

Appendix to the 'River Otter Beaver Trial' Science & Evidence Report: Respondents' Reasons for Answers Given in 2017 Nationwide Questionnaire

Roger Auster

University of Exeter

rea213@exeter.ac.uk

Funded by: Natural Environment Research Council

Contents

Introduction

Section 1: Perceptions of beaver impacts

Wildlife & Ecology

Water & Flooding

Soil & Ground Stability

Trees & Forestry

Economics

Education

Health & Welfare

Recreation & Leisure

Section 2: Reasons as to whether respondents support the process of beaver reintroduction to Great Britain

Section 3: Reasons given for views on required levels of legal protection

Section 4: Reasons as to whether respondents felt able to express opinions where it influences decision-makers

Introduction

A nationwide survey of attitudes towards beaver reintroduction was undertaken (prior to beavers in Scotland being listed as a European Protected Species). A number of results have been reported upon for the 'River Otter Beaver Trial' Science & Evidence Report and in the paper '*Unravelling perceptions of Eurasian beaver reintroduction in Great Britain*' (Auster et al., 2019, AREA, doi: 10.1111/area.12576).

In a number of the questions asked, respondents were given the opportunity to explain the reasons for their answers. The tables in this appendix document provide details of these answers.

The answers are broken down into the viewpoints expressed in each question. Within each viewpoint, the answers are presented in descending order of the frequency by which they were cited.

In these tables, please note the following for each viewpoint:

'N' refers to the number of usable comments left by respondents (ie, the number of respondents who left a usable answer to each respective question).

'n' refers to the number of reasons that were given within the usable comments.

'% of n' refers to the percentage of 'n' within each viewpoint.

An additional column is provided, with the title 'Reasoning Further Includes'. This column provides further explanations given by respondents for each reason. These further details were not included within the 'Reason' column as they were not necessarily provided by all respondents in each reason, but when stated they were in relation to each reason so are provided here for further details.

Finally, please note that these tables provide opinion data. The answers given may or may not be factually correct.

Section I: Perceptions of beaver impacts

Respondents to the survey were asked to score their views of the impacts of beavers on a 5-point scale. Scores indicated the following views of beaver impact. Scores 1 and 2 indicated negative views, Score 3 indicated a neutral view and Scores 4 and 5 indicated positive views. The questions asked about eight impact areas. The tables in this section give the reasons provided by respondents for each of these impact areas.

Wildlife & Ecology

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n
Positive N=2209* n=2209	Beavers improve/create habitats, leading to increased biodiversity	Benefit fish spawning, develop habitat mosaic/wetlands, woodland management [increases light], improved water quality, diversity in themselves, fast and slow water, new ecological niches, edge effects, consume invasive plant species. "Ecosystem Engineer"/"Keystone"	62.88
	Beneficial Ecosystem Services [unless directly linked to habitat/biodiversity]***	Water/soil management, ecotourism, education, broadly stated	17.66
	Beavers are a natural part of the ecosystem	'Native/indigenous species'. Restore balance, suited to British environment, historically present	8.42
	Considerations to take into account	Needs further research, some people negatively affected, need population control, tree damage, effects on fish, ecosystem has changed	3.26
	Generally positive	No negatives or concerns, biodiversity is good	2.94
	Redress damage to the environment from human interference		2.26
	Affection for beavers		0.95
	Don't know		0.50
	It says so in the research		0.45
	Species reintroduction is a good thing		0.27
	Difficult to know	Long absence, too early to know	0.14
	"It is obvious"		0.09
	Climate change mitigation	Carbon storage	0.05
	Will engage people with nature***		0.05
	Should allow for all wildlife		0.05
	Indicators of a healthy natural ecosystem		0.05
	Negative N=219** n=254	Beavers disturb or destroy other species, habitats and ecosystems	Barrier to migratory fish, damage to vegetation, possible spread of wildlife disease, upset ecological balance, competition for space, predate fish, loss of bird nesting habitat, fast water flow habitat loss, UK ecology is currently settled
Effects on people***		Watercourse damage leading to increased flood risk/erosion/sediment, effects on agriculture, infrastructure and fishing activity	16.14
Beavers have been absent for a long time, the ecosystem has changed		Available habitat has reduced	5.91
There will be excessive population growth		Absence of natural predators	4.72
Generally Negative		Experience of damage, beavers not needed, challenge to manage	2.76
Non-native species		"Alien", illegally released by individuals	2.76
Depends on context of location		Location [may not have capacity], politics of beaver management,	2.36
Interfere with other conservation efforts		Investment in struggling species better	0.79
Beaver tourists disturb wildlife***		Damage to riverbanks	0.39
Lack of knowledge			0.39
Too much emphasis is placed on non-human needs			0.39
Neutral N=108 n=111		Present positive and/or negative reasons [reflected above as appropriate]	
	Needs further research	Not enough evidence yet, pending results of reintroduction trial	18.92
	Neutral effect on ecosystem	Balance with other wildlife, were there until humans hunted them, wildlife adapts	12.61
	Context dependent	General view of reintroduction, location/type of waterway, management level, number of beavers	12.61
	Don't know		10.81
	Unsure of the question		1.80
	Limited impacts	Too few to have an effect	0.90
	Lack of available habitat for beavers		0.90

*including 39 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 41 negative comments in the neutral category, ***grouped factors explored in other impact questions

Water & Flooding

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n
Positive N=1940* n=2211	Reduced [downstream] flooding	Slower water flow, holding water back, forming channels, store water in landscape, [re]create floodplains/meanders, "Natural Flood Management", improved drainage, landscape roughness	39.85
	Manages or slows water flow/run-off [when not associated with flooding]	Improved drainage, use of dams, diverted water course	18.86
	Water storage and retention in landscape [when not associated with flood risk]	Storage in vegetation, maintain water in environment in dry periods, wetland creation, sponge effect	9.00
	Consider alongside other water management methods and nearby land uses/users [upstream]	Adaptation, cost effectiveness, dam location/bursts, waterway usage, stakeholder engagement, conflict with engineered solutions	7.46
	Natural[ising] river regulation	A natural part of the ecosystem. Keeping waterways clear, dredge waterbeds, maintain water level, water conservation, cost effective, structural diversity, restore land drained by man, wetland creation	6.29
	Improve water quality	Filtering through dams, encouraged plant growth absorbs pollutants, sediment settles in slowed flow	6.11
	Water management leading to habitats and benefits for other species***	Nutrients stored in new landscapes/spread in flooding	4.43
	Beavers build dams		1.90
	Reduced erosion***		1.40
	Generally positive		1.36
	Impacts are limited	Beaver population is low, European beavers don't dam	0.68
	Context dependent	Location, habitat degradation level, human development, available space for beavers	0.63
	"I don't know"		0.63
	Benefits are shown in research	Evidence from abroad/Scotland	0.54
	Needs more research	UK evidence	0.32
	Dams support banks, preventing them bursting		0.18
	"It's obvious"		0.14
	Increases irrigation		0.09
	Reduce the water table		0.05
	Contribute to harmful bacteria destruction		0.05
They drink water		0.05	
Negative N=289** n=305	Beavers add to flood risk [where people live or have land]	Caused by dams/dam breakage, felled trees, localised/upstream flooding [despite decreased risk downstream], undermining flood defences, drainage prevention, increased water table, generations taken to drain land for pasture will be undone	61.97
	Context Dependent	Dam location/size, management/licensing, cost	8.52
	Conflict with other water management objectives [broadly]	Change water flows, flood defences may become ineffective	7.54
	Leads to issues for other species***	Obstruct fish migration, ground-nesting bird habitat loss, trees	6.56
	Generally negative	Beavers restoring floodplains is nonsense, disease risk***	4.26
	Block waterways	Waterways used by humans, eg canals, fishing stretches	3.28
	Erosion***		2.30
	Large pieces of debris	Cause damage [in flood events]	2.30
	Sedimentation	Increased erosion	0.98
	Flood defences should be planned by people	Not left to animals	0.66
	Reduced rain interception and storage	Including due to felled trees	0.33
	Negatives in the short term	Whilst beavers adapt the environment	0.33
	Wetland recovery happening at alarming rate	For building purposes	0.33
	Don't know		0.33
	Infect water with disease		0.33
Neutral N=125 n=222	Present positive and/or negative reasons [reflected above as appropriate]		37.39
	"I don't know"		26.13
	Dependent upon environmental/social context	Rural v Urban environment, location, type of water body, management, who's perspective, upstream or downstream	18.47
	Limited or no effects	Too few beavers, easy to manage, not American beavers, same rain will fall, humans shouldn't develop on floodplains	7.66
	Neither positive nor negative effect		5.86
	Further research is required		2.25
	Focus shouldn't be on rewilding	Should be on changing human behaviours	0.90
	Don't understand the question		0.90
Shouldn't characterise as positive or negative	Water management is human concern	0.45	

*including 61 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 74 negative comments in the neutral category, ***explored further in other impact questions

Soil & Ground Stability

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n
Positive N=1224* n=1323	Increased soil stability and reduced erosion/scouring and topsoil runoff	Slowed water, reduced flooding, sediment build-up, biodiversity increase [vegetation], compact soil when entering/exiting water	38.32
	Sediment settles/filtered [when not linked to erosion or nutrient enhancement]	Repair erosion damage, pollutants removed from [downstream] soils, good for spawning fish/downstream communities	12.17
	Water/habitat management [when not linked to soil or ground stability]***	Increased biodiversity (including seed dispersal in faeces/moving vegetation), damaging nematodes in soil extinguished, flood/water flow management	9.60
	Nutrient enhancement in soil	Faeces, dead vegetation, prevented from washing away, seasonal flooding, burrowing. Restoration to pre-degradation conditions, allow for soil building communities (eg Sphagnum)	9.22
	Vegetation supports soil stability [when not linked to erosion]	Root structures	8.54
	Consider impacts for local land use/users	Unstable ground, breached dams, flooding, erosion, burrowing into flood defences, sediment effects for spawning fish, predictive methods may not be adequate	5.44
	Generally positive/no negatives	May take time to be fully realised, better than intense farming, learn from beavers where not to build	4.91
	"I don't know"		3.78
	Soil hydration and aeration	Wetland, moisture in drought, soil movement	2.87
	Naturalisation of soil management	Natural part of ecosystem, restoration	1.81
	Dams [and lodges] strengthen river banks		1.59
	Fertile soil left behind when beavers leave		0.60
	Soil is used in building dams and digging	Soil turnover	0.60
	Increased carbon storage in soils		0.23
	Further research is needed		0.15
	Benefits are shown in the research		0.08
	Affection for beavers		0.08
Negative N=335** n=347	Increased instability and erosion	From water, tree loss, "beaver watchers", destabilised banks/flood defences/fields, burrows, danger to tractors/machinery, vegetation removal	49.28
	Waterlogged/wet soils due to impeded water flow [when not linked to erosion]	Challenge for land use (farming, transport), impeded water flow/flooding***, less oxygen	21.04
	Removed vegetation loosens soil [when not directly linked to erosion]		16.14
	Generally negative or destructive	Shouldn't turn UK into experiment where consequences are difficult to undo, shouldn't interfere with nature	6.05
	Increase in sediment***	Erosion. Impact fish spawning grounds.	3.46
	Breached dams cause rapid erosion and sedimentation		1.44
	Soil composition change	Due to flooding, tree loss, increased carbon from dead wood	1.44
	Loosen foundations of infrastructure		0.58
	Countryside is not adapted to it		0.29
	Need for further research		0.29
Neutral N=790 n=790	"I don't know"/"No comment"	Not on the news	64.94
	Present positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		22.41
	Minimal or no impacts (don't dig, too few)	Beavers don't dig. Few beavers.	7.47
	Context dependent	Ground and soils, land use, trees felled	4.05
	Needs more research		0.63
	"Need I explain"		0.13
	Part of the natural ecosystem		0.13
	Changing farming practices would have greater benefit than beaver reintroduction		0.13
Impacts are easily managed		0.13	

*including 92 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 126 negative comments in the neutral category, ***explored further in other impact questions

Trees & Forestry

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n	
Positive N=1608* n=1726	Encourage regeneration, growth and structural diversity [not including species diversity]	<i>Coppicing/tree thinning, improved water /soil (nutrients), only fell fast growing plants. May take time to realise. Sustainable. Carbon store. Selective felling, allow succession</i>	56.84	
	Improved/new habitats support new/restored tree species [and biodiversity]	<i>More light/nutrients, habitats [wet environment], deadwood, succession, prevent species dominance.</i>	14.83	
	Need to consider affected stakeholders	<i>Commercial forestry, orchards, gardens. Benefits seen after time, woodland conservation planners</i>	6.78	
	Naturalised management	<i>Natural member of ecosystem, less human intervention needed (cheaper)</i>	5.85	
	Little impact	<i>Affect few/riparian trees, non-commercial species, economic opportunity, manage easily, "fine elsewhere"</i>	4.11	
	Clean up woody debris and diseased trees	<i>Improve woodland access, create space, nutrients.</i>	2.95	
	Generally positive	<i>Benefits outweigh negatives. No negatives.</i>	2.38	
	Context dependent	<i>Size of area, tree type/density/diseases/age, human values, other herbivores (eg deer).</i>	1.85	
	Seed spreading and cross pollination	<i>Movement of material, faeces</i>	0.87	
	"I don't know"		0.64	
	Requires management of beavers/forestry	<i>Tree planting, Easy protection.</i>	0.64	
	Water and soil management [broadly]**	<i>Water retention.</i>	0.58	
	Reduced erosion [stops trees washing away]	<i>Greater root density increases stability</i>	0.41	
	Invasive species management	<i>Eg Himalayan Balsam</i>	0.46	
	Beaver habitat protection leads to protected woodland	<i>Prevents deforestation</i>	0.35	
	Further research required	<i>Including into soils and lichens.</i>	0.23	
	Affection for beavers		0.17	
	Reduced risk of forest fire	<i>Reduced forest density</i>	0.06	
	Negative N=575** n=575	Damage/Fell trees [generally, not including loss of valuable trees]	<i>Loss of small woods/young trees. "Vandal"/not discriminatory, gnawing leads to disease, need more trees in countryside [climate change mitigation]. Damage greater if uncontrolled population growth. Examples</i>	63.65
		Loss of valuable trees	<i>Felling, land wetting. Lose mature/valuable trees (fruit, historic, ornamental or commercial). Conflict. Trees less straight from nibbling. Flooding</i>	17.22
Wetting area hard for trees [not including loss of valuable trees]		<i>Drowning roots.</i>	5.04	
Species composition change [can lead to species loss]**		<i>Affect species & associated lichens. Loss by floods. Scrub replaces mature trees. Change not needed.</i>	3.13	
Generally negative			1.91	
Would require management (tree planting, protect trees of value, can be challenging)		<i>Tree planting, tree protection. Can be challenging.</i>	1.74	
Context dependent		<i>Tree availability, grazing intensity (including other herbivores), commercial/natural woodland, woodland age</i>	1.39	
Tree removal can lead to erosion***			1.22	
Access to forests will become difficult		<i>Recreation and extraction.</i>	1.22	
Effects on animal species***		<i>Dams obstruct salmon/sea trout migration, insect habitat loss</i>	1.22	
Needs further research		<i>Forestry type, suitable habitats. Consequence unpredictable</i>	0.87	
Dislike beavers or tree loss			0.70	
"It's obvious"			0.17	
Tree removal leads to warm river		<i>Due to decreased shading in global warming</i>	0.17	
Higher priority habitat restoration projects		<i>Too soon to consider reintroduction</i>	0.17	
Manmade landscape needs human management		<i>Not by reintroduced species</i>	0.17	
Neutral N=457 n=457		Present positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		47.70
	"I don't know"	<i>Don't have enough information</i>	20.35	
	Limited effects	<i>Harvest small trees/close proximity/non-commercial species, small/short term damage, easily managed.</i>	18.60	
	Context dependent	<i>Habitat, human values/forestry objectives, intensity of activity, beaver population, management/monitoring</i>	8.53	
	Neutral effects	<i>Lost trees return, other species. Natural balance.</i>	3.06	
	Balance natural habitat and industry	<i>Can be challenging</i>	0.88	
	Needs further research	<i>Too soon to tell</i>	0.44	
Question needs further definition		0.44		

*including 196 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 163 comments in the neutral category,

***explored further in other impact questions

Economics

VIEW	REASON	Reasoning Further Includes	% of n
Positive N=2027*	[Eco]tourism, recreation and local business opportunity	'Beaver watching', photography, fishing [increased fish stock], hunting, farming (diversification/new areas from reduced flood risk/wildlife parks), merchandise, contributes to local/rural economies	43.38
n=2690	Beneficial Ecosystem Services [excluding ecotourism and business opportunity]**	Natural landscape management [flood/water quality/woodland/soil/drought/carbon retention/biodiversity. Health & wellbeing. Save costs, increase land value/reduce insurance. Cost effective. Meat/fur [when widespread]. "Natural Capital", economy relies on ecology/community development support for conservation	37.70
	Need to consider the negative impacts too	[Local] conflicts eg fisheries/landowners, need to support those affected. Negatives exaggerated/no problems with management. Reintroduction/management costs. Transport in tourism	5.43
	Beavers are a native species	Only not here due to humans, natural balance, have right to be here	2.97
	Benefits outweigh costs [recognise costs]	Trade-off, reintroduction costs are minimal, easy to manage	2.64
	Generally positive	Few negatives, benefits seen in [trial] research, negative views generally from misconceptions, good news story	2.49
	Benefits to conservation and research	Education/awareness***, fundraising	1.08
	Affection for beavers	Support for reintroduction	1.00
	Context dependent	Scale, 'novelty' value over time, if correct habitat/protected area, number/distribution of beavers, land use, infrastructure	0.97
	Nature shouldn't be about economics	Nature works in harmony, believe in biodiversity, beavers valuable, duty to share world with nature	0.71
	Job creation	Conservationists, management, tour guides	0.56
	There are gains but they are limited	Benefits few people, ecotourism gains exaggerated	0.41
	"I don't know"		0.22
	Needs further research	Research into habitat management	0.19
	Economics should be focused on sustainability	Rather than growth	0.15
	Destabilise hierarchical economical structure	Distribution of income across local communities	0.07
	Management needed for other species	Rather than beavers	0.04
Negative N=388**	[Riparian] costs of flood risk, wetland, erosion and tree damage	Loss of productive land/crops/trees. Reduced land value. Little financial support. Effects infrastructure, dam breaches. Examples	45.10
n=388	Management/Repair expenses	Conflict mitigation, population control, compensation, monitoring, staffing. "Who pays?"	15.21
	Risk of revenue loss from fishing/fisheries	Obstructed fish migration, loss of spawning habitat	9.79
	Costs not outweighed by benefits [although benefits recognised]	Agriculture loss > tourism gain, cost on migratory wildlife, limited/exaggerated tourism, tourism decrease as less novelty value when widespread, beavers can be seen in captivity	8.76
	Generally negative	No contribution towards economy/productivity, no environment benefit, dislike wildlife tourism	3.61
	Initial reintroduction [and trial] is costly		2.84
	Those affected by costs don't get benefits	Few benefit, costs to taxpayers	2.84
	Context dependent	Level of protection, location, if contained in parks	2.06
	Environment has changed since beavers were present	Impact current wildlife. "Manage for wildlife or beaver?"	2.06
	Better use of money elsewhere	Conserve species already within UK, vanity project	1.80
	Overpopulation leads to nuisance	Rapid increase, no natural predators	1.80
	More research required	Unforeseen consequences	1.29
	Protection may limit ability to manage	Similar to badgers, public objection to effective methods	1.03
	Beavers should not be reintroduced	Messing with nature, non-native species	0.77
	Disapproval of illegal release	Should have been prior consultation	0.52
	Beavers could introduce diseases***	Affect food chain	0.26
	Increase in footpath use increases damage and livestock disturbance	Uncontrolled Dogs	0.26
Neutral N=336	Presented both positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		45.24
n=336	"I don't know"	Not sure if have been a native species	27.08
	Context dependent	Number/distribution of beavers, livelihood/ human values, location, ecosystem effects, upstream v downstream, management/conflict resolution, 'novelty' value over time	8.04
	Limited or neutral effects	Cannot see how they affect economics, shouldn't use anymore for fur or meat. Natural inhabitant so no greater impact than other wildlife.	7.74
	Requires further research or evidence	Number/distribution, habitat availability, unknown long-term effects.	4.17
	Irrelevant/shouldn't be a factor in reintroduction	Economics negatively affect natural world, not about money, should only consider if significant impacts, question shouldn't even be asked	3.27
	Requires management	Conflict resolution, change often not liked, adaptation of land use	2.38
	Don't understand the question	Too complex/broad	1.79
	Economics is about humans, not beavers	It is how humans interact with beavers that has the effect	0.30

*including 132 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 119 negative comments in the neutral category,

***explored further in other impact questions

Education

VIEW	REASON	Reasoning Further Includes	% of n
Positive N=1908*	Gateway to learn broader about broader topics	Topics: ecology/conservation, invasive species, land use, Ecosystem Services (Natural Flood Management), art/literature, wellbeing, reintroduction debate, humans can be positive/cooperation, agricultural/environmental policy, less likely to make future mistakes	48.16
n=2174	Beneficial for children/schools	Seen in Scotland, localised level, maintain concentration, safe animal	13.57
	Learn about beavers specifically	Positives/negatives, ecosystem engineering, progress, research opportunity, broaden debate beyond hard lines	6.49
	Interesting and inspiring [generally stated]	Affection for beavers, novelty, enthusiasm, cute, good news story	5.89
	Get people outdoors/practical opportunity	Exercise/fresh air, ecotourism***, better than books/tv/zoo, visible signs, best way to learn, more accessible than abroad	5.29
	Generally positive view	Always something to learn, knowledge always of benefit	4.42
	Benefit for all ages and levels	Multi-scale, nationally and further afield	4.00
	Wildlife education is important [broadly stated]	A key part of reintroduction, reconnect people with natural world	3.08
	Beavers are a native species	Ecosystems part of curriculum, philosophy, need to look after world	2.99
	Something new to learn about	"New" species, not many charismatic/large UK species	2.48
	Demonstrate reintroduction [as a viable conservation technique]	With control, aid future project discussion, restore degraded ecosystems	1.10
	Context dependent	Teaching choices, media, interest, legalities behind release, trade-off with other impacts, level of damage, cost of talks	0.69
	Misinformation can be addressed	Examples of misinformation given, current lobbying with misinformation	0.64
	"I don't know"	Need to know more about the topic	0.60
	Understanding beavers [in the UK] will increase tolerance and reduce conflict		0.41
	Don't understand the question		0.14
	Education will need to be handled carefully	Beavers may become a 'scapegoat' for issues	0.05
Negative N=50**	Limited knowledge will be gained	Can learn from elsewhere/captivity, TV/internet/books better, can be taught in classroom, don't need beavers in wild to teach	18.87
n=53	Could be used to lobby for a particular viewpoint	Lobby for/against beavers, gloss over aspects, sets bad example, environmentalist don't want us to know the truth	16.98
	Educational benefit at high risk of negative impacts	Dislike beaver [reintroduction], need to educate supporters	16.98
	Will only learn of negatives	Learn the "hard way", non-native/invasive species case study	11.32
	No benefit		7.55
	Not enough education on the subject	Need to address misinformation	5.66
	Beavers don't teach or need education		5.66
	May disturb beavers or local people		3.77
	Education needs to be balanced and not detract from wider ecology	Beavers detract focus from wider ecology, all indigenous species v colonised species, environment has changed	3.77
	Wrong information is being used in education	People misunderstand how countryside works	3.77
	Beavers are only active at dawn and dusk	Not easily available	1.89
	Potential to lose educational resources elsewhere		1.89
	Benefit only from the effort put into education, not from the beavers themselves	Not the beavers themselves	1.89
Neutral N=314	"I don't know" or "No view"		29.94
n=314	Little or no impacts	Can learn about them/case study captivity or abroad, not relevant, people aren't interested, other wildlife, prioritise ecology/climate change adaptation, beavers don't teach, not until future generations, presence of animal doesn't encourage interest compared to non-native species	24.84
	Present positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		17.52
	Don't understand the question	"How do beavers impact education?"	9.87
	Context dependent	Interest level, how used (campaign/full education or happy story), amount of funding/resource, interest of authority, if in area, accessibility, scale of impacts, bias in presentation, audience	8.60
	Wildlife education is currently poor	National curriculum won't include, underfunded, outdoor activity restriction	5.10
	Too soon to know	Not enough research, no focus yet on education, propaganda so far	2.23
	Only of interest to limited groups	Ecologists/biologists, land managers	0.96
	Activity at dawn/dusk limits use in education		0.64
	Respondent not interested in education		0.32

*including 45 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 8 negative comments in the neutral category, ***explored further in other impact questions

Health & Welfare

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n	
Positive N=1154* n=1374	Get people outdoors/interacting with nature [when not directly attributed to mental or physical health]	Fresh air/'reconnecting with nature', talking/not watching TV	20.73	
	Beneficial Ecosystem Services improve welfare [not directly specified for mental/physical health]***	Improved natural environment, water quality, flood risk, biodiversity	18.76	
	Generally positive/Few negatives for health and welfare [when not specified as mental/physical health]	Positives outweigh negatives, nature good for people. Little or no disease risk (current population tested, easily managed, no higher risk than other species, exercise caution), no threat, all wildlife is beneficial	18.55	
	Mental health benefits	Connected with nature/spiritual, reduced flood risk stress, 'green therapy', reduced NHS bills	11.50	
	Sense of pleasure/satisfaction [when not attributed to mental health]	Knowing they are there, watching, inspiration, pride, 'feel-good factor', memorable experiences	10.93	
	Considerations of which to be aware	Animals kept away from site/dogs on leads, farm/fishing impacts, misconceptions, disease risk, road traffic accidents, mosquitoes	7.90	
	Physical health benefits	Exercise, reduced flood harm, reduced NHS bills	5.01	
	Ethical responsibility	Restore balance, consequently benefits people	2.12	
	Context dependent	View on beavers, upstream or downstream, level of impact, amount of support given if affected	1.06	
	Don't know/No Opinion		0.92	
	Stimulate interest, understanding and compassion		0.85	
	Health/wellbeing benefits seen in research		0.49	
	Needs further research	Certainty of level of disease risk	0.49	
	Sense of hope	Humans can be positive	0.42	
	Reduced disease transmission	Reduced pollution, slow water traps faecal matter with TB, feeling happier boosts immunity	0.14	
	Reduced antibiotic use in farmed salmon	Greater wild stock so less need for antibiotics for farms	0.07	
	Issues ultimately wouldn't be due to beavers		0.07	
	Negative N=242** n=264	Disturbance and damage leads to stress or decreased wellbeing	Flooding (land/infrastructure/people)***, visitors destroy environment, compromised animal enclosures, affect dog walking/playing areas	38.26
		Disease risk	From beavers and slow flowing water as vectors, mosquitoes attracted by wet environment	28.41
		Effects on other species***	Species displacement, fish populations [when not attributed to wellbeing] (reduced flows, siltation)	6.06
Generally negative		When direct contact. Not outweighed by positives, uncontrolled population [no natural predator]	6.06	
Risk of injury/death for people and livestock [excluding direct beaver aggression]		Unstable ground, drowning in ponds, dangerous felling, road accidents, if people interfere	4.55	
Context dependent		Perception, tensions, locality, not used to beavers, campaign groups	3.79	
Risk to beaver welfare		Disturbance from walkers, dog attacks, stress	3.03	
Beaver attacks and aggression		Biting, Intimidation	2.27	
Dislike for beavers		Lead to stress	1.52	
Requires further research		Certainty of disease risk before reintroduction	1.52	
Need decision on current species before debating a new one (eg. Badgers, Seagulls)		Wrong decisions set bad precedent for managing other species	1.52	
"I don't know"			1.52	
Limited effects		Current beavers tested, address misinformation	1.14	
Don't understand question			0.38	
Neutral N=866 n=866	Don't know/No opinion	Insufficient knowledge, difficult to quantify	38.45	
	Limited or No Effects	Disease risk low, irrelevant for most people, no different than other species, only if people act inappropriately, if UK beavers tested for disease, effects easy to manage [vaccines], limited contact	32.22	
	Present positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		18.82	
	Context dependent	Environmental impacts, level of [conflict] management, where farm located, beaver distribution and number	3.12	
	Needs research/evidence	Challenge to assess, awaiting trial results, screening, animal interactions, long term research	3.12	
	Don't understand the question	Unsure what it relates to, too broad	2.31	
	People/their animals should coexist with native species	Beavers may get unfair blame, maybe dogs on leads	0.58	
	Concern about people/their animals' effects on beavers		0.92	
	Beneficiaries may be different from the cost bearers	Support cost bearers if reintroduced	0.23	
	Reintroduction should be delayed until TB controlled	Beavers may be a disease reservoir	0.12	
Has been shown to have little effect in the research		0.12		

*including 92 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 117 negative comments in the neutral category

***explored further in other impact questions

Recreation & Leisure

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n	
Positive N=1825* n=2089	Encouraged outdoor activities and engagement with nature [excluding fishing/expanded to ecotourism]	Beaver/Wildlife/Bird watching [more species to spot, signs of activity], follow progress, potential for hides, photography, socialising, wellbeing, better than screens, enhance sport, better wild than captive, more swimming spots, protect natural space, enhanced outdoor experiences, controlled hunting	44.90	
	Beneficial for Ecotourism, Education & Conservation Awareness	Travel to see beavers, economic input, webcams, volunteering opportunity, information centres, 'attraction', learn from animals	30.64	
	Ecosystem Services improve recreational experiences [broadly]**	Biodiversity, less pollution, health/wellbeing, stable environment, aesthetic landscape/wild feel	6.85	
	Beneficial for fishing	Enhance experience, increase breeding sites/stocks, water quality	4.64	
	Other considerations (including public access, ability to see beavers, local conflicts, beaver welfare, 'novelty value')	Public access [flooding/tree felling/erosion], sports fields, fishing, difficult to see, local conflict, 'novelty', effects on beaver welfare/level of visitors [disturbance]/poaching risk/dogs	5.17	
	Generally positive	Especially for children, partner with other recreation, gains outweigh losses, don't attack humans	2.35	
	Affection for beavers		1.48	
	Excitement of new species [broadly]		1.20	
	Context dependent	Interest in ecology, level of impact, type of recreation [not hunting/safari parks/fishing]	0.91	
	Limited gains	Overestimate ecotourism, effects localised	0.72	
	Ethical values (eg environment belongs to everyone)	Native species, should live in wild, environment belongs to us all	0.62	
	Works positively elsewhere	Knapdale, France	0.14	
	Don't know		0.14	
	Opportunity for television		0.10	
	Provides study opportunities		0.10	
	Dislike the question		0.05	
	Negative N=179** n=229	Potential effects on fishing/fisheries	Disruption of fish habitat/migration routes by dams/felled trees, damaged riverbanks [visitors]	34.93
		Obstruction of river navigation/waterways	Canal damage, boating (including kayaking/canoeing)	17.47
		Access restricted	Dams limit water access/rights of way, protected sites	8.30
Restrict country/water sports [excluding fishing and boating]		Dog walkers keep dogs under strict control, effect game fishing	8.30	
Generally negative		Unintended consequences, losses outweigh gains, effects people differently	7.86	
Negative environmental change***		Rivers/flooding, unstable ground, habitat, farmland	7.86	
Risk to beaver welfare from recreationists		Disturbance, not enough awareness of natural world dog attacks	3.93	
Potential for too many visitors		Disturbance to local habitats and wildlife	2.62	
Impacts are overrated		Unlikely to be seen, challenging habitats	1.75	
Beavers are not there for our recreation			1.75	
Beavers should be in zoos/kept to private land			1.31	
"I don't know"			0.87	
Ecotourism will wane as novelty decreases			0.87	
Less recreational opportunity leads to economic losses***		Not staying in hotels	0.44	
Risk of injury (such as from coppiced tree spikes)***		Unstable ground, spikes on coppiced trees	0.44	
Resources better invested in other UK species		Conservation	0.44	
Needs further research			0.44	
Risk of trespass		Assume rights of way	0.44	
Neutral N=224 n=228		Present positive and/or negative reasons (reflected above as appropriate)		42.54
	Don't know or No Opinion	Hard to quantify	23.68	
	Little or no effect	Irrelevant for most people, seen where beavers are abroad, unlikely to interact (hard to see/secretive, create hard to access environment, away from humans). Current population 'contained', in UK not a sporting quarry, already have zoos	20.61	
	Context dependent	Distribution, [level of] management, animal welfare needs, balance between nature and humans, how communicated, activity in question, private/public land	6.14	
	Beavers should be left alone	Humans negatively impact wildlife, at least until established, not for entertainment	2.19	
	Other recreational [nature] opportunities	Current nature/woodlands, already recreational space	1.32	
	Beavers and what project represents are more important [than leisure/entertainment]	"It's not just about humans"	0.88	
	Needs further research	Fisheries impacts needs further exploration. Discussion/understanding on all sides	0.88	
	Don't understand question		0.88	
	Education will be required	Those enjoying countryside should be aware of what's in area	0.88	

*including 73 positive comments in the neutral category, **including 72 negative comments in the neutral category, ***explored further in other impact questions

Section 2: Reasons as to whether respondents support the process of beaver reintroduction to Great Britain

Respondents were asked whether they supported the process of beaver reintroduction to Great Britain, then asked to provide the **main** reason for their answer. The answers given are detailed here.

NB. This table continues on the following page.

VIEW	REASON	Further reasoning includes	% of n
Support N=2023 n=2580	Sense of ethics	Duty to reintroduce, "native species"/"natural heritage", extinct in Great Britain from human activity/depleted wildlife/repair damage, reconnect man/learn to live with environment, naturalise environment, learn from mistakes, asset, environment not changed much, act before too late, sustainability, can't complain about other countries if don't look after our own, support principle of rewilding [with scientific evidence, alongside conservation of other species]	36.82
	Ecosystem Services [excluding specific reference to economy/education/physical and mental health]	"Natural conservation", biodiversity (including by beavers being present themselves) reduced flooding, soil/water/tree management, climate change mitigation, wellbeing, investment in natural ecosystem, habitat restoration, naturalisation, beaver-watching, shown in evidence	33.88
	Generally positive	Negatives easily managed, benefits outweigh costs/opposing case not strong, won't cause harm, being considered so there's something in it, negative views based on ignorance, non-threatening species, multiple benefits, there is available habitat, "why not?"	11.63
	Affection for beavers/wildlife	Interesting/iconic, joy to see, misunderstood, lucky to be able to return	5.23
	Economic benefits	[Eco]tourism, agriculture, benefits underestimated	3.64
	Considerations	Support/mitigation for those affected, beaver welfare risk from opponents, no natural predators, reintroduction cost, time to see benefits, protection level, need more evidence [from trial]/trial length, educate misinformation, location, decide management early, effects on other species, policy uncertainty from Brexit, only with proper process, disease risk, reintroduction cost, IUCN Guidelines should be followed	2.75
	Opportunity to learn and engage/educate people in nature and conservation	Especially children, landowners/farmers. Flagship for conservation/natural flood management, need to adapt in face of climate change	2.56
	Sense of positivity and hope	Many negative stories of man impact on environment so it is good to have a positive one, flagship for conservation	0.93
	Successful projects/people live with beaver/wildlife [in Scotland and] elsewhere	France, Bavaria, Munich	0.85
	Revolutionary conservation method	Interesting science, part of balanced approach to wildlife/with other reintroductions, evidence-based conservation	0.70
	Help pave the way for other species reintroductions	Lynx, pine marten, wolf, bear	0.54
	Reintroduction has already started/decision been made in Scotland	Natural range expansion	0.16
	Improves physical and mental health	Getting people outdoors	0.16
	Hunting opportunity/good to eat		0.08
	Don't know		0.04
	Legal obligation to at least consider reintroduction	EU Habitats Directive	0.04
Don't support N=172 n=234	Risk to environment and wildlife	River[side] damage, downstream flood risk, countryside damage, impact on habitats and biodiversity [including fish when not linked to fishing]	24.03
	Economic risk	Cost of repairs, effects on agriculture/fishing/fisheries, undermine investment in infrastructure/fish passes	13.73
	Generally negative or no benefits	Witnessed damage, will eventually need culling, historically introductions not good, difficult to manage once here, shouldn't introduce if management required, there's a reason they went extinct, led by 'do-gooders', pointless, cause damage (broadly)	13.73
	Not enough suitable habitat	Human population larger, managed land, increased conflicts, small country, human-wildlife conflicts	10.73
	Environment has changed	Upset balance of nature, no longer have niche, create false environment, "Alien" species, no longer natural predators	9.01
	Resources should be put into what we already have	Conserve current species/invasive species management, farmers/landowners already trying to conserve, beavers a "vanity project", government not acting on current issues (eg overgrazing)	8.15
	Likely to be given strong protection making it difficult to manage effects	Similarly to badger situation, public objection to necessary lethal control [less of an issue in other countries], burden for land managers, costly	6.44
	Uncertainties	Cannot predict [rapid] spread of beavers, scale of hazards unknown, don't know long term, unintended consequences, cannot reverse the decision	3.00
	We live happily without them	Prefer countryside as it is now, no need for beavers	3.00
	No management arrangements in place/full impacts not been fully considered	No communication on impacts/management need, lack of faith in decision makers to make appropriate decisions regarding management	1.72
	Sets concerning precedent	Wolves, bears	1.29
	Taking place anyway/releases have taken place illegally	No consultation, lack of faith in decision makers	1.29
	Disease/Biosecurity risk		1.29
	Awaiting further evidence	Need research into potential negative impacts	1.29
	Risk to recreation [broadly]		0.86
	Costs not justified	Social and environmental budgets all currently being cut	0.43
Risk to welfare of beavers [from conflicts]	Shouldn't expect animals to clean up 'our mess'	0.43	
Undecided N=149 n=158	Don't know	Don't [personally] have enough information, hadn't thought about until questionnaire, need information on effects on wildlife/fish [migration, stocks], can't decide	31.65
	Needs further research/information and communication	Cost/benefit analysis, who is responsible for management and how, not sure if risks fully considered, use precautionary principle, concern after previous species introductions, need an impartial report [at end of trial]	22.78
	Context dependent	Level of conflict/support [agriculture, human population], level of protection, survival/success of beavers, effects on individual beaver welfare, ability to manage [with badger example], scale of reintroduction, who is leading the process	15.19

Unsure whether it is good to reintroduce into an environment that has changed	<i>Unsure if there is appropriate habitat, waterways perhaps too degraded</i>	8.86
Can see both positives and negatives		7.59
Conclusions can't be drawn until trial ends	<i>Should be longer</i>	5.70
Not sure if there is a scientific case for reintroduction	<i>Trial on Otter morphing into support for reintroduction, beavers arrived now trying to justify</i>	2.53
Unsure why to choose this species	<i>Rather than focus on protecting endangered species</i>	1.27
Can't predict how they will spread and how they may affect people		1.27
Respondent not immediately impacted	<i>Don't feel they can comment</i>	0.63
Benefits are overstated	<i>Effects on flood management</i>	0.63
Costly process when they are already in Britain		0.63
Managed reintroduction best in the current situation but population growth from illegal releases shouldn't have been allowed		0.63
Small part of what is needed for river restoration		0.63

Section 3: Reasons given for views on required levels of legal protection

Respondents were asked what level of legal protection for beavers would be required if they were to be reintroduced with the options of 'Strong Legal Protection', 'Limited Legal Protection' or 'No Legal Protection'. Respondents were then given the opportunity to explain their answers.

NB. The table continues on the following page.

LEVEL OF PROTECTION	REASON	REASONING FURTHER INCLUDES	% of n
Strong N=1779 n=1975	Protect beavers from persecution and cruelty	Disturbance, dogs, hunting/killing (including for meat/fur/sport), wildlife crime [has limited enforcement], including protection of habitats/lodges/dams, examples given, 'Not in my back yard' attitude	38.78
	Strongly protected to begin with to establish a population and research	Perhaps to later be relaxed, make financial investment worthwhile	15.29
	Sustain [vulnerable] population of beavers and habitat	Prevent another extinction, ensure reintroduction is [financially] worthwhile, beavers endangered, population should self-regulate	13.27
	Threat from opposition groups to beavers	Prevent select groups leading decisions, provide unity in management, people fear the unknown/change, should work together	7.90
	Should have same protection as other species	All species should be protected, protect other species by protecting beavers	5.57
	Need for only legitimate management	Shouldn't be managed by individuals, under license, alternatives to lethal control, conflict resolution	4.96
	People have little knowledge about or misunderstand beavers	Beavers don't eat fish/cause flooding/damage ecology/harbour disease, bad press/fake news leads to misconceptions	4.35
	We have a duty/need to protect them	Beavers should have rights, "Native" species	3.04
	Beavers provide many benefits	Few negatives, ecosystem services	1.82
	Prevent the same fate as badgers/birds of prey/foxes	Persecution/"badger baiting"/fox hunting, not enough protection enforcement, acting on misinformation	1.77
	Protection means public acknowledgment that beavers are important	Valuable, educates as to the benefits	1.16
	Economic interests will overrule environmental concerns without protection	Often do now, don't need pelts, abuse of nature, scapegoat beavers for unfair blame	0.91
	Already protected in Scotland/existing legislation	EU Habitats Directive [noting Brexit]	0.35
	Affection for beavers		0.20
	[Current] monitoring costs are high		0.20
	Strong protection is still not enough	Man is intolerant of wildlife	0.15
	Government/public attitudes to wildlife can't be trusted	Protection is only good if enforced	0.15
	Easier to weaken strong protection than the other way around	If needed	0.05
	Don't know		0.05
	Limited N=433 n=574	Beavers would require management	Need management plan [without one is against IUCN guidelines/unacceptable], perhaps licensed, population control [no natural predator], resolve stakeholder conflicts, support those negatively affected, perhaps protect in just breeding season, good communication, no natural predator, allow affected people to manage themselves, removal if trial proves negative, all animals need managing
Protect beavers from animal cruelty, harm or disturbance		Protected from hunting for sport/pelts/persecution, prevent disturbance from visitors, some people dislike change	11.50
Protected to begin with to establish a population		Maintain support for the process, time to research the impacts	8.19
Protected as much as other species		Similar to 'Badger Act'/'Wildlife & Countryside Act'. Shouldn't protect at expense of other species	3.48
There are negative impacts so need to support people negatively affected		"Pest", no natural predators so population growth	2.61
Sustain the population of beavers post-reintroduction		Protect in breeding season, no point reintroducing if allow hunting/culls	3.83
Too much protection counter-productive		Unnecessary legal cases, too much perceived as negative, UK has too much regulation, may restrict future reintroductions, prevents activities by man	3.31
Strong protection divides stakeholders		Too strong rules/regulations.	3.48
A situation like the one with badgers should be avoided		Lack legal framework, large population, emotive/politicised debate	2.26
Beavers need protection [broadly]		Where trials officially recognised, native species, all wildlife should be protected, otherwise defeats the point	3.48
Protection is a challenge to enforce or unnecessary		No longer at risk for meat/fur, current wildlife crime enforcement is limited, UK has poor record of handling wildlife protection, costly	1.39
Need further research			0.70
Protection should be relevant to the local area		Should be decided by those most affected	0.52
Promote acceptance of the animals		Easier to self-manage	1.39
Should be protected in reserves			0.70
Should have ability for sustainable harvest of beavers		Fur, castor oil, food	0.70
Emphasis should be on education			0.35
Shouldn't be reintroduced if legal protection needed			0.17
Persecution is unlikely			0.17
Protect financial investment in project			0.17
To allow ecotourism to reach its full potential			0.17
Protect beaver populations rather than individuals			0.17
Respondent feels they don't know enough			0.70
There is no choice		Due to existing policy, if reintroduced will be a government-backed decision	0.52
Illegal introductions shouldn't be tolerated			0.17
NB. In 63/433 (14.55%) of comments (N) limited protection was seen to be a balance between a reason that beavers need protection and the need for management. The reasons given are included above as appropriate.			
None N=113	Legal protection makes it difficult to undertake management where necessary [when not linked to management by affected people/landowners]	Need control of population numbers [rapid growth], leads to public opposition to control/culling, unless evidence no damage	29.46

n=129	Affected people/landowners should be able to take action themselves	<i>Without beauracratc processes, licensing makes an unworkable system</i>	18.60
	Beavers would be a problem	<i>"Pest/Vermin"</i>	13.95
	Beavers should not be reintroduced***	<i>Protect existing wildlife first, trial instigators will spin views their way, no benefits, risk to beavers from persecution</i>	10.08
	Beavers should be as protected as other species	<i>Maintain ecological balance, protect other species first</i>	6.98
	A situation like the one with badgers should be avoided	<i>Over-protected, large population, protests against government-approved culls</i>	5.43
	Beavers should be killed	<i>Made into hats</i>	4.65
	Legal protection should not be needed	<i>Unlikely to be persecuted, should be voluntarily accepted</i>	3.10
	Beavers are not a native species		2.33
	Focus should be on current species	<i>Current wildlife is struggling</i>	1.55
	Waste of [taxpayers'] money	<i>Costly</i>	1.55
	Legal protection will make fishing difficult	<i>Similarly to otter protection</i>	0.78
	Beavers have been illegally reintroduced		0.78
	Do not want beavers on own property		0.78

Section 4: Reasons as to whether respondents felt able to express opinions where it influences decision-makers

Respondents were asked whether they felt able to express their opinions where it influenced decision-makers, then given the opportunity to explain their answers.

VIEW	REASON	Further Reasoning Includes	% of n
YES N=877 n=944	There are platforms to share views	<i>Comprehensive consultation/asked to share views, decision makers easy to contact, people just need to use the available channels, support campaigning group or organisation, access to decision makers through work, specific methods referenced eg petition/email/social media/personally/completing survey</i>	24.79
	Have knowledge or experience in a relevant field or feel able to easily research topic	<i>Leading to informed arguments, there is plenty of available information</i>	20.87
	Respondent has strong views or is passionate of their view	<i>Feel able to outline argument/positives and negatives, led by evidence, specific arguments made</i>	15.68
	Public opinion is influential	<i>Already had an impact, young people's views can have an impact, every voice matters, as part of a larger body of voices</i>	9.64
	Have expressed views, or are involved in/supported a trial/campaign group	<i>Donations, by specific methods eg letter/MP/online/verbally etc, involved in the Scottish decision</i>	9.43
	Personal confidence in ability to express a view	<i>Good at public speaking, can be objective, can use evidence, outspoken</i>	7.73
	Decision makers [try to] take comments on board	<i>From all stakeholders, fair and open, listen to voters, interested in potential impacts</i>	4.13
	Sense of hope	<i>Hope view can make a difference, hope all views fairly considered</i>	2.12
	Respondent directly affected by reintroduction	<i>Live in area, seen beavers</i>	1.69
	Freedom of speech	<i>Right to be heard, UK is a democracy</i>	1.69
	Generally feel they can express their view	<i>No different to other decisions, engagement is important</i>	0.95
	Don't know		0.85
	Don't understand the question		0.21
	Reintroduction will lead to increased public engagement		0.11
	Perceived problems are now having to be dealt with		0.11
	NO N=1340 n=1385	Don't know enough about the topic	<i>Therefore not place to say/should be decided by stakeholders/those with better knowledge, need more knowledge to make convincing argument, just heard about it, not familiar with the evidence, would like to know more</i>
Disillusioned with decision makers/process		<i>Don't care about public, votes seen as more important, government has poor environmental record/economics takes precedence, consultation often used to mitigate concerns/ trial is a 'political showcase', lack of political will to remove beavers, vested interests, nobody interested in positive views, management decisions made by different people to those who reintroduced beavers, should be up to affected people to decide, votes/views on recent political matters meant little</i>	18.99
Don't know how or who to contact		<i>Not sure how decision made or by whom, what is official method</i>	9.53
Opportunity has not been/is not being provided		<i>Never been asked/survey is first time asked, no [personal] direct access to those involved, missed consultations, need for consultation, beavers introduced before consulted</i>	8.16
Personal views mean little		<i>Just one person, not in consulted bracket/seen as a stakeholder, not involved, not resident in the UK, no influence due to young/old age</i>	7.94
Government and decision makers listen to limited groups		<i>Unbalanced weighting, like the badger culls, money talks, listen to misinformation, to suit personal agendas</i>	6.06
Not good at or difficulty communicating, lack of confidence in doing so or unwilling to impose personal views		<i>Views too strong to give balanced views, struggle to articulate, English not first language</i>	4.12
Decision makers have already made up their minds		<i>Going ahead in Scotland, not a reintroduction trial anymore, trial overlooks factors, consultation is just to tick boxes</i>	3.75
Campaigning groups are noisy and override other voices		<i>Campaigns overlooks groups of people, celebrity attention</i>	2.31
Peer Pressure		<i>Intimidation, fear seen as biased, rumours circulate, overrides science, accusations of 'do-gooding/fluffy thinking', has been imposed by an urban idyll</i>	1.08
Do not want to		<i>Over-consultation, get on with it, technical questions of more importance/opinions shouldn't matter compared to morality and ecology, should be decided by informed people</i>	0.94
Lobbying groups and those with strong views are difficult to persuade		<i>Debate is too polarized</i>	0.94
It is now too late for consultation		<i>It's happened, asking now aims to alter attitudes and not seek views, unplanned reintroduction means no management plan</i>	0.87
Don't know			0.58
Worried about media coverage		<i>High influence, biased, beavers presented as 'cuddly and fun'</i>	0.51
Don't have time			0.43
Generally feel they cannot express their view		<i>'Inbuilt cynicism'</i>	0.36
Work for organisation with a stance		<i>'Tow the party line', personal views may not align</i>	0.36
Concerned of how beavers appeared without sanction			0.22
Issues are very complex		<i>Challenging process, confusion about reintroduction trials</i>	0.22
Personal opinions are not strong enough		<i>Mind not made up, not a concern for respondent</i>	0.22
Environmentalists should leave countryside/people alone			0.14
Strange question			0.14
Of interest only to a minority			0.07
Decisions are being made on the results of the trial			0.07
Takes too long to reintroduce a native animal			0.07
Other groups have already done what I would have			0.07

