvement** - Only 2.0% of respondents in the **community survey** had any involvement in the project. 98.0% of these respondents have had no involvement in the project at the time of questioning. 50.4% of respondents from the **mailing list** had involvement in the project. 49.6% of respondents have had no involvement in the project at the time of questioning.

**Community survey** - Only 4 respondents had had any involvement in RR8 therefore there are too few responses to reliably analyse further involvement results for this survey.

**Involvement with project activities/opportunities (mailing list only)** - The largest proportion of respondents had participated in weeding days/events (37.6%), in sharing information (35.8%), planting days (31.2%), as a participant in Open Days (30.3%) and as a participant in Community Days (25.7%) . The fewest respondents were involved as a participant in Citizen Science (1.8%) and as a community representative on a committee (9.2%).

**Future involvement** - The largest proportion of **community survey** respondents were unlikely to involve themselves in the project (72.6%), consisting of 36.8% who were unlikely and a further 35.8% who were very unlikely. The largest proportion of respondents from the **mailing list** were 'at least' likely to involve themselves in the project now or in the future (73.4%) compared to 19.3% who were 'at most' unlikely to do so.

## Importance

### **Project item/area importance**

**Community survey** - Planting days was considered the most important item to include as a part of the Rehabilitating Roe 8 project (4.295) followed by wildlife events (4.203), scientific information (4.047) volunteering opportunities (3.914) and educational events and programs (3.863). The items considered the least important were artwork (3.016), cultural experiences (3.421) and cultural events (3.502).

**Mailing list** - Wildlife events was considered the most important item to include as a part of the Rehabilitating Roe 8 project (4.71) followed by scientific information (4.63), project updates (4.49), planting days (4.41), trails (4.37), community days (4.34), educational events & programs (4.31) and volunteering opportunities (4.48). The items considered the least important were artwork (3.49), picnic tables, seats and benches (3.71), cultural events (3.97), pathways (4.26), cultural experiences (4.28). Despite being considered the least important, these items nevertheless scored above the mid-range for importance.