



# **PUBLIC OPINION OF FORESTRY 2007: SCOTLAND (preliminary report)**

Preliminary results from the 2007 Scottish survey of Public Opinion of Forestry, carried out on behalf of the Forestry Commission.

June 2007

**Prepared by:**

Economics & Statistics  
Forestry Commission  
Silvan House  
231 Corstorphine Road  
Edinburgh EH12 7AT  
United Kingdom

**Enquiries:**

Neil Grant: +44 (0)131 314 6218  
[statistics@forestry.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:statistics@forestry.gsi.gov.uk)

**Website:**

<http://www.forestry.gov.uk/statistics>

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Forests, woodland and trees in the media .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 <i>Forests, woodland and trees in the media.....</i>	7
<b>3. Scottish forest management.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 <i>Benefits of forestry.....</i>	8
3.2 <i>Forest management standards.....</i>	9
<b>4. Climate change.....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 <i>Impact of climate change.....</i>	10
4.2 <i>Woodlands impact on climate change.....</i>	11
4.3 <i>Forest management in response to climate change .....</i>	13
<b>5. Wood as a fuel.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6. Changes to woodland.....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 <i>Desire for change in woodland area.....</i>	15
6.2 <i>Location of new woodland .....</i>	16
<b>7. Woodland recreation .....</b>	<b>17</b>
7.1 <i>Visits to woodland.....</i>	17
7.2 <i>Type of woodland visited .....</i>	17
7.3 <i>Reasons for not visiting woodland.....</i>	18
7.4 <i>Frequency of woodland visits .....</i>	19
7.5 <i>Provision of woodland recreation opportunities.....</i>	20
7.6 <i>Woodland learning activities.....</i>	21
<b>Appendix 1: Scottish Opinion Survey Sampling Method .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix 2: TNS Omnibus Random Location Sampling Method .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Scotland Questionnaire 2007 .....</b>	<b>24</b>



## **Executive Summary**

### **2007 survey**

In 2007, four separate public opinion of forestry surveys were undertaken - across the UK (around 4,000 interviews, including a sample of 353 interviews in Scotland), Scotland (1,000 interviews), Wales (950 interviews) and Northern Ireland (1,000 interviews).

This report presents results of the survey in Scotland and compares, where appropriate, with the Scotland 2005 and 2003 surveys and the UK 2007 and GB 2005 surveys.

Some of the questions asked in the 2007 Scotland survey were the same as those asked in 2005 (and in earlier years); however, a number of new questions were asked on topics such as the relationship between forestry and climate change, woodfuel and forest management.

Separate reports provide similar results for England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Final reports, charting the results and providing contrasts by, for example, socio-demographic characteristics will be available in autumn 2007.

### **Forests, woodland and trees in the media**

58% of respondents had seen or read about forests, woodland and trees in the last 12 months on the television, radio or in the newspapers. Topics most widely recognised include 'public rights of access to woodland' and 'forests and woodlands helping to tackle climate change'.

The Scotland 2005 responses (26% recognition) are not in line with results from other surveys (Scotland 2003 - 49%, UK 2007 - 63% and GB 2005 50%). However, 2% of the increase in recognition in Scotland from 2005 to 2007 can be directly attributed to the inclusion of the new 'climate change' response option.

### **Forest management**

90% of adults in Scotland selected at least one public benefit as a good reason to support forestry with public money. The top reasons to support forestry were 'to provide places for wildlife to live', 'to provide places to walk in' and 'to help tackle climate change'.

Respondents were more likely to believe the standard of forest management is higher across 'Scotland' than in their 'local area' (42% and 32% respectively selecting either '1 very high' or '2').

### **Climate change**

58% of respondents believe that climate change will have a large impact on Scotland.

There was a high degree of agreement with a set of statements regarding the ways in which forests and woodlands can impact on climate change, for example 74% of respondents agreed that 'Trees are good because they remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and store it in wood'. However 50% of respondents incorrectly agreed that 'Scotland could offset all its greenhouse gas emissions by planting more trees'.

A set of statements was presented to the respondents to ascertain their views on the way in which Scottish forests should be managed in response to climate change. These generated a set of responses that reflect a belief that forestry is a method that can be used to mitigate the effects of climate change. For example, 86% of respondents agreed that 'A lot more trees should be planted' while only 9% agreed that 'There is nothing that anyone could do that would make any difference'.

### **Wood as a fuel**

4% of respondents said that they used wood as a fuel in their home, either on its own, or with other fuels. Of these, 74% classified themselves as an occasional user, while only 3% use it as the main fuel for heating their home.

### **Changes to woodland**

68% of respondents would like to see more woodland in their part of Scotland, a significantly higher proportion than in 2003 (58%) or 2005 (47%), but now more similar to the UK 2007 (71%) and GB 2005 (66%) results, while 28% of respondents wanted neither more nor less woodland.

The most popular locations for the creation of new woodlands were 'on former industrial sites' (61%), 'around new developments' (60%), 'in rural areas near existing forests' (46%) and 'within 500m\10 minutes walk from my home (42%)'.

### **Woodland recreation**

75% of respondents had visited a woodland or forest in the last few years, a significantly higher proportion than in 2003 (50%) or 2005 (64%). Of those respondents who had not visited, 36% gave their main reason for not visiting as 'not being interested', down from 69% in 2005.

Of those adults who had visited woodlands in the last few years, 45% had only visited woodlands in the countryside, 16% only woodlands in and around towns (up from 9% in 2005) and 39% had visited woodlands in both locations.

71% of woodland visitors said that they had been to a woodland or forest at least once a month in the summer of 2006 (similar to the 70% of respondents in the 2007 UK survey). 39% visited at least once a month in the winter of 2006/07 (40% in the 2007 UK survey).

Although the majority of respondents (57%) gave a positive response regarding the provision of woodland recreation opportunities across Scotland, a lower proportion of respondents (42%) rated the provision as highly in their local area.

15% of respondents said they and/or a member of their family had attended an organised learning activity or event to do with woodlands in the last 12 months. 8% of respondents mentioned a 'school trip' and 6% a 'guided walk or talk'.

# 1. Introduction

## Background

The Forestry Commission has conducted similar biennial surveys of public attitudes to forestry and forestry-related issues since 1995 though the surveys have evolved since then:

- In the initial surveys, a representative sample of 2,000 adults across Great Britain (GB) was surveyed;
  - In 2001, with more interest in country-level results within GB, additional questions were asked of representative samples of 1,000 adults across Scotland and Wales;
  - In 2003, the main survey was extended to include Northern Ireland in the 4,120 adults interviewed and separate surveys of 1,000 adults continued in Scotland and Wales;
  - In 2005 and 2007, the need for separate surveys in each country was confirmed, with the increased interest in country-level and regional information. However, the requirement for continued high-quality coherent information for GB/UK as a whole means that four separate surveys were undertaken each year
- 
- A representative sample of 4,000 adults across GB (2005) and across UK (2007)
  - A representative sample of 1,000 adults across Scotland
  - A representative sample of 1,000 adults across Wales
  - A representative sample of 1,000 adults across Northern Ireland

Some questions were asked in all four of the surveys conducted in 2007, but an increasing number are survey-specific.

## This report

This report presents results from the 2007 survey in Scotland and compares results, where appropriate, with the 2005 and 2003 Scottish surveys, with the UK 2007 survey and with the GB 2005 survey.

Separate reports present the results from the surveys undertaken in England, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Final reports, charting the results and providing contrasts by, for example, socio-demographic characteristics will be available in autumn 2007.

## Survey design

The information presented in this report is taken from the TNS Scottish Omnibus Survey carried out from 22<sup>nd</sup> - 27<sup>th</sup> February 2007 on behalf of the Forestry Commission. The survey was based on a representative sample of around 1,000 adults (aged 16 or over) across Scotland. More details of the sample method are given Appendix 1: Scottish Opinion Survey Sampling Method.

The Scottish information for 2005 and 2003, presented for comparison, is from similar omnibus surveys conducted by another market research company, **mruk**.

The GB 2005 and UK 2007 data presented in this report are taken from the RSGB General Omnibus and TNS CAPI Omnibus surveys respectively, both conducted by TNS. These surveys were based on representative samples of around 4,000 adults

(aged 16 or over). More details on the UK 2007 sample methods are given in Appendix 2: TNS Omnibus Random Location Sampling Method. Around 9% of the UK survey interviews (353) were conducted in Scotland.

It should be noted that for many questions in the Scotland 2005 survey, there was a much higher proportion of adults responding 'don't know' in comparison to the other surveys referred to in this report. As this was accompanied by a corresponding decrease in positive responses, this may distort comparisons between each of the surveys.

All results are subject to the effects of chance in sampling, so a range of uncertainty (confidence interval) should be associated with any result from the survey. The confidence intervals take into account the effect of clustering, weighting and stratification in the survey design (see Appendix 1: Scottish Opinion Survey Sampling Method and Appendix 2: TNS Omnibus Random Location Sampling Method).

- For questions asked to the whole Scotland sample of around 1,000, the range of uncertainty around any figure should be no more than +/- 4.6%.
- For responses of subgroups, i.e. questions not posed to the whole sample of respondents, the range of uncertainty is correspondingly higher.
- For questions asked to the whole UK 2007 and GB 2005 samples of around 4,000, the range of uncertainty around any figure should be no more than +/- 2.3%.
- For questions asked to the whole samples, differences of more than 5.2% between the Scotland and GB/UK surveys are statistically significant and differences of more than 6.6% between the Scotland 2007 survey and previous Scotland surveys, are statistically significant.

Results are shown as percentages. These have been individually rounded so may not always total to exactly 100.



## 2. Forests, woodland and trees in the media

### 2.1 Forests, woodland and trees in the media

Respondents were asked whether they had seen or read about Scottish forests, woods or trees on the television, radio or in the newspapers in the last twelve months. Over half of Scottish adults (58%) recalled seeing or reading about at least one topic (Table 1). The highest proportion of Scottish respondents had heard about 'public rights of access to woodland' (35% of respondents), up from 15% in 2005 and perhaps a positive reflection on the new Scottish Outdoor Access Code which clarifies details of the Land Reform Scotland Act (2003).

2% of respondents selected only the new 'climate change' category, therefore on a like-for-like basis, 56% of the 2007 respondents recognised one of the categories that were presented to the 2005 respondents.

Respondents in the Scotland surveys were around three times as likely to have recalled seeing or hearing about many of the topics in 2007 than in 2005. Recognition of topics was, on the whole, marginally lower in the 2007 Scotland survey than in the UK 2007 survey, the exception being the 'Public rights of access to woodland' option.

When interpreting these data, note that a different market research company was used for the 2007 Scotland survey (than the 2005 and 2003 Scotland surveys) and some of the positive change in recognition of topics could be attributed to this change. However, the UK 2007 and GB 2005 surveys also showed an increase in recognition across all categories, and these surveys were carried out by the same company.

**Table 1: Respondents who had seen or read about Scottish forests, woods or trees in the last 12 months (%)**

	GB	UK	Scotland		
	2005	2007	2003	2005	2007
Public rights of access to woodland	23	24	19	15	<b>35</b>
Tree planting	21	30	19	9	<b>27</b>
Forests and woodlands helping to tackle climate change	-	35	-	-	<b>25</b>
Birds and other animals in woodland	24	34	19	8	<b>23</b>
Forest and woodland as places to visit	18	25	14	6	<b>22</b>
Protests about roads /other developments on woodland	18	23	13	6	<b>19</b>
Loss of ancient or native woodland	15	20	9	5	<b>13</b>
Flowers and other plants in woodland	15	22	8	4	<b>13</b>
Restoration of ancient or native woodland	12	17	8	4	<b>13</b>
Selling public woodland	9	-	8	4	-
Community woodland	-	14	-	4	<b>13</b>
Woods in & around towns, new local woods or	-	-	-	4	<b>11</b>
Creation of new native woodland	11	15	6	4	<b>11</b>
Wood for fuel / (short rotation coppice)	7	11	4	2	<b>8</b>
Tree pests and diseases	10	13	5	3	<b>7</b>
Labelling/ certification of wood products	6	10	2	1	<b>6</b>
Timber transport	5	-	4	0	-
<b>Recalling at least one topic</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>58</b>

Base: All respondents - GB 2005 (4,000), UK 2007 (4,000), Scotland 2003 (1,018), 2005 (1,009), 2007 (1,007)

### 3. Scottish forest management

#### 3.1 Benefits of forestry

The Scottish Executive funds forestry in Scotland in many ways. Respondents were asked to select (from a list of possible public benefits) good reasons to support Scottish forestry with public money. 90% of respondents selected at least one benefit.

As in previous years, the top reason to support forestry in Scotland (Table 2) was 'to provide places for wildlife to live'. Higher levels of support were identified over most categories, in particular, for the new 'to help tackle climate change' option (57%, compared to the 38% support for the 'global warming' option in the Scotland 2005 survey. However, the caveat detailed in section 2.1 regarding a change in market research company applies equally to these Scotland results.

Support for most options was roughly similar in the 2007 Scotland and UK surveys and indeed the top five reasons to support forestry were the same in both surveys.

**Table 2: Whether respondent believes public benefits are good reasons to support forestry with public money (%)**

	GB	UK	Scotland		
	2005	2007	2003	2005	2007
To provide places for wildlife to live	67	72	50	39	<b>67</b>
To provide places to walk in	57	61	46	34	<b>61</b>
To help tackle climate change	-	61	-	-	<b>57</b>
To help prevent greenhouse effect/global warming	55	-	43	38	-
To improve the countryside landscape	53	55	34	31	<b>56</b>
To provide healthy places for physical activity, relaxation and stress relief	44	48	-	23	<b>49</b>
To support the economy in rural areas	41	45	37	37	<b>46</b>
To provide wood as a renewable fuel (pre 2007)	28	37	26	29	<b>36</b>
To provide renewable energy including wood as fuel (post 2007)*	36	38	32	27	<b>43</b>
To help rural tourism	36	38	32	27	<b>43</b>
To provide renewable energy ( <i>Scotland only</i> )*	-	-	25	24	-
To create pleasant settings for new and existing developments around towns	37	41	20	22	<b>43</b>
To restore former industrial land	30	34	20	22	<b>36</b>
To provide places to cycle or ride horses	35	40	19	22	<b>40</b>
So Scotland ( <i>UK/GB</i> ) can buy less wood products from abroad	30	37	27	30	<b>32</b>
To provide timber for sawmills & wood processing	23	26	17	22	<b>28</b>
To make woods more accessible to all in the community	36	37	23	18	<b>41</b>
At least one reason given	89	93	91	79	<b>90</b>

Base: All respondents - GB 2005 (4,000), UK 2007 (4,000), Scotland 2003 (1,018), 2005 (1,009), 2007 (1,007)

\*Scotland 2005 - the total number of respondents believing either providing wood as a renewable fuel or providing renewable energy is a good reason to support Scottish forestry with public money is 36%

### 3.2 Forest management standards

A new question in the 2007 surveys carried out in Scotland and in the UK asked about 'Forest Management', defined as referring to all activities in woodland, including woodland creation, recreation, wildlife management and timber production.

Respondents were asked to rate the standard of forest management both in Scotland (or UK) and in their local area. Ratings were given on a scale of 1-5, 1 being 'very high' and 5 being 'very low'.

Table 3 shows that overall, similar responses were received to the Scotland 'local area' question and to the 'UK' overall and UK 'local area' questions.

Respondents to the Scottish survey were more likely to believe the standard of forest management is higher across 'Scotland' than in their 'local area' (42% and 32% respectively selecting either '1 very high' or '2').

In addition, respondents to the Scottish survey were more likely to rate 'Scotland' forest management higher than UK respondents would rate either 'UK' or 'local area' forest management. 42% of Scottish survey respondents rated forest management as '1 very high' or '2', while of the UK respondents only 28% gave a similar rating to forest management in their 'local area' and 27% when asked about the 'UK'.

Around a fifth of respondents to the Scottish survey could not give a rating, presumably either because they didn't know enough about forests in Scotland/their local area or didn't know enough about forest management.

**Table 3: Standard of forest management**

		<b>(very high)</b>					<b>(very low)</b>	<i>Don't know</i>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Scotland 2007</b>	<b>Scotland</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	
	<b>Local area</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	
UK 2007	UK	6	21	35	9	3	26	
	Local area	7	21	29	12	6	25	

Base: All respondents Scotland (1,007), UK (4,000)

## 4. Climate change

The Scottish Executive has identified that climate change is widely recognised as the most serious environmental threat facing our planet. The Executive publication, *Changing Our Ways* (30 March 2006) covers action across all of the key sectors of Scotland's society and economy, including forestry and land use, and strengthens the Programme originally published in November 2000.

Globally, forest ecosystems play a key role in addressing climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and storing it in growing vegetation and soil. Deforestation caused by the unsustainable harvesting of timber and the conversion of forests to other land-uses leads to significant emissions of this stored carbon back to the atmosphere. Forests and woodlands can also be managed as a sustainable source of wood – an alternative energy source to fossil fuels, and a low-energy construction material.

Although, on a world scale, they cover a small area (17.2% of the Scotland surface area in 2007), the forests and woodlands in Scotland have a role to play too.

A new section of questions regarding this issue was added to the 2007 survey. This report has already noted in sections 2.1 and 3.1 respectively, that 'Forests and woodlands helping to tackle climate change' was one of the top answers provided by respondents when asked whether they had seen anything about UK forests in the media and when asked about the benefits to be gained from public support of forestry. Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 report the results of the other new questions on this topic.

### 4.1 Impact of climate change

The vast majority of respondents believe that climate change will have an impact on Scotland, with most believing that there will be a large impact (58% of all respondents).

**Table 4: Impact of climate change (%)**

	<b>Scotland 2007</b>
Large impact	58
Slight impact	31
No impact at all	4
Don't know	7

Base: All respondents (1,007)

## 4.2 Woodlands impact on climate change

In an attempt to gauge both the beliefs and knowledge of the public with respect to the interface between forests and climate change, respondents were asked about their level of agreement with a set of statements regarding the ways in which forests and woodlands in Scotland can impact on climate change.

Table 5 reveals a high level of agreement with each of the statements, with more respondents agreeing (selecting '1 strongly agree' or '2') with each statement than disagreeing (selecting '5 strongly disagree' or '4').

The highest level of agreement, almost three-quarters of respondents, was with the statement that 'Trees are good because they remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and store it in wood'. Around half of respondents believe that 'Cutting down forests and woodland makes climate change worse, even if they are replanted' and that 'Scotland could offset all its greenhouse gas emissions by planting more trees'.

**Table 5: Ways in which Scottish forests and woodlands can impact on climate change (%)**

	<b>(strongly agree)</b>					<b>(strongly disagree)</b>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
1. Trees are good because they remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and store it in wood	26	48	10	3	1	12	
2. Using wood for fuel is better for climate change than using fuels such as coal and gas	13	39	20	14	2	13	
3. Cutting down forests and woodland makes climate change worse, even if they are replanted	12	40	17	17	2	12	
4. Scotland could offset all its greenhouse gas emissions by planting more trees	13	36	19	15	3	13	
5. Using wood for fuel makes climate change worse because it releases carbon dioxide	8	31	22	18	2	18	
6. Using wood for building is better for climate change than using materials such as concrete and steel	10	29	20	21	2	17	

Base: All respondents (1,007)

It is helpful to consider the numbered statements shown above in Table 5 alongside the following common expert opinion<sup>1</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> Statement s and principles from the Forestry Commission 'Forestry and climate change' website: <http://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-6umkar>

1. In general, it is believed that forests and woodlands have a key role to play in mitigating the effects of climate change. Forests and woodlands do help to stabilise atmospheric carbon dioxide by sequestering and storing carbon in trees, vegetation and soils.
2. Wood and other materials derived from plants have an important contribution to make towards our future energy needs. Wood can be used as a low-carbon renewable energy source to substitute for fossil fuels.
3. In the short term, cutting down forests and woodlands does make climate change worse, as carbon stocks are released, but in the longer term this is countered by replanting. However, this harvesting and replanting should not be confused with deforestation, which implies a change in land cover from forest to non-forest land, whereas sustainable wood production involves cyclical harvesting and growing.
4. Afforestation makes an important contribution by sequestering carbon, but it is not feasible for the UK to become 'carbon neutral' through afforestation alone. It is estimated that to do this would require creation of some 50 million hectares of forest – approximately twice the land area of the UK. The same principle is of course also valid for Scotland.
5. Carbon released by burning woodfuel in modern, efficient systems is re-absorbed by growing trees in a cycle that reduces the amount of carbon released into the atmosphere. The long-term effect of tree planting, good forest management practices and efficient burning woodfuel in efficient systems should be about carbon neutral.
6. Wood products can be used as low-energy alternatives to materials such as concrete and steel, which involve high-energy use in their production. The biomass in wood products is also a carbon stock in its own right, just as much as biomass in living trees.

### 4.3 Forest management in response to climate change

The respondents were then presented with a series of statements regarding the way in which Scottish forests and woodlands should be managed in response to the threat of climate change.

There was a clear distinction in the level of agreement with the six statements posed, but for each, the majority of responses were in line with most expert opinion, as displayed below in Table 6.

The majority of respondents **agreed** that 'a lot more trees should be planted' (86%), that 'more information should be provided about the ways in which wood can be used to lessen our impact on the environment' (85%) and that 'different types of trees should be planted that will be more suited to future climates' (76%). Agreement with these points reflects a belief that climate change is occurring but also some amount of faith that forestry and wood can be utilised in an attempt to mitigate changes.

Conversely, a majority of respondents **disagreed** with the statements that 'there is nothing that anyone could do that would make any difference' (80%), that 'no action is needed; let nature take its course' (76%) and that 'trees should not be felled in any circumstances, even if they are replaced' (57%). The strong rejection of 'letting nature takes its course' and of the idea that 'there is nothing that anyone could do that would make any difference' again may indicate that respondents believe we can and should use our knowledge of forestry to attempt to make a difference.

**Table 6: Management of Scottish forests in response to the threat of climate change (%)**

	<b>(strongly agree)</b>					<b>(strongly disagree)</b>	<i>Don't know</i>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
A lot more trees should be planted	35	52	8	3	0		2
More information should be provided about the ways in which wood can be used to lessen our impact on the environment	28	57	10	0	1		3
Different types of trees should be planted that will be more suited to future climates	21	54	15	4	0		5
Trees should not be felled in any circumstances, even if they are replaced	4	15	20	46	10		5
No action is needed; let nature take its course	2	10	10	44	33		2
There is nothing that anyone could do that would make any difference	1	8	9	44	35		2

Base: All respondents (1,007)

## 5. Wood as a fuel

In 2007, 4% of respondents to the Scotland survey said that they used wood as a fuel in their home, either on its own, or with other fuels. This question was asked in separate 2007 public opinion surveys undertaken across the UK and in Wales, in the 2005 Wales public opinion survey, in a woodfuel consumption study in Scotland in 2004/05 and in the GB firewood survey in 1997.

Each of these surveys identified a small proportion of respondents who used wood as a fuel. It is notable that the 2007 Scotland result is similar to the Scotland 2004/5 result and that the UK result is not significantly different to the GB result from ten years earlier.

**Table 7: Proportion of respondents who use wood as a fuel in their home (%)**

Respondents who used wood as a fuel in their home, either on its own or with other fuels	
GB 1997	9
Scotland 2004/5	5
Wales 2005	11
Wales 2007	6
UK 2007	8
<b>Scotland 2007</b>	<b>4</b>

Base: All respondents in - GB 1997 (2,000), Scotland 2004/5 (4,006), Wales 2005 (1,001), Wales 2007 (953), UK 2007 (4,000), Scotland 2007 (1,007)

The respondents who did use wood for fuel were asked three further questions:

- The majority either obtained their wood fuel a few bags at a time (54%) or gathered it themselves (33%), while 10% received it by the truck load;
- The majority of respondents classified themselves as an occasional user (74%), while 22% said they used wood as a fuel regularly;
- Of those using wood, only 3% use it as the main fuel for heating their home, while the rest mainly use something else.



## 6. Changes to woodland

### 6.1 Desire for change in woodland area

Respondents were asked whether or not they would like more woodland in their part of Scotland. The majority (68%) indicated that they would like to see more woodland. Under a third of respondents (28%) would like to see neither more nor less woodland, while only a small number of respondents (less than 0.5%) stated they would like to see less woodland (Table 8).

**Table 8: Desire for more woodland (%)**

	GB	UK	Scotland		
	2005	2007	2003	2005	2007
More than half as much again	18	22	28	5	<b>16</b>
About half as much again	24	25	2	13	<b>23</b>
A little more	23	23	26	27	<b>28</b>
<i>More (total)</i>	<b>66</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>68</b>
Neither more nor less	29	25	26	30	<b>28</b>
Less	2	2	1	0	<b>0</b>
Don't know	4	2	15	23	<b>4</b>

Base: All respondents - GB (4,000), UK (4,000), Scotland 2003 (1,018), 2005 (1,009), 2007 (1,007)

NOTE: Respondents were asked about 'their part of the country' in the UK and GB surveys

Significantly fewer Scottish 2007 survey respondents than Scottish 2005 survey respondents answered don't know (4% and 23% respectively); respondents were correspondingly more likely to want more woodland in the Scotland 2007 survey than the Scotland 2005 survey (68% and 47% respectively). However, as already noted earlier in this report, a different survey contractor was selected in 2007 and one of the consequences appears to have been a lower tendency to accept a 'don't know' response in the 2007 survey.

Furthermore, it is clear that the 2007 Scotland survey results are now more similar to the UK 2007 and GB 2005 survey results than they are with the 2005 and 2003 Scotland survey results.

## 6.2 Location of new woodland

Those respondents who indicated that they would like to see more woodland, were then asked where they would like to see the woodland created. The question asked in the Scotland 2007 survey allowed respondents to select multiple response options, the results of which are shown below in Table 9.

**Table 9:** Location of new woodland, **Scotland 2007** survey (%)

Where respondents would like to see more woodland created	
On former industrial sites	61
Around new developments	60
In rural areas near existing forests	46
Within 500m/10 minutes walk from my home	42
Other	2
Don't know	1

Base: Respondents who wanted more woodland in their part of Scotland (682)

The two most popular options selected were 'On former industrial sites' (61%) and 'Around new developments' (60%), while 46% of respondents selected 'In rural areas near existing forests' and 42% 'Within 500m \ 10 minutes walk from my home'.

A similar question was asked in the 2005 Scotland survey, however the results (shown below in Table 10) are not directly comparable with the 2007 results because the respondents were asked to select only one option.

**Table 10:** Location of new woodland, **Scotland 2005** survey (%)

Where respondents would like to see more woodland created	
'Within 500m \ 10 minutes walk from my home'	46
'Around new developments'	28
'On former industrial sites'	13
'In rural areas near existing forests'	9
On farmland	2
Everywhere	-
Don't know	2

This question was not asked in the UK 2007, GB 2005 or Scotland 2003 surveys.

## 7. Woodland recreation

Two of the key themes of the Scottish Forestry Strategy<sup>2</sup> are Access and Health, and Community Development. Some of the primary aims of these themes are to make access to woodlands easier for all sectors of society and to help to improve the quality of life and well-being of people across Scotland. This section reports on questions relating to recreation in forests and woodland.

### 7.1 Visits to woodland

Three-quarters of respondents (75%) said that they had visited forests or woodlands for walks, picnics or other recreation in the last few years (Table 11). This represents a significant increase over the Scotland survey results received in 2005 and 2003 and is in line with the results from the 2007 UK survey.

**Table 11: Visited woodland in last few years (%)**

	GB	UK	Scotland		
	2005	2007	2003	2005	<b>2007</b>
Visited woodland in last few years	65	77	64	50	75

Base: All respondents - GB 2005 (4,000), UK 2007 (4,000), Scotland 2003 (1,018), 2005 (1,009), 2007 (1,007)

### 7.2 Type of woodland visited

Table 12 shows that 45% of Scotland 2007 survey respondents have only visited woodland in the countryside, 16% have only visited woodland in and around towns and 39% have visited both rural and urban woodland. Although the results from all the surveys shown in Table 12 are quite similar, one notable difference is that respondents in the Scotland 2007 survey were more likely than Scotland 2005 respondents to have visited only woodlands in an around towns.

**Table 12: Type of woodland visited (%)**

	GB 2005	UK 2007	Scotland 2003	Scotland 2005	<b>Scotland 2007</b>
In the countryside	46	40	45	47	<b>45</b>
Both	35	43	36	43	<b>39</b>
In and around towns	17	17	18	9	<b>16</b>
Don't know	2	0	0	1	<b>0</b>

Base: Respondents who had visited woodland in the last few years - GB 2005 (2,672), UK 2007 (3,065), Scotland 2003 (648), 2005 (508), 2007 (752)

<sup>2</sup> The Scottish Forestry Strategy (2006), Forestry Commission, Edinburgh, 2006

### 7.3 Reasons for not visiting woodland

Respondents who had not visited woodland in the last few years were asked about their main reason for not visiting (Table 13). The most frequently selected reason given in the Scotland 2007 survey was that the respondent was 'not interested in going' (36% of those who had not visited). The other main reasons given were 'other personal mobility reasons' (23%) 'not having a car' (14%).

Respondents in the Scottish surveys who had not visited woodland, were roughly half as likely to say that they were 'not interested in going' in 2007 (36%) as they were in 2005 (69%). However, it is likely that at least some of this difference could be attributed to the way in which the question was asked by the two different survey contractors used in 2005 (mruk) and in 2007 (TNS). Perhaps, for example, there was some difference in the emphasis put on the response options available.

**Table 13: Main reason for not visiting forest/woodland in last few years**

	GB 2005	UK 2007	Scotland 2003	Scotland 2005	<b>Scotland 2007</b>
Not interested in going	33	26	64	69	<b>36</b>
Other personal mobility reasons	17	18	6	5	<b>23</b>
Don't have a car	13	11	10	8	<b>14</b>
Woods are too far away	11	14	8	2	<b>6</b>
Lack of time	5	-	4	4	<b>5</b>
Prefer other areas of countryside	3	2	2	3	<b>3</b>
Lack of information	3	2	2	1	<b>2</b>
Concerns that woods are not safe	3	3	2	1	<b>1</b>
Other	6	17	2	3	<b>6</b>
Don't know / No particular reason	7	9	1	5	<b>5</b>

Base: Respondents who had not visited woodland in the last few years - UK 2007 (935), Scotland 2005 (473), 2007 (255)

#### 7.4 Frequency of woodland visits

Of the 75% of Scotland 2007 respondents who had visited woodland in the last few years, 71% said that they visited at least once a month in the summer of 2006 (Table 14) and 39% said that they visited at least once a month in the winter of 2006/7.

Around a quarter (23%) of those Scotland 2007 respondents who had visited woodland in the last few years said that they did not visit during the most recent winter. Only 4% said that they did not visit during the most recent summer.

Table 14 shows that the results from the Scotland and UK 2007 surveys are fairly similar.

**Table 14: Frequency of visit in last summer and winter (%)**

Summer 2006			Winter 2006/7	
Scotland 2007	UK 2007		Scotland 2007	UK 2007
13	14	Several times per week	8	7
27	29	Several times per month	12	13
31	27	About once per month	19	20
24	26	Less often	38	33
4	3	Never	23	27
-	0	Don't know	-	0

Base: Respondents who had visited woodland in the last few years - Scotland 2007 (752), UK 2007 (3,065)

By combining the information about those who had visited forests in the last few years with the frequency of visit information for the last year, it is possible to estimate the proportion of adults who have visited woodland in the last year. In this way it is estimated that 72% of adults had visited woodland during the last year, 71% in the summer of 2006, and 57% in the winter of 2006/2007.

### 7.5 Provision of woodland recreation opportunities

A new question in the Scotland 2007 survey asked respondents to rate the provision of woodland recreation opportunities. Respondents were asked to provide a rating for both Scotland and their local area. Ratings were given on a scale of 1-5, 1 being 'very good' and 5 being 'very poor'.

Table 15 shows that overall, although responses to the Scotland and local area questions were quite similar, respondents were more likely to be positive about woodland recreation provision across Scotland than in their local area. When asked about Scotland, 57% of respondents were positive (providing a response of '1 - very high' or '2', while only 42% of respondents scored this highly when asked about their local area.

Around a tenth of respondents could not give a rating, presumably because either they didn't know enough or had no experience of woodland recreation.

**Table 15: Provision of woodland recreation in... (%)**

		<b>(very good)</b>		<b>(very poor)</b>			<i>No experience/ Don't know</i>
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>Scotland 2007 survey</b>	Scotland	17	41	25	4	1	13
	Your local area	11	31	30	13	4	11

Base: All respondents in Scotland - 2007 (1,007)

## 7.6 Woodland learning activities

Respondents were asked whether they, or any member of their family, had attended any organised learning activities or events to do with woodland or forests within the last 12 months.

In 2007, a total of 15% of adults said that they or a member of their family had attended such an event. Of those that had attended an organised learning activity or event in the last 12 months, 8% had attended a 'school trip' and 6% a 'guided walk or talk'. A small number said they had attended some other type of organised learning activity or event. Table 16 indicates that the responses received from the 2007 Scotland survey were similar to the 2005 results.

**Table 16: Woodland learning activities attended (%)**

	Scotland 2005	<b>Scotland 2007</b>
School trip	5	<b>8</b>
Guided walk/talk	5	<b>6</b>
Other	1	<b>1</b>
-----		
None	90	<b>85</b>

Base: All respondents (1,007)

NOTE: Respondents were able to give more than one response - a total of 1,026 responses, including 'none', were received

## **Appendix 1: Scottish Opinion Survey Sampling Method**

The information presented in this report is taken from the **Scottish Opinion Survey** carried out by TNS from 22<sup>nd</sup> - 27<sup>th</sup> February 2007 on behalf of the Forestry Commission.

### **SAMPLING**

The survey was based on a representative sample of around 1,000 adults (aged 16 or over) across Scotland. The survey ensures a consistently representative sample of the Scottish adult population in terms of sex, age, working status and socio-economic grade.

Each month, interviewing is undertaken in 42 sampling points across the country. These points are selected to be representative of the geographical distribution of the Scottish population. In each of these points interviewers aim to undertake 25 interviews. Interviews must be undertaken within interlocking quotas applied on the basis of sex, age, socio-economic group and working status.

As different sampling points are used each month, over a 12 months' period, interviewing is undertaken in 504 points. To ensure adequate coverage, the numbers of interviews achieved in each local authority area are monitored to minimise the under or over representation of any particular areas.

### **INTERVIEWING AND QUOTA CONTROLS**

Only one interview may be undertaken per household and a random route procedure is adopted within each sampling point requiring a minimum of five households being left between each successful interview. This procedure helps ensure that interviewing in each sample point is not restricted to a small geographic area only containing individuals with similar demographic and lifestyle characteristics, thereby minimising the effects of clustering within the sample.

A spread in the timing of interviews facilitates the completion of sample quotas with interviewers contacting respondents during both weekdays and weekends and at different times of day.

### **DESIGN EFFECT**

As a quota sampling approach does not permit measurement of the likelihood of members of the population being included in the survey, confidence intervals can only be estimated and should therefore be treated as indicative.

As with all multi-stage sample designs, there are effects on the magnitude of the standard error of estimates that arise from a number of sources. The greatest contributors are caused negatively by the effects of clustering and weighting and positively by the effects of stratification. These are collectively known as 'design effects'.

The 'design factor' is used to estimate the ratio of the standard error of these complex sample estimates to that of a simple random sample of the same size. Design factors vary from one variable to another depending on the inter-correlations that exist between that variable and the causes of variation in the size of the standard error. For example social grade tends to be correlated between households in small geographical areas and thus variables that are correlated with social grade (e.g. visits to woodland) will have larger design factors. Such design factors need to be individually calculated from actual data to obtain accurate estimates for any given variable. Common practice is the use of a 'modal' value for application to estimates. For the Omnibus Taylor Nelson Sofres recommend a design factor of 1.5 be applied to the calculation of confidence limits and when testing for significance.



## **Appendix 2: TNS Omnibus Random Location Sampling Method**

(UK 2007 survey)

### **SAMPLING FRAME**

The TNS CAPI Omnibus employs a random location methodology. 2001 Census small area statistics and the Postal Address File (PAF) were used to define sample points. These are areas of similar population sizes formed by the combination of wards, with the constraint that each point must be contained within a single Government Office Region (GOR). In addition, geographic systems were employed to minimise the drive time required to cover each area as optimally as possible. 600 points were defined south of the Caledonian Canal in Great Britain (GB), and, for UK samples, another 25 points were defined in a similar fashion in Northern Ireland.

### **STRATIFICATION AND SAMPLE POINT SELECTION**

278 points were selected south of the Caledonian Canal for use by the Omnibus after stratification by Government Office Region and Social Grade. They were also checked to ensure they are representative by an urban and rural classification. Those points are divided into two replicates. Each set is used in alternate weeks. 16 of the points in Northern Ireland were selected and divided into four replicates. Those replicates are used in rotation to give a wide spread across the Province over time in the UK samples. Similarly the statistical accuracy of the GB sampling is maximised by issuing sequential waves of fieldwork systematically across the sampling frame to provide maximum geographical dispersion. This ensures that the sample point selection remains representative for any specific fieldwork wave.

### **SELECTION OF CLUSTERS WITHIN SAMPLING POINTS**

All the sample points in the sampling frame have been divided into two geographically distinct segments each containing, as far as possible, equal populations. The segments comprise aggregations of complete wards. For the Omnibus alternate A and B halves are worked each wave of fieldwork. Each week different wards are selected in each required half and Census Output Areas selected within those wards. Then, blocks containing an average of 150 addresses are sampled in those areas from the PAF.

### **DESIGN EFFECT**

As with all multi-stage sample designs, there are effects on the magnitude of the standard error of estimates that arise from a number of sources. The greatest contributors are caused negatively by the effects of clustering and weighting and positively by the effects of stratification. These are collectively known as 'design effects'. The 'design factor' is used to estimate the ratio of the standard error of these complex sample estimates to that of a simple random sample of the same size. Design factors vary from one variable to another depending on the inter-correlations that exist between that variable and the causes of variation in the size of the standard error. For example social grade tends to be correlated between households in small geographical areas and thus variables that are correlated with social grade (e.g. visits to woodland) will have larger design factors. Such design factors need to be individually calculated from actual data to obtain accurate estimates for any given variable. Common practice is the use of a 'modal' value for application to estimates. For the Omnibus TNS recommend a design factor of 1.5 be applied to the calculation of confidence limits and when testing for significance.

### **INTERVIEWING AND QUOTA CONTROLS**

Assignments are conducted over two days of fieldwork and are carried out on weekdays from 2 p.m. – 8 p.m. and at the weekend. Quotas are set by sex (male, female housewife, female non-housewife); within female housewife, presence of children and working status, and within men, working status, to ensure a balanced sample of adults within effective contacted addresses. Interviewers are instructed to leave 3 doors between each successful interview.

### Appendix 3: Scotland Questionnaire 2007

<p><b>Q1</b></p>	<p><b>You may have seen or read about Scottish forests, woods or trees on the television, radio or in the newspapers. From this list, can you please tell me which of these topics you have seen or read anything about in the last 12 months?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Multi choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Birds and other animals in woodlands</li> <li>• Flowers and other plants in woodlands</li> <li>• Forests and woodlands as places to visit</li> <li>• Community woodlands</li> <li>• Woods in and around towns, new local woods, improved local access</li> <li>• Tree planting</li> <li>• Tree pests and diseases</li> <li>• Wood for fuel / (short rotation coppice)</li> <li>• Loss of ancient or native woodlands</li> <li>• Restoration of ancient or native woodlands</li> <li>• Creation of new native woodlands</li> <li>• Public rights of access to woodlands</li> <li>• Protests about roads or other developments on woodlands</li> <li>• Labelling/certification of wood products</li> <li>• Forests and woodlands helping to tackle climate change</li> <li>• Other (specify)</li> <li>• None of these</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q2</b></p>	<p><b>In Scotland, public money is given to support forestry, the planting and management of all types and sizes of forests and woods, because it is believed to be of public benefit. From this list, please tell me which of the following reasons are good reasons to support forestry in this way?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Multi choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To support the economy in rural areas</li> <li>• To help rural tourism</li> <li>• To provide timber for sawmills and wood processing</li> <li>• To provide renewable energy including wood as fuel</li> <li>• So that Scotland can buy less wood products from abroad</li> <li>• To make woods more accessible to all in the community</li> <li>• To help tackle climate change</li> <li>• To provide places for wildlife to live</li> <li>• To provide places to walk in</li> <li>• To provide places to cycle or ride horses</li> <li>• To provide healthy places for physical activity, relaxation and stress relief</li> <li>• To improve the countryside landscape</li> <li>• To create pleasant settings for developments around towns</li> <li>• To restore former industrial land</li> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q3</b></p>	<p><b>How much of an impact do you think climate change will have on Scotland?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large impact</li> <li>• Slight impact</li> <li>• No impact at all</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>

<p><b>Q4</b></p>	<p><b>Would you agree or disagree with the following statements about the ways in which forests and woodlands in Scotland can impact on climate change?</b>          ((1) strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, (5) strongly disagree, and don't know)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees are good because they remove carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and store it in wood</li> <li>• Cutting down forests and woodland makes climate change worse, even if they are replanted</li> <li>• Using wood for fuel is better for climate change than using fuels such as coal and gas</li> <li>• Using wood for fuel makes climate change worse because it releases carbon dioxide</li> <li>• Using wood for building is better for climate change than using materials such as concrete and steel</li> <li>• Scotland could offset all its greenhouse gas emissions by planting more trees</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q5</b></p>	<p><b>Do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding how Scottish forests and woodlands should be managed in response to the threat of climate change?</b>          ((1) strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, (5) strongly disagree, and don't know)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is nothing that anyone could do that would make any difference</li> <li>• No action is needed; let nature take its course</li> <li>• A lot more trees should be planted</li> <li>• Trees should not be felled in any circumstances, even if they are replaced</li> <li>• Different types of trees should be planted that will be more suited to future climates</li> <li>• More information should be provided about the ways in which wood can be used to lessen our impact on the environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q6</b></p>	<p><b>'Forest Management' refers to all activities in woodland, including woodland creation, recreation, wildlife management and timber production.</b></p> <p>On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very high and 5 is very low, how would you rate the standard of forest management in:</p> <p>a. Scotland          b. your local area</p>
<p><b>Q7</b></p>	<p><b>a. Do you ever use wood as a fuel in your home, either on its own or with other fuels?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No <i>(skip to Q8)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>b. Do you get the wood by the truck load, or a few bags at a time, or gather it yourself?</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. by the truck load</li> <li>2. a few bags at a time</li> <li>3. gather it yourself</li> <li>4. don't know</li> </ol> <p><b>c. Do you use wood as a fuel regularly or only occasionally?</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. regularly</li> <li>2. occasionally</li> <li>3. don't know</li> </ol> <p><b>d. Is wood the main fuel for heating your home, or do you mainly use something else?</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. main fuel</li> <li>2. mainly use something else</li> <li>3. don't know</li> </ol>

<p><b>Q8</b></p>	<p><b>a. In the last few years, have you visited forests or woodlands for walks, picnics or other recreation?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No (<i>then skip to Q8c</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>b. Did you visit woodlands in the countryside or woodlands in and around towns? (<i>then skip to Q9</i>)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodlands in the countryside</li> <li>• Woodlands in and around towns</li> <li>• Both in the countryside and around towns</li> </ul> <p><b>c. What was the main reason that you did not visit? (<i>then skip to Q10</i>)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not interested in going</li> <li>• Don't have a car</li> <li>• Lack of suitable public transport</li> <li>• Other personal mobility reasons (difficulty in walking, unwell, etc.)</li> <li>• Woods are too far away</li> <li>• Lack of facilities (play areas, picnic areas, etc.)</li> <li>• Lack of information about woods to visit</li> <li>• Prefer other areas of countryside</li> <li>• Concerns that woods are not safe</li> <li>• Other (specify)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q9</b></p>	<p><b>a. How frequently did you visit forests and woodlands last summer, i.e. between April and September 2006?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several times per week</li> <li>• Several times per month</li> <li>• About once a month</li> <li>• Less often</li> <li>• Never</li> </ul> <p><b>b. And how often this winter, i.e. since October 2006?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several times per week</li> <li>• Several times per month</li> <li>• About once a month</li> <li>• Less often</li> <li>• Never</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q10</b></p>	<p><b>How would you rate the provision of woodland recreation opportunities in</b> (Scale 1-5, (1)very good, good, fair, poor, very poor(5), no experience/don't know)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• your local area</li> <li>• Scotland</li> </ul>

<p><b>Q11</b></p>	<p><b>a. Would you like to have more or less woodland in your part of Scotland?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More</li> <li>• Neither more nor less     <i>(skip to Q12)</i></li> <li>• Less                             <i>(skip to Q12)</i></li> <li>• Don't know                     <i>(skip to Q12)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>b. How much more woodland would you like to have in your part of the Scotland?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A little more</li> <li>• About half as much again</li> <li>• More than that</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul> <p><b>c. Where would you like to see more woodland created?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Multi choice)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within 500m/10 minutes walk from my home</li> <li>• Around new developments</li> <li>• On former industrial sites</li> <li>• In rural areas near existing forests</li> <li>• On farmland</li> <li>• Other (specify)</li> <li>• Don't know</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q12</b></p>	<p><b>Have you and/or your family attended any of the following organised learning activities or events to do with woodlands in the last 12 months?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School trip</li> <li>• Guided walk or talk</li> <li>• Other (please specify)</li> <li>• None</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q13</b></p>	<p><b>Do you have any long-term illness, health problems or disability which limits your daily activities or the work you can do?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> </ul>