
**4/2 Lake Weyba Drive, Noosaville
Queensland 4566 Australia
Phone: (07) 5455.5797
Email: kewagama@iprimus.com.au**

**NATIONAL SURVEY OF BAIT AND
BERLEY USE BY RECREATIONAL
FISHERS: A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
FOCUSING ON PRAWNS/SHRIMP**

*Report to:
Biosecurity Australia*

January 2007

SUMMARY

Background – the 2002 Survey

In 2001, Biosecurity Australia identified specific information needs in relation to bait and berley usage by recreational fishers. This information was required to address a range of policy issues, including a major *Import Risk Analysis* (IRA) for prawns/shrimp. After extensive development and testing, the *National Survey of Bait and Berley Use by Recreational Fishers* (AFFA 2002) was conducted by Kewagama Research and detailed information provided in terms of usage patterns/annual quantities for the major bait species.

The study comprised a telephone survey of 8,000 households across Australia, with excellent response rates (85%) achieved and some 1,371 recreational fishing households identified. Among these, a substantial majority (1,123) reported some ‘in-scope’ bait/berley usage (i.e. aquatic animals) in the previous 12 months and a detailed further interview was conducted with one randomly-selected household member (i.e. bait-user, aged 5 years or more). Using benchmark information from a major national survey of recreational fishing (NRIFS, Henry and Lyle 2003) and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the survey results were calibrated and expanded to resident population estimates.

Information from the survey has been used by Biosecurity Australia in development of its import risk analysis for prawns and prawn products – particularly, in terms of the levels of bait/berley usage of uncooked prawns that were ‘sold as seafood’. While the 2002 survey detected some such usage, a very low proportion of potentially imported product was assessed, i.e. the vast majority referred to whole prawns below the minimum import size limit (15 grams or approx. 13 cm in length).

Since 2002, substantially larger quantities of prawn/shrimp products have consistently been imported into Australia – leading to concerns that increased availability and relatively low prices may have resulted in increased usage of imported prawn products by recreational fishers.

The 2006 Follow-up Survey – Design Issues, Data Needs and Objectives

In July 2006, Biosecurity Australia commissioned Kewagama Research to conduct a follow-up survey of original respondents (recreational fishers) from the 2002 survey – of whom, some 95% had indicated availability to be re-contacted, if required. Despite the elapsed four years, around two-thirds of these households were identified as ‘re-contactable’ through telephone directory searches.

By re-interviewing these respondents, a ‘before and after’ assessment could be applied to those reporting any recreational fishing in the most recent 12 months (referred to as ‘repeat’ fishers). As in the 2002 survey, a recall-based assessment of bait/berley usage was required in terms of key bait types (aquatic animals). However, more detailed assessment was only required for prawns/shrimp – i.e. acquisition sources and estimated quantities used for purchased bait. Disaggregation of these results was again required by purchase form (live, whole dead etc.), region, water body type and season.

Additional information was required to assess the incidence of change between the two surveys (and associated reasons) for factors such as levels of fishing effort and bait vs. lure usage. Awareness assessment was also required in terms of (i) national point-of-sale labelling of

seafood products (imported vs. local, country of origin) and (ii) any advice not to use imported uncooked prawns as bait or berley.

Despite the new question sequences, the follow-up survey amounts to an effective repeat of the 2002 survey for key data elements and provides assessment of changes in bait usage patterns among the population sub-group concerned. While not providing coverage of the total fishing population, the follow-up survey represents a highly cost-effective alternative to a total repeat of the 2002 survey.

Survey Implementation and Analysis

After development and testing, the survey was conducted by telephone in August to October 2006 by two highly-experienced interviewers, both of whom had worked on the 2002 survey. A total of 873 specific respondents were identified for the follow-up survey – i.e. of 1,371 potential interviews, 95% were available for follow-up and adequate contact details were established for 67%. By design, no substitution of specific respondents was permitted and 745 fully-responding interviews were completed. This represents a response rate of 92%, when ‘sample loss’ is excluded (e.g. deceased, moved overseas).

After editing, coding and data entry, the survey results were calibrated and expanded on the same basis as the 2002 survey. By design, no attempt was made to provide survey results based on current population estimates. In fact, to enable comparability between the two surveys, population weights from the 2002 survey were simply replicated for each respondent and the survey estimates routinely expressed as (e.g.) “2002 population estimate of ‘repeat’ recreational fishers”. Also, for quantity-based estimates, adjustment factors for ‘recall bias’ from the 2002 survey were again employed (see further details in Section 3.6.4).

Summary of Results

The following results have been compiled on a national basis, for the proportions of the 2002 resident population (*private dwelling* basis) represented by respondents to the follow-up survey. All fishing activity and bait usage assessments refer to the period August 2005 – July 2006. Note: standard error calculations are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions and methodologies in Sections 2 and 3.

- 745 respondents to the follow-up survey represent an estimated 52.6% of all recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) from the 2002 survey (i.e. 1,521,598 of the estimated total 2,890,723). Note: recreational fishing is defined as any attempted harvesting of aquatic animals for non-commercial purposes (including crabbing, prawning, diving for lobster etc)
- 486 respondents reported some recreational fishing activity in the most recent 12 months, representing an estimated 33% of fishers from the 2002 survey (i.e. 954,482 of 2,890,723). These ‘repeat’ fishers (954,482) form the primary analysis group for the follow-up survey

Importantly, these fishers should not be viewed as representative of other fishers. In fact, their behaviour may well be very different, as characterised by: residential ‘stability’ (re-contact was successful); greater fishing experience/expertise (by design, no ‘new’ fishers could be included); and related to this, substantially higher avidity profiles (days fished annually). While these factors necessitate care in interpreting the survey results, in certain cases they afford increased utility – due to the varying proportions that these fishers comprise of the total estimates in 2002. For example, whereas ‘repeat’ fishers account for 33% of all fishers from the 2002 survey, they

comprise over half (54%) of the users of prawns ‘sold as seafood’ and two-thirds (67%) of the quantities used at that time. To assist in these comparisons, relevant data tables of total estimates from the 2002 survey have been included in Appendix B.

- in the 2006 survey, the vast majority of ‘repeat’ fishers (871,001 – 91%) reported some usage of ‘in-scope’ bait/berley (aquatic animals) in the previous 12 months – compared with 824,881 (86%) for the 2002 survey. Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), this represents a significant increase among the ‘repeat’ fisher group.

The results in Table A below have been summarised from Section 4.2 of the report.

Summary Table A: Bait/Berley Usage in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ for 10 Key Bait Types and Changes² since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		Prawns/ shrimp	Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	Crabs	Salt- water Crayfish	Fresh- water Crayfish	Abalone	Other Shellfish	Trout and Salmon	Salt- water Fish	Fresh- water Fish
Yes	No.	508648	476534	18555	3175	134364	8387	287520	4277	531262	5850
	%	53.3%	49.9%	1.9%	0.3%	14.1%	0.9%	30.1%	0.4%	55.7%	0.6%
No	No.	445834	477948	935927	951308	820118	946096	666962	950205	423220	948633
	%	46.7%	50.1%	98.1%	99.7%	85.9%	99.1%	69.9%	99.6%	44.3%	99.4%
Total ¹	No.	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Increase/decrease² in 2005/06 ...											
(a) No. of Users (+/-)	No.	-4079	108769	-35953	-991	24907	1515	-24036	277	-19575	-749
(b) Prop'n of 2001/02	%	-0.8%	29.6%	-66.0%	-23.8%	22.8%	22.1%	-7.7%	6.9%	-3.6%	-11.4%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers (i.e. follow-up survey respondents)

² Change is expressed as (a) the increase/decrease in no. of users of that bait type compared with the 2002 survey and (b) the proportion of change (%) based on 2001/02 user estimates

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), no significant difference emerged in the numbers of ‘repeat’ recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp in the 2006 and 2002 surveys (53.3% and 53.7% respectively). However, significant differences were revealed for increased numbers using squid, cuttlefish and octopus and decreased numbers using crabs.

In Table B (overleaf), the survey estimates for prawns/shrimp users from Table A have been disaggregated by acquisition source (see Section 5.2 of the report for further details).

Summary Table B: Acquisition Sources of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ and Changes² since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		Purchaser-Users			Personally Caught	TOTAL USERS
		'Sold as Bait'	'Sold as Seafood'	Total		
Yes	No.	423660	75839	464268	101992	508648
	%	44.4%	7.9%	48.6%	10.7%	53.3%
No	No.	530822	878643	490215	852490	445834
	%	55.6%	92.1%	51.4%	89.3%	46.7%
Total ¹	No.	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Increase/decrease² in 2005/06 ...						
(a) No. of Users (+/-)	No.	-32425	19034	-5998	-2767	-4079
(b) Prop'n of 2001/02	%	-7.1%	33.5%	-1.3%	-2.6%	-0.8%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers (follow-up survey respondents)

² Change is expressed as (a) the increase/decrease in no. of users of that acquisition source compared with the 2002 survey and (b) the proportion of change (%) based on 2001/02 user estimates

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), significant differences have emerged in the above table for increased numbers of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns 'sold as seafood' in the 2006 survey – 7.9% represents a one-third (33.5%) increase over the 2002 survey estimate of 6%.

By design, usage quantities were assessed in the 2006 and 2002 surveys for purchased bait only (i.e. not for 'personally caught' prawns). A comparison of total prawn/shrimp quantities used by purchase source is contained in Table C below (see Section 5.3 of the report for further details).

Summary Table C: Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers

YEAR	Total Quantity/Mean		'Sold as Bait'	'Sold as Seafood'	TOTAL
2005/06	Quantity	Kgs.	333926	59579	393506
	Mean per User	Kgs.	0.79	0.79	0.85
2001/02	Quantity	Kgs.	413006	50504	463510
	Mean per User	Kgs.	0.91	0.89	0.99
Increase/decrease² in 2005/06 ...					
(a) Quantity (+/-)		Kgs.	-79080	9075	-70004
(b) Prop'n of 2001/02		%	-19.1%	18.0%	-15.1%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated quantities of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers ... from purchase sources only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in both the 2002 and 2006 surveys

² Change is expressed as (a) the increase/decrease in quantities for that acquisition source compared with the 2002 survey and (b) the proportion of change (%) based on 2001/02 estimates

Based on results from the quantity-based comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences have emerged in the above table.

Note: whereas in Table B, a significant increase was observed for ‘sold as seafood’ prawn users (33.5%), lower mean usage quantities for this purchase source in 2005/06 (0.79 kg per user vs. 0.89 kg in 2001/02) have resulted in a lesser increase in estimated total quantities (18%). Readers should also refer to relevant standard error estimates contained in Appendix A.

Other key findings in relation to prawns/shrimp usage (from Section 5 of the report) include:-

Reasons for Purchasing Prawns (as Bait/Berley) from a Seafood Supplier were assessed for respondents reporting any usage for the acquisition source ‘sold as seafood’. In the 2006 survey, *Convenience/access issues* emerged as the predominant reason (the main reason for 47% of respondents), with *Freshness/quality* the next most popular (34%), followed by *Price* (15%). By contrast, in the 2002 Survey *Freshness/quality* was reported as the main reason by 42% of respondents, with *Convenience/access issues* (36%) and *Price* (14%). Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), significant differences have emerged for increased reporting of *Convenience/access issues*;

Methods Used to Bait the Hook with Prawns during line fishing were assessed among all prawn/shrimp users. In both the 2006 and 2002 surveys, the rankings of the top three methods did not change: *Whole (dead)* emerged as the predominant method (the main method for 57% and 65% of respondents, respectively), followed by *With the head off (some shell and flesh used)* (19% in each survey) and *Peeled (no head or shell)* (17% and 8% respectively). Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), significant differences have emerged for increased reporting of *Peeled (no head or shell)*. However, usage form should not be confused with purchase form (see discussion below);

Purchase Forms of Prawns were assessed for quantities reported for each purchase source. In both the 2006 and 2002 surveys, the vast majority of prawns/shrimp ‘sold as bait’ referred to *Pre-packaged frozen (whole)* prawns (87% and 82%, respectively), with *Loose/unpackaged (whole)* prawns dominating the remainder (13% and 17%). For prawns ‘sold as seafood’, *Whole (dead)* prawns (sold loose/unpackaged) accounted for the vast majority in both surveys (89% and 96%, respectively). The remainder referred to *With the head off* (5% and 4%) and *Shelled (incl. tail fans on)* (6% and 0%). Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test), no significant differences have emerged in the above results at the national level and in many cases, the small sub-samples involved have precluded this analysis (e.g. for *Shelled* prawns ‘sold as seafood’) – see discussion in Section 5.3, Tables 14 and 15;

Size Preferences for Bait Prawns were assessed, but only for purchase forms where an effective choice of size might exist, namely *Loose/unpackaged whole* prawns, either ‘sold as seafood’ or ‘sold as bait’ (i.e. not *pre-packaged frozen* bait prawns). For each purchase source, respondents were asked to assign proportions of reported quantities to four size ranges. Results on a total purchase source basis for the 2006 and 2002 surveys are as follows: *Less than 5cm* (29% and 17%, respectively); *5-9cm* (68% and 76%); *9-13cm* (3% and 7%); and *More than 13cm* (0% in both surveys). Note: the small sub samples involved in the above results have precluded any comparative analysis;

Potentially Imported Prawns used as Bait/Berley were also assessed through analysis of the various purchase forms and size groups of prawns/shrimp ‘sold as seafood’. Due to size-based import restrictions, all reported quantities of whole uncooked prawns below the 13cm limit (discussed above) were routinely classified as not potentially imported. All others were

classified as potentially imported, namely any whole prawns above the 13cm size limit (none was reported in either survey) and the various other purchase forms (head off, shelled etc). In the 2006 survey, 11% of the estimated 59.6 tonnes of 'sold as seafood' prawns (see Table C earlier) emerged as potentially imported. In the 2002 survey, 4% of the 50.5 tonnes for the 'repeat' fisher group was assessed as potentially imported (see further details in Section 5.4, Tables 18a and b). Note: for all fishers in 2002, 13% of the 75.7 tonnes was assessed as potentially imported (see Appendix B, Table 18c). The small sub samples involved in the above results have precluded any comparative analysis.

Also, in specific additional questioning for the 2006 survey, all respondents reporting usage of 'sold as seafood' prawns were asked whether any of their purchases referred to imported product. Among the small number reporting any potentially imported purchase forms (a total of seven respondents), one cited imported product, two reported local product only and four were 'unsure' (see Section 5.4, Table 19).

Section 6 of the report contains a detailed analysis of ***Behaviour Change*** for the 'repeat' fisher group, including extensive assessment of the reasons for such change. In addition to changes in usage of specific bait types, purchase sources of prawns etc (see Tables A, B and C earlier), several other aspects of recreational fishing were assessed. For changes in the levels of fishing effort (days fished) between the two surveys, the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), revealed no significance difference (see Section 6.3, Table 22). Wholesale changes in specific fishing methods are assessed in Table D below.

Summary Table D: Fishing Methods used in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ and Changes² since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		'In-scope' Bait (aquatic animals)	'Other' Bait (bread, meat etc)	Lures, Flies, Jigs
Yes	No.	871001	251634	581989
	%	91.3%	26.4%	61.0%
No	No.	83481	702848	372493
	%	8.7%	73.6%	39.0%
Total ¹	No.	954482	954482	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Increase/Decrease² in 2005/6 ...</i>				
(a) No. of Users (+/-)	No.	46119	-75622	50802
(b) Prop'n of 2001/02	%	5.6%	-23.1%	9.6%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers (follow-up survey respondents)

² Change is expressed as (a) the increase/decrease in no. of users of that fishing method compared with the 2002 survey and (b) the proportion of change (%) based on 2001/02 user estimates

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test), significant differences have emerged in the above table for increased numbers using 'in-scope' bait (as reported earlier) and lures/flys/jigs, with decreased numbers using 'other' bait (bread, meat etc). However, when the results to additional questioning in terms of proportions of fishing time spent using 'in-scope' bait vs. lures are included, no significant differences emerge. Overall, 21% of 'repeat' fishers were assessed as fishing *more* with bait in 2005/06, 19% were assessed as fishing *less*, 23% *about the same* – with the remainder (37%) ineligible for this assessment, e.g. those using only lures in both periods (see further details in Sections 6.4 and 6.5).

Section 7 of the report contains an **Awareness Assessment** for the ‘repeat’ fisher group, in terms of (i) national requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products (imported vs. local, country of origin) and (ii) any advice not to use imported uncooked prawns/shrimp as bait/berley. (Note: national labelling requirements were introduced by *FSANZ* after the time of the 2002 survey). By design, this questioning was positioned at the end of the survey to avoid any corruptive influences in behavioural assessment and importantly, the 2002 survey contained no mention or discussion of these issues. The results to these assessments are contained in Summary Table E below.

Summary Table E: Awareness Assessments - Imported Seafood Products - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹

ANY AWARENESS ...	National Labelling Requirements for Seafood Products ...		Any Advice <u>Not</u> to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley
	Imported vs. Local (all products)	Country of Origin (unpackaged products)	
Full awareness	No.	481476	319724
	%	50.4%	33.5%
Some awareness ²	No.	87007	99661
	%	9.1%	10.4%
No awareness	No.	385999	535098
	%	40.4%	56.1%
Total ¹	No.	954482	954482
	%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers (follow-up survey respondents)

² For product labelling assessments, this includes cases where respondents reported awareness of the existence of such labelling, but not the requirement ("just seen in shops")

Further details of these assessments are contained in Sections 7.2 and 7.3, where substantially different awareness levels emerge by state of residence – with the highest levels consistently reported in Queensland. Also, further analysis of awareness levels for the imported prawn/disease risk issue reveal that, whereas a minority of ‘repeat’ fishers claim at least some awareness (14.4% in Table E above), similarly low levels of awareness emerge among prawn users generally (16%) and ‘sold as seafood’ prawn users (18%). Note: immediately following this question sequence, interviewers routinely explained to all respondents (at varying levels of detail, depending on respondent awareness) the various reasons/factors associated with the disease risk issue and imported prawns.

As a final question in the 2006 survey, all respondents were asked if they would be available for a future follow-up survey, if required. Before asking this question, interviewers explained that while no such survey was currently planned, it might occur within the next 12 months. In response, 96% indicated some availability (94% *yes*, 4% *no* and 2% *unsure*), with the vast majority of those declining (or unsure) referring to cases where the respondent reported no recreational fishing in the 2006 survey and no likelihood of any fishing in the future. Among the ‘repeat’ fisher group, 99% availability was achieved and these results provide an important further indicator of the overall success of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page
1	INTRODUCTION			1
1.1	Background (the 2002 Survey)	1
1.2	The 2006 Follow-up Survey	2
1.3	Study Objectives	2
1.4	Report Format and Important Notes to the Reader	3
1.5	Acknowledgements	5
2	SURVEY SCOPE AND KEY DEFINITIONS			6
2.1	Preamble	6
2.2	Scope	6
2.2.1	<i>Geographic Scope</i>	6
2.2.2	<i>Dwellings and Households in Scope</i>	6
2.2.3	<i>Persons in Scope</i>	6
2.2.4	<i>Temporal Scope</i>	7
2.2.5	<i>Fishing Activities in Scope</i>	8
2.2.6	<i>Bait Species in Scope</i>	8
2.3	Other Key Survey Definitions	9
2.3.1	<i>Acquisition Sources</i>	9
2.3.2	<i>Forms of Purchase and Usage</i>	10
2.3.3	<i>Quantities Used</i>	11
2.3.4	<i>Location, Water Body Type and Season of Usage</i>	11
3	SURVEY METHODOLOGY			12
3.1	Survey Design	12
3.1.1	<i>Overview of Survey</i>	12
3.1.2	<i>Recall Bias and Other Survey Design Issues</i>	14
3.1.3	<i>Output Specifications</i>	14
3.1.4	<i>Questionnaire Design and Pilot-Testing</i>	15
3.2	Sampling	15
3.3	Enumeration and Response	17
3.4	Data Editing and Processing	19
3.5	Data Imputation	19
3.5.1	<i>Bait Quantities – Numbers Reported</i>	20
3.5.2	<i>Bait Quantities – Pack Sizes Unknown</i>	20
3.5.3	<i>Bait Quantities – Usage by Region, Water Body Type & Season</i>	20
3.6	Data Expansion and Adjustment	21
3.6.1	<i>Population Benchmarks and Integrated Weighting</i>	22
3.6.2	<i>Adjustments for Non-response</i>	22
3.6.3	<i>Adjustments for Sub-sampling of Fishers within Households</i>	23
3.6.4	<i>Adjustments for Recall Bias</i>	24

continued/.....

3.7	Analysis and Reporting	25
3.7.1	<i>Analysis and Data Outputs</i>	25
3.7.2	<i>Error Estimation</i>	25
3.7.3	<i>Comparative Analysis</i>	30
3.8	Bait Supplier Survey	34
4	RESULTS: RECREATIONAL FISHING AND BAIT USAGE			35
4.1	Recreational Fishing Participation	35
4.2	Bait Usage (Aquatic Animals)	36
5	RESULTS: PRAWNS/SHRIMP USED AS BAIT/BERLEY			41
5.1	Introduction	41
5.2	Results on a Fisher Base	41
5.3	Quantities	48
5.4	Potentially Imported Prawns/Shrimp	58
6	RESULTS: BEHAVIOUR CHANGE ASSESSMENTS (2006 VS. 2002)			63
6.1	Introduction	63
6.2	Reasons for No Recreational Fishing in Previous 12 Months (2005/06)			63
6.3	Changes in Levels of Recreational Fishing Effort – ‘Repeat’ Fishers			67
6.4	Changes in Usage of ‘In-scope’ Bait, Other Bait and Lures/Flys/etc			72
6.5	Changes in Proportion of Fishing Time Using Bait vs Lures/etc			81
6.6	Changes in Usage of Specific ‘In-scope’ Bait Types (1-10)			86
6.7	Changes in Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Acquisition Source			106
7	RESULTS: AWARENESS ASSESSMENT – IMPORTED SEAFOOD PRODUCTS			115
7.1	Introduction	115
7.2	Awareness of Requirements for Point-of-Sale Labelling of Seafood Products	115
7.3	Awareness of Any Advice <u>Not</u> to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley	116
7.4	Availability for a Future Follow-up Survey (if required)			120
8	REFERENCES			122
APPENDICES:				
A	STANDARD ERROR TABLES			123
B	DATA TABLES FROM THE 2002 SURVEY			184

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background (the 2002 Survey)

In early 2001, Biosecurity Australia identified specific information needs in relation to bait and berley usage by recreational fishers in Australia. This information was required to address a range of policy issues, including a major *Import Risk Analysis* (IRA) for prawns. An understanding of usage patterns for other bait species was also required for future assessment work. In December 2001, Kewagama Research was commissioned to design and conduct to meet these data needs.

From the outset, it was evident that an innovative research design would be required to address the various objectives and constraints of the project. Timing constraints alone precluded the use of an ‘ideal’ data collection method (viz, a 12 month diary survey) and a multi-faceted ‘recall’ survey of the population was ultimately employed. By design, an integral component of the survey instrument involved the use of benchmark information from a major national survey of recreational fishing (NRIFS, Henry and Lyle 2003) primarily to calibrate for non-response and recall bias. Other benchmarking information was also employed, e.g. ABS population estimates (see later discussion in Section 3).

After extensive development and pilot-testing work, the *National Survey of Bait and Berley Use by Recreational Fishers* was conducted during mid 2002 using a telephone survey method at a stratified random sample of 8,000 households across Australia. Excellent response rates were achieved (85%, after exclusion of ‘sample loss’ e.g. disconnected phone numbers) and detailed interviews were conducted with some 5,686 households to assess participation in recreational fishing, bait usage etc. in the previous 12 months. Among these, 1,371 households were identified as recreational fishing households, with the vast majority (1,123) reporting some ‘in-scope’ bait usage (i.e. aquatic animals) in the reference period. For this latter group, a detailed further interview was conducted with one randomly-selected bait user (aged 5 years or more) from each household, to determine bait usage over the previous 12 months. Results from the survey were expanded to resident population estimates and presented in a comprehensive report to Biosecurity Australia in December 2002 (AFFA 2002).

Information from the survey has been used by Biosecurity Australia in development of the Prawn IRA and particularly, in terms of the levels of bait/berley usage (and estimated quantities) of un-cooked prawns/shrimp that were ‘sold as seafood’. Despite import restrictions on ‘small’ whole uncooked prawns (i.e. below 15 grams, or approx. 13 cm in length), other potentially imported prawn products could be sourced by fishers from seafood suppliers. The 2002 survey detected some usage of ‘sold as seafood’ prawns/shrimp, although the vast majority was assessed as local product (principally whole uncooked prawns below 13cm in length) and low levels of potentially imported prawns emerged (see later discussion in Section 5.4). Note: at that time, mandatory point-of-sale labelling of imported vs. local products had not been introduced (by *FSANZ*) and any questioning of survey respondents in this regard was not considered worthwhile.

Since the time of the 2002 survey, substantially larger quantities of prawn/shrimp products have consistently been imported into Australia – leading to concerns that increased availability and relatively low prices may have resulted in increased usage of imported prawn products by recreational fishers.

1.2 The 2006 Follow-up Survey

In July 2006, after exploring various options to quantify any such changes, Biosecurity Australia commissioned Kewagama Research to conduct a 'follow-up' survey of original respondents (recreational fishers) from the 2002 Bait/Berley Survey. Note: as a final question in the 2002 study, all fishing households were asked if they would be available for a future 'follow-up' survey of some kind, if required. In response, a very high proportion of these households (96%) indicated at least some availability, with only 4% declining.

As four years had elapsed since the 2002 survey, initially there were concerns as to the proportion of respondents who might ultimately be re-contacted (change of address, telephone phone numbers etc). However, preliminary investigations of 'white pages' listings revealed that around two-thirds of these households either had the same telephone number/address or were adequately identifiable at some new number/address.

Other concerns also emerged in terms of restricting the scope of the Follow-up Survey to recreational fishing households (as opposed to all households) from the 2002 survey. Whereas, inclusion of all households would have provided enhanced coverage of fishers (namely, previous non-fishers who may have since taken up the sport), cost-benefit analysis clearly contra-indicated this approach, due to the very large number of additional interviews required. This issue, along with implications for 'representation' are further discussed in Sections 1.4, 2 and 3.

1.3 Study Objectives

Objectives for the Follow-up Survey are summarised below:-

- (i) for those respondents from the 2002 survey identified as recreational fishers and available for a follow-up survey, to optimise the number of fully-responding interviews in the 2006 Follow-up Survey and therefore optimise representation of the population sub-groups involved;
- (ii) to estimate the numbers/proportions that Follow-up Survey respondents represent of the 2002 resident population of Australia (aged 5 years or more) who went recreational fishing in both survey periods (i.e. in the 12 months prior to both the 2002 and 2006 studies) – referred to in this report as 'repeat fishers';
- (iii) to estimate the numbers/proportions of 'repeat fishers' using 'aquatic animals' as bait/berley in the most recent 12 months, for 14 different bait types (as per the 2002 survey) and for prawns/shrimp (only), to estimate the quantities used in that time for a range of key variables such as acquisition source, purchase form, location and season of usage. Note: additional questioning (to the 2002 survey) was included to assess usage/quantities of prawns/shrimp that were imported vs. local (among 'sold as seafood' users);
- (iv) to identify any significant behavioural changes in bait usage patterns/etc of 'repeat fishers', together with analysis of reported reasons for such change;

- (v) to assess awareness levels of ‘repeat fishers’ of requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products as imported vs. local and importantly, in terms of any recall of advice not to use imported uncooked prawns/shrimp as bait or berley.

Note: detailed data elements and survey definitions are further discussed in Section 2.

1.4 Report Format and Important Notes to the Reader

The remainder of this report comprises a detailed discussion of study scope and definitions (Section 2), other methodological issues (Section 3), with substantive survey results in Sections 4 through 7. By design, this report very much aligns with the reporting structure used for the 2002 survey (AFFA 2002), to assist in review/comparison of the two studies. In fact, up to Section 5, the various sections, sub-sections and data tables (incl. their numbering) are virtually identical to the 2002 report. Other aspects for consideration by readers are:-

- in accordance with the agreed reporting structure, the survey results are presented without interpretation or commentary – unless such information refers to important definitions or methodological issues;
- the study findings are presented as detailed tabulations of ‘expanded’ data – i.e. estimates of the total resident population as at 2002 (persons aged 5 years or more – based on ABS data) or estimated total quantities of bait used (kgs) by the populations sub-groups concerned. In the footnotes below each table, the relevant ‘Table base’ is defined;
- IMPORTANTLY however, the restricted scope of the study (i.e. available, re-contactable fishers from the 2002 survey) necessitates care in interpreting these results. Put simply, the results are only representative of the population sub-groups concerned and not the total population (see further discussion in Sections 2, 3 and 4.1);
- below each estimate, proportions are routinely expressed as column percentages (*italicised*);
- due to rounding, some row and column totals for population/quantity estimates may not add precisely (single integer differences only);
- as a general rule, data tabulations are disaggregated by state/territory, as the ‘column variable’ – with state/territory of residence routinely applied to person-based estimates and state/territory of usage for prawn/shrimp quantities. Also, in all analysis/reporting, NSW and ACT results have been combined in a single analysis cell. As the ACT is geographically contained within NSW, behavioural homogeneity has been assumed;
- the ‘row variable’ represents the key analysis variable for the table. In Tables 1 through 19, the data are routinely disaggregated for each answer category in the survey questionnaire. While this has resulted in multiple rows of ‘zero data’ in several tables (e.g. un-reported purchase forms for prawns in Table 14a), this approach has been employed to clearly describe the classifications used in the survey. However, in Tables 20 through 61 (analysis of behaviour change), the large number of potential ‘reasons’ codes has precluded this approach;

- in terms of ‘non-sample error’ (e.g. non-response and reporting biases), optimum data quality has been achieved through a range of measures/outcomes in the study, e.g. the very high response rates achieved (92% nationally). Whereas population weights/expansion factors have generally been replicated from the 2002 survey, readers are referred to Section 3 for more detailed discussion of this issue and also in terms of specific data calibration methods employed to account for ‘recall bias’ in prawn quantity estimation;
- in any sample survey, estimate precision is also affected by ‘sample error’ – due to the fact that sampling was employed, as opposed to a total enumeration (or census) of the population concerned. To account for this, appropriate error tolerances have been calculated for all substantive data tabulations and presented as Relative Standard Errors (RSE) in Appendix A. Where small sub-samples exist, the error levels can be quite large and routinely, for cell sizes of less than 5 respondents the RSE not been calculated/ reported (and shown as ‘n/a’ – see further discussion in Appendix A). Readers should therefore refer to (and apply) this information when interpreting the study results;
- other statistical testing has also been applied to assess significance in behaviour changes (bait usage etc) between the 2002 and 2006 surveys. These assessments are reported in the text after relevant tables in Sections 4, 5 and 6. Again, minimum cell sizes have been employed, with significant differences only being assessed where at least 20 respondents exist in the ‘change group/cell’ concerned (see further discussion in Sections 3.7.3 and 4). Again, readers should refer to (and apply) these significance assessments when interpreting the study results;
- further to this, the levels of disaggregation in the data tabulations vary in accordance with the strength of the underlying data. For the more common occurrences, quite extensive disaggregation/tabulations have been included. For the less common, few tables are provided and in some cases, the raw (i.e. un-expanded) survey data are discussed in the text of the report to provide a qualitative perspective;
- also, ‘zero’ estimates commonly occur in the disaggregation cells of the data tables. Importantly, this is not to suggest that no such occurrence exists in the population overall – rather, that none was reported within the detection limits of the survey sample. Therefore, readers should routinely interpret such results as ‘nil or negligible’;
- the information obtained through the survey conforms with stated output requirements for the project. While a comprehensive range of data tabulations has been included in this report, additional information can be obtained from the survey database. The computer database is an output requirement of the study and subject to error tolerances, considerable further interrogation may be undertaken.

Note: any enquiries regarding this report may be referred to the author: Laurie West, Managing Director, Kewagama Research (see title page for contact details).

1.5 Acknowledgements

As for the previous study, the 2006 Follow-up Survey has been a most successful undertaking. In achieving this outcome, the following contributions are acknowledged:-

- ***Biosecurity Australia Liaison Staff***: in particular, Dr. Geoff Grossel and Dr. Robert Heard, for their subject-matter expertise, professionalism and support throughout the project – and for once again, enduring the complexity and tedium of the survey design and analysis processes;
- ***Consultant Staff and Technical Advisors*** : Cheryl Munro (Assist. Project Manager, Kewagama Research), Gerry Baerken (IT Consultant, GBS Software) and Dale Wallace (Statistician, ABS Canberra) for expert statistical advice – in significance testing for behaviour change assessments and standard error calculations. Also, Dr. Jeremy Lyle and Dennis Reid for advice and review of the study;
- ***Survey Interviewers***: two interviewers (Shirley Munro and Robyn Parry) completed all 873 interviews for the survey – both had a major interviewing involvement in the 2002 survey and assisted in the development of this study. Given the highly complex nature of the questionnaire and the fact that specific respondents were required to be interviewed personally in most cases, the 92% response rate achieved is clear evidence of their skill and tenacity. While interviewer performance can be measured in several ways (e.g. response rates), other less-tangible factors are equally important and once again, the commitment of our interviewers to this quite complex project is very much appreciated;
- ***Bait Suppliers***: as for the 2002 survey, major bait suppliers around Australia were contacted to obtain information to assist in coding and analysis of the survey (principally to establish *pack size* information for bait prawns – see further discussion in Section 3.8). Information was also provided in terms of time-series data for bait prawns sales, for general trend assessment. The co-operation of these businesses is greatly appreciated;
- Finally, our thanks are extended to the many hundreds of people who responded to the Follow-up Survey – and in particular, the more avid fishers for whom, the survey inherently required more of their time.

2 SURVEY SCOPE AND KEY DEFINITIONS

2.1 Preamble

In determining the scope and definitions for the survey, appropriate comparability was required with the 2002 Bait/Berley Survey – which in turn, was developed to align with relevant benchmarking sources at the time (e.g. ABS population data and NRIFS). The information contained in this section addresses scope and definitions of broad relevance to the 2006 study, together with comparable information for the 2002 survey, where appropriate. Definitions of a more isolated/issue-specific nature are discussed in relevant areas in the remainder of the report. Also, where appropriate, certain survey design and methodology issues are discussed in this section, although Section 3 primarily addresses these matters.

2.2 Scope

2.2.1 Geographic Scope

For both the 2002 and 2006 surveys, identical geographic scope definitions were applied:-

In terms of residency, the sampling universe was confined to the eight states and territories of Australia. External territories were excluded (e.g. Christmas and Cocos/Keeling Islands).

For fishing activity, geographic scope was defined as the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

2.2.2 Dwellings and Households in Scope

For the 2002 survey, *Private dwellings* (ABS definition) were included. *Non-private dwellings* (NPD's – e.g. hotels, nursing homes, gaols etc.) were excluded. At that time, around 98% of Australian residents resided in private dwellings (ABS 1996).

For the 2006 Follow-up Survey, eligible households were defined as those fully-responding households from the 2002 survey:-

(i) with one or more member (aged 5 years or more), reporting some recreational fishing activity in the previous 12 months (2001/02), regardless of the type of fishing undertaken, bait usage or not; and

(ii) indicated some availability for a future follow-up survey, if required; and

(iii) were ultimately assessed as being 're-contactable' – either at the original telephone number or address, or were 'adequately' identifiable at some new number/address.

2.2.3 Persons in Scope

For the 2002 survey, 'Persons in Scope' were defined as follows:-

Residency Status: Australian residents only were included (i.e. overseas visitors were excluded – ABS definition).

Age Criteria: for general survey purposes (e.g. household size and demographic profiling), respondents of all ages were included. However, for substantive survey data (fishing activity, bait usage etc) an age criterion of 5 years or more at the time of interview was applied. In the NRIFS and other surveys, this has been determined as the absolute minimum age at which a child might undertake effective recreational fishing activity.

In the 2002 survey, 1,371 households were identified as recreational fishing households, of which 1,123 were classified as ‘in-scope’ bait users. In this latter group, a detailed further interview about bait usage was conducted with one randomly selected bait user from each household. For purposes of the 2006 Follow-up Survey, these specific respondents (only) were eligible for re-interview.

However, for those 248 non-bait using fisher households in the 2002 survey (e.g. lure users only), no random selections of respondents within these households (or further interviews) were conducted at the time. Therefore prior to the 2006 survey, random selection of one recreational fisher from each such household was undertaken to mirror the selection process for the bait-using households in 2002. Accordingly, a further 248 specific respondents were identified as eligible for re-interview.

In total, these 1,371 specific respondents formed the potential gross sample for the Follow-up Survey. After availability for follow-up (96%) and current ‘white pages’ listings (67%) were considered/applied, an ultimate sample of 873 such respondents was achieved – see further discussion in Section 3.2

2.2.4 *Temporal Scope*

For the 2002 survey, Temporal Scope was defined as follows:-

For many purposes, a ‘time of interview’ definition was necessarily applied in the survey (e.g. age criterion, residency status).

However, for behavioural assessment (e.g. recreational fishing, bait usage), a reference period of ‘the previous 12 months’ was applied - 1 May 2001 to 30 April, 2002. This reference period was chosen to align with the Diary Survey from the NRFS (May 2000 to April 2001). It also facilitated respondent ‘recall’ for the study, by avoiding any ‘fragmentation’ of peak fishing seasons within the reference period. For example, in the southern states, the Easter period (April) represents the end of warmer/peak season fishing activity – and for many, the end of all fishing until the next summer.

Further to this, behavioural information was collected in the survey on the basis of two seasons – ‘winter’ (the colder months – May to October 01) and ‘summer’ (the warmer months – November 01 to April 02).

For the 2006 Follow-up Survey, the timing of the survey’s enumeration required a recall period for behavioural assessment of 1 August 2005 to 31 July 2006 – two months later than for the 2002 survey, but still avoiding ‘fragmentation’ of peak fishing periods.

Seasonal definitions for ‘winter’ and ‘summer’ remained the same as for the 2002 survey (May to October and November to April, respectively). Although the 2005/06 ‘winter’ season was

unavoidably split (August – October 2005 and May – July 2006), this was readily dealt with in questionnaire design and did not present any difficulties for respondents or interviewers.

2.2.5 Fishing Activities in Scope

Definitions of fishing activities were identical for the both the 2002 and 2006 surveys:-

Recreational fishing was defined as any capture or attempted capture of aquatic animals (finfish, crabs, prawns etc. – not amphibians, mammals, reptiles, insects etc) in Australian waters (marine or freshwater) in the survey reference period – other than for commercial fishing purposes. Note: any recreational fishing activity by commercial fishers was included in the scope of the study. This definition also embraces the range of recreational harvesting methods, including line fishing, active or passive nets/traps, spear-fishing and diving/hand-collecting.

Bait/berley usage was defined as any recreational fishing using uncooked* aquatic animals (or parts thereof) as bait or berley (an attractant). Other bait/berley types such as bread, meat, cheese were excluded. Therefore, recreational fishers only using ‘non-bait/berley’ methods (e.g. lures/fly fishing) or out-of-scope bait types in the reference period were excluded from this definition.

However, unlike for the 2002 survey, specific additional questioning was included in the 2006 survey to assess lure/fly/etc usage, ‘other bait usage’ (e.g. bread, meat) and ‘other fishing’ activities, where no bait/berley of any kind was used (e.g. prawning, spearfishing and diving/hand-collecting).

Note*: ‘uncooked’ was further defined as including smoked fish etc, on the basis that respondents could not reasonably be expected to delineate ‘cold vs. hot’ smoked products. Similarly, dried or salted products were defined as uncooked. On the other hand, all canned products were regarded as cooked and routinely excluded.

2.2.6 Bait Species in Scope

Definitions of Bait Species in Scope were identical for both the 2002 and 2006 surveys:-

Further to the above definition of bait/berley usage, in-scope bait types were defined using a hierarchical description of 14 generic bait types of interest to the study. This approach was employed to minimise any respondent confusion in terms of taxonomic definitions – whereby the following 14 bait types were read out by the interviewer and further defined, where necessary:-

Aquatic Animal Bait Type

- 1) Prawns or shrimp
- 2) Squid, cuttlefish or octopus
- 3) Crabs
- 4) Saltwater crayfish or lobster

Further Definitions

cherabin, pistol/snapping prawns etc
calamari
mud, sand, spanner, rock etc
scampi, bugs

continued/.....

5)	Freshwater crayfish	yabbies, redclaw, marron etc
6)	Abalone	high value shellfish, gut used as bait
7)	Other shellfish like oysters, mussels or pippis	cockles, scallops, clams
8)	Trout or Salmon	brown/rainbow trout; Atlantic/ chinook salmon; <u>not</u> Australian salmon
9)	Saltwater fish like pilchards, mullet, garfish or yellowtail	also scad or yakka
10)	Freshwater fish like perch, guppies, goldfish or carp	—
11)	Sharks or stingrays	any kind
12)	Worms	beach, sand, blood – <u>not</u> garden worms
13)	Saltwater yabbies or nippers	bass yabbies, pink nippers – pump used
14)	And our last category covers things like starfish, sea urchins and barnacles ... and anything else that lives in water	aquatic snails, sea cucumber, jelly fish, chitins, cunjevoi

The above 14 bait types were required for general assessment purposes in both the 2002 and 2006 surveys. In the 2002 survey, more detailed information (e.g. quantities used) was collected for Bait Types 1-10 and in the 2006 survey, this information was only collected for Prawns/Shrimp (Bait Type 1)

2.3 Other Key Survey Definitions

2.3.1 Acquisition Sources

In the 2002 survey, the following definitions were applied to each of the 10 key bait types. In the 2006 survey, the same definitions were applied, but to prawns/shrimp only:-

(i) 'Sold as Bait': refers to any in-scope bait type which was presented/sold as bait. While conventional bait suppliers (e.g. tackle shops, service stations), do not (or may not) sell product other than bait, the supplier type was by no means the key determinant here. Many seafood suppliers sell bait, often from a separate 'bait' freezer, but also in the form of scraps/waste material from processing

(ii) 'Sold as Seafood': refers to any in-scope bait type which was presented/sold as seafood, i.e. for human consumption. Valid suppliers include seafood retailers, restaurants and supermarkets

(iii) 'Personally Caught': refers to any in-scope bait type that was caught by the respondent (or a friend, relative etc) and includes any by-product usage e.g. after filleting, fish frames used for berley or crab traps.

The following definitions/procedures were also applied in relation to 'Acquisition Sources':-

- by design, quantities of bait used were only assessed in the survey for Acquisition Sources (i) and (ii) above. In relevant data tabulations, these are referred to as ‘Purchase Sources’, but also include any cases where no payment was made e.g. scraps provided free of charge
- to ensure that respondents clearly understood these definitions, considerable care was taken in the survey design, interviewer briefing and the interview itself, to avoid any ambiguity or misunderstanding. Importantly, this approach was consistently vindicated by interviewer feedback and data editing throughout the project.

2.3.2 *Forms of Purchase and Usage*

In the 2002 survey, specific classifications of purchase forms (e.g. live, whole dead etc) were developed for each of the 10 bait types and purchase sources within. Incidence and usage quantities for the previous 12 months were assessed on this basis.

For the 2006 survey, the classifications for prawns/shrimp were replicated from the 2002 study and the following extract from the 2002 survey report has been modified/included to describe the development of these classifications:-

Each classification reflects the possible forms in which the particular bait type could be purchased or acquired. While certain purchase forms were considered unlikely to be reported for given bait types (and subsequently confirmed in the results), this approach ensured completeness and exclusivity in the results. The purchase forms for each of the bait types/purchase sources are detailed in relevant data tabulations in Section 5 (in both the 2002 and 2006 reports).

However, central to the design philosophy of both the 2002 and 2006 surveys, is the concept that bait purchased in a particular form may or may not be used in that form. After extensive deliberation in the design phase of the 2002 survey, it was determined that (almost universally), the form purchased would be entirely used (or disposed of) in an aquatic environment. For example, even where whole prawns are purchased and routinely headed or peeled before baiting the hook, the waste material is invariably discarded into the water, with some anglers choosing to berley this way.

For product ‘Sold as Bait’, exceptions to this were considered rare (e.g. fish flesh used for pet food and heads/frames used for berley). Nevertheless, interviewers were alerted to this possibility. For product ‘Sold as Seafood’, exceptions were considered more likely – resulting in the routine inclusion of an additional ‘purchase form’ in each case, e.g. in Table 15 (in both the 2002 and 2006 reports) for Prawns/Shrimp ‘Sold as Seafood’, the final purchase form is ‘*Purchased whole/etc. but only heads/shells used*’ (i.e. the flesh may have been eaten). In this case, any reported usage quantities refer to the waste material only.

Note: the foregoing is not to be confused with cases where a fisher might purchase (say) a quantity of whole prawns and use a proportion of them (whole) for fishing and the remainder (whole) for some other purpose. As the form did not alter between purchase and usage, quantity estimation is the only issue here and these cases were readily dealt with in the interview process.

2.3.3 *Quantities Used*

In the 2002 survey, estimates of quantities used (kgs) were obtained for each of the 10 key bait types. In the 2006 survey, these data were collected for prawns/shrimp only and quantities used (kgs), purchase sources etc. refer to personal use by fishers in the process of recreational fishing for the survey reference period (excluding ‘Personally Caught’ bait/berley). As discussed above, usage extends to include ‘disposal’ of bait/waste material in an aquatic environment. Note: reported bait usage quantities have been expanded and calibrated (for ‘recall’ bias), in accordance with procedures detailed in Section 3.5 and 3.6.

2.3.4 *Region, Water Body Type and Season of Usage*

In the 2002 Survey, detailed disaggregations were provided of estimated quantities purchased/used for each of the 10 bait types and purchase sources, by state/territory, water body type and season. In the 2006 survey, this disaggregation capability is provided for prawns/shrimp only and reported in Table 17 (at the national level only). Due to the relatively small sub-samples involved, it was agreed that equivalent state/territory tables be excluded from the report, but be available in the database, if required.

Procedures for deriving these estimates are addressed in Section 3.5.3. In terms of definitions, state/territory is discussed in Sections 1.4 and 2.2.1 and season (‘winter’ vs. ‘summer’), in Section 2.2.4.

In terms of water body type, ‘Freshwater’ was defined as all freshwater impoundments, rivers etc, including the upper reaches of rivers which ultimately drain to the sea. ‘Saltwater’ was defined as all offshore and coastal waters, estuaries and tidal rivers (including brackish water). In both cases, respondent perception was ultimately relied upon, with more objective delineation regarded as impractical.

3 SURVEY METHODOLOGY

3.1 Survey Design

3.1.1 Overview of Survey

The Follow-up Survey was conducted as an Australia-wide confidential telephone survey in mid 2006 (mostly August/September), with a gross sample of 873 specific respondents (recreational fishers) from the 2002 survey. Unlike the 2002 survey, where the ‘primary sampling unit’ was an effectively ‘anonymous’ household (associated with a randomly selected telephone number), the 2006 survey required that specific individual respondents be re-interviewed – to comply with the ‘before and after’ assessment objective of the study. Under no circumstances was any substitution of respondents permitted.

In preliminary questions, each respondent was assessed in terms of any recreational fishing activity in the previous 12 months (1 August 2005 to 31 July 2006). For those reporting no activity, their main/other reasons (for not fishing) were assessed, along with availability for a future follow-up survey (if required) and the interview terminated.

For respondents reporting any recreational fishing activity in the previous 12 months (‘repeat fishers’), the remainder of the survey questionnaire applied. Personal interviews were routinely conducted (i.e. by speaking directly with the selected respondent), with ‘proxy’ interviews confined to appropriate cases only (e.g. a parent answering for a child).

In the remaining survey questions, many were simply replicated (in terms of question wording/answer categories etc) from the 2002 survey. By design however, other questions from the 2002 survey were not included (e.g. quantity assessments for bait types other than prawns) and several ‘new’ questions were included (e.g. behaviour change and awareness assessments). The survey questions are summarised below (largely in order of the questionnaire)-

- (i) for the previous 12 months, assessment of general ‘avidity’ (days fished) and any usage of: (a) in-scope bait/berley (aquatic animals); (b) ‘other’ bait (e.g. bread meat etc); (c) lures/flys etc; and (d) ‘other’ fishing (e.g. prawning, spearfishing, diving/hand-collecting);

For respondents reporting any in-scope bait/berley usage:-

- (ii) a detailed assessment of the number of days fished in the previous 12 months by state/territory, water body type and season (defined in Section 2.3.4). Note: ‘recall’ bias inherent to this questioning is further discussed in Section 3.1.2;
- (iii) assessment of any usage in the previous 12 months of 14 ‘aquatic animal’ bait types (see Section 2.2.6);

Detailed information for Prawns/Shrimp usage in the previous 12 months was then assessed in terms of:-

- (iv) areas of usage – state/territory, water body type and season (consistent with item (ii) above);

- (v) usage by Acquisition Source ('Sold as Bait', 'Sold as Seafood' and 'Personally Caught');
- (vi) if 'Sold as Seafood' reported, reasons for purchase (as opposed to from a bait supplier) and a new question sequence (i.e. not asked in the 2002 survey) – whether any purchases related to imported prawn products (yes, no, unsure);
- (vii) for each Purchase Source (i.e. 'Sold as Bait' and 'Sold as Seafood') and specific Purchase Forms within (e.g. live, whole dead etc), estimated quantities personally used in the previous 12 months. By design, quantities could be reported in kilograms, numbers or 'packets', but were ultimately coded as weights (see Section 3.5 for further details);
- (viii) for all prawn/shrimp users, assessment of preferred methods for baiting the hook (e.g. whole vs. shelled etc) and important size range information for selected purchase forms;

Note: the remainder of the questionnaire refers to new survey questions (i.e. not asked in the 2002 survey) and applied to all 'repeat fishers' (i.e. including non-bait users):-

- (ix) potential 'behaviour changes' between 2002 and 2006 were then assessed for each respondent (using 2002 database information 'mail-merged' onto the first page of each specific respondent's questionnaire) in terms of: (a) any significant increases/decrease in level of fishing effort (days fished); (b) 'wholesale' changes in usage of in-scope bait (i.e. used in 2002 and not in 2006 [or vice versa]), and also for 'other' bait and lures/fly/etc; (c) new/discontinued usage of specific Bait Types (1-10); and also for acquisition sources of prawns/shrimp (sold as bait, sold as seafood and personally caught). For each assessed behaviour change, main/other reasons were sought and recorded;
- (x) assessment of respondent awareness (classified as full awareness, some or none) in terms of three issues: (a) national requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products as imported or local; (b) additional requirements for 'country of origin' labelling for unpackaged seafood products; and (c) recall of any advice not to use imported uncooked prawns as bait or berley. In the latter case, those reporting at least some awareness were further questioned in terms of: what was advised (i.e. why imported prawns should not be used); where this information was first heard/seen (main/other source); and when this occurred.

Immediately after the above question sequence, interviewers routinely explained to all respondents (at varying levels of detail, depending on respondent awareness) the various reasons/factors associated with the disease risk/imported prawns issue. In addition to thorough interviewer briefing, substantial detail was provided within the text of the questionnaire to assist in this regard. Importantly, this educative component of the survey was positioned at the end of the survey to avoid any corruptive influences in behavioural data or awareness assessment. Moreover, throughout earlier parts of the interview (and indeed for the entire 2002 survey) interviewers were instructed to avoid any discussion of the disease risk/imported prawns issue.

The final question in the survey assessed availability of 'repeat fishers' for a future follow-up survey, if required.

As for the 2002 study, the above survey structure was never intended as a stand-alone design. Rather, information from a number of sources has been incorporated into the overall study – including, results from the 2002 survey, ABS data (population weights), NRIFS data (‘recall bias’ adjustments) and information from major bait suppliers (principally for unknown pack sizes for bait prawns). These and other design aspects are further discussed in the remainder of Section 3.

3.1.2 *Recall Bias and Other Survey Design Issues*

As for the 2002 survey, ‘recall bias’ was identified a major issue for reporting precision in the Follow-up Survey. Recall or memory bias is an important factor in behavioural assessment generally – and especially in recreational fishing surveys, where significant over-estimates of fishing effort and catch have been assessed (by factors of double and more). In the 2002 survey report, this issue was exhaustively addressed and interested readers are referred to Sections 3.1.2 and 3.6.4 of that report (AFFA 2002).

The adjustment factors for recall bias that were developed and applied in the 2002 Survey have also been employed in the Follow-up Survey and therefore provide direct comparability between the two surveys for the population sub-group concerned (‘repeat fishers’). This issue is further discussed in Section 3.6.4 of this report.

The use of a 12 month recall period for behavioural assessment was employed (again to maintain comparability with the 2002 survey) on the basis that the above effects could be accounted for (i.e. measured and calibrated) and that various comparability links with secondary datasets (2002 survey, ABS and NRIFS data) would be maintained. Note: where appropriate, many questions in the 2006 survey were effectively replicated from the 2002 survey.

3.1.3 *Output Specifications*

At the commencement of a research project, the routine practice of this company is to develop and prioritise detailed output specifications, in conjunction with client liaison staff. As an important first step in the design (and to avoid being ‘technique driven’), this process should ideally be completed before the survey methodology is determined. In some previous projects, this approach has resulted in a totally different methodology from initial expectations. Despite the constraints of an established design, output specifications for the survey were developed to achieve optimum data quality and utility – within the obvious limits of a recall survey covering a 12 month period.

In this regard, respondent comprehension and burden were (again) major considerations. While the Follow-up Survey collected substantially less behavioural data than the 2002 survey, the inclusion of additional questioning for behaviour change and awareness assessment somewhat offset this reduction. However, in reviewing the various data elements and potential maximum length of the interview, no concerns emerged in terms of respondent comprehension or burden. Nevertheless, our usual design philosophy was applied, namely to seek data at a level of detail/resolution that could consistently be provided by all respondents.

Output specifications for the project (covering all survey scope, data elements/definitions and disaggregation requirements) were detailed in a major document jointly developed by consultant and client staff (20 July, 2006). This information is primarily discussed in Section 2 earlier.

3.1.4 Questionnaire Design and Pilot-Testing

The above output specifications formed a ‘blue-print’ for questionnaire design and after several drafts, the questionnaire was finalised on 21 August 2006. Due to the many similarities with the 2002 survey (which underwent substantial field testing), many aspects of the questionnaire did not require testing at all.

However, for new questionnaire sequences, formal testing could only be conducted for the awareness assessment section – i.e. without ‘wasting’ interviews on actual survey respondents, no viable sample was available to test the behaviour change questions.

As the only practical alternative, less formal testing of the questionnaire was conducted by consultant staff and the two interviewers for the Follow-up Survey – by synthesising various interview scenarios and thorough checking of sequencing logic, question ambiguity etc. Despite the complexity of the ultimate questionnaire (especially in the ‘sequence guides’ for behaviour change assessment), the Follow-up Survey was successfully completed – as evidenced by the 92% response rate (and 99% availability among ‘repeat fishers’ for any further follow-up survey, see Section 7.4)

Note: copies of the final questionnaire document have been provided to Biosecurity Australia, along with appropriate briefing of liaison staff in terms of interviewing conventions, sequencing instructions etc. Interested readers requiring such information may contact the author (Laurie West – see title page for contact details).

3.2 Sampling

In the 2002 survey, the sample design comprised a two-stage cluster sample, where the household represented the primary sampling unit and recreational fishers within the household, the secondary unit. Complete details of relevant sampling procedures are contained in Section 3.2 of the 2002 Survey Report (AFFA 2002).

For purposes of the 2006 Follow-up Survey, the only ‘sampling’ (as such) refers to the retention of one randomly-selected bait-user from each of the 1,123 bait-using households from the 2002 – together with equivalent random selection of one recreational fisher from each of 248 non-bait using households from 2002. This issue is also discussed in Sections 2.2.3 and 3.6.3.

These 1,371 specific respondents from these households therefore formed the potential gross sample for the 2006 survey. However, after availability for a future follow-up survey was considered (as assessed in the 2002 Survey), the size of this potential sample decreased somewhat, as shown in Table 1 overleaf.

Table 1: Follow-up Survey Availability - All Recreational Fishing Households¹ from the 2002 Survey² by State/Territory of Residence

AVAILABILITY FOR FOLLOW-UP		NSW/ACT ³	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No. %	316 91.9%	201 92.2%	221 96.1%	166 94.9%	160 88.9%	101 80.2%	88 89.8%	1253 91.4%
No	No. %	14 4.1%	7 3.2%	4 1.7%	4 2.3%	14 7.8%	12 9.5%	9 9.2%	64 4.7%
Unsure	No. %	14 4.1%	10 4.6%	5 2.2%	5 2.9%	6 3.3%	13 10.3%	1 1.0%	54 3.9%
Total²	No. %	344 100%	218 100%	230 100%	175 100%	180 100%	126 100%	98 100%	1371 100%

Notes:

¹ Recreational fishing is defined as any attempted harvesting of aquatic organisms for non-commercial purposes

² Table base: all fully responding recreational fishing households from the 2002 Survey ('raw' data basis)

³ For sampling/analysis purposes, the ACT is combined with NSW

Also, detailed study definitions and methodologies are contained in Sections 2 and 3

Despite the four years since the 2002 survey, a substantial majority of eligible respondents/households retained the same telephone number/address or were adequately identifiable at some new number/address, as revealed by automated 'White Pages' checking by *Sensis*. However, a significant minority were returned as inadequate matches – an apparently typical mobility level, given the elapsed time. Further internet-based checking of these latter cases was undertaken by consultant staff in an attempt to improve the coverage/representation of the Follow-up Survey. Although this produced some success (principally among the more uncommon surnames), a necessarily conservative approach was employed due to privacy concerns. The results of this work are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Current 'White Pages' Telephone Listing - Available Recreational Fishers/Households¹ from the 2002 Survey by State/Territory of Residence

CURRENT TELEPHONE LISTING		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No. %	237 71.8%	150 71.1%	140 61.9%	122 71.3%	96 57.8%	82 71.9%	46 51.7%	873 66.8%
No	No. %	93 28.2%	61 28.9%	86 38.1%	49 28.7%	70 42.2%	32 28.1%	43 48.3%	434 33.2%
Total¹	No. %	330 100%	211 100%	226 100%	171 100%	166 100%	114 100%	89 100%	1307 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: fully responding recreational fishers/households from the 2002 Survey, with some availability for a follow-up survey (i.e. 'Yes' or 'Unsure' from Table 1)

Also, detailed study definitions and methodologies are contained in Sections 2 and 3

Therefore, the ultimate sample for the 2006 Follow-up Survey comprised 873 specific respondents across Australia.

3.3 Enumeration and Response

Two highly-skilled interviewers based in NSW and QLD conducted the survey. Both have extensive experience in recreational fishing surveys (including the 2002 Bait/Berley Survey and the NRIFS) and were directly involved in the development of the 2006 survey questionnaire. Interviewer training for the survey comprised one-to-one telephone briefing sessions, together with detailed written instructions (scope, definitions etc). Due to the complexity of the questionnaire, the first actual interviews were conducted with respondents assessed as being 'simpler' cases, based on 2002 database information (e.g. low avidity, few bait types, etc). This enabled the interviewers to progressively gain familiarity/fluency with the questions and sequencing, before having to deal with the more complex interviews (high avidity, many bait types, changes in targets/bait types etc).

Commencing in late August 2006, the vast majority of interviews were completed during September, with a small number being finalised in early October (e.g. respondents returning from extended trips). Throughout the survey, completed interviews were progressively despatched to the survey office for checking and data processing.

By design, no substitution of selected respondents/households was permitted – as is consistent with the 'before and after' assessment objective of the survey. Optimum response was therefore required to maximise representation from the survey sample and to achieve this, interviewer skill and persistence are always important. While the survey was, of course conducted on a voluntary basis, very low levels of 'refusals' were incurred – only 2% of the overall sample (Table 3, overleaf). Also, substantial call-backs were made to minimise 'non-contacts', with a minimum requirement of 10 'effective' calls over the assignment period (i.e. calls at different times, days of week etc).

Whereas 'non-response' can be minimised in these ways (i.e. Items 2-5, and 8 in Table 3 overleaf), other causes of incomplete interviews are un-avoidable, namely the 'sample loss' categories (Items 6, 7 and 9 in Table 3).

The 'sample-take' analysis in Table 3 overleaf is based on all response categories for the 873 respondents in the Follow-up Survey sample.

Table 3: Sample-Take Analysis - All Recreational Fishers in the Follow-up Survey¹ by State/Territory of Residence

RESPONSE TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Fully Responding	No.	208	135	115	106	72	71	38	745
	%	87.8%	90.0%	82.1%	86.9%	75.0%	86.6%	82.6%	85.3%
2) Full Refusal	No.	6	3	4	1	3	0	2	19
	%	2.5%	2.0%	2.9%	0.8%	3.1%	0.0%	4.3%	2.2%
3) Part Refusal	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4) Full Non-contact	No.	6	6	10	6	10	4	3	45
	%	2.5%	4.0%	7.1%	4.9%	10.4%	4.9%	6.5%	5.2%
5) Part Non-contact	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6) Number Disconnected (no new number found)	No.	6	3	0	2	5	1	0	17
	%	2.5%	2.0%	0.0%	1.6%	5.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.9%
7) Incorrect Contact Details (no new number found)	No.	4	1	3	0	4	5	2	19
	%	1.7%	0.7%	2.1%	0.0%	4.2%	6.1%	4.3%	2.2%
8) Other Non-response e.g. language difficulties	No.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
	%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
9) Other Sample Loss e.g. deceased, living overseas	No.	6	2	8	7	1	1	1	26
	%	2.5%	1.3%	5.7%	5.7%	1.0%	1.2%	2.2%	3.0%
Total Sample¹	No.	237	150	140	122	96	82	46	873
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: fully responding recreational fishers from the 2002 Survey, with some availability for a follow-up survey (i.e. 'Yes' or 'Unsure' from Table 1) and a current telephone listing (per *Sensis*)

Also, detailed study definitions and methodologies are contained in Sections 2 and 3

However, for response rate assessment, the above results have been analysed to exclude all 'sample loss' categories (Items 6, 7 and 9). Accordingly, fully-responding households have been percentaged on total 'eligible' households, i.e. where a response could (or should) have been obtained, to reveal a national response rate of 92% (Table 4 overleaf).

Table 4: Response Analysis - Eligible Recreational Fishers in the Follow-up Survey¹ by State/Territory of Residence

RESPONSE TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Fully Responding	No.	208	135	115	106	72	71	38	745
	%	94.1%	93.8%	89.1%	93.8%	83.7%	94.7%	88.4%	91.9%
2) Full Refusal	No.	6	3	4	1	3	0	2	19
	%	2.7%	2.1%	3.1%	0.9%	3.5%	0.0%	4.7%	2.3%
3) Part Refusal	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4) Full Non-contact	No.	6	6	10	6	10	4	3	45
	%	2.7%	4.2%	7.8%	5.3%	11.6%	5.3%	7.0%	5.5%
5) Part Non-contact	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8) Other Non-response e.g. language difficulties	No.	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
	%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Total¹	No.	221	144	129	113	86	75	43	811
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: eligible recreational fishers in the follow-up survey i.e. excluding 'sample loss' categories from Table 3, e.g. disconnected telephone numbers

Also, detailed study definitions and methodologies are contained in Sections 2 and 3

The survey results contained in this report have been based on 745 fully responding interviews nationally (Item 1 in Table 4 above).

3.4 Data Editing and Processing

As a routine practice, completed survey questionnaires were subjected to several editing processes: clerical editing by interviewers and then by office staff; 'input editing' in data entry software; and detailed computer-based editing (incl. range and logic) prior to analysis. A key feature of this work concerns early detection of apparent errors/omissions to enable prompt resolution – especially in (albeit rare) cases, where a respondent needs to be re-contacted.

Data entry for the survey was completed by consultant office staff, in a 'flat file' format using Microsoft Excel. In addition to the various editing functions described above, a separate validation of the survey work and data entry was completed where a 5% random sample of completed questionnaires was physically checked against the results in the survey database (and no errors/inconsistencies were found).

3.5 Data Imputation

Cases where survey results were systematically imputed (i.e. where missing/unknown information was inferred) are discussed below. All other imputing was confined to very rare cases of minor omissions detected in editing – and only where the answer could be inferred with certainty.

3.5.1 *Bait Quantities (Prawns/Shrimp) – Numbers Reported*

By design, bait usage quantities could be reported in numbers, as opposed to weights. Although this occurred infrequently and for particular purchase forms only (e.g. loose/unpackaged whole prawns), the questionnaire routinely accommodated such cases with separate fields for kilograms and numbers. All such cases were later converted to weights, using length/weight data established during the 2002 survey.

Imputed weights for whole uncooked prawns are as follows: less than 5cm overall length – 1.4 grams (based on 4 cm mean); 5cm to 9cm – 3 grams (based on 7cm mean); 9 to 13 cm – 9 grams (based on 11cm mean); and although not ultimately required, > 13cm – 22 grams (based on 15 cm mean).

3.5.2 *Bait Quantities (Prawns/shrimp) – Pack Sizes Unknown*

Whereas quantities reported in numbers were infrequent, reporting of ‘packs’ of bait prawns occurred quite commonly, with the pack size often unknown by the respondent. As for the 2002 survey, the questionnaire allowed for general calculation/reporting of quantities in the form of an ‘equation’. In the following example ... “6 days x 1 small pack/2 persons x 200g” the pack size was known and the total (600g) could be calculated. Where the pack size was unknown, the equation would be ... “6 days x 1 small pack/2 persons x ?” and the total left blank. All such cases were calculated during office editing (prior to data entry) using up-dated information from bait suppliers in terms of standard pack sizes – 200g for a ‘small’ pack and 400g for a medium/large pack.

Importantly, the relatively high incidence of unknown pack sizes is not considered a concern to estimation precision. In this respect, a key design assumption was that most fishers have identifiable patterns of bait usage and could quite reliably estimate their daily usage. Rather, the ‘number of days fished’ has always been the major concern, as a component of the standard reporting ‘equation’ (and for ‘recall bias’ – see Section 3.6.4).

3.5.3 *Bait Quantities (Prawns/Shrimp) – Usage by Region, Water Body Type and Season*

As described in Section 3.1.1, usage quantities were assessed for the various acquisition sources and purchase forms for prawns/shrimp. This information was collected for each respondent on a national basis, covering all water body types and seasons for the previous 12 months. Specific questioning was also included to enable estimation/disaggregation of quantities used in time and space (Items [ii] and [iv] in Section 3.1.1).

These question sequences produced a ‘28 cell’ usage assessment for prawns/shrimp (7 states/territories x 2 water body types x 2 seasons) and a similar assessment for the number of days fished overall. The results from these two question sequences were combined to estimate usage proportions for the 28 cells for prawns/shrimp reported by each respondent. That is, proportions were assigned to each ‘valid’ cell, based on the proportion of days fished in these cells. For example, where a respondent’s only fishing in the period was in NSW saltwater, but in both ‘winter’ and ‘summer’ (say 1 and 4 days, respectively) and prawn usage was reported for both seasons, proportions would be assigned in the prawns database as follows ... 20% (i.e. 1/5 days) to the cell for *NSW_Saltwater_Winter* and 80% (4/5 days) to *NSW_Saltwater_Summer*.

Always totalling 100% for each prawn user, these proportions were then applied to reported bait quantities to estimate usage in time and space, i.e. in each of the 28 cells. In many cases, this process involved no imputation at all, i.e. where usage occurred in only one state/territory, water body type and season. Among the remainder, the vast majority referred to 'two cell splits' only (e.g. the 20/80 ratio in the above example). More complex 'splits' were quite uncommon and especially for 'water body type', where usage in both freshwater and saltwater was extremely rare.

3.6 Data Expansion and Adjustment

In the 2002 survey, a multi-faceted weighting/expansion process was employed to enable survey results to be routinely provided as resident population estimates (either person-based or quantities [kgs] of bait used). The various philosophies, procedures and adjustment factors employed in this process were exhaustively documented in Section 3.6 of the 2002 report (AFFA 2002).

For the 2006 Follow-up Survey, it was decided that for person-based expansion of survey results, the original expansion factors/weights for each respondent would be effectively replicated from the 2002 survey – to ensure direct comparability between the two studies (i.e. for the population sub-groups involved). For all bait-users from the 2002 survey, the expansion factors were simply replicated. However, for the former non-bait users, an additional adjustment factor was required to account for the recent random selection process within these households (see further discussion in 3.6.3). Accordingly, the various 'table bases' for data tabulations in Section 4 onwards are routinely expressed as (e.g.) "2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers".

However, for expansion of quantity-based results in the Follow-up Survey, a different approach was required – due to the fact that certain respondents reported substantially increased or decreased levels of fishing effort between the two studies. As 'avidity' level was the key variable in the development and application of 'recall bias' adjustment factors in the 2002 survey, it followed that equivalent adjustment factors in the 2006 survey should reflect any such changes in avidity (see further discussion in 3.6.4).

Note: it was considered inappropriate to attempt to update these weightings or survey results for current population estimates, for several reasons – principally, that no broad-scale sampling of the current population was employed in the study and no secondary data are available in terms of participation rates.

Importantly, it was equally inappropriate to attempt to adjust/correct the 2006 survey results (in some way) to provide estimates of the total fisher population as at 2002. Whereas (at first glance), this might seem feasible (e.g. through adjustments to account for higher avidity profiles of 'repeat' fishers), this approach was clearly contra-indicated due to many other behavioural uncertainties – e.g. the residential 'stability' (vs. instability) of the 2006 response group (vs. other fishers), where the latter might be more likely to alter their behaviour as a result of location change. The absence of actual data for 'new' recruits to recreational fishing was also a major factor. Therefore, it was determined that any comparisons of data between the two surveys be routinely confined to 2002 population estimates for 2006 survey respondents (primarily, the 'repeat' fisher group, see further discussion in Section 4.1). However, where

required, the varying proportions that these fishers comprise of the total estimates for the 2002 survey can be considered as part of any interpretation of the findings (see discussion in Section 5.4).

The remaining discussion in Sections 3.6.1 to 3.6.4 comprises a summary of the weighting and adjustment factors that were replicated from the 2002 survey, together with additional procedures employed for the 2006 study.

3.6.1 *Population Benchmarks and Integrated Weighting*

For the 2002 survey, population benchmarks were sourced from Estimated Resident Population (ERP) data, as at June 2001 (ABS 2002). Benchmark data for private dwelling households were provided by stratum and household size (1, 2 or 3+ persons) – a total of 7,393,042 households nationally. For persons, the benchmarks were provided by stratum, sex and age group (less than 5 years, 5-14, 15-29, 30-44, 45-59 and 60 years or more) – a total of 18,863,130 residents nationally (and 17,581,317 – aged 5 years or more). Using a method known as *Integrated Weighting* (Lemaitre and Dufour, 1987), ABS consultant staff provided expansion factors (weights) which, when applied to ‘raw’ survey data would produce estimates conforming to the benchmark totals. Integrated weighting simultaneously considers characteristics for households (size) and persons (sex and age) and seeks to maximise convergence at all levels – namely, stratum, households by size and persons by sex/age. Through this approach, all persons in a given household and the household itself are assigned the same weight. The use of integrated weights (as opposed to independent weights for households and persons) is more consistent with cluster sampling, since the latter can result in different weights for each individual within a household (and the household itself).

For the 2006 survey, the integrated weights for individual respondents were replicated from the 2002 study.

3.6.2 *Adjustments for Non-response*

For the 2002 survey, minor adjustments for non-response bias were applied to the integrated weights – based on data from the NRIFS. Put simply, non-respondents have different levels of fishing participation from respondents, with ‘refusals’ having substantially lower participation and ‘non-contacts’ somewhat higher participation. Although the effect of these adjustments was very minor in terms of ultimate survey results (due to the high response rates achieved), their application ensured direct comparability with data from the NRIFS. The non-response adjustment factors employed in the 2002 survey are shown below:-

<u>Household Size</u>	<u>Adjustment - Fisher Households</u>
1 person	1.0111743*
2 persons	0.9692740
3 or more persons	0.9894910

Note*: this ‘upward’ adjustment is a direct result of the relatively high proportion of single-person households in the ‘non-contact’ group – where in turn, higher participation rates exist.

For the 2006 survey, these adjustment factors have been replicated for individual respondents to maintain comparability between the two surveys, i.e. all integrated weights, adjusted for non-response were replicated from the 2002 survey. However, by contrast, no attempt was made to apply any further adjustments for non-response incurred in the Follow-up Survey itself. This was partly due to the low levels of non-response involved – but mostly due to the absence of sufficient ‘evidence’ to establish these adjustment factors. Ideally, a specific non-response follow-up survey of some kind is required to profile any behavioural differences between respondents and non respondents. Furthermore, the recommended analysis approach for the survey routinely deals with this issue – namely, that the survey results are only to be viewed as representative of the population sub-groups responding to the survey.

3.6.3 *Adjustments for Sub-sampling of Fishers within Households*

Adjustments factors were applied in the 2002 survey to account for the random selection of one bait-user within each bait-using household (1,123 households). However, at that time, no random selection (nor further interview information) was required for the (248) non-bait using fisher households. To ensure symmetry/comparability in the Follow-up Survey, appropriate random selections were made by consultant staff for this latter group, prior to the conduct of the survey. These selections were made within each household using a random number generator, whereby a random number was assigned to each household in the range 1 to ‘n’, where ‘n’ was the number of persons (aged 5 years or more) reporting any recreational fishing activity in the 2002 survey. For example, in a 5 person household (all ages), where Person No’s 1, 3 and 4 were fishers, a random number in the range 1 to 3 was generated and if it were (say) 2, then Person No. 3 from the household would have been selected for re-interview (i.e. the 2nd of 3 fishers). Identical procedures from the 2002 survey were applied to account for the differing ‘selection chances’ arising from this process and adjustment factors developed to maintain the benchmark populations for related survey estimates. These procedures are discussed below.

In developing these adjustments, relevant variables were analysed by stratum (e.g. sex, age group, ‘general avidity’ and the number of eligible household members) – initially to compare the profiles of all such fishers with those selected for the remainder of the interview. Due to the large number of cells involved, many small cell sizes emerged for selected fisher counts – translating to unacceptably large (potential) adjustment factors. To achieve an optimum balance in terms of benchmark alignment and the magnitude of these adjustments, further analysis was conducted whereby various cells were collapsed and different variable combinations assessed.

Ultimately, these adjustments were largely calculated on the basis of two variables within each stratum, namely sex and ‘general’ avidity (days fished: 1-4, 5-14, 15 or more) – as these were shown to be the most critical determinants of respondent behaviour. Moreover, the exclusion of ‘age group’ from this process was shown to have quite minor effects on benchmark alignment. Unlike in the 2002 survey, where large numbers of bait-users resulted in minimal further cell-collapsing, the small number of non-bait users here resulted in five cases where ‘nil’ selections occurred for a given cell. However, as for the 2002 survey, all referred to females in the smaller strata/cells and further cell-collapsing was applied – primarily by combining the low and middle avidity groups. The effects of this cell-collapsing were assessed as negligible on the basis of reported data from both the 2002 and 2006 surveys.

Some 451 non-bait using respondents were eligible for selection from the 248 households concerned. Consistent with this, the mean of all adjustment factors is 1.87. As would be expected, the vast majority of adjustment factors are clustered around the mean – although some

larger factors emerged (the largest being 6.33). From an analysis of those with a value greater than 4, virtually all refer to females (one exception) in lower avidity cells. After further analysis of the impact of these adjustments on the 2006 survey results, no additional cell collapsing was required – due to the low levels of ‘repeat’ fishing activity and bait usage (namely, one ‘repeat’ fisher only who reported no prawn usage).

The above adjustment factors for the non-bait user group (248 respondents), together with equivalent adjustments for the bait-user group (1,123 respondents) have enabled fisher population benchmarks to be maintained for the 1,371 potential gross sample for the Follow-up Survey. Also, as was the case for non-response adjustment, no attempt was made to re-calculate these adjustment factors on the basis of reported avidity for the Follow-up Survey. Whereas ‘avidity shifts’ occurred between the two surveys for some respondents, these adjustment factors were retained to simplify and optimise comparability between the two studies. By contrast, a different approach was necessarily employed in terms of ‘recall bias’ – see discussion in Section 3.6.4 below.

Note: expansion factors from the above process (i.e. a product of the adjusted integrated weight and the ‘selected fisher’ adjustment factor) have been applied in producing all fisher-based estimates for Table 5 onwards in the report (i.e. not quantity-based estimates – Section 3.6.4 below).

3.6.4 *Adjustments for Recall Bias*

As for the 2002 survey, adjustment for the effects of ‘recall bias’ represent the most significant calibration of results for the 2006 survey. As discussed earlier, ‘recall bias’ has been shown to result in significant over-estimation of fishing effort (days fished). Since ‘days fished’ was directly employed in calculating bait usage quantities for the vast majority of respondents (and perhaps indirectly for many others), it follows that bait quantities would also be over-estimated. In the 2002 survey, these effects were measured and calibrated, using benchmark data from the NRIFS Diary Survey, on the basis that the diary method represented the most reliable assessment of such behaviour over time. These results were compared to data from the 2002 survey in a detailed analysis as described in the original report. Interested readers are referred to Section 3.6.4 of that report (AFFA 2002). The calculation of these adjustment factors for the 2002 survey is summarised below:-

Avidity Comparison <u>Group (proportion)</u>	NRIFS Diary Survey (Days fished 2000/01) <u>Range</u> <u>Mean</u>		AFFA Bait/Berley Survey (Days fished 2001/02) <u>Range</u> <u>Mean</u>		Adjustment Factor* (for <u>recall bias</u>)
1) lowest 37%	1-2	1.4318685	1-4	2.6526198	0.5397941
2) next 29%	3-5	3.8033056	5-13	8.3721825	0.4542789
3) next 22%	6-12	8.1984693	14-31	19.724506	0.4156489
4) highest 12%	13-169	23.749699	32-260	66.626817	0.3564586
Total	n/a	6.3271171	n/a	15.794616	0.4005869

Note*: adjustment factors for each avidity group were calculated by dividing the mean (days fished) for the NRIFS by the mean for the Bait/Berley Survey.

For the 2006 survey, these adjustments factors were again employed but not routinely retained for each respondent. Rather, the appropriate adjustment factor from the above table was assigned to each respondent reporting any usage of prawns in the 2006 survey, in accordance with his/her avidity grouping (1-4 above) for the 2005/06 reference period. This departure from routine retention of 2002 survey weights/adjustment factors was undertaken to account for the different avidity levels reported by some former bait/prawn users (2005/6 vs. 2001/02) and to more realistically estimate their reported prawn usage quantities – and consistently, with the estimation process for the 2002 survey. This approach also enabled other respondents to be assigned an appropriate adjustment for the first time – namely those prawn users who did not report any bait/prawn usage in the 2002 survey.

Note: expansion factors from the above process (i.e. a product of the [twice] adjusted integrated weight and the ‘recall bias’ adjustment factor) have been applied in producing all quantity-based estimates for Table 12 onwards in the report.

3.7 Analysis and Reporting

3.7.1 Analysis and Data Outputs

The structure and range of data tabulations presented in this report were determined in consultation with Biosecurity Australia liaison staff. In accordance with the agreed reporting structure, these results have been presented without interpretation or commentary – one of several reporting conventions discussed in Section 1.4.

The survey database was also an output requirement of the project and copies of relevant databases have been provided to Biosecurity Australia, along with detailed briefing of liaison staff. Note: for privacy reasons, all personal information for respondents (names, addresses, phone numbers etc) have been removed from databases provided to Biosecurity Australia. However, this information (along with completed survey questionnaires) has been retained by our company to enable further research by Biosecurity Australia (if required) and more detailed disaggregation of survey results (see discussion below). Importantly, once these requirements have been met, all survey questionnaires will be ‘destroyed under supervision’ and any personal information permanently deleted from the databases.

All primary survey data are contained in several ‘flat file’ databases (Microsoft *Excel*), comprising person-based and quantity based data for the 2006 survey (and counterpart information for the 2002 study). In this regard, considerable potential exists for further interrogation of these databases.

3.7.2 Error Estimation

Standard error tables for all substantive survey results are contained in Appendix A – where data tabulations from the report have been replicated, showing relative standard errors (RSE) for each survey estimate. Application of the errors is also discussed in the introduction to the Appendix, e.g. calculation of confidence intervals.

As for the 2002 survey, error estimation has been based on approximations which are considered adequate for the purposes of the study. In 2002, all error estimates were derived on a state-basis

and combined for the Australian total. This approach was shown to consistently produce only minor differences and slightly more conservative error levels, when compared to more detailed stratum-based calculations. The same approach has been taken for the 2006 error estimates to enable the relevant comparisons to be drawn. Also, the error estimates are based on a cascading principle, where the estimate for a particular level is based on a proportion multiplied by an estimate of the population base calculated at the previous level.

Note: these error terms relate to ‘sampling error’ only – any variability for components of ‘non-sampling error’ (e.g. ‘recall bias’) is not included. All variance estimators employed $\left[\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{X})\right]$ are defined in the remainder of this sub-section.

The estimated relative standard error $\left(\widehat{RSE}\right)$ is defined by:

$$\widehat{RSE}(\widehat{X}) = \frac{\sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{X})}}{\widehat{X}}$$

(i) ESTIMATION OF POPULATION-BASED VARIABLES (PERSONS)

(a) Fishers

The estimated number of fishers $\left(\widehat{NF}\right)$ is derived by summing the expansion factors (i.e. integrated person weights adjusted for non-response) for each responding person in the sample.

$$\widehat{NF} = \sum_{i=1}^{nP} w_{i,P} y_{i,F}$$

where:

- nP is the raw sample count of 2002 recreational fishers who fully responded to the follow up survey;
- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response for person i ; and
- $y_{i,F} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if person } i \text{ is a fisher} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.

The error on this estimate is *approximated* as the binomial variance estimator:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NF}\right) = \frac{\widehat{NP}^2}{nP} * \frac{\widehat{NF}}{\widehat{NP}} * \left(1 - \frac{\widehat{NF}}{\widehat{NP}}\right)$$

where:

- \widehat{NP} is the 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fully responded to the follow up survey (private dwelling basis only).

(b) Bait-Users

The estimated number of bait-users (\widehat{NFB}) is derived by summing the expansion factors (i.e. integrated person weights adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households) for each responding repeat fisher who used bait.

$$\widehat{NFB} = \sum_{i=1}^{nF} w_{i,P} y_{i,FB}$$

where:

- nF is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers;
- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i ; and
- $y_{i,FB} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if person } i \text{ is a bait user} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.

The error on this estimate is *approximated* as the variance of a product of independent variables:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NFB}\right) = \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NF}\right) * \left(\frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right)^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right) * \widehat{NF}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NF}\right) * \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right)$$

where $\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right)$ is *approximated* as the binomial variance estimator:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right) = \frac{1}{nF} * \frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}} * \left(1 - \frac{\widehat{NFB}}{\widehat{NF}}\right).$$

(c) Prawn-Users

The estimated number of prawn-users (\widehat{NFBP}) is derived by summing the expansion factors (i.e. integrated person weights adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households) for each bait-user who used prawns.

$$\widehat{NFBP} = \sum_{i=1}^{nFB} w_{i,P} y_{i,FBP}$$

where:

- nFB is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used bait;
- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i ; and
- $y_{i,FBP} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if person } i \text{ is a prawn user} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

The error on this estimate is *approximated* as the variance of a product of independent variables:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right) = \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NFB}\right) * \left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right)^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right) * \widehat{NFB}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{NFB}\right) * \widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right)$$

where $\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right)$ is *approximated* as the binomial variance estimator:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}\left(\widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right) = \frac{1}{nFB} * \widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}} * \left(1 - \widehat{\frac{NFBP}{NFB}}\right)$$

(d) Prawn-users disaggregated by other variables

Estimates and errors associated with prawn-users disaggregated by other variables (such as acquisition source and purchase form) are calculated using analogous principles and calculations.

(ii) ESTIMATION OF BAIT QUANTITIES

The estimates of quantity used for a given type of bait, e.g. prawns (\widehat{QBP}) are derived by summing the expanded estimates of quantities of prawns for each prawn purchaser-user,

$$\widehat{QBP} = \sum_{i=1}^{nFBP} w_{i,P} * QBP_i$$

where:

- $nFBP$ is the raw sample count of bait-users who use prawns;
- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i ; and
- QBP_i is the reported quantity of prawns used for person i , adjusted for recall bias.

The expanded estimates of bait quantities can also be expressed as the product of the estimated total number of prawn purchaser-users (\widehat{NFBP}) and the weighted mean quantity of prawns used by these fishers (\widehat{WMBP}):

$$\widehat{QBP} = \widehat{NFBP} * \widehat{WMBP}$$

The error on this estimate is therefore *approximated* as the variance of the product of independent variables:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{QBP}) = \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBP}) * \widehat{NFBP}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBP}) * \widehat{WMBP}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBP}) * \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBP})$$

Noting that:

- $\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBP})$ is as given previously; and
- $\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBP}) = \frac{1}{nFBP \left(\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP} w_{i,P} - 1 \right)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{nFBP} w_{i,P} QBP_i^2 - \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP} w_{i,P} QBP_i \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP} w_{i,P}} \right\}$

where:

- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i; and
- $nFBP$ is the raw sample count of bait-users who use prawns; and
- QBP_i is the quantity of prawns reported for person i, adjusted for recall bias.

Similarly, for the estimate of quantity of a particular bait type (e.g. prawns (P)) for a particular method M is given as:

$$\widehat{QBPM} = \sum_{i=1}^{nFBPM} w_{i,P} * QBPM_i$$

where:

- $nFBPM$ is the raw sample count of bait-users who use prawns for method M;
- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i; and
- $QBPM_i$ is the reported quantity of prawns used for person i using method M, adjusted for recall bias.

The expanded estimates of bait quantities associated with method M can also be expressed as the product of the estimated total number of prawn purchaser-users using method M (\widehat{NFBPM}) and the weighted mean quantity of prawns used by these fishers (\widehat{WMBPM}):

$$\widehat{QBPM} = \widehat{NFBPM} * \widehat{WMBPM}$$

The error on this estimate is therefore *approximated* as the variance of the product of independent variables:

$$\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{QBPM}) = \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBPM}) * \widehat{NFBPM}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBPM}) * \widehat{WMBPM}^2 + \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBPM}) * \widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBPM})$$

Noting that:

- $\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{NFBPM})$ is as given previously; and
- $\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{WMBPM}) = \frac{1}{nFBPM \left(\sum_{i=1}^{nFBPM} w_{i,P} - 1 \right)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{nFBPM} w_{i,P} QBPM_i^2 - \frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{nFBPM} w_{i,P} QBPM_i \right]^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{nFBPM} w_{i,P}} \right\}$

where:

- $w_{i,P}$ is the integrated person weight adjusted for non-response and sub-sampling within households for person i; and
- $nFBPM$ is the raw sample count of bait-users who use prawns for method M; and
- $QBPM_i$ is the quantity of prawns reported for person i using method M, adjusted for recall bias.

3.7.3 Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis has been used to test whether differences in corresponding 2002 and 2006 *sample* based estimates are significant. A modified paired sample t-test has been employed for testing significant differences in proportions associated with the sample-based people estimates. For tests of significant differences in mean prawn quantities, a test statistic based on the normal distribution has been derived.

Due to the unusual nature of the 2006 Bait/Berley Survey (calibration to the 2002 population and not including new recreational fishers), *sample-based analysis only* is described below.

(i) COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR POPULATION BASED VARIABLES (PERSONS)

It is important that users of the results from the following comparative analysis are aware that:-

- the proportions used in the comparative analysis are unweighted. They do not align with population estimates published for the 2002 or 2006 survey;

- no attempts have been made to extrapolate the results of the comparative analysis to the population; they apply only to those repeat fishers who responded to both the 2002 and the 2006 surveys. Inferences for the population should not be drawn.

The comparison of sample-based proportions can be characterised as a ‘before and after’ study on binary data. The change data item (c) is defined as the difference between the 2006 binary data item (y_{2006}) and the 2002 binary data item (y_{2002}) from which the sample proportions were calculated.

$$c_i = y_{i,2006} - y_{i,2002}$$

where:

- $y_{i,2006} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if unit } i \text{ has characteristic of interest in 2006} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$; and
- $y_{i,2002} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if unit } i \text{ has characteristic of interest in 2002} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$.

The corresponding sample based proportions are calculated as:

$$\hat{p}_{sample,2006} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{common}} y_{i,2006}}{n_{common}} \text{ and } \hat{p}_{sample,2002} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{common}} y_{i,2002}}{n_{common}}$$

where:

- n_{common} is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers.

The difference between the proportions is given as:

$$\hat{p}_{sample,c} = \hat{p}_{sample,2006} - \hat{p}_{sample,2002}$$

The modified version of the paired t-test method is an approximation and assumes that the proportions are not close to 0 or 1. The framework and calculations for a two-sided hypothesis test at the 5% significance level is provided below.

The null and alternate hypotheses are given as:

$$H_o : P_{change} = 0$$

$$H_a : P_{change} \neq 0$$

The test statistic is defined as $T = \frac{\hat{p}_{sample,change} - P_{change}}{S_c}$ where:

$$s_c = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{common}-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_{common}} c_i^2 - \frac{1}{n_{common}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_{common}} c_i \right)^2 \right)}}{\sqrt{n_{common}}}$$

Note that c_i takes on values of -1, 0 and 1.

Under the null hypothesis, the test statistic takes the value of $T = \frac{\hat{p}_{sample,change}}{s_c}$ and follows a t-distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom. The null hypothesis should be rejected at the 5% level if

$$|T| > t_{n_{common}-1} (0.975)$$

t-values are obtained from standard statistical tables. If the calculated value of the test statistic is greater than the standard t-value then the null hypothesis should be rejected. In such a case, we can conclude that the difference is statistically significant. The sign of the difference (+/-) provides an indication of whether the difference is characterised by an increase or a decrease.

(ii) COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR PRAWN QUANTITIES

Comparative analysis of prawn quantity measures obtained from the 2006 and the 2002 Bait/Berley Surveys is motivated by comparisons of sample based means. The mean prawn quantity used by 2006 users is compared to the mean prawn quantity used by 2002 users. It is important to ensure that users of the results are aware that:

- while the results tabulated in Section 5 are estimated total prawn usage in kilograms, the comparative analysis is based on sample mean prawn usage. Testing of means is required to ensure that the test is sensitive to changes in the quantity of prawns used as well as the changes in the proportion of fishers involved; and
- unweighted means have been used. No attempt has been made to extrapolate the results of the comparative analysis to the population; they apply only to those responding repeat fishers who reported prawn usage in either or both of the 2002 and the 2006 surveys.

The comparison of mean prawn usage is characterised as a hypothesis test on continuous data. The change (\bar{c}_{prawn}) is defined as the difference between the 2006 data item mean ($\bar{y}_{prawn,2006}$) and the corresponding 2002 data item mean ($\bar{y}_{prawn,2002}$). Each mean is calculated over the responding repeat fishers who reported prawn usage in the relevant year.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_{prawn} &= \bar{y}_{prawn,2006} - \bar{y}_{prawn,2002} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{06}} y_{i,prawn,2006}}{nFBP_{06}} - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{02}} y_{i,prawn,2002}}{nFBP_{02}} \end{aligned}$$

The framework and calculations for a two sided hypothesis test at the 5% significance level is provided below.

The null and alternate hypotheses are given as:

$$H_o : \bar{C} = 0$$

$$H_a : \bar{C} \neq 0$$

The test statistic is defined as $Z = \frac{\bar{c}_{prawn} - \bar{C}}{S_{\bar{c}_{prawn}}}$ where:

$$S_{\bar{c}_{prawn}}^2 = \frac{nFBP_{06only}}{nFBP_{06}^2} s_{06,06only}^2 + \frac{nFBP_{02only}}{nFBP_{02}^2} s_{02,02only}^2 + \frac{nFBP_{both}}{nFBP_{06}^2} s_{06,both}^2 + \frac{nFBP_{both}}{nFBP_{02}^2} s_{02,both}^2 - \frac{2nFBP_{both}}{nFBP_{06}nFBP_{02}} s_{0602,both}$$

and:

- $nFBP_{06only}$ is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006 but not in 2002;
- $nFBP_{02only}$ is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2002 but not in 2006;
- $nFBP_{06}$ is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006;
- $nFBP_{02}$ is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2002;
- $nFBP_{both}$ is the raw sample count of responding repeat fishers who used prawns in both 2006 and 2002;
- $s_{06,06only}^2$ is the measure of variability between the reported quantities in 2006, measured for the responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006 but not in 2002;
- $s_{02,02only}^2$ is the measure of variability between the reported quantities in 2002, measured for the responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2002 but not in 2006;
- $s_{06,both}^2$ is the measure of variability between the reported quantities in 2006, measured for the responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006 *and* in 2002;
- $s_{02,both}^2$ is the measure of variability between the reported quantities in 2002, measured for the responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006 *and* in 2002;

- $s_{0602,both}$ is the measure of variability of the reported quantities in 2006 *and* the reported quantities in 2002 considered in conjunction with one another, measured for the responding repeat fishers who used prawns in 2006 *and* in 2002;

where:

- $s_{year,group}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{F-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{group}} y_{i,prawn,year}^2 - \frac{1}{nFBP_{group}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{group}} y_{i,prawn,year} \right)^2 \right)$; and
- $s_{02,06,both} = \frac{1}{nFBP_{both}-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{group}} y_{i,prawn,2006} y_{i,prawn,2002} - \frac{1}{nFBP_{both}} \sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{group}} y_{i,prawn,2006} \sum_{i=1}^{nFBP_{group}} y_{i,prawn,2002} \right)$.

Under the null hypothesis, the test statistic takes the value of $Z = \frac{\bar{c}_{prawn} - \bar{c}_{prawn}}{s_{c_{prawn}}}$ and approximates to a standard normal distribution. The null hypothesis should be rejected at the 5% significance level if

$$|Z| > 1.96.$$

The value of 1.96 is obtained from standard statistical tables. If the null hypothesis is rejected, we can conclude that the difference is statistically significant. The sign of the difference (+/-) provides an indication of whether the difference is characterised by an increase or a decrease.

3.8 Bait Supplier Survey

In the 2002 survey, the major bait suppliers around Australia were contacted to establish pack size information (weights) for key bait species – see detailed discussion in Section 3.8 of the 2002 report (AFFA 2002).

For the 2006 study, an appropriate sample of these suppliers was identified (12 of the 23 contacted in 2002) and re-contacted to establish current pack sizes for bait prawns, with the result that no change had occurred between the two studies. Additional information was sought in terms of annual quantities of bait prawns sold over the last 5 years to provide trend information over time – for comparison to the results of the population surveys for 2002 and 2006. This information has been collected on commercial-in-confidence basis and aggregated data have been provided in a separate report to Biosecurity Australia.

4 RESULTS: RECREATIONAL FISHING AND BAIT USAGE

The information contained in this section (and Section 5) has been presented in the order of corresponding sections and tables from the 2002 survey report (AFFA 2002). As a person/ fisher-based assessment, no household-based data have been provided for the 2006 survey.

Commencing with Table 5, the data tables (and numbers) align with corresponding tables from the 2002 report, through to Table 17 (Section 5). However, in Table 6 onwards, the data have been routinely presented in two separate tables – both on a ‘repeat’ fisher base for: (a) 2006 survey results; and (b) comparable 2002 survey results. In accordance with the recommended analysis approach (and ‘representation’ issues discussed in Sections 1 to 3), comparisons of results from the two studies should only be made on this basis.

All significance tests in terms of changes in behaviour have been based on these comparisons (albeit using raw data calculations – see discussion in 3.7.3 earlier) and the results routinely discussed in the text following the (b) Table in each case. Also, to assist in reviewing the varying proportions that ‘repeat’ fishers comprise of the total estimates for the 2002 survey, corresponding tables from the original report have been included in Appendix B, (and numbered Tables 5c to 17c).

4.1 Recreational Fishing Participation

In Table 5 overleaf, participation in recreational fishing is assessed for the 745 respondents (aged 5 years or more) to the 2006 Follow-up Survey – expressed as estimates of the 2002 resident population. Additional information has been included in the table, showing total estimates for all fishers (aged 5 years or more) from the 2002 survey and the proportions covered by the 2006 Survey.

Table 5: Any Recreational Fishing¹ in the Previous 12 Months (2005/06) - 'Former' Fishers (2001/02)² aged 5 years or more by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FISHING ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	63.2%	72.1%	59.5%	58.2%	48.9%	69.9%	68.8%	62.7%
No	No.	191070	85369	133755	58900	72675	16688	8659	567116
	%	36.8%	27.9%	40.5%	41.8%	51.1%	30.1%	31.2%	37.3%
Total²	No.	518815	305760	330486	141015	142341	55394	27788	1521598
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Fishers (5 yrs or more) - 2002 Survey population estimate	No.	902856	519235	664423	240019	389719	106846	67626	2890723
Proportion represented by the Follow-up Survey	%	57.5%	58.9%	49.7%	58.8%	36.5%	51.8%	41.1%	52.6%

Notes:

¹ Recreational fishing is defined as any attempted harvesting of aquatic organisms for non-commercial purposes

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fully responded to the follow-up survey
Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

The results in the above table reveal that just over half (52.6%) of the 2002 population of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) are effectively covered by respondents to the Follow-up Survey. Among these, a majority (62.7%) reported some kind of recreational fishing in both survey reference periods – i.e. ‘repeat’ fishers (on a ‘raw’ data basis, some 486 of the 745 respondents). This population sub-group forms the analysis base for virtually all substantive results for the 2006 survey.

Although recreational fishing participation rates for the current population are not available, if they were similar to 2002, these respondents might account for around one third of all fishers. Yet in many ways (as discussed in Section 3.6) their characteristics/behaviour may well be very different from fishers generally and ‘skewed’ towards (e.g.) residential stability, higher levels of fishing experience (by design, no ‘new’ fishers have been included) and related to this, higher levels of avidity (days fished). Indeed, these ‘repeat fishers’ reported generally higher avidity levels in 2002 compared to the general fishing population at that time: for the low avidity group (1-4 days fished), 33% and 44% respectively; the middle avidity group (5-14 days), 29% and 30%; and the high avidity group (15 or more days), 38% and 26%. For the 2006 survey, corresponding avidity profiles of ‘repeat fishers’ were: low 32%, middle 35% and high 33%.

Note: in Section 6 (Tables 20 and 21), additional results have been presented for those (37.3%) respondents (from Table 5 above) reporting no fishing in the previous 12 months – i.e. main/other reasons for not fishing in that time.

4.2 Bait Usage (Aquatic Animals)

All respondents (aged 5 years or more) reporting any recreational fishing activity in the previous 12 months (Table 5) were then assessed in terms of ‘in-scope’ bait/berley usage (i.e. aquatic

animals) during that time, the results to which appear in Table 6a, followed by Table 6b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 6a (2006): Any 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Usage¹ in Previous 12 Months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	299180	197676	189721	72058	63000	31333	18034	871001
	%	91.3%	89.7%	96.4%	87.8%	90.4%	80.9%	94.3%	91.3%
No	No.	28566	22716	7009	10056	6666	7374	1095	83481
	%	8.7%	10.3%	3.6%	12.2%	9.6%	19.1%	5.7%	8.7%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ 'In-scope' bait/berley is defined as any kind of aquatic animal (i.e. plants and terrestrial animals are excluded)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fished in both survey reference periods ('repeat' recreational fishers)

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 6b (2002 Comparison): Any 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Usage¹ in Previous 12 Months (2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	258238	190361	196731	73856	59828	32575	13293	824881
	%	78.8%	86.4%	100.0%	89.9%	85.9%	84.2%	69.5%	86.4%
No	No.	69507	30031	0	8259	9837	6131	5836	129601
	%	21.2%	13.6%	0.0%	10.1%	14.1%	15.8%	30.5%	13.6%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ 'In-scope' bait/berley is defined as any kind of aquatic animal (i.e. plants and terrestrial animals are excluded)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fished in both survey reference periods ('repeat' recreational fishers)

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge for increased 'in-scope' bait usage among 'repeat fishers' residing in NSW/ACT and also at the national level.

All respondents reporting any 'in-scope' bait/berley use were then assessed in terms of usage in the previous 12 months of 14 specific bait types – in Table 7a overleaf, followed by Table 7b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 7a (2006): Bait Types Used in Previous 12 Months - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

BAIT TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Prawns/Shrimp	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648
	%	77.0%	24.6%	75.1%	30.1%	69.9%	41.3%	47.9%	58.4%
2) Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	No.	182260	92559	79564	43029	40755	22649	15718	476534
	%	60.9%	46.8%	41.9%	59.7%	64.7%	72.3%	87.2%	54.7%
3) Crabs	No.	8394	5974	0	1653	1129	1404	0	18555
	%	2.8%	3.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.8%	4.5%	0.0%	2.1%
4) Saltwater Crayfish	No.	1117	0	2058	0	0	0	0	3175
	%	0.4%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
5) Freshwater Crayfish	No.	44153	69655	12721	6466	0	0	1370	134364
	%	14.8%	35.2%	6.7%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	15.4%
6) Abalone	No.	5255	0	2130	0	0	1002	0	8387
	%	1.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	1.0%
7) Other Shellfish	No.	51623	108823	49488	63941	7175	6470	0	287520
	%	17.3%	55.1%	26.1%	88.7%	11.4%	20.6%	0.0%	33.0%
8) Trout and Salmon	No.	3093	0	0	0	731	454	0	4277
	%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.5%
9) Saltwater Fish	No.	175463	122316	115511	30817	49551	25552	12052	531262
	%	58.6%	61.9%	60.9%	42.8%	78.7%	81.6%	66.8%	61.0%
10) Freshwater Fish	No.	1898	3380	0	0	0	0	572	5850
	%	0.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.7%
11) Sharks and Rays	No.	0	0	2058	0	0	0	254	2311
	%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.3%
12) Worms	No.	94585	54257	80494	16764	2380	2401	288	251167
	%	31.6%	27.4%	42.4%	23.3%	3.8%	7.7%	1.6%	28.8%
13) Saltwater Yabbies/ Nippers	No.	68593	17503	72612	0	0	226	0	158933
	%	22.9%	8.9%	38.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	18.2%
14) Other Aquatic Animals (e.g. barnacles, limpets and cunjevoi)	No.	0	4292	0	0	0	0	0	4292
	%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	289.7%	266.8%	294.7%	255.8%	231.3%	233.3%	215.7%	275.0%
Total Bait Users¹	No.	299180	197676	189721	72058	63000	31333	18034	871001
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using aquatic animals as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 7b (2002 Comaprison): Bait Types Used in Previous 12 Months - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

BAIT TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Prawns/Shrimp	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727
	%	83.3%	45.2%	65.2%	35.7%	74.1%	25.8%	33.0%	62.2%
2) Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	No.	81650	94281	79086	44453	45413	13103	9780	367765
	%	31.6%	49.5%	40.2%	60.2%	75.9%	40.2%	73.6%	44.6%
3) Crabs	No.	31486	11119	7621	0	1951	2332	0	54508
	%	12.2%	5.8%	3.9%	0.0%	3.3%	7.2%	0.0%	6.6%
4) Saltwater Crayfish	No.	0	4166	0	0	0	0	0	4166
	%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
5) Freshwater Crayfish	No.	23591	73643	12223	0	0	0	0	109457
	%	9.1%	38.7%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
6) Abalone	No.	3979	1334	0	0	1166	392	0	6871
	%	1.5%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	1.2%	0.0%	0.8%
7) Other Shellfish	No.	58124	123632	53135	61745	8157	6762	0	311556
	%	22.5%	64.9%	27.0%	83.6%	13.6%	20.8%	0.0%	37.8%
8) Trout and Salmon	No.	0	4000	0	0	0	0	0	4000
	%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
9) Saltwater Fish	No.	159254	131157	133335	40351	47697	30196	8847	550836
	%	61.7%	68.9%	67.8%	54.6%	79.7%	92.7%	66.6%	66.8%
10) Freshwater Fish	No.	1935	2689	1975	0	0	0	0	6599
	%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
11) Sharks and Rays	No.	0	0	1973	0	4080	0	0	6053
	%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
12) Worms	No.	97077	63833	79189	18997	2996	1223	0	263316
	%	37.6%	33.5%	40.3%	25.7%	5.0%	3.8%	0.0%	31.9%
13) Saltwater Yabbies/Nippers	No.	37723	26466	87975	0	0	1223	1616	155004
	%	14.6%	13.9%	44.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	12.2%	18.8%
14) Other Aquatic Animals (e.g. barnacles, limpets and cunjevoi)	No.	14946	0	0	0	0	5144	0	20090
	%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	2.4%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	280.7%	326.9%	297.2%	259.9%	260.4%	211.1%	185.2%	287.7%
Total Bait Users¹	No.	258238	190361	196731	73856	59828	32575	13293	824881
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using aquatic animals as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerged for usage of the following bait types among ‘repeat’ fishers:-

Prawns/Shrimp: decrease for Victorian residents;

Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus: increases for NSW/ACT residents and nationally;

Crabs: decrease nationally

Saltwater Yabbies/Nippers: increase for NSW/ACT residents

For all other bait types in Tables 7a and b, no significant differences were revealed.

5 RESULTS: PRAWNS/SHRIMP USED AS BAIT/BERLEY

5.1 Introduction

The information contained in this section refers to person-based and quantity-based assessments of prawn/shrimp usage. As discussed at the commencement of Section 4, Tables 8 through 17 (in Sections 5.2 and 5.3) directly align with their counterparts in the 2002 survey report. In each case, two tables have been included, for the 'repeat' fisher group: (a) 2006 survey results; and (b) comparable 2002 survey results, with the results of significance testing routinely discussed in the text following the (b) Table.

In Section 5.4, additional tables have been included (Tables 18a/b and 19) in an assessment of potentially imported prawns/shrimp ('sold as seafood').

5.2 Results on a Fisher Base

As a major bait type, some 235 ('repeat' fisher) respondents reported using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months. For each respondent, usage was firstly assessed in terms of three acquisition sources – in Table 8a below, followed by Table 8b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 8a (2006): Acquisition Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	No.	208968	40008	101096	15464	39402	11017	7705	423660
	%	90.8%	82.1%	71.0%	71.4%	89.5%	85.2%	89.2%	83.3%
Sold as Seafood	No.	42235	3878	20235	0	6257	3234	0	75839
	%	18.3%	8.0%	14.2%	0.0%	14.2%	25.0%	0.0%	14.9%
Personally Caught	No.	21274	16232	53403	6994	2580	0	1509	101992
	%	9.2%	33.3%	37.5%	32.3%	5.9%	0.0%	17.5%	20.1%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	118.3%	123.4%	122.7%	103.7%	109.6%	110.2%	106.6%	118.3%
Total Prawn Users¹	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 8b (2002 Comparison): Acquisition Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	No.	205678	77907	109541	17631	33849	7894	3584	456085
	%	95.6%	90.6%	85.5%	66.8%	76.3%	94.1%	81.8%	89.0%
Sold as Seafood	No.	28407	8334	12996	810	4962	498	798	56805
	%	13.2%	9.7%	10.1%	3.1%	11.2%	5.9%	18.2%	11.1%
Personally Caught	No.	29479	11564	43546	7949	10765	1223	232	104758
	%	13.7%	13.4%	34.0%	30.1%	24.3%	14.6%	5.3%	20.4%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	122.6%	113.8%	129.6%	100.0%	111.8%	114.6%	105.3%	120.5%
Total Prawn Users¹	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for decreased usage of prawns/shrimp 'sold as bait' by Victorian residents and increased usage of 'sold as seafood' prawns/shrimp at the national level.

Respondents reporting any usage of prawns/shrimp for the acquisition source 'Sold as Seafood' were subsequently questioned to establish their main (and any other) reasons for doing so. The results in the following tables are presented on a national basis, with three un-reported answer categories from the survey questionnaire included in 'Other' (namely, choice of species, choice of form and choice of quantity) – in Table 9a (overleaf), followed by Table 9b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 9a (2006): Reasons for Purchasing Prawns/Shrimp from a 'Seafood Supplier' (vs. Bait Supplier) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Choice - size	No. %	3284 4.3%	1441 1.9%	1843 2.4%
Freshness/quality	No. %	34077 44.9%	25832 34.1%	8245 10.9%
Price	No. %	22427 29.6%	11745 15.5%	10682 14.1%
Convenience/access issues	No. %	44566 58.8%	35317 46.6%	9249 12.2%
Intention change (originally seafood)	No. %	1504 2.0%	1504 2.0%	0 0.0%
Other (incl. choice of species, form and quantity)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	45820 60.4%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 139.6%	75839 100%	75839 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp that were 'Sold as Seafood', as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 9b (2002 Comparison): Reasons for Purchasing Prawns/Shrimp from a 'Seafood Supplier' (vs. Bait Supplier) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Choice - size	No.	6494	4651	1843
	%	11.4%	8.2%	3.2%
Freshness/quality	No.	28544	23893	4651
	%	50.2%	42.1%	8.2%
Price	No.	9296	8078	1218
	%	16.4%	14.2%	2.1%
Convenience/access issues	No.	20182	20182	0
	%	35.5%	35.5%	0.0%
Intention change (originally seafood)	No.	4080	0	4080
	%	7.2%	0.0%	7.2%
Other (incl. choice of species, form and quantity)	No.	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	45013
	%	n/a	n/a	79.2%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	56805	56805
	%	120.8%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp that were 'Sold as Seafood', as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers in terms of increased reporting of 'convenience/access issues' as the main reason for using prawns/shrimp 'sold as seafood' (at the national level).

The following tables assess usage preferences in terms of main (and any other) methods used to bait the hook in line fishing with prawns/shrimp – for all users, aggregated on a national basis. In the 2006 survey, additional detail was sought in this questioning for both 'head off' and 'peeled' prawns, in terms of usage of the whole remaining body of the prawn, or cut/pieces of the body – see Table 10a (overleaf). Table 10b (2002 comparison), provides this information in aggregated form.

Table 10a (2006): Methods Used to Bait Hook with Prawns/Shrimp - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

METHOD		ANY MENTION	MAIN METHOD	2ND METHOD	3RD METHOD
Live	No. %	52608 10.3%	36306 7.1%	16302 3.2%	0 0.0%
Whole (dead)	No. %	335804 66.0%	289912 57.0%	33455 6.6%	12437 2.4%
With the head off (some shell and flesh) ...					
(a) Whole body (remainder)	No. %	109991 21.6%	74970 14.7%	32874 6.5%	2148 0.4%
(b) Part of the body (cut/pieces)	No. %	43807 8.6%	23071 4.5%	13664 2.7%	7073 1.4%
(c) Total (head off)	No. %	(153799) (30.2%)	(98041) (19.3%)	(46538) (9.1%)	(9220) (1.8%)
Peeled (no head or shell) ...					
(a) Whole body (remainder)	No. %	99385 19.5%	56568 11.1%	39959 7.9%	2858 0.6%
(b) Part of the body (cut/pieces)	No. %	56809 11.2%	27440 5.4%	24283 4.8%	5085 1.0%
(c) Total (peeled)	No. %	(156194) (30.7%)	(84009) (16.5%)	(64242) (12.6%)	(7943) (1.6%)
Other (i.e. head specifically used)	No. %	380 0.1%	380 0.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No 2nd/3rd method	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	348112 68.4%	479047 94.2%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 137.4%	508648 100%	508648 100%	508648 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 10b (2002 Comparison): Methods Used to Bait Hook with Prawns/Shrimp - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

METHOD		ANY MENTION	MAIN METHOD	2ND METHOD	3RD METHOD
Live	No.	43769	39185	4584	0
	%	8.5%	7.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Whole (dead)	No.	381102	331236	41705	8161
	%	74.3%	64.6%	8.1%	1.6%
With the head off (some shell and flesh)	No.	201294	99694	101601	0
	%	39.3%	19.4%	19.8%	0.0%
Peeled (no head or shell)	No.	126734	40715	57177	28842
	%	24.7%	7.9%	11.2%	5.6%
Other (i.e. head specifically used)	No.	4044	1896	2148	0
	%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%
No 2nd/3rd method	No.	n/a	n/a	305513	475724
	%	n/a	n/a	59.6%	92.8%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	512727	512727	512727
	%	147.6%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for increased usage of prawns which are 'peeled (no head or shell)' as the main method for baiting the hook (at the national level). Note: however, usage form should not be confused with purchase form, where 2% of all prawn users in the 2006 survey reported any purchase of 'peeled' prawns (see Section 5.3, Tables 14 and 15).

The results in Tables 11a and b (overleaf) assess the extent to which residents of each state/territory used prawns/shrimp locally, as opposed to other regions of Australia. To assist in this regard, the table cells conforming to 'home' state/territory usage have been highlighted.

Table 11a (2006): State/Territory of Usage of Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

STATE/TERRITORY OF ...			RESIDENCE						
USAGE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
NSW/ACT	No.	222419	17911	4982	2819	0	1294	0	249425
	%	96.6%	36.8%	3.5%	13.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	49.0%
VIC	No.	2323	35939	0	4511	0	398	0	43171
	%	1.0%	73.8%	0.0%	20.8%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	8.5%
QLD	No.	9265	7254	142421	1181	0	0	0	160121
	%	4.0%	14.9%	100.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%
SA	No.	0	541	0	19966	0	0	0	20507
	%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	92.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
WA	No.	1925	0	0	0	44010	0	0	45935
	%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%
TAS	No.	0	905	0	0	0	12534	0	13440
	%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.9%	0.0%	2.6%
NT	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8642	8642
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1.7%
Total ²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	102.5%	128.4%	103.5%	131.5%	100.0%	110.0%	100.0%	106.4%
Total Prawn Users ¹	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals may add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 11b (2002 Comparison): State/Territory of Usage of Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

STATE/TERRITORY OF ...			RESIDENCE						
USAGE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
NSW/ACT	No.	213376	16009	10017	663	0	0	0	240065
	%	99.2%	18.6%	7.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	46.8%
VIC	No.	0	74565	0	0	0	0	0	74565
	%	0.0%	86.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.5%
QLD	No.	1678	0	126598	0	0	0	0	128276
	%	0.8%	0.0%	98.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
SA	No.	0	0	0	26390	0	0	0	26390
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%
WA	No.	0	1439	0	0	44358	0	0	45797
	%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.9%
TAS	No.	0	905	0	0	0	8391	0	9296
	%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1.8%
NT	No.	0	0	2940	0	0	0	4382	7322
	%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1.4%
Total ²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	100.0%	108.1%	108.9%	102.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	103.7%
Total Prawn Users ¹	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals may add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for decreased usage within Victoria by Victorian residents and increased usage within Queensland by Australian residents.

5.3 Quantities

All results in this sub-section refer to estimates of total quantities of prawns/shrimp used in the previous 12 months from 'purchase sources' only, i.e. usage quantities were not assessed for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp. In Table 12a (overleaf), quantities for each purchase source are assessed by state/territory of residence, followed by Table 12b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 12a (2006): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	193158	49547	55858	6288	15705	9423	3947	333926
	%	84.2%	94.2%	77.9%	100.0%	79.2%	96.5%	100.0%	84.9%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	36235	3067	15802	0	4130	344	0	59579
	%	15.8%	5.8%	22.1%	0.0%	20.8%	3.5%	0.0%	15.1%
Total¹	Kgs.	229393	52614	71661	6288	19835	9767	3947	393506
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Purchaser-Users²	No.	225743	41112	117301	15464	44010	12932	7705	464268
Mean Kgs. Per Purchaser-User²	Kgs.	1.02	1.28	0.61	0.41	0.45	0.76	0.51	0.85

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) ... from 'purchase sources' only

² Excludes those who only used prawns/shrimp that were 'Personally Caught'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 12b (2002 Comparison): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	205935	52535	124647	4780	21324	2657	1128	413006
	%	88.2%	93.8%	88.1%	94.8%	92.4%	99.6%	67.5%	89.1%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	27671	3478	16795	262	1744	11	544	50504
	%	11.8%	6.2%	11.9%	5.2%	7.6%	0.4%	32.5%	10.9%
Total¹	Kgs.	233606	56013	141442	5042	23068	2667	1672	463510
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Purchaser-Users²	No.	211053	79125	114142	18441	34732	8391	4382	470266
Mean Kgs. Per Purchaser-User²	Kgs.	1.11	0.71	1.24	0.27	0.66	0.32	0.38	0.99

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only

² Excludes those who only used prawns/shrimp that were 'Personally Caught'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for decreased usage quantities of both 'sold as bait' and 'total' prawns/shrimp by Queensland residents – the direct result of substantially lower mean usage quantities (per purchaser-user).

Estimated quantities of prawns/shrimp used in the previous 12 months (from purchase sources only) are assessed by state/territory of usage in Table 13a (below), followed by Table 13b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 13a (2006): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	202207	29778	67108	5729	15745	9413	3947	333926
	%	86.2%	90.9%	77.1%	100.0%	79.2%	96.5%	100.0%	84.9%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	32253	2966	19885	0	4130	344	0	59579
	%	13.8%	9.1%	22.9%	0.0%	20.8%	3.5%	0.0%	15.1%
Total¹	Kgs.	234460	32744	86992	5729	19876	9757	3947	393506
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 13b (2002 Comparison): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	220279	28905	123776	4579	31583	2698	1187	413006
	%	88.4%	92.4%	88.1%	94.6%	94.8%	99.6%	68.6%	89.1%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	28799	2371	16773	262	1744	11	544	50504
	%	11.6%	7.6%	11.9%	5.4%	5.2%	0.4%	31.4%	10.9%
Total¹	Kgs.	249078	31276	140549	4842	33326	2708	1731	463510
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers in the above analysis.

Also, when 2005/06 national usage quantities are analysed in terms of general fishing 'avidity' (days fished) of 'repeat fishers', it emerges that the low avidity group (1-4 days fished) accounts for some 29% of all purchaser-users of prawns/shrimp (36% in 2002), but only 9% of estimated total quantities used (9% in 2002). Corresponding results for the medium avidity group (5-14 days fished) are 31% of purchaser-users (22% in 2002) and 18% of total quantities (16% in 2002) and for the high avidity group (15 or more days fished), 39% of purchaser-users (42% in

2002) and 74% of total quantities (76% in 2002). Note: the impacts of avidity in terms of 'Sold as Seafood' prawn usage are further analysed and discussed in Section 5.4

Estimated total quantities used of prawns/shrimp 'Sold as Bait' (per Tables 13a and b) have been disaggregated for each specific 'purchase form' in the survey questionnaire – in Table 14a (below), followed by Table 14b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 14a (2006): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Bait' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	1274	0	54	0	0	0	0	1328
	%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Pre-packaged frozen (whole)	Kgs.	167303	29778	58909	5729	15745	9332	3947	290744
	%	82.7%	100.0%	87.8%	100.0%	100.0%	99.1%	100.0%	87.1%
Loose/unpackaged (whole)	Kgs.	33630	0	8144	0	0	0	0	41774
	%	16.6%	0.0%	12.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ²	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	81	0	81
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	202207	29778	67108	5729	15745	9413	3947	333926
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Bait'

² Refers to one respondent only (Tasmania), who reported purchasing bait prawns in a brine solution/punnet

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 14b (2002 Comparison): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Bait' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	1957	104	0	0	0	0	0	2061
	%	0.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Pre-packaged frozen (whole)	Kgs.	146680	28801	123776	4579	31583	2052	1187	338658
	%	66.6%	99.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	76.1%	100.0%	82.0%
Loose/unpackaged (whole)	Kgs.	71642	0	0	0	0	349	0	71991
	%	32.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%	0.0%	17.4%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	297	0	297
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	220279	28905	123776	4579	31583	2698	1187	413006
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Bait'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for decreased usage quantities of 'pre-packaged frozen whole' prawns within Queensland (by Australian residents).

In the following tables, estimated total quantities used of prawns/shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' (per Tables 13a and b) have been disaggregated for each specific 'purchase form' in the survey questionnaire.

In the 2006 survey, additional detail was sought in this questioning for 'shelled' (or peeled) prawns, in terms of further processing of some kind (e.g. skewered, marinated or crumbed), as opposed to whole/pieces of shelled prawns – see Table 15a (overleaf). Table 15b (the 2002 comparison), provides this information in aggregated form.

Table 15a (2006): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead)	Kgs.	29177	0	19784	0	4130	176	0	53268
	%	90.5%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	100.0%	51.1%	0.0%	89.4%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	2966	0	0	0	0	0	2966
	%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ...									
(a) Processed in some way ²	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	120	0	120
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	34.8%	0.0%	0.2%
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs.	3077	0	100	0	0	49	0	3225
	%	9.5%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	0.0%	5.4%
(c) Total	Kgs.	(3077)	(0)	(100)	(0)	(0)	(168)	(0)	(3345)
	%	(9.5%)	(0.0%)	(0.5%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(48.9%)	(0.0%)	(5.6%)
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	32253	2966	19885	0	4130	344	0	59579
	%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	0%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

² Refers to one respondent only (Tasmania), who reported purchasing skewered/marinated prawns

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 15b (2002 Comparison): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead)	Kgs.	28799	587	16773	262	1744	11	544	48720
	%	100.0%	24.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	96.5%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	1784	0	0	0	0	0	1784
	%	0.0%	75.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	28799	2371	16773	262	1744	11	544	50504
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for the above analysis. Note: in the 2006 survey, some 2% of all prawn users (7 respondents in total) reported any usage of prawns for the purchase form 'Shelled – incl tail fan on' (i.e. in Tables 14a and 15a). This is not to be confused with the larger numbers of prawn users reporting 'Peeled' prawns as a preferred method of baiting the hook (see Tables 10a and b earlier).

The results in Tables 16a and b (overleaf) estimate quantities of whole prawns/shrimp used (for selected purchase forms), in terms of four size groups (total body length basis). This assessment was confined to certain purchase forms, on the basis that they represent the main situations where an effective choice of size might exist, i.e. any loose/unpackaged prawns (as opposed to pre-packaged frozen prawns from bait suppliers).

In this question sequence, respondents were asked to assign proportions of reported quantities to each of the four size groups. However, in developing and testing this approach, it was recognised that many respondents would be unable to accurately assess prawn sizes, to the extent that misreporting by one size group (up or down) could reasonably be expected – especially for prawn sizes close to the limits of adjoining groups. The significant minority of quantities assigned to the smallest group ('less than 5cm or 2 inches') is considered at least partly attributable to this imprecision – namely, where respondents wishing to report quite small prawns, may have inappropriately opted for the smallest group. On the other hand, misreporting by two size groups was considered highly unlikely. For example, where a respondent used (say) 14cm prawns, substantial under-estimation would be required (by at least 5cm) for the quantity to be assigned to the 5–9cm group.

In the context of 'semi-quantitative' analysis, this assessment has clearly achieved its objectives – namely, to gain an understanding of fisher preferences/usage in relation to prawn size and the extent to which large prawns (>13cm) might be sourced from seafood suppliers. In terms of the latter, the impacts of any reporting imprecision in the 9-13cm group can only be minimal – due to the small numbers involved and the likely 'distribution skew' towards the lower end of the 9-13cm range.

Table 16a (2006): Estimated Size of Whole Prawns/Shrimp - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Selected Source/ Purchase Forms - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

SIZE RANGE		SOLD AS BAIT (Loose/unpackaged)	SOLD AS SEAFOOD (Whole dead)	TOTAL
Less than 5cm	Kgs.	13776	14302	28078
	%	33.0%	26.8%	29.5%
5 to 9cm	Kgs.	27998	36406	64404
	%	67.0%	68.3%	67.8%
9 to 13cm	Kgs.	0	2560	2560
	%	0.0%	4.8%	2.7%
More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	41774	53268	95041
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) ... Purchased 'Whole (dead)' and either 'Sold as Bait' (but excluding pre-packaged frozen) or 'Sold as Seafood' Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 16b (2002 Comparison): Estimated Size of Whole Prawns/Shrimp - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Selected Source/Purchase Forms - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

SIZE RANGE		SOLD AS BAIT (Loose/unpackaged)	SOLD AS SEAFOOD (Whole dead)	TOTAL
Less than 5cm	Kgs.	7073	13668	20741
	%	9.8%	28.1%	17.2%
5 to 9cm	Kgs.	59872	31522	91394
	%	83.2%	64.7%	75.7%
9 to 13cm	Kgs.	5046	3530	8576
	%	7.0%	7.2%	7.1%
More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	71991	48720	120711
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... Purchased 'Whole (dead)' and either 'Sold as Bait' (but excluding pre-packaged frozen) or 'Sold as Seafood' Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Note: the small sub samples involved in the above results have precluded any comparative analysis.

The following results estimate national usage of prawns/shrimp by water body type, season and purchase source in Table 17a (overleaf), followed by Table 17b (the 2002 comparison).

Table 17a (2006): Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Water Body Type and Season - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Purchase Source - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

WATER BODY TYPE	SEASON		SOLD AS □ BAIT	SOLD AS SEAFOOD	TOTAL
Freshwater	Winter	Kgs. %	5491 1.6%	2657 4.5%	8148 2.1%
	Summer	Kgs. %	14110 4.2%	1604 2.7%	15715 4.0%
Saltwater	Winter	Kgs. %	98538 29.5%	20972 35.2%	119509 30.4%
	Summer	Kgs. %	215787 64.6%	34346 57.6%	250134 63.6%
Total¹		Kgs. %	333926 100%	59579 100%	393506 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used (in any State/Territory) by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 17b (2002 Comparison): Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Water Body Type and Season - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Purchase Source - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

WATER BODY TYPE	SEASON		SOLD AS □ BAIT	SOLD AS SEAFOOD	TOTAL
Freshwater	Winter	Kgs. %	4273 1.0%	0 0.0%	4273 0.9%
	Summer	Kgs. %	8965 2.2%	2153 4.3%	11118 2.4%
Saltwater	Winter	Kgs. %	137844 33.4%	17786 35.2%	155630 33.6%
	Summer	Kgs. %	261924 63.4%	30565 60.5%	292489 63.1%
Total¹		Kgs. %	413006 100%	50504 100%	463510 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used (in any State/Territory) by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for the above analysis.

In the 2002 survey report, further disaggregation of the information in Tables 17a and b was provided in separate tables for each state/territory. Due to relatively small sub-samples in many cases, equivalent tables for the 2006 survey have (by agreement) not been included in this report. However, the survey database contains these data – with further information related to state/territory of usage discussed in Section 5.4 below.

5.4 Potentially Imported Prawns/Shrimp

In both the 2002 and 2006 surveys, the quantities of potentially imported ‘sold as seafood’ prawns were assessed through appropriate classification of various purchase forms, together with size assessments for whole uncooked prawns (Tables 15a/b and 16a/b, respectively). In Table 18a (overleaf), this information has been further distilled to more clearly assess this issue and includes the more detailed sub-forms for ‘shelled’ prawns from Table 16a. Table 18b (the 2002 comparison), provides this information in aggregated form. Note: in Appendix B, equivalent information for all fishers (2002) has been provided in Table 18c.

Table 18a (2006): Import Potential¹ of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used² (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM	ANY IMPORT POTENTIAL ...			
		YES	NO	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	n/a	0	0
	%	n/a	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead) ...				
(a) Less than 5cm	Kgs.	n/a	14302	14302
	%	n/a	26.8%	24.0%
(b) 5 to 9cm	Kgs.	n/a	36406	36406
	%	n/a	68.3%	61.1%
(c) 9 to 13cm	Kgs.	n/a	2560	2560
	%	n/a	4.8%	4.3%
(d) More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
(e) Total	Kgs.	(0)	(53268)	(53268)
	%	(0.0%)	(100.0%)	(89.4%)
With the head off	Kgs.	2966	n/a	2966
	%	47.0%	n/a	5.0%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ...				
(a) Processed in some way ³	Kgs.	120	n/a	120
	%	1.9%	n/a	0.2%
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs.	3225	n/a	3225
	%	51.1%	n/a	5.4%
(c) Total	Kgs.	(3345)	n/a	(3345)
	%	(53.0%)	n/a	(5.6%)
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Total²	Kgs.	6312	53268	59579
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Purchase Forms involving whole prawns (live or dead) below the 13cm size class are classified as having no import potential (i.e. the first 4 categories in the above table). All remaining Purchase Forms are classified as potential imports

² Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

³ Refers to one respondent only (Tasmania), who reported purchasing skewered/marinated prawns

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 18b (2002 Comparison): Import Potential¹ of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used² (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORT POTENTIAL ...		
		YES	NO	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	n/a	0	0
	%	n/a	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead) ...				
(a) Less than 5cm	Kgs.	n/a	13668	13668
	%	n/a	28.1%	27.1%
(b) 5 to 9cm	Kgs.	n/a	31522	31522
	%	n/a	64.7%	62.4%
(c) 9 to 13cm	Kgs.	n/a	3530	3530
	%	n/a	7.2%	7.0%
(d) More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
(e) Total	Kgs.	(0)	(48720)	(48720)
	%	(0.0%)	(100.0%)	(96.5%)
With the head off	Kgs.	1784	n/a	1784
	%	100.0%	n/a	3.5%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ...	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Total¹				
	Kgs.	1784	48720	50504
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Purchase Forms involving whole prawns (live or dead) below the 13cm size class are classified as having no import potential (i.e. the first 4 categories in the above table). All remaining Purchase Forms are classified as potential imports

² Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (customised, normal distribution-based test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for the above analysis, due to the small sub-sample sizes involved (see discussion below).

In the 2006 survey, some 38 respondents ('raw' data basis) reported any usage of 'sold as seafood' prawns. Among these, potentially imported prawns were identified for only 7 respondents. Despite the small sub-sample, around half of this usage was reported in NSW/ACT (3 respondents), with the remainder in Tasmania (2 respondents) and (1 respondent each) in Victoria and Queensland. For the 2002 survey, no such usage was reported outside NSW/ACT and Victoria, whether from the 'repeat fisher' group or any other respondent.

Also, when these results are analysed in terms of avidity it emerges that in both surveys, the higher avidity groups dominated the usage quantities of ‘sold as seafood’ prawns generally and totally so, for potentially imported products – i.e. none was reported by the low avidity group, (again) whether from the ‘repeat fisher’ group or any other respondent.

However, in specific additional questioning for the 2006 survey, all respondents reporting usage of ‘sold as seafood’ prawns in the previous 12 months were asked whether any of their purchases referred to imported product (yes, no or unsure). Note: as discussed earlier, national requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products (as imported etc) were introduced by *FSANZ* after the time of the 2002 survey. In response, among the 38 respondents reporting any ‘sold as seafood’ prawn usage, 1 reported purchasing imported product, with 24 citing local product only and 13 ‘unsure’. When this analysis is confined to potentially imported prawns, only 7 respondents remain (as discussed above). Among these, 1 reported imported product, with 2 reporting local product only and 4 ‘unsure’. Despite the small sub-sample involved, the results for this latter group have been included in Table 19, for completeness/comparison with earlier results.

Table 19 (2006): Any Imported Prawns Reported¹ - Potentially Imported 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used² (Kgs) - Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORTED PRAWNS USED ...			TOTAL (Potentially Imported)
		YES	NO	UNSURE	
Whole (dead) - more than 13cm	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	0	2966	2966
	%	0.0%	0.0%	62.5%	47.0%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ...					
(a) Processed in some way ³	Kgs.	120	0	0	120
	%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs.	0	1449	1777	3225
	%	0.0%	100.0%	37.5%	51.1%
(c) Total	Kgs.	(120)	(1449)	(1777)	(3345)
	%	(100.0%)	(100.0%)	(37.5%)	(51.1%)
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/ shells used	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total²	Kgs.	120	1449	4743	6312
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ All respondents reporting usage of 'sold as seafood' prawns were asked if any of their purchases were imported product or not

² Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by 'repeat' recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood' and the Purchase Form/Size Class is classified as 'potentially imported' - see Table 18a earlier

³ Refers to one respondent only (Tasmania), who reported purchasing skewered/marinated prawns

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Note: as the above results refer to questioning in the 2006 survey only, no comparative analysis has been conducted.

6 RESULTS: BEHAVIOUR CHANGE ASSESSMENTS (2006 VS 2002)

6.1 Introduction

The information contained in this section has been compiled for a range of question sequences specifically developed for the Follow-up Survey, to assess behaviour changes of relevance to the study – in terms of main/other reasons reported by respondents for such changes (see earlier discussion in Section 3.1.1). Commencing with an assessment of respondents reporting no recreational fishing activity in the previous 12 months (Section 6.2 below), the remaining Sections (6.3 to 6.7) assess various behaviour changes by ‘repeat’ fishers (e.g. more/less fishing effort, changes in bait usage etc.).

A standardised code-frame was routinely applied to the range of reasons reported for these changes. In developing this code-frame, 18 discrete reasons codes were identified, including quite detailed coding to account for various aspects of a fishing-related nature, bait quality and performance etc. Each of these codes has been employed in at least one of Tables 20 to 61, in Section 6. However, as discussed in Section 1.4 (due to the large number of reasons codes), only those codes for which responses apply have been included in each assessment/table. An exception to this approach is the ‘Other’ category, which is routinely shown in each table.

In the remainder of Section 6, all assessments of behaviour change refer to ‘repeat’ fishers only. For each assessment, the incidence of any such change has been routinely analysed and reported (see Table 22), followed by results of the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test) in each case.

An appropriate assessment of reported ‘reasons’ is then provided in each case, depending on the levels of change involved. Firstly, where a change of some kind has been assessed for more than 5% of ‘repeat’ fishers (population-based, but around 25 respondents), an analysis of the main/other reasons reported has been included on a national basis (see Table 23). More detailed analysis has only been included where the change refers to more than 15% of such fishers (around 75 respondents), with further disaggregation provided at the state/territory level, in terms of the main reasons reported (see Tables 24a and b). Note: in the above analysis criteria, the relatively low limits applied (5% and 15%) enable qualitative assessment in certain cases and as usual, readers should refer to (and apply) standard error calculations from Appendix A. In all other cases, no ‘reasons’ assessment has been included in the report (e.g. Table 43 – changes in usage of saltwater crayfish as bait/berley). However, the survey database routinely contains this information and in many cases, data tabulations not included in the report have been provided to Biosecurity Australia.

Note: additional information relevant to the various assessments for ‘repeat fishers’ has been included at the commencement of Section 6.3.

6.2 Reasons for No Recreational Fishing in Previous 12 Months (2005/06)

By design, the Follow-up Survey sought to re-interview respondents from the 2002 survey assessed as recreational fishers at that time. As shown in Table 5 (Section 4.1), over a third of all respondents to the Follow-up Survey (37.3%) reported no recreational fishing (of any kind) in the most recent 12 months.

In direct contrast to the higher avidity profiles of 'repeat fishers' (see discussion in Section 4.1), these respondents have obviously lower avidity profiles, based on data from the 2002 survey: 61% in the low avidity group (1-4 days fished); 27% in the middle avidity group (5-14 days); and 12% in the high avidity group (15 days or more). Also, whereas the NRIFS (and other surveys) have shown that year-to-year variations in recreational fishing participation by individuals do occur (and more so, among the low avidity group), no secondary datasets have been identified of direct relevance to this issue, i.e. where a four year 'gap' has been assessed.

For each respondent reporting no recent fishing activity, subsequent questioning assessed the main/other reasons for this 'change' – the results to which appear in Table 20 overleaf.

Table 20: Reasons for No Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - Former Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Work/business-related	No.	233657	210180	23478
	%	41.2%	37.1%	4.1%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	73937	70725	3211
	%	13.0%	12.5%	0.6%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	133906	95808	38098
	%	23.6%	16.9%	6.7%
Home/family-related	No.	118365	79969	38395
	%	20.9%	14.1%	6.8%
Social-related (e.g. friend stopped fishing)	No.	25640	10175	15465
	%	4.5%	1.8%	2.7%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	3144	3144	0
	%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	36102	32217	3884
	%	6.4%	5.7%	0.7%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	26733	9134	17599
	%	4.7%	1.6%	3.1%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	4377	4377	0
	%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	15148	6819	8329
	%	2.7%	1.2%	1.5%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	31154	21300	9854
	%	5.5%	3.8%	1.7%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	13051	13051	0
	%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%
Other	No.	10215	10215	0
	%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	408803
	%	n/a	n/a	72.1%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	567116	567116
	%	127.9%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fully responded to the follow-up survey, but reported no recreational fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - see Table 5 earlier

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

In Table 21 (overleaf), the main reasons reported in Table 20 (above) have been disaggregated by state/territory of residence.

Table 21: Main Reason for No Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - Former Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	57704	25023	73378	13291	29807	6250	4727	210180
	%	30.2%	29.3%	54.9%	22.6%	41.0%	37.5%	54.6%	37.1%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	20416	22601	6985	10758	6222	3744	0	70725
	%	10.7%	26.5%	5.2%	18.3%	8.6%	22.4%	0.0%	12.5%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	41400	4547	10240	18041	18875	1750	955	95808
	%	21.7%	5.3%	7.7%	30.6%	26.0%	10.5%	11.0%	16.9%
Home/family-related	No.	29054	16323	14455	7403	9571	3163	0	79969
	%	15.2%	19.1%	10.8%	12.6%	13.2%	19.0%	0.0%	14.1%
Social-related (e.g. friend stopped fishing)	No.	0	7514	2661	0	0	0	0	10175
	%	0.0%	8.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	1191	1953	0	0	0	0	3144
	%	0.0%	1.4%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	15845	0	10591	4535	0	1246	0	32217
	%	8.3%	0.0%	7.9%	7.7%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	5.7%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	7972	1162	0	0	0	0	0	9134
	%	4.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	999	3378	0	0	0	0	0	4377
	%	0.5%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	1619	0	1376	968	2857	0	0	6819
	%	0.8%	0.0%	1.0%	1.6%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	3309	3043	7624	1680	4205	0	1439	21300
	%	1.7%	3.6%	5.7%	2.9%	5.8%	0.0%	16.6%	3.8%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	7225	0	3056	1233	0	0	1538	13051
	%	3.8%	0.0%	2.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	2.3%
Other	No.	5527	586	1436	991	1139	536	0	10215
	%	2.9%	0.7%	1.1%	1.7%	1.6%	3.2%	0.0%	1.8%
Total ¹	No.	191070	85369	133755	58900	72675	16688	8659	567116
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more) who fully responded to the follow-up survey, but reported no recreational fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - see Table 5 earlier

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

6.3 Changes in Levels of Recreational Fishing Effort – ‘Repeat’ Fishers

As discussed in Section 3.1.1, relevant database information from the 2002 survey was provided on the first page of the 2006 questionnaire for each respondent in terms of avidity group, reported days fished, bait types used etc. After obtaining equivalent information for the 2006 survey, comparisons were made by the interviewer to determine whether certain behaviour changes had occurred or not – and if so, appropriate ‘reasons’ questions were asked.

The first of these assessments identified ‘substantial’ changes in levels of recreational fishing effort (days fished) between the 2002 and 2006 surveys. In the 2002 survey, all recreational fishers were assessed in terms of general avidity group, but by design, only those reporting ‘in-scope’ bait/berley use (aquatic animals) were assessed in terms of the number of days fished in the previous 12 months (recall basis). This information was primarily required for bait quantity estimation and the same approach was employed in the 2006 survey.

Any substantial change in fishing effort among ‘repeat’ fishers was therefore assessed in one of two ways:-

- (i) for those reporting ‘in-scope’ bait usage in both surveys (and therefore, days fished assessments obtained), pre-determined upper/lower limits printed onto each questionnaire were routinely applied by the interviewer. Note: these limits were calculated on the basis of a 33% increase/25% decrease (for 50 days or more fished in 2002), then using a ‘sliding-scale’ up to a 50% increase/33% decrease (from 49 days down to 10 days fished) and appropriately larger proportional increases/decreases below the 10 day level (e.g. for 5 days, upper/lower limits of 10/2 days were applied);
- (ii) for all other ‘repeat’ fishers, changes in avidity group (1-4 days, 5-14, 15 or more) were applied, i.e. an increase/decrease by one or more of these groups. Note: in cases where this approach resulted in effectively ‘insignificant’ changes being assessed (e.g. respondents close to the limits of two avidity groups), the reasons code “no reason/nothing in particular” was often applied.

Changes in levels of fishing effort between the two surveys are assessed in Table 22 overleaf.

Table 22: Changes in Levels of Annual Fishing Effort¹ (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
More (2005/06)	No.	88642	61362	30789	16340	14604	12551	5898	230186
	%	27.0%	27.8%	15.7%	19.9%	21.0%	32.4%	30.8%	24.1%
Less (2005/06)	No.	82936	54683	59341	23663	25469	5776	4249	256117
	%	25.3%	24.8%	30.2%	28.8%	36.6%	14.9%	22.2%	26.8%
No Change	No.	156168	104347	106601	42111	29592	20380	8982	468179
	%	47.6%	47.3%	54.2%	51.3%	42.5%	52.7%	47.0%	49.1%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Comparisons of reported days fished (recall basis) were made between the two surveys (2005/06 and 2001/02) - according to pre-determined limits (see discussion preceding Table 22)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers - see Table 5 earlier

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge among 'repeat' fishers for increased fishing effort by Tasmanian residents (only).

For those respondents determined as fishing substantially more or less in the 2006 survey, subsequent questioning assessed the main/other reasons for this change – the results to which appear in Table 23 overleaf.

Table 23: Reasons for More/Less Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		MORE FISHING (2005/06) ...			LESS FISHING (2005/06) ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Work/business-related	No.	82381	72381	10000	110914	102013	8901
	%	35.8%	31.4%	4.3%	43.3%	39.8%	3.5%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	5283	3989	1294	28379	24358	4020
	%	2.3%	1.7%	0.6%	11.1%	9.5%	1.6%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	12449	9345	3104	26192	24349	1843
	%	5.4%	4.1%	1.3%	10.2%	9.5%	0.7%
Home/family-related	No.	29671	24000	5671	60228	35267	24961
	%	12.9%	10.4%	2.5%	23.5%	13.8%	9.7%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No.	22850	19535	3314	6422	3557	2865
	%	9.9%	8.5%	1.4%	2.5%	1.4%	1.1%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	14701	14701	0	0	0	0
	%	6.4%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	52098	43146	8953	17382	15161	2220
	%	22.6%	18.7%	3.9%	6.8%	5.9%	0.9%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	0	0	0	8989	8989	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	3.5%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	6238	3010	3227
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	1.3%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	454	454	0	16645	6384	10261
	%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	6.5%	2.5%	4.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7057	2813	4244	10801	7400	3400
	%	3.1%	1.2%	1.8%	4.2%	2.9%	1.3%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	5268	5268	0	20327	11994	8333
	%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%	7.9%	4.7%	3.3%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	31482	31482	0	11124	11124	0
	%	13.7%	13.7%	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%
Other	No.	4737	3072	1665	2510	2510	0
	%	2.1%	1.3%	0.7%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	191941	n/a	n/a	186083
	%	n/a	n/a	83.4%	n/a	n/a	72.7%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	230186	230186	n/a	256117	256117
	%	116.6%	100%	100%	127.3%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, assessed as fishing substantially more or less in 2005/06 (than in 2001/02) - see Table 22

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

The main reasons reported in Table 23 have been disaggregated by state/territory in Table 24a below (more fishing) and Table 24b (less fishing) overleaf.

Table 24a: Main Reasons for MORE Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	8959	32826	10633	4447	8128	5654	1735	72381
	%	10.1%	53.5%	34.5%	27.2%	55.7%	45.0%	29.4%	31.4%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1225	0	2764	0	0	0	0	3989
	%	1.4%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	3362	0	0	0	4046	1937	0	9345
	%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.7%	15.4%	0.0%	4.1%
Home/family-related	No.	11171	4483	5072	0	1609	0	1665	24000
	%	12.6%	7.3%	16.5%	0.0%	11.0%	0.0%	28.2%	10.4%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No.	11937	2111	2599	0	0	1002	1887	19535
	%	13.5%	3.4%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	32.0%	8.5%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	2677	5013	2258	4357	0	396	0	14701
	%	3.0%	8.2%	7.3%	26.7%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	6.4%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	25295	7327	6083	2541	822	1010	68	43146
	%	28.5%	11.9%	19.8%	15.6%	5.6%	8.0%	1.2%	18.7%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	0	0	0	0	454	0	454
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	2011	0	0	0	0	801	0	2813
	%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	1.2%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	2131	0	0	1962	0	633	542	5268
	%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	0.0%	5.0%	9.2%	2.3%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	18182	9602	0	3033	0	665	0	31482
	%	20.5%	15.6%	0.0%	18.6%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	13.7%
Other	No.	1690	0	1382	0	0	0	0	3072
	%	1.9%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Total ¹	No.	88642	61362	30789	16340	14604	12551	5898	230186
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, assessed as fishing substantially more in 2005/06 (than in 2001/02) - see Table 22

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 24b: Main Reasons for LESS Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	23145	28669	27705	9559	11136	656	1143	102013
	%	27.9%	52.4%	46.7%	40.4%	43.7%	11.4%	26.9%	39.8%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1117	12828	2228	1989	1449	4747	0	24358
	%	1.3%	23.5%	3.8%	8.4%	5.7%	82.2%	0.0%	9.5%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	15446	680	2941	2244	3037	0	0	24349
	%	18.6%	1.2%	5.0%	9.5%	11.9%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
Home/family-related	No.	10441	1457	8770	4846	6706	0	3046	35267
	%	12.6%	2.7%	14.8%	20.5%	26.3%	0.0%	71.7%	13.8%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No.	1867	1690	0	0	0	0	0	3557
	%	2.3%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	3776	7617	2689	1079	0	0	15161
	%	0.0%	6.9%	12.8%	11.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	8989	0	0	0	0	0	0	8989
	%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	3010	0	0	0	0	0	0	3010
	%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3104	2289	0	0	990	0	0	6384
	%	3.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7400	0	0	0	0	0	0	7400
	%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	0	1855	10079	0	0	0	60	11994
	%	0.0%	3.4%	17.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	4.7%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	8416	0	0	2335	0	373	0	11124
	%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	4.3%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	1071	0	0	2510
	%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Total ¹	No.	82936	54683	59341	23663	25469	5776	4249	256117
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, assessed as fishing substantially less in 2005/06 (than in 2001/02) - see Table 22

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

6.4 Changes in Usage of 'In-scope' Bait, Other Bait and Lures/Flys/etc

Using information collected in the 2006 survey and 2002 data printed on the first page of the questionnaire, any 'wholesale' changes in usage of 'in-scope' bait (aquatic animals) were assessed for each respondent, i.e. where such bait usage was reported in the 2002 survey and not in the 2006 survey (or vice versa). Equivalent assessments were also undertaken for 'Other' Bait (bread, meat etc) and Lures/flys/jigs. In all three cases, subsequent questioning assessed the main/other reasons for any such changes. Commencing with 'in-scope' bait, the results from these assessments are presented in Tables 25 to 31a/b.

Table 25: Changes in 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Usage¹ (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'IN-SCOPE' BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	55378	15911	0	4401	8403	1933	5247	91274
	%	16.9%	7.2%	0.0%	5.4%	12.1%	5.0%	27.4%	9.6%
2001/02 only	No.	14437	8596	7009	6199	5232	3176	506	45155
	%	4.4%	3.9%	3.6%	7.5%	7.5%	8.2%	2.6%	4.7%
Both years	No.	243801	181765	189721	67657	54597	29399	12787	779727
	%	74.4%	82.5%	96.4%	82.4%	78.4%	76.0%	66.8%	81.7%
Neither year	No.	14128	14120	0	3858	1434	4198	589	38327
	%	4.3%	6.4%	0.0%	4.7%	2.1%	10.8%	3.1%	4.0%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ 'In-scope' bait/berley is defined as any kind of aquatic animal (i.e. plants and terrestrial animals are excluded)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge for increased 'in-scope' bait usage among 'repeat fishers' residing in NSW/ACT and also at the national level (as reported in relation to Tables 6a and b earlier).

Table 26: Reasons for Change of 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	4536	4536	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	1111	1111	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	11219	11219	0	5855	5855	0
	%	12.3%	12.3%	0.0%	13.0%	13.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	4235	1041	3194	2220	0	2220
	%	4.6%	1.1%	3.5%	4.9%	0.0%	4.9%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1525	1525	0	5855	0	5855
	%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	13.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	6951	5426	1525	6214	6214	0
	%	7.6%	5.9%	1.7%	13.8%	13.8%	0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	0	0	1248	1248	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	43959	41848	2111	27964	22277	5687
	%	48.2%	45.8%	2.3%	61.9%	49.3%	12.6%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	3503	3503	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	7.8%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	17764	17764	0	0	0	0
	%	19.5%	19.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	12451	12451	0	411	411	0
	%	13.6%	13.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	84443	n/a	n/a	31392
	%	n/a	n/a	92.5%	n/a	n/a	69.5%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	91274	91274	n/a	45155	45155
	%	107.5%	100%	100%	130.5%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using aquatic animals as bait/berley only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 25

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 27: Changes in 'OTHER' Bait/Berley Usage¹ (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'OTHER' BAIT/ BERLEY USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	2821	2892	3006	0	0	498	0	9217
	%	0.9%	1.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.0%
2001/02 only	No.	29467	32513	10227	5536	1090	4389	1616	84839
	%	9.0%	14.8%	5.2%	6.7%	1.6%	11.3%	8.4%	8.9%
Both years	No.	90881	77774	9387	25819	23920	11684	2952	242417
	%	27.7%	35.3%	4.8%	31.4%	34.3%	30.2%	15.4%	25.4%
Neither year	No.	204575	107212	174110	50760	44655	22136	14560	618009
	%	62.4%	48.6%	88.5%	61.8%	64.1%	57.2%	76.1%	64.7%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ 'OTHER' Bait/berley is defined as any kind of other organic material (e.g. plants, insects and terrestrial animals) and includes bread, weed, manufactured bait, meat, cheese - but excludes all aquatic animals

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge for decreased 'Other bait' usage among 'repeat fishers' at the national level only.

Table 28: Reasons for Change of 'OTHER' Bait/Berley Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	2220	2220	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	786	786	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1453	0	1453	0	0	0
	%	15.8%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	5415	0	5415
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.0%	6.4%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3006	3006	0	7579	5966	1613
	%	32.6%	32.6%	0.0%	8.9%	7.0%	1.9%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	3185	3185	0	26009	26009	0
	%	34.6%	34.6%	0.0%	30.7%	30.7%	0.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	9689	9689	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%	11.4%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	0	0	36268	35234	1034
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.7%	41.5%	1.2%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1587	1587	0	4934	4934	0
	%	17.2%	17.2%	0.0%	5.8%	5.8%	0.0%
Other	No.	1439	1439	0	0	0	0
	%	15.6%	15.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	7764	n/a	n/a	76777
	%	n/a	n/a	84.2%	n/a	n/a	90.5%
Total ^{1,2}	No.	n/a	9217	9217	n/a	84839	84839
	%	115.8%	100%	100%	109.5%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Other' Bait (i.e. not aquatic animals) as bait/berley only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 27

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 29: Changes in Lure/Fly/etc Usage¹ (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY LURE/ETC USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	35276	11507	29826	3550	19796	5906	0	105861
	%	10.8%	5.2%	15.2%	4.3%	28.4%	15.3%	0.0%	11.1%
2001/02 only	No.	18477	9352	18617	2300	4539	0	1775	55059
	%	5.6%	4.2%	9.5%	2.8%	6.5%	0.0%	9.3%	5.8%
Both years	No.	161816	139202	67139	38746	28742	28219	12265	476128
	%	49.4%	63.2%	34.1%	47.2%	41.3%	72.9%	64.1%	49.9%
Neither year	No.	112177	60330	81148	37519	16589	4582	5089	317434
	%	34.2%	27.4%	41.2%	45.7%	23.8%	11.8%	26.6%	33.3%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Lures/flys/jigs are defined as any man-made device (primarily/usually non-organic material) used to simulate the appearance or movement of an aquatic animal/insect etc.

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), significant differences emerge for increased lure/fly etc. usage among 'repeat fishers' residing in NSW/ACT and also at the national level.

Table 30: Reasons for Change of Lure/Fly/etc Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	1203	1203	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	0	0	0
	%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	4629	4629	0	2813	1522	1291
	%	4.4%	4.4%	0.0%	5.1%	2.8%	2.3%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1453	0	1453	0	0	0
	%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	3194	0	3194	0	0	0
	%	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	7879	7879	0	0	0	0
	%	7.4%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	19924	13744	6180	13340	13340	0
	%	18.8%	13.0%	5.8%	24.2%	24.2%	0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	3053	3053	0	5922	5922	0
	%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	10.8%	10.8%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	30918	29718	1200	26427	26427	0
	%	29.2%	28.1%	1.1%	48.0%	48.0%	0.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2726	2726	0	0	0	0
	%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	41717	39217	2500	4409	4409	0
	%	39.4%	37.0%	2.4%	8.0%	8.0%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	4895	4895	0	0	0	0
	%	4.6%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	No.	2833	0	2833	2235	2235	0
	%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	86800	n/a	n/a	53768
	%	n/a	n/a	82.0%	n/a	n/a	97.7%
Total ^{1,2}	No.	n/a	105861	105861	n/a	55059	55059
	%	118.0%	100%	100%	102.3%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Lures/flys etc only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 29

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 30: Reasons for Change of Lure/Fly/etc Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	1203	1203	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	0	0	0
	%	1.6%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	4629	4629	0	2813	1522	1291
	%	4.4%	4.4%	0.0%	5.1%	2.8%	2.3%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1453	0	1453	0	0	0
	%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	3194	0	3194	0	0	0
	%	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	7879	7879	0	0	0	0
	%	7.4%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	19924	13744	6180	13340	13340	0
	%	18.8%	13.0%	5.8%	24.2%	24.2%	0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	3053	3053	0	5922	5922	0
	%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%	10.8%	10.8%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	30918	29718	1200	26427	26427	0
	%	29.2%	28.1%	1.1%	48.0%	48.0%	0.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2726	2726	0	0	0	0
	%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	41717	39217	2500	4409	4409	0
	%	39.4%	37.0%	2.4%	8.0%	8.0%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	4895	4895	0	0	0	0
	%	4.6%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other	No.	2833	0	2833	2235	2235	0
	%	2.7%	0.0%	2.7%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	86800	n/a	n/a	53768
	%	n/a	n/a	82.0%	n/a	n/a	97.7%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	105861	105861	n/a	55059	55059
	%	118.0%	100%	100%	102.3%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Lures/flys etc only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 29

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 31a: Main Reasons for Lure/Fly/etc Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Home/family-related	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3953 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	676 11.4%	0 0.0%	4629 4.4%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. %	5045 14.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2833 14.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7879 7.4%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	10284 29.2%	0 0.0%	2941 9.9%	519 14.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13744 13.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. %	677 1.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2376 12.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3053 2.9%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	3819 10.8%	1453 12.6%	11513 38.6%	864 24.3%	11399 57.6%	670 11.3%	0 0.0%	29718 28.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	0 0.0%	1525 13.3%	1200 4.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2726 2.6%
Experimenting/trying different things	No. %	13413 38.0%	8529 74.1%	7361 24.7%	2167 61.0%	3187 16.1%	4560 77.2%	0 0.0%	39217 37.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	2037 5.8%	0 0.0%	2858 9.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4895 4.6%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Total ¹	No. %	35276 100%	11507 100%	29826 100%	3550 100%	19796 100%	5906 100%	0 0%	105861 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Lures/Fly/etc only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 29

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 31b: Main Reasons for Lure/Fly/etc Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1203 67.8%	1203 2.2%
Home/family-related	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. %	1522 8.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1522 2.8%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	3633 19.7%	5338 57.1%	2760 14.8%	0 0.0%	1609 35.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13340 24.2%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. %	5922 32.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5922 10.8%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	7400 40.1%	1182 12.6%	12045 64.7%	2300 100.0%	2929 64.5%	0 0.0%	572 32.2%	26427 48.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No. %	0 0.0%	2832 30.3%	1577 8.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4409 8.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2235 12.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2235 4.1%
Total ¹	No. %	18477 100%	9352 100%	18617 100%	2300 100%	4539 100%	0 0%	1775 100%	55059 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Lures/Fly/etc only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 29

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

6.5 Changes in Proportion of Fishing Time Using ‘In-scope’ Bait vs. Lures/etc

The information contained in Section 6.4 assesses ‘wholesale’ changes in usage of bait, lures etc between the 2002 and 2006 surveys. In Table 25, a net increase in ‘in-scope’ bait usage has been assessed among ‘repeat’ fishers of around 4% (i.e. for 9.6% for 2005/06 only less 5.7% for 2001/02 only). In Table 29, a similar increase emerged in terms of lure/fly/etc usage of just over 5% (i.e. 11.1% for 2005/06 only less 5.8% for 2001/02 only). By contrast, a decrease in ‘Other’ bait usage (bread, meat etc.) was assessed at around 8% (see Table 27).

In the design phase of the 2006 survey, the issue of potentially higher usage levels of lures (in particular, ‘soft plastics’) was a major consideration – in terms of potential impacts on bait usage levels and quantities. As a result of this, specific additional questioning was included in the 2006 survey to assess this issue for those respondents reporting usage of both ‘in-scope’ bait and lures/flys/etc in both survey reference periods (some 208 respondents among 486 ‘repeat’ fishers). The first question in this sequence assessed respondent perception as to the whether “more, less or about the same” proportion of their fishing time in 2005/06 (vs. 2001/02) was spent using ‘in-scope’ bait (vs. lures etc) – i.e. regardless of the potentially varying amounts of (absolute) time spent fishing in the two periods. Note: interviewers carefully explained this concept to each respondent to avoid any confusion in this regard.

However, the most appropriate analysis of this entire issue (changes in bait vs. lure usage) involves a combination of the results to this question sequence and relevant data obtained for other respondents (who did not use ‘in-scope’ bait and lures/etc in both periods). Put simply, many other respondents who reported ‘wholesale’ usage changes (Tables 25 and 29), can be routinely classified as spending more (or less) proportional fishing time in 2005/06 (vs. 2001/02) using ‘in-scope’ bait (vs. lures etc). For example (i) a respondent who used ‘in-scope’ bait in both periods, but only used lures/etc in 2005/06 would be classified as ‘less’ (bait usage in 2005/06) and (ii) a respondent who used only lures in 2001/02 and only ‘in-scope’ bait in 2005/06 would be classified as ‘more’. Note: by definition, none of these ‘other’ respondents can be classified as ‘about the same’ (proportion of time).

However, among these ‘other’ respondents are relatively large numbers of fishers, for whom this analysis (more, less or about the same) is clearly not applicable e.g. (i) the many respondents who only used ‘in-scope’ bait in both reference periods and (ii) those using ‘Other’ bait only (e.g. bread, meat). In Table 32 (overleaf), these respondents have been classified as ‘Other fishers/not applicable’ and have been included in the analysis for consistency/completeness purposes (i.e. an analysis base of all ‘repeat’ fishers).

Table 32: Changes in Proportion of Fishing Time¹ Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/Flys/etc (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

PROPORTION OF FISHING TIME 2005/06 ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
More with bait ³	No.	79029	56446	28124	14547	4741	7714	9022	199623
	%	24.1%	25.6%	14.3%	17.7%	6.8%	19.9%	47.2%	20.9%
Less with bait ³	No.	45336	42836	46473	7548	26134	12906	2518	183752
	%	13.8%	19.4%	23.6%	9.2%	37.5%	33.3%	13.2%	19.3%
About the same ³	No.	72291	49291	40985	21636	19272	9740	1911	215126
	%	22.1%	22.4%	20.8%	26.3%	27.7%	25.2%	10.0%	22.5%
Other fishers/not applicable ³	No.	131089	71819	81148	38383	19518	8346	5678	355981
	%	40.0%	32.6%	41.2%	46.7%	28.0%	21.6%	29.7%	37.3%
Total²	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ A 'proportion of time' assessment approach was applied (as opposed to 'absolute' amounts of time) - see discussion immediately preceding this table.

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

³ The first three rows, refer to certain respondents using 'in-scope' bait and lures in one or more survey reference period, determined as 'eligible' for this assessment. The 4th row (Other fishers/not applicable) refers to 'ineligible' respondents - see discussion immediately preceding this table

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Based on results from the comparative analysis (modified paired sample T-test – see Section 3.7.3), no significant differences emerge in terms of the above analysis.

However, in interpreting the above results it should (again) be noted that respondents to the 2006 survey should not be considered representative of all other fishers – as discussed previously, naturally higher avidity profiles exist among the 'repeat' fisher group. In fact, when the above results are analysed by avidity level (2006 survey), a relatively small 'dynamic' emerges among the low avidity group (1-4 days fished) – where 9% reported 'more' usage of 'in-scope' bait in 2005/06, 9% reported 'less', 21% 'about the same' and 62% in the 'other fisher' category. These results are consistent with the nature of low avidity, with increasing avidity correlating with increasing 'dynamics' in this assessment – for the middle avidity group (5-14 days fished): 22%, 20%, 22% and 36% (respectively) and the high avidity group (15 days or more): 31%, 28%, 24% and 17% (respectively).

Table 33: Reasons for More/Less Proportion of Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs Lures/Flys/etc (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		MORE TIME USING BAIT (2005/06) ...			LESS TIME USING BAIT (2005/06) ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	8368	6470	1898	0	0	0
	%	4.2%	3.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	3880	1203	2677	1080	1080	0
	%	1.9%	0.6%	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	1700	0	1700
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	13241	11950	1291	4629	4629	0
	%	6.6%	6.0%	0.6%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	1041	1041	0	0	0	0
	%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	8113	1525	6588	9894	9894	0
	%	4.1%	0.8%	3.3%	5.4%	5.4%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	68970	67445	1525	54960	48684	6276
	%	34.6%	33.8%	0.8%	29.9%	26.5%	3.4%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	29563	19722	9840	4301	4301	0
	%	14.8%	9.9%	4.9%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	74186	72075	2111	62362	57786	4576
	%	37.2%	36.1%	1.1%	33.9%	31.4%	2.5%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	902	902	0	9070	6945	2126
	%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	4.9%	3.8%	1.2%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	7393	7393	0	44127	38955	5171
	%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	24.0%	21.2%	2.8%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	7660	7660	0	5306	5306	0
	%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	2.9%	2.9%	0.0%
Other	No.	2235	2235	0	13037	6171	6866
	%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	7.1%	3.4%	3.7%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	173692	n/a	n/a	157038
	%	n/a	n/a	87.0%	n/a	n/a	85.5%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	199623	199623	n/a	183752	183752
	%	113.0%	100%	100%	114.5%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting more or less proportion of fishing time using bait (aquatic animals) vs lures/flys etc in 2005/06 (vs. 2001/02) - see Table 32

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 34a: Main Reasons for More Proportional Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/etc in 2005/06 - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	2677	3793	0	0	0	0	0	6470
	%	3.4%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1203	1203
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.6%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	6573	4108	0	0	0	0	1269	11950
	%	8.3%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	6.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	1041	0	0	0	1041
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	24641	22928	10291	5616	1139	1923	906	67445
	%	31.2%	40.6%	36.6%	38.6%	24.0%	24.9%	10.0%	33.8%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	9027	6415	0	1613	0	1002	1665	19722
	%	11.4%	11.4%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	13.0%	18.5%	9.9%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	33422	9490	14020	3676	2700	4789	3978	72075
	%	42.3%	16.8%	49.9%	25.3%	56.9%	62.1%	44.1%	36.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	0	902	0	0	902
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	4515	1577	1300	0	0	0	7393
	%	0.0%	8.0%	5.6%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2689	3671	0	1300	0	0	0	7660
	%	3.4%	6.5%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Other	No.	0	0	2235	0	0	0	0	2235
	%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Total ¹	No.	79029	56446	28124	14547	4741	7714	9022	199623
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting more proportional fishing time using bait (aquatic animals) vs lures/flys etc in 2005/06 (vs. 2001/02) - see Table 32

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 34b: Main Reasons for Less Proportional Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/etc in 2005/06 - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	1080	0	0	0	0	0	1080
	%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	3953	0	0	676	0	4629
	%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	0.0%	2.5%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	5045	0	1919	0	2833	0	96	9894
	%	11.1%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%	3.8%	5.4%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	16337	14293	10488	2212	2314	3041	0	48684
	%	36.0%	33.4%	22.6%	29.3%	8.9%	23.6%	0.0%	26.5%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	677	1248	0	0	2376	0	0	4301
	%	1.5%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	9137	11409	16569	2632	11399	4218	2422	57786
	%	20.2%	26.6%	35.7%	34.9%	43.6%	32.7%	96.2%	31.4%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	2905	1200	537	2303	0	0	6945
	%	0.0%	6.8%	2.6%	7.1%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	9780	11901	7361	2167	3187	4560	0	38955
	%	21.6%	27.8%	15.8%	28.7%	12.2%	35.3%	0.0%	21.2%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2037	0	2858	0	0	411	0	5306
	%	4.5%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	2.9%
Other	No.	2323	0	2126	0	1722	0	0	6171
	%	5.1%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total ¹	No.	45336	42836	46473	7548	26134	12906	2518	183752
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting less proportional fishing time using bait (aquatic animals) vs lures/flys etc in 2005/06 (vs. 2001/02) - see Table 32

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

6.6 Changes in Usage of Specific 'In-scope' Bait Types (1-10)

Using information collected in the 2006 survey and 2002 data printed on the first page of the questionnaire, any 'wholesale' changes in usage of specific 'in-scope' bait types (aquatic animals) were assessed for each respondent for the first 10 bait types contained in Tables 7a and b, Section 4.2) – i.e. where a bait type was reported in the 2002 survey and not in the 2006 survey (or vice versa). In each case, the incidence of any changes has been routinely assessed, followed by appropriate 'reasons' assessments, depending on the level of change involved.

Commencing with Bait Type 1 (Prawns/shrimp) these assessments are contained in Tables 35 through 54.

Table 35: Changes in Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY PRAWN/ SHRIMP USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	41629	21563	26867	5343	6588	9692	5893	117575
	%	12.7%	9.8%	13.7%	6.5%	9.5%	25.0%	30.8%	12.3%
2001/02 only	No.	26416	58824	12623	10074	6935	5150	1633	121655
	%	8.1%	26.7%	6.4%	12.3%	10.0%	13.3%	8.5%	12.7%
Both years	No.	188638	27153	115553	16316	37422	3241	2749	391072
	%	57.6%	12.3%	58.7%	19.9%	53.7%	8.4%	14.4%	41.0%
Neither year	No.	71062	112852	41687	50381	18720	20623	8854	324180
	%	21.7%	51.2%	21.2%	61.4%	26.9%	53.3%	46.3%	34.0%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of decreased prawn/shrimp usage by Victorian residents (only).

Table 36: Reasons for Change of Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2769 2.3%	2769 2.3%	0 0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2191 1.8%	2191 1.8%	0 0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. %	22040 18.7%	22040 18.7%	0 0.0%	7146 5.9%	5855 4.8%	1291 1.1%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. %	1525 1.3%	1525 1.3%	0 0.0%	14990 12.3%	3010 2.5%	11980 9.8%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	13248 11.3%	8949 7.6%	4299 3.7%	18394 15.1%	18394 15.1%	0 0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. %	4891 4.2%	4891 4.2%	0 0.0%	8520 7.0%	8520 7.0%	0 0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	50688 43.1%	45643 38.8%	5045 4.3%	66460 54.6%	57807 47.5%	8652 7.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	15955 13.6%	13324 11.3%	2630 2.2%	2968 2.4%	2968 2.4%	0 0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No. %	11402 9.7%	9789 8.3%	1613 1.4%	2706 2.2%	2706 2.2%	0 0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	11414 9.7%	11414 9.7%	0 0.0%	15996 13.1%	15996 13.1%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1439 1.2%	1439 1.2%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	103987 88.4%	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	99731 82.0%
Total ^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 112%	117575 100%	117575 100%	n/a 118%	121655 100%	121655 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Prawns/Shrimp only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 35

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 37a: Main Reasons for Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3307	5816	5822	2207	2833	786	1269	22040
	%	7.9%	27.0%	21.7%	41.3%	43.0%	8.1%	21.5%	18.7%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3480	1393	1919	0	0	2156	0	8949
	%	8.4%	6.5%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	7.6%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	1268	0	2182	0	1441	0	0	4891
	%	3.0%	0.0%	8.1%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	18832	6196	8497	2446	2314	4399	2959	45643
	%	45.2%	28.7%	31.6%	45.8%	35.1%	45.4%	50.2%	38.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	7058	0	5590	0	0	676	0	13324
	%	17.0%	0.0%	20.8%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	11.3%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	6449	0	0	0	0	1674	1665	9789
	%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.3%	28.3%	8.3%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1234	6632	2858	690	0	0	0	11414
	%	3.0%	30.8%	10.6%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	41629	21563	26867	5343	6588	9692	5893	117575
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Prawns/Shrimp only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 35

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 37b: Main Reasons for Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	2769	0	0	0	0	0	2769
	%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	%	4.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	5855	0	0	0	0	0	0	5855
	%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	3010	0	0	0	0	0	0	3010
	%	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	6310	8612	0	663	0	328	18394
	%	9.4%	10.7%	68.2%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	20.1%	15.1%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	6105	0	0	1513	902	0	0	8520
	%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%	13.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	5668	31630	4011	4673	5370	5150	1304	57807
	%	21.5%	53.8%	31.8%	46.4%	77.4%	100.0%	79.9%	47.5%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	2282	0	686	0	0	0	2968
	%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	1053	0	1653	0	0	0	2706
	%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	16.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2185	12261	0	1549	0	0	0	15996
	%	8.3%	20.8%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Total ¹	No.	26416	58824	12623	10074	6935	5150	1633	121655
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Prawns/Shrimp only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 35

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 38: Changes in Squid, Cuttlefish or Octopus Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SQUID/ETC USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	113345	34772	21754	16109	4339	11541	6006	207866
	%	34.6%	15.8%	11.1%	19.6%	6.2%	29.8%	31.4%	21.8%
2001/02 only	No.	12734	36494	21275	17533	8998	1995	68	99098
	%	3.9%	16.6%	10.8%	21.4%	12.9%	5.2%	0.4%	10.4%
Both years	No.	68916	57786	57811	26920	36415	11108	9712	268668
	%	21.0%	26.2%	29.4%	32.8%	52.3%	28.7%	50.8%	28.1%
Neither year	No.	132751	91338	95891	21553	19913	14062	3343	378851
	%	40.5%	41.4%	48.7%	26.2%	28.6%	36.3%	17.5%	39.7%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of increased squid/etc. usage by NSW/ACT residents and also at the national level.

Table 39: Reasons for Change of Squid/etc Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	6306	6306	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	6.4%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	2191	2191	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	2055	2055	0
	%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	26685	25202	1483	0	0	0
	%	12.8%	12.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	1898	0	0	0	0
	%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	2516	2516	0	4062	0	4062
	%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	4.1%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	17737	13078	4658	14759	14029	731
	%	8.5%	6.3%	2.2%	14.9%	14.2%	0.7%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	43723	33621	10103	2761	2761	0
	%	21.0%	16.2%	4.9%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	79834	67148	12687	44203	43092	1111
	%	38.4%	32.3%	6.1%	44.6%	43.5%	1.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	10104	10104	0	9934	9934	0
	%	4.9%	4.9%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	48146	43423	4723	2359	2359	0
	%	23.2%	20.9%	2.3%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	10877	10877	0	16371	16371	0
	%	5.2%	5.2%	0.0%	16.5%	16.5%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	172512	n/a	n/a	93194
	%	n/a	n/a	83.0%	n/a	n/a	94.0%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	207866	207866	n/a	99098	99098
	%	117%	100%	100%	106%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Squid, Cuttlefish or Octopus only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 38

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 40a: Main Reasons for Squid/etc Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	10370	4885	5822	594	0	2263	1269	25202
	%	9.1%	14.0%	26.8%	3.7%	0.0%	19.6%	21.1%	12.1%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	0	0	0	0	1898
	%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	990	0	0	2516
	%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	22.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	11760	0	0	0	1318	0	13078
	%	0.0%	33.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.4%	0.0%	6.3%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	23080	0	2453	3217	984	3886	0	33621
	%	20.4%	0.0%	11.3%	20.0%	22.7%	33.7%	0.0%	16.2%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	33283	8508	9520	8185	882	2031	4737	67148
	%	29.4%	24.5%	43.8%	50.8%	20.3%	17.6%	78.9%	32.3%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	8240	0	1505	0	0	359	0	10104
	%	7.3%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	4.9%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	34289	4027	0	1942	1483	1683	0	43423
	%	30.3%	11.6%	0.0%	12.1%	34.2%	14.6%	0.0%	20.9%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2185	4067	2453	2171	0	0	0	10877
	%	1.9%	11.7%	11.3%	13.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	113345	34772	21754	16109	4339	11541	6006	207866
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Squid, Cuttlefish or Octopus only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 38

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 40b: Main Reasons for Squid/etc Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1117	5189	0	0	0	0	0	6306
	%	8.8%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	%	8.7%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	2055	0	0	0	0	2055
	%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	5279	2940	3074	0	254	0	14029
	%	19.5%	14.5%	13.8%	17.5%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	14.2%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	1248	0	1513	0	0	0	2761
	%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	0	10215	16280	9301	5965	1330	0	43092
	%	0.0%	28.0%	76.5%	53.1%	66.3%	66.7%	0.0%	43.5%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	3600	1189	0	2044	3033	0	68	9934
	%	28.3%	3.3%	0.0%	11.7%	33.7%	0.0%	100.0%	10.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	1255	1104	0	0	0	0	0	2359
	%	9.9%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	3170	11190	0	1601	0	411	0	16371
	%	24.9%	30.7%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	20.6%	0.0%	16.5%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	12734	36494	21275	17533	8998	1995	68	99098
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Squid, Cuttlefish or Octopus only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 38

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 41: Changes in Crab Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY CRAB USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	4146	5974	0	1653	0	1404	0	13178
	%	1.3%	2.7%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	1.4%
2001/02 only	No.	27238	11119	7621	0	822	2332	0	49131
	%	8.3%	5.0%	3.9%	0.0%	1.2%	6.0%	0.0%	5.1%
Both years	No.	4248	0	0	0	1129	0	0	5377
	%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Neither year	No.	292113	203299	189110	80461	67715	34970	19129	886796
	%	89.1%	92.2%	96.1%	98.0%	97.2%	90.3%	100.0%	92.9%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of decreased crab usage at the national level only.

Table 42: Reasons for Change of Crab Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No. %	2014 15.3%	2014 15.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1898 3.9%	1898 3.9%	0 0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. %	1653 12.5%	0 0.0%	1653 12.5%	2481 5.1%	0 0.0%	2481 5.1%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	838 6.4%	838 6.4%	0 0.0%	12910 26.3%	12910 26.3%	0 0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	8073 61.3%	8073 61.3%	0 0.0%	19864 40.4%	19042 38.8%	822 1.7%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3277 6.7%	1380 2.8%	1898 3.9%
Experimenting/trying different things	No. %	2253 17.1%	2253 17.1%	0 0.0%	1935 3.9%	1935 3.9%	0 0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2978 6.1%	2978 6.1%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8989 18.3%	8989 18.3%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	11524 87.5%	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	43931 89.4%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 113%	13178 100%	13178 100%	n/a 111%	49131 100%	49131 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Crabs only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 41

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 43: Changes in Saltwater Crayfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SALTWATER CRAYFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1117	0	2058	0	0	0	0	3175
	%	0.3%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
2001/02 only	No.	0	4166	0	0	0	0	0	4166
	%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Neither year	No.	326628	216226	194673	82115	69665	38706	19129	947142
	%	99.7%	98.1%	99.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.2%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of saltwater crayfish.

Table 44: Changes in Freshwater Crayfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FRESHWATER CRAYFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	35523	20793	2623	6466	0	0	1370	66775
	%	10.8%	9.4%	1.3%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	7.0%
2001/02 only	No.	14962	24780	2126	0	0	0	0	41868
	%	4.6%	11.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
Both years	No.	8630	48862	10098	0	0	0	0	67590
	%	2.6%	22.2%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%
Neither year	No.	268631	125956	181884	75649	69665	38706	17759	778250
	%	82.0%	57.2%	92.5%	92.1%	100.0%	100.0%	92.8%	81.5%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of freshwater crayfish.

Table 45: Reasons for Change of Freshwater Crayfish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	3337	3337	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%	8.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	7062	7062	0	0	0	0
	%	10.6%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	2783	2783	0	1898	1898	0
	%	4.2%	4.2%	0.0%	4.5%	4.5%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	5956	1525	4431	0	0	0
	%	8.9%	2.3%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	7286	5761	1525	2584	2584	0
	%	10.9%	8.6%	2.3%	6.2%	6.2%	0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	2131	2131	0	0	0	0
	%	3.2%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	31811	31811	0	20150	20150	0
	%	47.6%	47.6%	0.0%	48.1%	48.1%	0.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	5142	3244	1898
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%	7.7%	4.5%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	17415	14311	3105	0	0	0
	%	26.1%	21.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	0	0	0	1169	1169	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1390	1390	0	7361	7361	0
	%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%	17.6%	17.6%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	2126	2126	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	5.1%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	57714	n/a	n/a	39970
	%	n/a	n/a	86.4%	n/a	n/a	95.5%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	66775	66775	n/a	41868	41868
	%	114%	100%	100%	105%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Freshwater Crayfish only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 44

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 46: Changes in Abalone Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY ABALONE USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1275	0	2130	0	0	1002	0	4407
	%	0.4%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.5%
2001/02 only	No.	0	1334	0	0	1166	392	0	2892
	%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Both years	No.	3979	0	0	0	0	0	0	3979
	%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Neither year	No.	322491	219058	194600	82115	68499	37313	19129	943204
	%	98.4%	99.4%	98.9%	100.0%	98.3%	96.4%	100.0%	98.8%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of abalone.

Table 47: Changes in Other Shellfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY OTHER SHELLFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	20930	22337	12871	10184	828	4591	0	71741
	%	6.4%	10.1%	6.5%	12.4%	1.2%	11.9%	0.0%	7.5%
2001/02 only	No.	27432	37146	16518	7989	1810	4883	0	95777
	%	8.4%	16.9%	8.4%	9.7%	2.6%	12.6%	0.0%	10.0%
Both years	No.	30693	86486	36617	53756	6348	1879	0	215779
	%	9.4%	39.2%	18.6%	65.5%	9.1%	4.9%	0.0%	22.6%
Neither year	No.	248691	74423	130724	10185	60681	27354	19129	571186
	%	75.9%	33.8%	66.4%	12.4%	87.1%	70.7%	100.0%	59.8%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of 'Other shellfish'.

Table 48: Reasons for Change of Other Shellfish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	2297	2297	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	8261	8261	0	0	0	0
	%	11.5%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	4681	4681	0	0	0	0
	%	6.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	1041	1041	0	1336	0	1336
	%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.4%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1382	0	1382	3515	1034	2481
	%	1.9%	0.0%	1.9%	3.7%	1.1%	2.6%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	5113	3588	1525	22343	21309	1034
	%	7.1%	5.0%	2.1%	23.3%	22.2%	1.1%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	36304	34193	2111	44393	41017	3376
	%	50.6%	47.7%	2.9%	46.4%	42.8%	3.5%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	7572	5674	1898	11899	11899	0
	%	10.6%	7.9%	2.6%	12.4%	12.4%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	9944	6840	3105	5668	5668	0
	%	13.9%	9.5%	4.3%	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	7464	7464	0	11114	11114	0
	%	10.4%	10.4%	0.0%	11.6%	11.6%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	1439	1439	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	61720	n/a	n/a	87550
	%	n/a	n/a	86.0%	n/a	n/a	91.4%
Total ^{1,2}	No.	n/a	71741	71741	n/a	95777	95777
	%	114%	100%	100%	109%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Other Shellfish only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 47

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 49a: Main Reasons for Other Shellfish Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3105	4702	0	0	0	454	0	8261
	%	14.8%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%	0.0%	11.5%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	2783	0	0	0	4681
	%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	1041	0	0	0	1041
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	1165	1104	0	0	0	1318	0	3588
	%	5.6%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.7%	0.0%	5.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	13432	8963	5815	3164	0	2819	0	34193
	%	64.2%	40.1%	45.2%	31.1%	0.0%	61.4%	0.0%	47.7%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	5674	0	0	0	0	5674
	%	0.0%	0.0%	44.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	1330	1404	1382	1896	828	0	0	6840
	%	6.4%	6.3%	10.7%	18.6%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	0	6164	0	1300	0	0	0	7464
	%	0.0%	27.6%	0.0%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	20930	22337	12871	10184	828	4591	0	71741
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Other Shellfish only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 47

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 49b: Main Reasons for Other Shellfish Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	2297	0	2297
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	47.0%	0.0%	2.4%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1034	0	0	0	0	0	0	1034
	%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	5930	12004	3376	0	0	0	0	21309
	%	21.6%	32.3%	20.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7953	17463	5007	6199	1810	2586	0	41017
	%	29.0%	47.0%	30.3%	77.6%	100.0%	53.0%	0.0%	42.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	1399	1306	8135	1059	0	0	0	11899
	%	5.1%	3.5%	49.2%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.4%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5668	0	0	0	0	0	0	5668
	%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	5449	4934	0	732	0	0	0	11114
	%	19.9%	13.3%	0.0%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.6%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Total ¹	No.	27432	37146	16518	7989	1810	4883	0	95777
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Other Shellfish only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 47

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 50: Changes in Trout/Salmon Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY TROUT/ SALMON USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	3093	0	0	0	731	454	0	4277
	%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.4%
2001/02 only	No.	0	4000	0	0	0	0	0	4000
	%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Neither year	No.	324652	216391	196731	82115	68935	38253	19129	946204
	%	99.1%	98.2%	100.0%	100.0%	99.0%	98.8%	100.0%	99.1%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of trout or salmon.

Table 51: Changes in Saltwater Fish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SALTWATER FISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	74123	12102	6991	2423	11237	3630	6597	117103
	%	22.6%	5.5%	3.6%	3.0%	16.1%	9.4%	34.5%	12.3%
2001/02 only	No.	57914	20944	24814	11957	9383	8273	3392	136678
	%	17.7%	9.5%	12.6%	14.6%	13.5%	21.4%	17.7%	14.3%
Both years	No.	101340	110213	108521	28394	38314	21922	5455	414159
	%	30.9%	50.0%	55.2%	34.6%	55.0%	56.6%	28.5%	43.4%
Neither year	No.	94368	77132	56405	39340	10732	4881	3685	286543
	%	28.8%	35.0%	28.7%	47.9%	15.4%	12.6%	19.3%	30.0%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of saltwater fish species.

Table 52: Reasons for Change of Saltwater Fish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	4119	3432	686
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	2.5%	0.5%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	1111	1111	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	2297	2297	0
	%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	20179	20179	0	0	0	0
	%	17.2%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	3994	0	3994
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	962	962	0	15640	13325	2316
	%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	11.4%	9.7%	1.7%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	0	0	13099	13099	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	9.6%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	68402	59722	8680	74700	70213	4487
	%	58.4%	51.0%	7.4%	54.7%	51.4%	3.3%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	3150	3150	0	7378	7378	0
	%	2.7%	2.7%	0.0%	5.4%	5.4%	0.0%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	33766	30661	3105	5668	5668	0
	%	28.8%	26.2%	2.7%	4.1%	4.1%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2429	2429	0	11165	11165	0
	%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%	8.2%	8.2%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	8989	8989	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%	6.6%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	103618	n/a	n/a	125195
	%	n/a	n/a	88.5%	n/a	n/a	91.6%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	117103	117103	n/a	136678	136678
	%	112%	100%	100%	108%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Saltwater Fish only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 51

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 53a: Main Reasons for Saltwater Fish Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	8260	3857	0	0	6794	0	1269	20179
	%	11.1%	31.9%	0.0%	0.0%	60.5%	0.0%	19.2%	17.2%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	0	0	0	0	838	124	962
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	1.9%	0.8%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	35658	6563	5609	1848	4443	2159	3443	59722
	%	48.1%	54.2%	80.2%	76.3%	39.5%	59.5%	52.2%	51.0%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2517	0	0	0	0	633	0	3150
	%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%	2.7%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	25260	1683	1382	575	0	0	1761	30661
	%	34.1%	13.9%	19.8%	23.7%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	26.2%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2429	0	0	0	0	0	0	2429
	%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	74123	12102	6991	2423	11237	3630	6597	117103
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Saltwater Fish only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 51

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 53b: Main Reasons for Saltwater Fish Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	3432	0	0	0	0	0	0	3432
	%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0	1111
	%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	2297	0	2297
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%	1.7%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	3885	6316	0	0	643	0	13325
	%	4.3%	18.5%	25.5%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	0.0%	9.7%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	7180	0	2235	2480	0	0	1203	13099
	%	12.4%	0.0%	9.0%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	35.5%	9.6%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	15571	17059	13503	9477	7080	5334	2188	70213
	%	26.9%	81.5%	54.4%	79.3%	75.5%	64.5%	64.5%	51.4%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2316	0	2760	0	2303	0	0	7378
	%	4.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	24.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5668	0	0	0	0	0	0	5668
	%	9.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	11165	0	0	0	0	0	0	11165
	%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.2%
Other	No.	8989	0	0	0	0	0	0	8989
	%	15.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.6%
Total ¹	No.	57914	20944	24814	11957	9383	8273	3392	136678
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using Saltwater Fish only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 51

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 54: Changes in Freshwater Fish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FRESHWATER FISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1898	3380	0	0	0	0	572	5850
	%	0.6%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.6%
2001/02 only	No.	1935	2689	1975	0	0	0	0	6599
	%	0.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Neither year	No.	323913	214322	194756	82115	69665	38706	18557	942034
	%	98.8%	97.2%	99.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.0%	98.7%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 7a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of freshwater fish species.

6.7 Changes in Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Acquisition Source

Using information collected in the 2006 survey and 2002 data printed on the first page of the questionnaire, any 'wholesale' changes in usage of prawns/shrimp for each of three acquisition sources ('sold as bait', 'sold as seafood' and 'personally caught') were assessed for each respondent – i.e. where an acquisition source was reported in the 2002 survey and not in the 2006 survey (or vice versa). In each case, the incidence of any changes has been routinely assessed, followed by appropriate 'reasons' assessments, depending on the level of change involved.

Commencing with prawns/shrimp 'sold as bait', these assessments are contained in Tables 55 through 61.

Table 55: Changes in 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'SOLD AS BAIT' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	44516	17331	23443	5548	14042	8230	4956	118066
	%	13.6%	7.9%	11.9%	6.8%	20.2%	21.3%	25.9%	12.4%
2001/02 only	No.	41227	55231	31888	7715	8490	5106	834	150491
	%	12.6%	25.1%	16.2%	9.4%	12.2%	13.2%	4.4%	15.8%
Both years	No.	164452	22677	77654	9916	25359	2787	2749	305594
	%	50.2%	10.3%	39.5%	12.1%	36.4%	7.2%	14.4%	32.0%
Neither year	No.	77551	125153	63746	58935	21774	22583	10589	380331
	%	23.7%	56.8%	32.4%	71.8%	31.3%	58.3%	55.4%	39.8%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 8a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of decreased usage of prawns/shrimp 'sold as bait' for Victorian residents only.

Table 56: Reasons for Change of 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	2769	2769	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	2191	2191	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	19730	19730	0	7146	5855	1291
	%	16.7%	16.7%	0.0%	4.7%	3.9%	0.9%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	1898	1898	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1525	1525	0	24798	8564	16234
	%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	16.5%	5.7%	10.8%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	7848	3549	4299	25042	25042	0
	%	6.6%	3.0%	3.6%	16.6%	16.6%	0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	6566	6566	0	18894	13598	5295
	%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%	12.6%	9.0%	3.5%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	50921	43765	7156	59586	50933	8652
	%	43.1%	37.1%	6.1%	39.6%	33.8%	5.7%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	29091	24620	4471	18878	16981	1898
	%	24.6%	20.9%	3.8%	12.5%	11.3%	1.3%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	10072	8459	1613	2706	2706	0
	%	8.5%	7.2%	1.4%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	9853	9853	0	18516	18516	0
	%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%	12.3%	12.3%	0.0%
Other	No.	0	0	0	1439	1439	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	100526	n/a	n/a	117121
	%	n/a	n/a	85.1%	n/a	n/a	77.8%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	118066	118066	n/a	150491	150491
	%	115%	100%	100%	122%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Sold as Bait' Prawns/Shrimp only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 55

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 57a: Main Reasons for 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3307	4885	5822	1613	2833	0	1269	19730
	%	7.4%	28.2%	24.8%	29.1%	20.2%	0.0%	25.6%	16.7%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	1393	0	0	0	2156	0	3549
	%	0.0%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.2%	0.0%	3.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	4384	0	2182	0	0	0	0	6566
	%	9.8%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	18832	5255	8497	2446	2314	4399	2022	43765
	%	42.3%	30.3%	36.2%	44.1%	16.5%	53.5%	40.8%	37.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	11640	0	4085	0	8895	0	0	24620
	%	26.1%	0.0%	17.4%	0.0%	63.3%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5119	0	0	0	0	1674	1665	8459
	%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.3%	33.6%	7.2%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1234	4273	2858	1488	0	0	0	9853
	%	2.8%	24.7%	12.2%	26.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total ¹	No.	44516	17331	23443	5548	14042	8230	4956	118066
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Sold as Bait' Prawns/shrimp only in 2005/06 (i.e. not in 2001/02) - see Table 55

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 57b: Main Reasons for 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	2769	0	0	0	0	0	2769
	%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	%	2.7%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	5855	0	0	0	0	0	0	5855
	%	14.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.9%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	0	0	0	0	1898
	%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	4115	0	2894	0	1555	0	0	8564
	%	10.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	18.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	7558	14012	0	663	0	328	25042
	%	6.0%	13.7%	43.9%	0.0%	7.8%	0.0%	39.3%	16.6%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	6105	0	5079	1513	902	0	0	13598
	%	14.8%	0.0%	15.9%	19.6%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	5668	29164	4011	3863	3068	4653	506	50933
	%	13.7%	52.8%	12.6%	50.1%	36.1%	91.1%	60.7%	33.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	9119	2293	2126	686	2303	454	0	16981
	%	22.1%	4.2%	6.7%	8.9%	27.1%	8.9%	0.0%	11.3%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	1053	0	1653	0	0	0	2706
	%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	4874	9875	3767	0	0	0	0	18516
	%	11.8%	17.9%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Total ¹	No.	41227	55231	31888	7715	8490	5106	834	150491
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Sold as Bait' Prawns/shrimp only in 2001/02 (i.e. not in 2005/06) - see Table 55

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 58: Changes in 'Sold as Seafood' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'SOLD AS SEAFOOD' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	32229	3878	10614	0	5375	3234	0	55331
	%	9.8%	1.8%	5.4%	0.0%	7.7%	8.4%	0.0%	5.8%
2001/02 only	No.	18401	8334	3376	810	4080	498	798	36296
	%	5.6%	3.8%	1.7%	1.0%	5.9%	1.3%	4.2%	3.8%
Both years	No.	10005	0	9621	0	882	0	0	20508
	%	3.1%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Neither year	No.	267109	208179	173120	81305	59329	34975	18331	842347
	%	81.5%	94.5%	88.0%	99.0%	85.2%	90.4%	95.8%	88.3%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 8a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of increased usage of prawns/shrimp 'sold as seafood' at the national level only.

Table 59: Reasons for Change of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. %	3560 6.4%	3560 6.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. %	1898 3.4%	1898 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. %	8861 16.0%	6864 12.4%	1997 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	6056 10.9%	3282 5.9%	2774 5.0%	3376 9.3%	3376 9.3%	0 0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. %	11688 21.1%	8518 15.4%	3170 5.7%	3116 8.6%	3116 8.6%	0 0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	8162 14.8%	6990 12.6%	1172 2.1%	13815 38.1%	10440 28.8%	3376 9.3%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	26847 48.5%	24219 43.8%	2628 4.8%	17126 47.2%	15285 42.1%	1841 5.1%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4080 11.2%	4080 11.2%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	43590 78.8%	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	31080 85.6%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 121%	55331 100%	55331 100%	n/a 114%	36296 100%	36296 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 58

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 60: Changes in 'Personally Caught' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'PERSONALLY CAUGHT' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	19597	12860	17989	594	1441	0	1509	53989
	%	6.0%	5.8%	9.1%	0.7%	2.1%	0.0%	7.9%	5.7%
2001/02 only	No.	27802	8191	8132	1549	9626	1223	232	56756
	%	8.5%	3.7%	4.1%	1.9%	13.8%	3.2%	1.2%	5.9%
Both years	No.	1678	3372	35414	6400	1139	0	0	48003
	%	0.5%	1.5%	18.0%	7.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Neither year	No.	278669	195968	135195	73572	57460	37483	17388	795734
	%	85.0%	88.9%	68.7%	89.6%	82.5%	96.8%	90.9%	83.4%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As reported in relation to Tables 8a and b (earlier), comparative analysis results (see Section 3.7.3), reveal no significant differences among 'repeat' fishers in terms of usage of 'personally caught' prawns/shrimp.

Table 61: Reasons for Change of 'Personally Caught' Prawns/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. %	9459 17.5%	9459 17.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. %	1898 3.5%	1898 3.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. %	12831 23.8%	12831 23.8%	0 0.0%	3608 6.4%	3608 6.4%	0 0.0%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. %	11176 20.7%	11176 20.7%	0 0.0%	1841 3.2%	1841 3.2%	0 0.0%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. %	4132 7.7%	4132 7.7%	0 0.0%	8333 14.7%	4957 8.7%	3376 5.9%
Availability of bait/etc	No. %	3871 7.2%	1973 3.7%	1898 3.5%	27235 48.0%	25395 44.7%	1841 3.2%
Experimenting/trying different things	No. %	10409 19.3%	7304 13.5%	3105 5.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. %	5218 9.7%	5218 9.7%	0 0.0%	20956 36.9%	20956 36.9%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	48987 90.7%	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	51539 90.8%
Total ^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 109%	53989 100%	53989 100%	n/a 109%	56756 100%	56756 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, using 'Personally Caught' Prawns/Shrimp only in 2005/06 or only in 2001/02 - see Table 60

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

7 RESULTS: AWARENESS ASSESSMENT – IMPORTED SEAFOOD PRODUCTS

7.1 Introduction

The final substantive question sequence in the 2006 survey assessed respondent awareness in relation to three specific issues: (i) national requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products as imported or local; (ii) further requirements for ‘country of origin’ labelling for unpackaged seafood products; and (iii) recall of any advice not to use imported uncooked prawns as bait or berley. In each case, awareness was assessed in terms of (a) full awareness, (b) some (incl. vague) awareness or (c) no awareness.

As discussed in Section 3.1.1, this questioning was positioned at the end of the questionnaire to avoid any potential ‘corruptive’ influences on behavioural data. The results to these assessments have been included in Section 7.2 (Items (i) and (ii) above) and Section 7.3 (Item iii). Note: the final question in the survey assessed respondent availability for a future follow-up survey (if required), the results to which have been included in Section 7.4.

7.2 Awareness of Requirements for Point-of-Sale Labelling of Seafood Products

Respondent awareness of national requirements for point-of-sale labelling of seafood products as imported or local is assessed in Table 62 below (for all ‘repeat’ fishers).

Table 62: Awareness of General Point-of-Sale Labelling Requirements (Imported vs. Local Seafood) - ‘Repeat’ Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	149839	94579	134503	31822	39601	19207	11926	481476
	%	45.7%	42.9%	68.4%	38.8%	56.8%	49.6%	62.3%	50.4%
Some awareness ²	No.	22439	24253	27993	1449	5196	4210	1467	87007
	%	6.8%	11.0%	14.2%	1.8%	7.5%	10.9%	7.7%	9.1%
No awareness	No.	155467	101560	34234	48844	24869	15290	5736	385999
	%	47.4%	46.1%	17.4%	59.5%	35.7%	39.5%	30.0%	40.4%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of ‘repeat’ recreational fishers

² Includes cases where respondents reported awareness of the existence of such labelling, but not the requirement (“just seen in shops”)

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

All respondents reporting at least some awareness of general labelling requirements (close to 60% in Table 62, above) were subsequently questioned in terms of specific requirements for ‘country of origin’ labelling for unpackaged seafood products. While those reporting no awareness of general labelling requirements were (logically) excluded from this questioning,

they have been included in Table 63 below, (in the 'No awareness' category) for analysis consistency, i.e. an analysis base of all 'repeat' fishers.

Table 63: Awareness of Specific Point-of-Sale Labelling Requirements (Country of Origin of Seafood) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	93560	62721	99310	13084	33144	10538	7367	319724
	%	28.5%	28.5%	50.5%	15.9%	47.6%	27.2%	38.5%	33.5%
Some awareness ²	No.	36331	29139	18204	8531	1220	2787	3449	99661
	%	11.1%	13.2%	9.3%	10.4%	1.8%	7.2%	18.0%	10.4%
No awareness	No.	197855	128531	79217	60499	35302	25381	8313	535098
	%	60.4%	58.3%	40.3%	73.7%	50.7%	65.6%	43.5%	56.1%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

² Includes cases where respondents reported awareness of the existence of such labelling, but not the requirement ("just seen in shops")

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

7.3 Awareness of Any Advice Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley

The approach employed for product labelling requirements in Tables 62 and 63 (above) largely conforms to an 'aided' awareness assessment, i.e. where effectively all information in relation to the issue is imparted to the respondent in initial questioning. A contrasting approach was employed in the following assessment, where minimal information was provided in initial questioning ('unaided') to establish whether the respondent recalled hearing/seeing any advice on the issue of not using imported uncooked prawns/shrimp as bait or berley. By design, no other information (principally 'why' this practice is not recommended) was included in initial questioning, to enable respondent knowledge of the issue to be objectively assessed in later questions. Initial 'unaided' awareness of this issue is assessed in Table 64 overleaf (for all 'repeat' fishers).

Table 64: Awareness of Any Advice Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	8564	5924	41720	0	9934	1336	1726	69204
	%	2.6%	2.7%	21.2%	0.0%	14.3%	3.5%	9.0%	7.3%
Some awareness	No.	15470	20860	25424	798	4522	480	506	68061
	%	4.7%	9.5%	12.9%	1.0%	6.5%	1.2%	2.6%	7.1%
No awareness	No.	303711	193607	129587	81316	55210	36890	16896	817217
	%	92.7%	87.8%	65.9%	99.0%	79.2%	95.3%	88.3%	85.6%
Total¹	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

When the above results are analysed for respondents reporting any prawn/shrimp usage in the 2006 survey, similarly low awareness levels emerge – with 16% reporting at least some awareness (9.6% full awareness and 4.4% some awareness). Among ‘sold as seafood’ prawn users (although very small sub-samples exist), similar levels also emerge – with 18% reporting at least some awareness.

In subsequent questioning, all respondents claiming at least some awareness of this issue were firstly assessed in terms of what they recalled about this advice, i.e. why imported uncooked prawns should not be used as bait/berley. Main/other reasons were sought and details recorded for later office coding, which distilled these responses into four discrete categories (see Table 65 overleaf). Note: in terms of this coding structure, very few respondents reported any second/other reasons – therefore, this analysis has been confined to ‘main’ reasons reported.

Also, for all remaining assessments in relation this issue (Tables 65 to 67), the analysis has been confined to population estimates of those respondents claiming at least some awareness of the issue (as opposed to all ‘repeat’ fishers).

Table 65: Knowledge/Recall of Main Reason¹ Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

MAIN REASON ¹ ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Disease Risk (essential detail understood)	No.	11231	13588	60199	798	6844	1562	1443	95666
	%	46.7%	50.7%	89.7%	100.0%	47.3%	86.0%	64.6%	69.7%
Other/vague mention of 'disease'	No.	4760	0	5789	0	3992	254	0	14795
	%	19.8%	0.0%	8.6%	0.0%	27.6%	14.0%	0.0%	10.8%
'Incorrect' reason (e.g. buy Australian)	No.	3687	0	0	0	0	0	0	3687
	%	15.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
No knowledge/recall	No.	4355	13197	1155	0	3620	0	789	23117
	%	18.1%	49.3%	1.7%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	35.4%	16.8%
Total²	No.	24034	26784	67143	798	14456	1816	2233	137265
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ The 1st row of the table ('Disease Risk') conforms to all respondents specifically reporting disease risk to aquatic animal populations (prawns or otherwise). The 2nd row ('Other/etc') includes all other cases where 'disease' was reported (including risk to humans)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting any awareness of advice not to use imported uncooked prawns/shrimp as bait/berley - see Table 64

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

All respondents claiming at least some awareness of the issue were then assessed in terms of the main/other sources of this information – the results to which appear in Table 66 overleaf. Note: for completeness, all response categories from the survey questionnaire have been included in the table (in aggregate form at least).

Table 66: Sources of Information - Advice Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ...		ANY MENTION	MAIN SOURCE	OTHER SOURCE
Fishing tackle shop (staff)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Other fishers	No. %	25467 18.6%	17836 13.0%	7631 5.6%
Fishing magazine	No. %	12730 9.3%	8004 5.8%	4726 3.4%
Other print media	No. %	33002 24.0%	33002 24.0%	0 0.0%
Fishing show (TV/radio)	No. %	58144 42.4%	53887 39.3%	4257 3.1%
Other electronic media	No. %	3092 2.3%	3092 2.3%	0 0.0%
All government sources	No. %	4964 3.6%	0 0.0%	4964 3.6%
Unsure/no recall	No. %	21443 15.6%	21443 15.6%	0 0.0%
Other	No. %	3376 2.5%	0 0.0%	3376 2.5%
No 2nd source	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	112311 81.8%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 118%	137265 100%	137265 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting any awareness of advice not to use imported prawns as bait/berley - see Table 64

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Finally, all respondents claiming at least some awareness of this issue were then broadly assessed in terms of when they first heard/saw/etc. anything about this issue – the results to which appear in Table 67 overleaf.

Table 67: When Advice First Heard/Seen - Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

WHEN ADVICE HEARD/SEEN ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
In the last few months	No.	8831	1453	27376	0	10980	0	2233	50874
	%	36.7%	5.4%	40.8%	0.0%	76.0%	0.0%	100.0%	37.1%
In the last (3 to) 12 months	No.	12591	21972	19999	0	0	480	0	55042
	%	52.4%	82.0%	29.8%	0.0%	0.0%	26.4%	0.0%	40.1%
More than a year ago	No.	2611	1248	17108	798	990	1336	0	24092
	%	10.9%	4.7%	25.5%	100.0%	6.9%	73.6%	0.0%	17.6%
Unsure/no recall	No.	0	2111	2661	0	2485	0	0	7257
	%	0.0%	7.9%	4.0%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%
Total¹	No.	24034	26784	67143	798	14456	1816	2233	137265
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of 'repeat' recreational fishers, reporting any awareness of advice not to use imported uncooked prawns as bait/berley - see Table 64

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

As discussed in 3.1.1 earlier, immediately after the above question sequence (i.e. as assessed in Tables 64 to 67), interviewers routinely explained to all respondents (at varying levels of detail, depending on respondent awareness) the various reasons/factors associated with the disease risk issue and imported prawns. Interviewers were thoroughly briefed on the issue and substantial detail provided within the text of the questionnaire to assist in this regard.

7.4 Availability for a Future Follow-up Survey (if required)

As a final question in the 2006 survey, all respondents (including non-fishers in 2005/06) were asked if they would be available for a future follow-up survey, if required. Before asking this question, interviewers routinely explained that while no such survey was currently planned, it might be likely to occur within the next 12 months. The results to this question are presented in Table 68 overleaf.

Table 68: Availability for Further Follow-up Survey - All Respondents¹ by State/Territory of Residence

AVAILABILITY ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	207	130	99	105	54	67	38	700
	%	99.5%	96.3%	86.1%	99.1%	75.0%	94.4%	100.0%	94.0%
No	No.	0	2	12	1	14	3	0	32
	%	0.0%	1.5%	10.4%	0.9%	19.4%	4.2%	0.0%	4.3%
Unsure	No.	1	3	4	0	4	1	0	13
	%	0.5%	2.2%	3.5%	0.0%	5.6%	1.4%	0.0%	1.7%
Total¹	No.	208	135	115	106	72	71	38	745
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Note:

¹ Table base: all fully responding interviews from the 2006 Follow-up Survey - see Tables 3 and 4 earlier

Importantly, when the above results are further analysed among the ‘repeat’ fisher group, it emerges that virtually all (99%) indicated availability for a further follow-up survey. In the above table, the vast majority of those declining (or ‘unsure’) refer to cases where the respondent reported no recreational fishing activity in 2005/06 and no likelihood of any fishing in the future.

Clearly, these high levels of availability reflect equivalent levels of interest and commitment among respondents towards research that is truly relevant to recreational fishing. Again, the skill and professionalism of our interviewers are evident here – and together with our respondents, their contribution to the success of this project cannot be over-emphasized.

8 REFERENCES

ABS (1996) Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996 Census of Population and Housing, Basic Community Profiles (CDATA) and Estimated Resident Populations (June 1996), Catalogue No: 3210.1.

ABS (2002) Australian Bureau of Statistics, Estimated Resident Populations (June 2001), Catalogue No: 3210.1 and unpublished data.

AFFA (2002) National Survey of Bait and Berley Use by Recreational Fishers. Report to Biosecurity Australia by Kewagama Research, December 2002

Henry, G.W. and Lyle, J.M. (2003) The National Recreational and Indigenous Fishing Survey, Final Report, July 2003. FRDC Project No. 99/158

Lemaitre, G. and Dufour, J. (1987) An Integrated Method for Weighting Persons and Families, in *Survey Methodology* December 1987 Vol. 13 No.2 pp 199-207 Statistics Canada.

APPENDIX A: STANDARD ERROR TABLES

Information in this appendix refers to standard error calculations for survey estimates contained in this report. Commencing with *Summary Table A*, each substantive data tabulation has been replicated from the body of the report to show the survey estimate and the 'relative standard error' (RSE) for each cell within the table. As a general rule, RSE estimates for column totals (i.e. the total 'row') have only been included where the information is not available in an earlier (higher level) table. Also, the original table numbering has been retained, prefixed by 'Error'.

Expressed as a percentage, the RSE refers to the relative amount (+ or -) by which the estimate might vary due to 'sample error' (see discussion of confidence intervals below). Procedures employed in developing the error terms are discussed in some detail in Section 3.7.2.

In all cases where a survey estimate of zero occurs, the RSE is shown as *n/a*. As discussed in Section 1.4, this is not to suggest that no such occurrence exists in the relevant population overall – rather, that none was reported within the detection limits of the survey sample. Zero estimates should therefore be interpreted as 'nil or negligible'.

Also, for estimates based on very small sub-samples (less than 5 respondents), the RSE is shown as *n/a*. Below this level, the influences of differing stratum weights can result in misleading error estimation. Although other survey estimates can refer to quite small proportions of the population or quantity estimates, where necessary, it is recommended that a 50% RSE be generally applied for conservative analysis purposes. On this basis, 95% confidence limits would approximate (+/-) 100% (see discussion below). If required, even higher upper limits may of course be applied.

To calculate **95% confidence intervals** for a given survey estimate, the RSE is multiplied by 1.96 then applied to the estimate. For example, in *Summary Table A* (below), the estimate for Prawns/shrimp usage is 508,648 'repeat' fishers and the RSE is 5.1%. The 95% confidence interval for this estimate is 457,804 – 559,492 where:

- the lower limit is calculated as $508,648 \times (1 - [1.96 \times 5.1\%])$; and
- the upper limit is calculated as $508,648 \times (1 + [1.96 \times 5.1\%])$.

Error Summary Table A: Bait/Berley Usage in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers for 10 Key Bait Types and Changes since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		Prawns/ shrimp	Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	Crabs	Salt- water Crayfish	Fresh- water Crayfish	Abalone	Other Shellfish	Trout and Salmon	Salt- water Fish	Fresh- water Fish
Yes	No.	508648	476534	18555	3175	134364	8387	287520	4277	531262	5850
	RSE	5.1%	5.4%	32.7%	n/a	11.7%	48.8%	7.5%	n/a	5.0%	n/a
No	No.	445834	477948	935927	951308	820118	946096	666962	950205	423220	948633
	RSE	5.6%	5.3%	2.9%	2.8%	3.4%	2.9%	4.1%	2.8%	5.8%	2.8%
Total	No.	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482

Error Summary Table B: Acquisition Sources of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers and Changes since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		Purchaser-Users			Personally Caught	TOTAL USERS
		'Sold as Bait'	'Sold as Seafood'	Total		
Yes	No.	423660	75839	464268	101992	508648
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>5.9%</i>	<i>16.4%</i>	<i>5.5%</i>	<i>14.0%</i>	<i>5.1%</i>
No	No.	530822	878643	490215	852490	445834
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>4.9%</i>	<i>3.1%</i>	<i>5.2%</i>	<i>3.2%</i>	<i>5.6%</i>
Total	No.	954482	954482	954482	954482	954482

Error Summary Table C: Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers

YEAR	Total Quantity/Mean		'Sold as Bait'	'Sold as Seafood'	TOTAL
2005/06	Quantity	Kgs.	333926	59579	393506
		<i>RSE</i>	<i>13.1%</i>	<i>25.5%</i>	<i>12.0%</i>
2001/02	Quantity	Kgs.	413006	50504	463510
		<i>RSE</i>	<i>16.8%</i>	<i>38.7%</i>	<i>15.4%</i>

Error Summary Table D: Fishing Methods used in 2005/06 by 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers and Changes since 2001/02

ANY USAGE IN 2005/06 ...		'In-scope' Bait (aquatic animals)	'Other' Bait (bread, meat etc)	Lures, Flies, Jigs
Yes	No.	871001	251634	581989
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>3.2%</i>	<i>8.1%</i>	<i>4.6%</i>
No	No.	83481	702848	372493
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>14.9%</i>	<i>3.9%</i>	<i>6.3%</i>
Total	No.	954482	954482	954482

Error Summary Table E: Awareness Assessments - Imported Seafood Products - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers

ANY AWARENESS ...		National Labelling Requirements for Seafood Products ...		Any Advice <u>Not</u> to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley
		Imported vs. Local (all products)	Country of Origin (unpackaged products)	
Full awareness	No.	481476	319724	69204
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>5.3%</i>	<i>7.0%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>
Some awareness	No.	87007	99661	68061
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>14.6%</i>	<i>13.6%</i>	<i>16.6%</i>
No awareness	No.	385999	535098	817217
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>6.2%</i>	<i>4.9%</i>	<i>3.4%</i>
Total	No.	954482	954482	954482

Error Table 5: Any Recreational Fishing in the Previous 12 Months (2005/06) - 'Former' Fishers (2001/02) aged 5 years or more by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FISHING ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482
	<i>RSE</i>	5.3%	5.4%	7.7%	8.2%	12.0%	7.8%	10.9%	2.8%
No	No.	191070	85369	133755	58900	72675	16688	8659	567116
	<i>RSE</i>	9.1%	13.8%	11.3%	11.5%	11.5%	18.1%	24.1%	4.8%
Total	No.	518815	305760	330486	141015	142341	55394	27788	1521598

Error Table 6a (2006): Any Bait/Berley Usage in Previous 12 Months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	299180	197676	189721	72058	63000	31333	18034	871001
	<i>RSE</i>	5.9%	6.4%	8.0%	9.4%	13.2%	10.4%	12.0%	3.2%
No	No.	28566	22716	7009	10056	6666	7374	1095	83481
	<i>RSE</i>	28.3%	30.2%	n/a	33.6%	n/a	30.3%	n/a	14.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 6b (2002 Comparison): Any Bait/Berley Usage in Previous 12 Months (2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	258238	190361	196731	73856	59828	32575	13293	824881
	<i>RSE</i>	6.9%	6.7%	7.7%	9.2%	13.8%	9.9%	17.2%	3.3%
No	No.	69507	30031	0	8259	9837	6131	5836	129601
	<i>RSE</i>	17.4%	25.9%	n/a	37.3%	n/a	33.6%	32.3%	11.8%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 7a (2006): Bait Types Used in Previous 12 Months - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

BAIT TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Prawns/Shrimp	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648
	RSE	7.7%	19.7%	10.7%	21.9%	17.4%	22.1%	25.0%	5.1%
2) Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	No.	182260	92559	79564	43029	40755	22649	15718	476534
	RSE	9.3%	13.0%	16.4%	14.2%	18.4%	14.5%	14.4%	5.4%
3) Crabs	No.	8394	5974	0	1653	1129	1404	0	18555
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	32.7%
4) Saltwater Crayfish	No.	1117	0	2058	0	0	0	0	3175
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5) Freshwater Crayfish	No.	44153	69655	12721	6466	0	0	1370	134364
	RSE	22.4%	15.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.7%
6) Abalone	No.	5255	0	2130	0	0	1002	0	8387
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	48.8%
7) Other Shellfish	No.	51623	108823	49488	63941	7175	6470	0	287520
	RSE	20.6%	11.6%	22.0%	10.5%	50.0%	33.6%	n/a	7.5%
8) Trout and Salmon	No.	3093	0	0	0	731	454	0	4277
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
9) Saltwater Fish	No.	175463	122316	115511	30817	49551	25552	12052	531262
	RSE	9.6%	10.5%	12.6%	17.7%	16.0%	13.0%	19.0%	5.0%
10) Freshwater Fish	No.	1898	3380	0	0	0	0	572	5850
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
11) Sharks and Rays	No.	0	0	2058	0	0	0	254	2311
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12) Worms	No.	94585	54257	80494	16764	2380	2401	288	251167
	RSE	14.5%	18.5%	16.3%	25.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	8.2%
13) Saltwater Yabbies/ Nippers	No.	68593	17503	72612	0	0	226	0	158933
	RSE	17.5%	34.9%	17.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.6%
14) Other Aquatic Animals (e.g. barnacles, limpets and cunjevoi)	No.	0	4292	0	0	0	0	0	4292
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Bait Users	No.	299180	197676	189721	72058	63000	31333	18034	871001

Error Table 7b (2002 Comparison): Bait Types Used in Previous 12 Months - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

BAIT TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Prawns/Shrimp	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727
	RSE	8.1%	13.8%	11.6%	19.5%	17.2%	29.8%	39.1%	5.1%
2) Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	No.	81650	94281	79086	44453	45413	13103	9780	367765
	RSE	15.7%	12.9%	16.4%	13.9%	16.9%	22.5%	22.7%	6.4%
3) Crabs	No.	31486	11119	7621	0	1951	2332	0	54508
	RSE	26.7%	44.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.8%
4) Saltwater Crayfish	No.	0	4166	0	0	0	0	0	4166
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
5) Freshwater Crayfish	No.	23591	73643	12223	0	0	0	0	109457
	RSE	31.1%	15.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.0%
6) Abalone	No.	3979	1334	0	0	1166	392	0	6871
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	53.8%
7) Other Shellfish	No.	58124	123632	53135	61745	8157	6762	0	311556
	RSE	19.1%	10.5%	21.0%	10.8%	45.7%	33.8%	n/a	7.2%
8) Trout and Salmon	No.	0	4000	0	0	0	0	0	4000
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
9) Saltwater Fish	No.	159254	131157	133335	40351	47697	30196	8847	550836
	RSE	10.3%	9.9%	11.2%	14.9%	16.3%	11.0%	24.5%	4.8%
10) Freshwater Fish	No.	1935	2689	1975	0	0	0	0	6599
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
11) Sharks and Rays	No.	0	0	1973	0	4080	0	0	6053
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
12) Worms	No.	97077	63833	79189	18997	2996	1223	0	263316
	RSE	14.2%	16.8%	16.4%	23.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	7.9%
13) Saltwater Yabbies/Nippers	No.	37723	26466	87975	0	0	1223	1616	155004
	RSE	24.2%	28.0%	15.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.8%
14) Other Aquatic Animals (e.g. barnacles, limpets and cunjevoi)	No.	14946	0	0	0	0	5144	0	20090
	RSE	39.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	31.3%
Total Bait Users	No.	258238	190361	196731	73856	59828	32575	13293	824881

Error Table 8a (2006): Acquisition Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	No.	208968	40008	101096	15464	39402	11017	7705	423660
	<i>RSE</i>	8.4%	21.7%	14.1%	27.6%	18.9%	24.4%	27.7%	5.9%
Sold as Seafood	No.	42235	3878	20235	0	6257	3234	0	75839
	<i>RSE</i>	23.0%	<i>n/a</i>	36.9%	<i>n/a</i>	55.9%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	16.4%
Personally Caught	No.	21274	16232	53403	6994	2580	0	1509	101992
	<i>RSE</i>	33.2%	33.6%	21.4%	44.1%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	14.0%
Total Prawn Users	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648

Error Table 8b (2002 Comparison): Acquisition Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	No.	205678	77907	109541	17631	33849	7894	3584	456085
	<i>RSE</i>	8.5%	14.8%	13.3%	27.9%	21.0%	30.9%	43.5%	5.6%
Sold as Seafood	No.	28407	8334	12996	810	4962	498	798	56805
	<i>RSE</i>	29.2%	<i>n/a</i>	48.8%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	20.1%
Personally Caught	No.	29479	11564	43546	7949	10765	1223	232	104758
	<i>RSE</i>	28.6%	44.3%	25.0%	47.3%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	14.5%
Total Prawn Users	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727

Error Table 9a (2006): Reasons for Purchasing Prawns/Shrimp from a 'Seafood Supplier' (vs. Bait Supplier) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Choice - size	No.	3284	1441	1843
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Freshness/quality	No.	34077	25832	8245
	<i>RSE</i>	24.5%	28.2%	49.9%
Price	No.	22427	11745	10682
	<i>RSE</i>	30.2%	41.8%	<i>n/a</i>
Convenience/access issues	No.	44566	35317	9249
	<i>RSE</i>	21.4%	24.1%	47.1%
Intention change (originally seafood)	No.	1504	1504	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other (incl. choice of species, form and quantity)	No.	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	45820
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	21.1%
Total	No.	n/a	75839	75839

Error Table 9b (2002 Comparison): Reasons for Purchasing Prawns/Shrimp from a 'Seafood Supplier' (vs. Bait Supplier) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Choice - size	No. <i>RSE</i>	6494 <i>n/a</i>	4651 <i>n/a</i>	1843 <i>n/a</i>
Freshness/quality	No. <i>RSE</i>	28544 <i>28.9%</i>	23893 <i>31.6%</i>	4651 <i>n/a</i>
Price	No. <i>RSE</i>	9296 <i>n/a</i>	8078 <i>n/a</i>	1218 <i>n/a</i>
Convenience/access issues	No. <i>RSE</i>	20182 <i>34.5%</i>	20182 <i>34.5%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Intention change (originally seafood)	No. <i>RSE</i>	4080 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4080 <i>n/a</i>
Other (incl. choice of species, form and quantity)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	45013 <i>22.7%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	56805	56805

Error Table 10a (2006): Methods Used to Bait Hook with Prawns/Shrimp - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

METHOD		ANY MENTION	MAIN METHOD	2ND METHOD	3RD METHOD
Live	No.	52608	36306	16302	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>19.9%</i>	<i>24.1%</i>	<i>36.3%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead)	No.	335804	289912	33455	12437
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>6.9%</i>	<i>7.7%</i>	<i>25.1%</i>	<i>41.6%</i>
With the head off (some shell and flesh) ...					
(a) Whole body (remainder)	No.	109991	74970	32874	2148
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>13.5%</i>	<i>16.5%</i>	<i>25.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(b) Part of the body (cut/pieces)	No.	43807	23071	13664	7073
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>21.9%</i>	<i>30.4%</i>	<i>39.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(c) Total (head off)	No.	(153799)	(98041)	(46538)	(9220)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>11.2%</i>	<i>14.3%</i>	<i>21.2%</i>	<i>48.3%</i>
Peeled (no head or shell) ...					
(a) Whole body (remainder)	No.	99385	56568	39959	2858
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>14.2%</i>	<i>19.2%</i>	<i>23.0%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(b) Part of the body (cut/pieces)	No.	56809	27440	24283	5085
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>19.1%</i>	<i>27.8%</i>	<i>29.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(c) Total (peeled)	No.	(156194)	(84009)	(64242)	(7943)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>11.1%</i>	<i>15.6%</i>	<i>17.9%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other (i.e. head specifically used)	No.	380	380	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd/3rd method	No.	n/a	n/a	348112	479047
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>6.8%</i>	<i>5.4%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	508648	508648	508648

Error Table 10b (2002 Comparison): Methods Used to Bait Hook with Prawns/Shrimp - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

METHOD		ANY MENTION	MAIN METHOD	2ND METHOD	3RD METHOD
Live	No. <i>RSE</i>	43769 22.1%	39185 23.4%	4584 69.3%	0 <i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead)	No. <i>RSE</i>	381102 6.4%	331236 7.0%	41705 22.6%	8161 51.8%
With the head off (some shell and flesh)	No. <i>RSE</i>	201294 9.6%	99694 14.3%	101601 14.1%	0 <i>n/a</i>
Peeled (no head or shell)	No. <i>RSE</i>	126734 12.5%	40715 22.9%	57177 19.2%	28842 27.3%
Other (i.e. head specifically used)	No. <i>RSE</i>	4044 <i>n/a</i>	1896 <i>n/a</i>	2148 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd/3rd method	No. <i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	305513 7.4%	475724 5.4%
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	512727	512727	512727

Error Table 11a (2006): State/Territory of Usage of Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

STATE/TERRITORY OF ...		RESIDENCE							
USAGE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
NSW/ACT	No. <i>RSE</i>	222419 7.9%	17911 32.1%	4982 <i>n/a</i>	2819 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1294 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	249425 8.4%
VIC	No. <i>RSE</i>	2323 <i>n/a</i>	35939 22.8%	0 <i>n/a</i>	4511 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	398 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	43171 22.1%
QLD	No. <i>RSE</i>	9265 50.8%	7254 50.1%	142421 10.7%	1181 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	160121 10.9%
SA	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	541 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	19966 23.2%	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	20507 32.3%
WA	No. <i>RSE</i>	1925 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	44010 17.4%	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	45935 21.4%
TAS	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	905 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	12534 22.5%	0 <i>n/a</i>	13440 40.0%
NT	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	8642 25.0%	8642 49.9%
Total Prawn Users	No.	230267	48716	142421	21659	44010	12932	8642	508648

Error Table 11b (2002 Comparison): State/Territory of Usage of Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

STATE/TERRITORY OF ...		RESIDENCE							
USAGE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
NSW/ACT	No.	213376	16009	10017	663	0	0	0	240065
	RSE	8.2%	35.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8.7%
VIC	No.	0	74565	0	0	0	0	0	74565
	RSE	n/a	15.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.7%
QLD	No.	1678	0	126598	0	0	0	0	128276
	RSE	n/a	n/a	11.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.4%
SA	No.	0	0	0	26390	0	0	0	26390
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.6%
WA	No.	0	1439	0	0	44358	0	0	45797
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	17.2%	n/a	n/a	21.6%
TAS	No.	0	905	0	0	0	8391	0	9296
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	29.8%	n/a	48.5%
NT	No.	0	0	2940	0	0	0	4382	7322
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	39.1%	54.7%
Total Prawn Users	No.	215054	85977	128176	26390	44358	8391	4382	512727

Error Table 12a (2006): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	193158	49547	55858	6288	15705	9423	3947	333926
	RSE	18.4%	38.4%	34.4%	39.9%	39.4%	43.6%	52.1%	13.1%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	36235	3067	15802	0	4130	344	0	59579
	RSE	39.0%	n/a	51.1%	n/a	82.2%	n/a	n/a	25.5%
Total	Kgs.	229393	52614	71661	6288	19835	9767	3947	393506
	RSE	17.0%	38.6%	28.1%	39.9%	35.2%	41.3%	52.1%	12.0%
Mean Kgs. Per Purchaser-User	Kgs.	1.02	1.28	0.61	0.41	0.45	0.76	0.51	0.85
	RSE	17.0%	38.6%	28.1%	39.9%	35.2%	41.3%	52.1%	12.0%

Error Table 12b (2002 Comparison): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	205935	52535	124647	4780	21324	2657	1128	413006
	<i>RSE</i>	25.4%	39.3%	40.0%	35.9%	39.4%	39.1%	68.7%	16.8%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	27671	3478	16795	262	1744	11	544	50504
	<i>RSE</i>	62.5%	<i>n/a</i>	77.9%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	38.7%
Total	Kgs.	233606	56013	141442	5042	23068	2667	1672	463510
	<i>RSE</i>	23.4%	36.9%	35.9%	34.2%	36.8%	38.5%	55.3%	15.4%
Mean Kgs. Per Purchaser-User	Kgs.	1.11	0.71	1.24	0.27	0.66	0.32	0.38	0.99
	<i>RSE</i>	23.4%	36.9%	35.9%	34.2%	36.8%	38.5%	55.3%	15.4%

Error Table 13a (2006): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	202207	29778	67108	5729	15745	9413	3947	333926
	<i>RSE</i>	17.5%	40.0%	32.4%	40.9%	39.0%	44.0%	52.1%	13.1%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	32253	2966	19885	0	4130	344	0	59579
	<i>RSE</i>	39.2%	<i>n/a</i>	43.2%	<i>n/a</i>	82.2%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	25.5%
Total	Kgs.	234460	32744	86992	5729	19876	9757	3947	393506
	<i>RSE</i>	16.3%	43.4%	26.1%	40.9%	34.9%	41.6%	52.1%	12.0%

Error Table 13b (2002 Comparison): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	220279	28905	123776	4579	31583	2698	1187	413006
	<i>RSE</i>	24.0%	32.9%	40.4%	34.3%	43.9%	37.5%	71.8%	16.8%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	28799	2371	16773	262	1744	11	544	50504
	<i>RSE</i>	58.3%	<i>n/a</i>	78.0%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	38.7%
Total	Kgs.	249078	31276	140549	4842	33326	2708	1731	463510
	<i>RSE</i>	22.0%	31.4%	36.3%	32.7%	41.5%	37.1%	57.2%	15.4%

Error Table 14a (2006): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Bait' - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	1274 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	54 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1328 <i>n/a</i>
Pre-packaged frozen (whole)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	167303 <i>17.7%</i>	29778 <i>40.0%</i>	58909 <i>35.4%</i>	5729 <i>40.9%</i>	15745 <i>39.0%</i>	9332 <i>45.3%</i>	3947 <i>52.1%</i>	290744 <i>13.4%</i>
Loose/unpackaged (whole)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	33630 <i>61.6%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	8144 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	41774 <i>51.5%</i>
With the head off	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	81 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	81 <i>n/a</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	202207	29778	67108	5729	15745	9413	3947	333926

Error Table 14b (2002 Comparison): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Bait' - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	1957 <i>n/a</i>	104 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2061 <i>n/a</i>
Pre-packaged frozen (whole)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	146680 <i>20.9%</i>	28801 <i>33.2%</i>	123776 <i>40.4%</i>	4579 <i>34.3%</i>	31583 <i>43.9%</i>	2052 <i>37.6%</i>	1187 <i>71.8%</i>	338658 <i>16.5%</i>
Loose/unpackaged (whole)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	71642 <i>62.3%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	349 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	71991 <i>61.0%</i>
With the head off	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	297 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	297 <i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	220279	28905	123776	4579	31583	2698	1187	413006

Error Table 15a (2006): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	29177 <i>43.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	19784 <i>44.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4130 <i>82.2%</i>	176 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	53268 <i>28.1%</i>
With the head off	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2966 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2966 <i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail fans on) ...									
(a) Processed in some way	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	120 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	120 <i>n/a</i>
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	3077 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	100 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	49 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3225 <i>57.7%</i>
(c) Total	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	(3077) <i>n/a</i>	(0) <i>n/a</i>	(100) <i>n/a</i>	(0) <i>n/a</i>	(0) <i>n/a</i>	(168) <i>n/a</i>	(0) <i>n/a</i>	(3345) <i>55.2%</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	32253	2966	19885	0	4130	344	0	59579

Error Table 15b (2002 Comparison): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	28799 <i>58.3%</i>	587 <i>n/a</i>	16773 <i>78.0%</i>	262 <i>n/a</i>	1744 <i>n/a</i>	11 <i>n/a</i>	544 <i>n/a</i>	48720 <i>39.6%</i>
With the head off	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1784 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1784 <i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	28799	2371	16773	262	1744	11	544	50504

Error Table 16a (2006): Estimated Size of Whole Prawns/Shrimp - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) by Selected Source/ Purchase Forms - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

SIZE RANGE		SOLD AS BAIT (Loose/unpackaged)	SOLD AS SEAFOOD (Whole dead)	TOTAL
Less than 5cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	13776 <i>n/a</i>	14302 <i>66.7%</i>	28078 <i>56.0%</i>
5 to 9cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	27998 <i>60.5%</i>	36406 <i>32.3%</i>	64404 <i>28.0%</i>
9 to 13cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2560 <i>n/a</i>	2560 <i>n/a</i>
More than 13cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	41774 <i>51.5%</i>	53268 <i>28.1%</i>	95041 <i>23.6%</i>

Error Table 16b (2002 Comparison): Estimated Size of Whole Prawns/Shrimp - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) by Selected Source/Purchase Forms - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

SIZE RANGE		SOLD AS BAIT (Loose/unpackaged)	SOLD AS SEAFOOD (Whole dead)	TOTAL
Less than 5cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	7073 <i>48.4%</i>	13668 <i>65.6%</i>	20741 <i>42.1%</i>
5 to 9cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	59872 <i>66.6%</i>	31522 <i>41.6%</i>	91394 <i>41.9%</i>
9 to 13cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	5046 <i>89.5%</i>	3530 <i>60.2%</i>	8576 <i>52.7%</i>
More than 13cm	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	71991 <i>61.0%</i>	48720 <i>39.6%</i>	120711 <i>35.5%</i>

Error Table 17a (2006): Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Water Body Type and Season - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) by Purchase Source - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

WATER BODY TYPE	SEASON		SOLD AS □BAIT	SOLD AS SEAFOOD	TOTAL
Freshwater	Winter	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	5491 <i>57.1%</i>	2657 <i>n/a</i>	8148 <i>46.7%</i>
	Summer	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	14110 <i>38.3%</i>	1604 <i>n/a</i>	15715 <i>37.7%</i>
Saltwater	Winter	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	98538 <i>16.1%</i>	20972 <i>30.3%</i>	119509 <i>14.2%</i>
	Summer	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	215787 <i>13.1%</i>	34346 <i>26.0%</i>	250134 <i>12.5%</i>
Total		Kgs.	333926	59579	393506

Error Table 17b (2002 Comparison): Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Water Body Type and Season - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) by Purchase Source - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

WATER BODY TYPE	SEASON		SOLD AS □BAIT	SOLD AS SEAFOOD	TOTAL
Freshwater	Winter	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	4273 <i>45.9%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4273 <i>45.5%</i>
	Summer	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	8965 <i>43.1%</i>	2153 <i>n/a</i>	11118 <i>47.3%</i>
Saltwater	Winter	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	137844 <i>21.3%</i>	17786 <i>45.4%</i>	155630 <i>19.3%</i>
	Summer	Kgs. <i>RSE</i>	261924 <i>16.4%</i>	30565 <i>41.1%</i>	292489 <i>15.1%</i>
Total		Kgs.	413006	50504	463510

Error Table 18a (2006): Import Potential of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORT POTENTIAL ...		
		YES	NO	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	n/a	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead) ...				
(a) Less than 5cm	Kgs.	n/a	14302	14302
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>66.7%</i>	<i>66.7%</i>
(b) 5 to 9cm	Kgs.	n/a	36406	36406
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>32.3%</i>	<i>32.3%</i>
(c) 9 to 13cm	Kgs.	n/a	2560	2560
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(d) More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(e) Total	Kgs.	(0)	(53268)	(53268)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>28.1%</i>	<i>28.1%</i>
With the head off	Kgs.	2966	n/a	2966
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail <input type="checkbox"/> fans on) ...				
(a) Processed in some way	Kgs.	120	n/a	120
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs.	3225	n/a	3225
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>57.7%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>57.7%</i>
(c) Total	Kgs.	(3345)	n/a	(3345)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>55.2%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>55.2%</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/ shells used	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	6312	53268	59579
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>51.4%</i>	<i>28.1%</i>	<i>25.5%</i>

Error Table 18b (2002 Comparison): Import Potential of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORT POTENTIAL ...		
		YES	NO	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	n/a	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Whole (dead) ...				
(a) Less than 5cm	Kgs.	n/a	13668	13668
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>65.6%</i>	<i>65.6%</i>
(b) 5 to 9cm	Kgs.	n/a	31522	31522
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>41.6%</i>	<i>41.6%</i>
(c) 9 to 13cm	Kgs.	n/a	3530	3530
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>60.2%</i>	<i>60.2%</i>
(d) More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(e) Total	Kgs.	(0)	(48720)	(48720)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>39.6%</i>	<i>39.6%</i>
With the head off	Kgs.	1784	n/a	1784
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail <input type="checkbox"/> fans on) ...	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/ shells used	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	1784	48720	50504
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>39.5%</i>	<i>38.7%</i>

Error Table 19 (2006): Any Imported Prawns Reported - Potentially Imported 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used (Kgs) - Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORTED PRAWNS USED ...			TOTAL (Potentially Imported)
		YES	NO	UNSURE	
Whole (dead) - more than 13cm	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
With the head off	Kgs.	0	0	2966	2966
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Shelled (incl. tail <input type="checkbox"/> fans on) ...					
(a) Processed in some way	Kgs.	120	0	0	120
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
(b) Whole/pieces (unprocessed)	Kgs.	0	1449	1777	3225
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>57.7%</i>
(c) Total	Kgs.	(120)	(1449)	(1777)	(3345)
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>55.2%</i>
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/ shells used	Kgs.	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	Kgs.	120	1449	4743	6312
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>51.4%</i>

Error Table 20: Reasons for No Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - Former Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Work/business-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	233657 8.8%	210180 9.4%	23478 30.3%
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	73937 16.8%	70725 17.2%	3211 <i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No. <i>RSE</i>	133906 12.2%	95808 14.6%	38098 23.7%
Home/family-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	118365 13.0%	79969 16.1%	38395 23.6%
Social-related (e.g. friend stopped fishing)	No. <i>RSE</i>	25640 29.0%	10175 <i>n/a</i>	15465 37.5%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	3144 <i>n/a</i>	3144 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No. <i>RSE</i>	36102 24.3%	32217 25.8%	3884 <i>n/a</i>
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No. <i>RSE</i>	26733 28.4%	9134 <i>n/a</i>	17599 35.1%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	4377 <i>n/a</i>	4377 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	15148 37.9%	6819 <i>n/a</i>	8329 <i>n/a</i>
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No. <i>RSE</i>	31154 26.2%	21300 31.8%	9854 47.0%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	13051 40.8%	13051 40.8%	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	10215 46.2%	10215 46.2%	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	408803 6.1%
Total	No.	n/a	567116	567116

Error Table 21: Main Reason for No Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - Former Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	57704	25023	73378	13291	29807	6250	4727	210180
	RSE	20.2%	29.6%	17.8%	32.3%	23.4%	33.9%	35.5%	9.4%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	20416	22601	6985	10758	6222	3744	0	70725
	RSE	35.4%	31.3%	n/a	36.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	17.2%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	41400	4547	10240	18041	18875	1750	955	95808
	RSE	24.3%	n/a	n/a	27.1%	31.0%	n/a	n/a	14.6%
Home/family-related	No.	29054	16323	14455	7403	9571	3163	0	79969
	RSE	29.4%	37.3%	n/a	n/a	45.2%	n/a	n/a	16.1%
Social-related (e.g. friend stopped fishing)	No.	0	7514	2661	0	0	0	0	10175
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	1191	1953	0	0	0	0	3144
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	15845	0	10591	4535	0	1246	0	32217
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.8%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	7972	1162	0	0	0	0	0	9134
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	999	3378	0	0	0	0	0	4377
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	1619	0	1376	968	2857	0	0	6819
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	3309	3043	7624	1680	4205	0	1439	21300
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	31.8%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	7225	0	3056	1233	0	0	1538	13051
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40.8%
Other	No.	5527	586	1436	991	1139	536	0	10215
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	46.2%
Total	No.	191070	85369	133755	58900	72675	16688	8659	567116

Error Table 22: Changes in Levels of Annual Fishing Effort (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
More (2005/06)	No.	88642	61362	30789	16340	14604	12551	5898	230186
	RSE	15.1%	17.1%	28.7%	25.8%	34.3%	21.9%	32.0%	8.5%
Less (2005/06)	No.	82936	54683	59341	23663	25469	5776	4249	256117
	RSE	15.7%	18.3%	19.7%	20.8%	24.9%	34.8%	39.2%	8.0%
No Change	No.	156168	104347	106601	42111	29592	20380	8982	468179
	RSE	10.4%	11.9%	13.4%	14.4%	22.7%	15.5%	24.0%	5.4%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 23: Reasons for More/Less Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		MORE FISHING (2005/06) ...			LESS FISHING (2005/06) ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Work/business-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	82381 14.7%	72381 15.8%	10000 43.0%	110914 12.6%	102013 13.2%	8901 n/a
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	5283 n/a	3989 n/a	1294 n/a	28379 25.4%	24358 27.4%	4020 n/a
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No. <i>RSE</i>	12449 38.5%	9345 44.5%	3104 n/a	26192 26.5%	24349 27.4%	1843 n/a
Home/family-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	29671 24.8%	24000 27.7%	5671 57.1%	60228 17.3%	35267 22.7%	24961 27.1%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No. <i>RSE</i>	22850 28.4%	19535 30.7%	3314 n/a	6422 n/a	3557 n/a	2865 n/a
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	14701 35.4%	14701 35.4%	0 n/a	0 n/a	0 n/a	0 n/a
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No. <i>RSE</i>	52098 18.7%	43146 20.5%	8953 45.4%	17382 32.5%	15161 34.9%	2220 n/a
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 n/a	0 n/a	0 n/a	8989 n/a	8989 n/a	0 n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 n/a	0 n/a	0 n/a	6238 n/a	3010 n/a	3227 n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	454 n/a	454 n/a	0 n/a	16645 33.3%	6384 53.8%	10261 42.4%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	7057 n/a	2813 n/a	4244 n/a	10801 n/a	7400 n/a	3400 n/a
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No. <i>RSE</i>	5268 59.3%	5268 59.3%	0 n/a	20327 30.1%	11994 39.2%	8333 47.1%
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	31482 24.1%	31482 24.1%	0 n/a	11124 40.7%	11124 40.7%	0 n/a
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	4737 n/a	3072 n/a	1665 n/a	2510 n/a	2510 n/a	0 n/a
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	191941 9.4%	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	186083 9.6%
Total	No.	n/a	230186	230186	n/a	256117	256117

Error Table 24a: Main Reasons for MORE Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	8959	32826	10633	4447	8128	5654	1735	72381
	RSE	50.0%	26.1%	47.8%	n/a	n/a	33.5%	n/a	15.8%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1225	0	2764	0	0	0	0	3989
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	3362	0	0	0	4046	1937	0	9345
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	44.5%
Home/family-related	No.	11171	4483	5072	0	1609	0	1665	24000
	RSE	44.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.7%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No.	11937	2111	2599	0	0	1002	1887	19535
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30.7%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	2677	5013	2258	4357	0	396	0	14701
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	35.4%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	25295	7327	6083	2541	822	1010	68	43146
	RSE	29.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.5%
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	0	0	0	0	454	0	454
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	2011	0	0	0	0	801	0	2813
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	2131	0	0	1962	0	633	542	5268
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	18182	9602	0	3033	0	665	0	31482
	RSE	34.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.1%
Other	No.	1690	0	1382	0	0	0	0	3072
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	88642	61362	30789	16340	14604	12551	5898	230186

Error Table 24b: Main Reasons for LESS Recreational Fishing in the previous 12 months (2005/06) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Work/business-related	No.	23145	28669	27705	9559	11136	656	1143	102013
	RSE	32.4%	25.3%	29.4%	33.7%	39.1%	n/a	n/a	13.2%
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1117	12828	2228	1989	1449	4747	0	24358
	RSE	n/a	37.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	38.9%	n/a	27.4%
Personal preference (e.g. new sport/rec.)	No.	15446	680	2941	2244	3037	0	0	24349
	RSE	40.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.4%
Home/family-related	No.	10441	1457	8770	4846	6706	0	3046	35267
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	47.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.7%
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No.	1867	1690	0	0	0	0	0	3557
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other 'access'-related	No.	0	3776	7617	2689	1079	0	0	15161
Cost/etc. of recreational fishing licences	No.	8989	0	0	0	0	0	0	8989
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	3010	0	0	0	0	0	0	3010
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3104	2289	0	0	990	0	0	6384
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	53.8%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7400	0	0	0	0	0	0	7400
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No.	0	1855	10079	0	0	0	60	11994
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	8416	0	0	2335	0	373	0	11124
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40.7%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	1071	0	0	2510
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	82936	54683	59341	23663	25469	5776	4249	256117

Error Table 25: Changes in 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'IN-SCOPE' BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	55378	15911	0	4401	8403	1933	5247	91274
	RSE	19.8%	36.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a	62.4%	34.5%	14.2%
2001/02 only	No.	14437	8596	7009	6199	5232	3176	506	45155
	RSE	40.4%	50.2%	n/a	43.4%	n/a	48.1%	122.5%	20.6%
Both years	No.	243801	181765	189721	67657	54597	29399	12787	779727
	RSE	7.3%	7.1%	8.0%	10.0%	14.9%	11.2%	17.9%	3.5%
Neither year	No.	14128	14120	0	3858	1434	4198	589	38327
	RSE	40.8%	38.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	41.4%	n/a	22.4%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 26: Reasons for Change of 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/ Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4536 <i>n/a</i>	4536 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1111 <i>n/a</i>	1111 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	11219 <i>41.1%</i>	11219 <i>41.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5855 <i>n/a</i>	5855 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No. <i>RSE</i>	4235 <i>n/a</i>	1041 <i>n/a</i>	3194 <i>n/a</i>	2220 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2220 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5855 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5855 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	6951 <i>n/a</i>	5426 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	6214 <i>n/a</i>	6214 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1248 <i>n/a</i>	1248 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	43959 <i>20.7%</i>	41848 <i>21.2%</i>	2111 <i>n/a</i>	27964 <i>25.7%</i>	22277 <i>28.6%</i>	5687 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3503 <i>n/a</i>	3503 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	17764 <i>32.6%</i>	17764 <i>32.6%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	12451 <i>n/a</i>	12451 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	411 <i>n/a</i>	411 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	84443 <i>14.8%</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	31392 <i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	91274	91274	<i>n/a</i>	45155	45155

Error Table 27: Changes in 'OTHER' Bait/Berley Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'OTHER' BAIT/ BERLEY USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	2821	2892	3006	0	0	498	0	9217
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>46.0%</i>
2001/02 only	No.	29467	32513	10227	5536	1090	4389	1616	84839
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>27.8%</i>	<i>24.8%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>40.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>14.8%</i>
Both years	No.	90881	77774	9387	25819	23920	11684	2952	242417
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>14.8%</i>	<i>14.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>19.8%</i>	<i>25.9%</i>	<i>22.9%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>8.3%</i>
Neither year	No.	204575	107212	174110	50760	44655	22136	14560	618009
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>8.5%</i>	<i>11.6%</i>	<i>8.8%</i>	<i>12.6%</i>	<i>17.3%</i>	<i>14.5%</i>	<i>15.7%</i>	<i>4.4%</i>
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 28: Reasons for Change of 'OTHER' Bait/Berley Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON	2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	2220	2220
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	786	786
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1453	0	1453	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	5415	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3006	3006	0	7579	5966
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>51.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	3185	3185	0	26009	26009
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>27.5%</i>	<i>27.5%</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	9689	9689
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>45.4%</i>	<i>45.4%</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	0	0	36268	35234
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>23.2%</i>	<i>23.5%</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1587	1587	0	4934	4934
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	1439	1439	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	7764	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>50.0%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	n/a	9217	9217	n/a	84839

Error Table 29: Changes in Lure/Fly/etc Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY LURE/ETC USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	35276	11507	29826	3550	19796	5906	0	105861
	RSE	25.3%	43.2%	29.2%	n/a	28.9%	34.3%	n/a	13.2%
2001/02 only	No.	18477	9352	18617	2300	4539	0	1775	55059
	RSE	35.5%	n/a	37.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.6%
Both years	No.	161816	139202	67139	38746	28742	28219	12265	476128
	RSE	10.2%	9.4%	18.2%	15.3%	23.1%	11.6%	18.6%	5.4%
Neither year	No.	112177	60330	81148	37519	16589	4582	5089	317434
	RSE	13.0%	17.2%	16.2%	15.6%	32.0%	39.5%	35.2%	7.0%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 30: Reasons for Change of Lure/Fly/etc Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1203 <i>n/a</i>	1203 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	1700 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1700 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	4629 <i>n/a</i>	4629 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2813 <i>n/a</i>	1522 <i>n/a</i>	1291 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1453 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1453 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No. <i>RSE</i>	3194 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3194 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	7879 <i>n/a</i>	7879 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	19924 <i>30.9%</i>	13744 <i>37.3%</i>	6180 <i>n/a</i>	13340 <i>41.8%</i>	13340 <i>41.8%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	3053 <i>n/a</i>	3053 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5922 <i>n/a</i>	5922 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	30918 <i>24.8%</i>	29718 <i>25.3%</i>	1200 <i>n/a</i>	26427 <i>28.8%</i>	26427 <i>28.8%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	2726 <i>n/a</i>	2726 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	41717 <i>21.3%</i>	39217 <i>21.9%</i>	2500 <i>n/a</i>	4409 <i>n/a</i>	4409 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	4895 <i>n/a</i>	4895 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	2833 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2833 <i>n/a</i>	2235 <i>n/a</i>	2235 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	86800 <i>14.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	53768 <i>18.8%</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	105861	105861	<i>n/a</i>	55059	55059

Error Table 31a: Main Reasons for Lure/Fly/etc Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	3953	0	0	676	0	4629
	RSE	n/a	n/a	79.5%	n/a	n/a	135.9%	n/a	64.4%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	5045	0	0	0	2833	0	0	7879
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	10284	0	2941	519	0	0	0	13744
	RSE	45.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37.3%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	677	0	0	0	2376	0	0	3053
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	3819	1453	11513	864	11399	670	0	29718
	RSE	n/a	n/a	46.7%	n/a	40.4%	n/a	n/a	25.3%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	1525	1200	0	0	0	0	2726
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	13413	8529	7361	2167	3187	4560	0	39217
	RSE	40.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.9%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2037	0	2858	0	0	0	0	4895
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	35276	11507	29826	3550	19796	5906	0	105861

Error Table 31b: Main Reasons for Lure/Fly/etc Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1203	1203
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	1522	0	0	0	0	0	0	1522
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3633	5338	2760	0	1609	0	0	13340
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	41.8%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	5922	0	0	0	0	0	0	5922
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7400	1182	12045	2300	2929	0	572	26427
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	46.8%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	28.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying	No.	0	2832	1577	0	0	0	0	4409
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	2235	0	0	0	0	2235
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	18477	9352	18617	2300	4539	0	1775	55059

Error Table 32: Changes in Proportion of Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/Flys/etc (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

PROPORTION OF FISHING TIME 2005/06 ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
More with bait	No.	79029	56446	28124	14547	4741	7714	9022	199623
	RSE	16.1%	18.0%	30.1%	27.5%	62.4%	29.5%	23.9%	9.3%
Less with bait	No.	45336	42836	46473	7548	26134	12906	2518	183752
	RSE	22.1%	21.2%	22.7%	39.1%	24.5%	21.5%	52.8%	9.7%
About the same	No.	72291	49291	40985	21636	19272	9740	1911	215126
	RSE	17.0%	19.5%	24.4%	21.9%	29.4%	25.7%	n/a	8.9%
Other fishers/not applicable	No.	131089	71819	81148	38383	19518	8346	5678	355981
	RSE	11.8%	15.4%	16.2%	15.4%	29.1%	28.2%	32.8%	6.5%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 33: Reasons for More/Less Proportion of Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs Lures/Flys/etc (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		MORE TIME USING BAIT (2005/06) ...			LESS TIME USING BAIT (2005/06) ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	8368 <i>n/a</i>	6470 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. <i>RSE</i>	3880 <i>n/a</i>	1203 <i>n/a</i>	2677 <i>n/a</i>	1080 <i>n/a</i>	1080 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1700 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1700 <i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	13241 <i>37.4%</i>	11950 <i>39.4%</i>	1291 <i>n/a</i>	4629 <i>n/a</i>	4629 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1041 <i>n/a</i>	1041 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	8113 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	6588 <i>n/a</i>	9894 <i>n/a</i>	9894 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	68970 <i>16.2%</i>	67445 <i>16.4%</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	54960 <i>17.9%</i>	48684 <i>n/a</i>	6276 <i>53.0%</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	29563 <i>25.0%</i>	19722 <i>30.6%</i>	9840 <i>n/a</i>	4301 <i>n/a</i>	4301 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	74186 <i>15.6%</i>	72075 <i>15.8%</i>	2111 <i>n/a</i>	62362 <i>16.8%</i>	57786 <i>17.4%</i>	4576 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	902 <i>n/a</i>	902 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	9070 <i>44.1%</i>	6945 <i>50.4%</i>	2126 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	7393 <i>n/a</i>	7393 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	44127 <i>20.0%</i>	38955 <i>21.3%</i>	5171 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	7660 <i>n/a</i>	7660 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5306 <i>n/a</i>	5306 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	2235 <i>n/a</i>	2235 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	13037 <i>36.8%</i>	6171 <i>n/a</i>	6866 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	173692 <i>10.0%</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	157038 <i>10.5%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	199623	199623	n/a	183752	183752

Error Table 34a: Main Reasons for More Proportional Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/etc in 2005/06 - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	2677	3793	0	0	0	0	0	6470
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1203	1203
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	6573	4108	0	0	0	0	1269	11950
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	39.4%
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	1041	0	0	0	1041
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	24641	22928	10291	5616	1139	1923	906	67445
	RSE	31.9%	30.1%	48.6%	46.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.4%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	9027	6415	0	1613	0	1002	1665	19722
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30.6%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	33422	9490	14020	3676	2700	4789	3978	72075
	RSE	27.0%	47.8%	41.9%	n/a	n/a	37.7%	42.3%	15.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	0	0	902	0	0	902
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	4515	1577	1300	0	0	0	7393
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2689	3671	0	1300	0	0	0	7660
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	No.	0	0	2235	0	0	0	0	2235
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	79029	56446	28124	14547	4741	7714	9022	199623

Error Table 34b: Main Reasons for Less Proportional Fishing Time Using Bait (Aquatic Animals) vs. Lures/etc in 2005/06 - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	1080	0	0	0	0	0	1080
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	3953	0	0	676	0	4629
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i>n/a</i>	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	5045	0	1919	0	2833	0	96	9894
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	16337	14293	10488	2212	2314	3041	0	48684
	RSE	39.9%	39.6%	45.9%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	53.7%	<i>n/a</i>	19.2%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	677	1248	0	0	2376	0	0	4301
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	9137	11409	16569	2632	11399	4218	2422	57786
	RSE	50.7%	44.1%	35.6%	<i>n/a</i>	33.7%	44.1%	86.4%	17.6%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	2905	1200	537	2303	0	0	6945
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	50.5%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	9780	11901	7361	2167	3187	4560	0	38955
	RSE	49.2%	43.2%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	21.4%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2037	0	2858	0	0	411	0	5306
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	2323	0	2126	0	1722	0	0	6171
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	45336	42836	46473	7548	26134	12906	2518	183752

Error Table 35: Changes in Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY PRAWN/ SHRIMP USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	41629	21563	26867	5343	6588	9692	5893	117575
	RSE	23.1%	31.0%	30.9%	46.8%	n/a	25.8%	32.1%	12.4%
2001/02 only	No.	26416	58824	12623	10074	6935	5150	1633	121655
	RSE	29.5%	17.5%	46.1%	33.6%	51.2%	37.0%	n/a	12.2%
Both years	No.	188638	27153	115553	16316	37422	3241	2749	391072
	RSE	9.1%	27.4%	12.6%	25.8%	19.5%	47.6%	n/a	6.1%
Neither year	No.	71062	112852	41687	50381	18720	20623	8854	324180
	RSE	17.2%	11.2%	24.2%	12.7%	29.9%	15.4%	24.3%	6.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 36: Reasons for Change of Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	2769	2769	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	2191	2191	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	22040	22040	0	7146	5855	1291
	<i>RSE</i>	28.3%	28.3%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1525	1525	0	14990	3010	11980
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	35.3%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	13248	8949	4299	18394	18394	0
	<i>RSE</i>	36.5%	44.4%	<i>n/a</i>	31.8%	31.8%	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	4891	4891	0	8520	8520	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	46.8%	46.8%	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	50688	45643	5045	66460	57807	8652
	<i>RSE</i>	18.8%	19.7%	<i>n/a</i>	16.6%	17.9%	46.4%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	15955	13324	2630	2968	2968	0
	<i>RSE</i>	33.3%	36.4%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	11402	9789	1613	2706	2706	0
	<i>RSE</i>	39.3%	42.4%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	11414	11414	0	15996	15996	0
	<i>RSE</i>	39.3%	39.3%	<i>n/a</i>	34.1%	34.1%	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	1439	1439	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	n/a	n/a	103987	n/a	n/a	99731
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	13.2%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	13.5%
Total	No.	n/a	117575	117575	n/a	121655	121655

Error Table 37a: Main Reasons for Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3307	5816	5822	2207	2833	786	1269	22040
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>28.3%</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	3480	1393	1919	0	0	2156	0	8949
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>44.4%</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	1268	0	2182	0	1441	0	0	4891
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	18832	6196	8497	2446	2314	4399	2959	45643
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>41.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>19.7%</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No.	7058	0	5590	0	0	676	0	13324
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>36.4%</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	6449	0	0	0	0	1674	1665	9789
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>42.4%</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1234	6632	2858	690	0	0	0	11414
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>39.3%</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	41629	21563	26867	5343	6588	9692	5893	117575

Error Table 37b: Main Reasons for Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	2769	0	0	0	0	0	2769
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	5855	0	0	0	0	0	0	5855
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	3010	0	0	0	0	0	0	3010
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	6310	8612	0	663	0	328	18394
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	31.8%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	6105	0	0	1513	902	0	0	8520
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	46.8%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	5668	31630	4011	4673	5370	5150	1304	57807
	RSE	n/a	25.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	37.0%	n/a	17.9%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	2282	0	686	0	0	0	2968
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	1053	0	1653	0	0	0	2706
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2185	12261	0	1549	0	0	0	15996
	RSE	n/a	43.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34.1%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	26416	58824	12623	10074	6935	5150	1633	121655

Error Table 38: Changes in Squid, Cuttlefish or Octopus Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SQUID/ETC USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	113345	34772	21754	16109	4339	11541	6006	207866
	RSE	12.9%	23.9%	34.6%	26.0%	65.4%	23.1%	31.7%	9.1%
2001/02 only	No.	12734	36494	21275	17533	8998	1995	68	99098
	RSE	43.0%	23.2%	35.0%	24.8%	44.6%	n/a	n/a	13.6%
Both years	No.	68916	57786	57811	26920	36415	11108	9712	268668
	RSE	17.5%	17.7%	20.0%	19.3%	19.9%	23.7%	22.6%	7.8%
Neither year	No.	132751	91338	95891	21553	19913	14062	3343	378851
	RSE	11.7%	13.1%	14.4%	22.0%	28.8%	20.3%	45.1%	6.3%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 39: Reasons for Change of Squid/etc Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	6306	6306	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	2191	2191	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	2055	2055	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	26685	25202	1483	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>27.6%</i>	<i>28.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	1898	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	2516	2516	0	4062	0	4062
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	17737	13078	4658	14759	14029	731
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>33.9%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>35.5%</i>	<i>36.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	43723	33621	10103	2761	2761	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>21.4%</i>	<i>24.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	79834	67148	12687	44203	43092	1111
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>15.6%</i>	<i>17.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>20.5%</i>	<i>20.8%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No.	10104	10104	0	9934	9934	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>45.1%</i>	<i>45.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>43.3%</i>	<i>43.3%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	48146	43423	4723	2359	2359	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>20.3%</i>	<i>21.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	10877	10877	0	16371	16371	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>43.5%</i>	<i>43.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>33.7%</i>	<i>33.7%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	172512	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	93194
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>10.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>14.1%</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	207866	207866	<i>n/a</i>	99098	99098

Error Table 40a: Main Reasons for Squid/etc Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	10370	4885	5822	594	0	2263	1269	25202
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	28.4%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	0	0	0	0	1898
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	990	0	0	2516
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	11760	0	0	0	1318	0	13078
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	23080	0	2453	3217	984	3886	0	33621
	RSE	33.7%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	24.5%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	33283	8508	9520	8185	882	2031	4737	67148
	RSE	27.6%	53.9%	<i>n/a</i>	36.9%	<i>n/a</i>	68.1%	38.7%	17.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	8240	0	1505	0	0	359	0	10104
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	45.1%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	34289	4027	0	1942	1483	1683	0	43423
	RSE	27.2%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	21.4%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2185	4067	2453	2171	0	0	0	10877
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	43.5%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	113345	34772	21754	16109	4339	11541	6006	207866

Error Table 40b: Main Reasons for Squid/etc Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	1117	5189	0	0	0	0	0	6306
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	2055	0	0	0	0	2055
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	5279	2940	3074	0	254	0	14029
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	36.5%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	1248	0	1513	0	0	0	2761
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	0	10215	16280	9301	5965	1330	0	43092
	RSE	n/a	n/a	40.1%	36.5%	54.9%	n/a	n/a	20.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	3600	1189	0	2044	3033	0	68	9934
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	43.3%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	1255	1104	0	0	0	0	0	2359
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	3170	11190	0	1601	0	411	0	16371
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33.7%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	12734	36494	21275	17533	8998	1995	68	99098

Error Table 41: Changes in Crab Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY CRAB USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	4146	5974	0	1653	0	1404	0	13178
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38.5%
2001/02 only	No.	27238	11119	7621	0	822	2332	0	49131
	RSE	29.0%	44.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.7%
Both years	No.	4248	0	0	0	1129	0	0	5377
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Neither year	No.	292113	203299	189110	80461	67715	34970	19129	886796
	RSE	6.1%	6.1%	8.1%	8.4%	12.4%	9.1%	10.9%	3.1%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 42: Reasons for Change of Crab Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend fished more/less)	No. <i>RSE</i>	2014 <i>n/a</i>	2014 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1653 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1653 <i>n/a</i>	2481 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2481 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	838 <i>n/a</i>	838 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	12910 <i>40.0%</i>	12910 <i>40.0%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	8073 <i>47.8%</i>	8073 <i>47.8%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	19864 <i>32.0%</i>	19042 <i>32.7%</i>	822 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3277 <i>n/a</i>	1380 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	2253 <i>n/a</i>	2253 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1935 <i>n/a</i>	1935 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2978 <i>n/a</i>	2978 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	8989 <i>n/a</i>	8989 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	11524 <i>40.8%</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	43931 <i>20.9%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	13178	13178	n/a	49131	49131

Error Table 43: Changes in Saltwater Crayfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SALTWATER CRAYFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1117	0	2058	0	0	0	0	3175
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001/02 only	No.	0	4166	0	0	0	0	0	4166
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Neither year	No.	326628	216226	194673	82115	69665	38706	19129	947142
	RSE	5.3%	5.5%	7.8%	8.2%	12.0%	7.8%	10.9%	2.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 44: Changes in Freshwater Crayfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FRESHWATER CRAYFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	35523	20793	2623	6466	0	0	1370	66775
	RSE	25.2%	31.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.8%
2001/02 only	No.	14962	24780	2126	0	0	0	0	41868
	RSE	39.6%	28.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.4%
Both years	No.	8630	48862	10098	0	0	0	0	67590
	RSE	52.5%	19.6%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.7%
Neither year	No.	268631	125956	181884	75649	69665	38706	17759	778250
	RSE	6.7%	10.2%	8.4%	9.0%	12.0%	7.8%	12.3%	3.6%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 45: Reasons for Change of Freshwater Crayfish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3337 <i>n/a</i>	3337 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	7062 <i>n/a</i>	7062 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	2783 <i>n/a</i>	2783 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	5956 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	4431 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	7286 <i>n/a</i>	5761 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	2584 <i>n/a</i>	2584 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	2131 <i>n/a</i>	2131 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	31811 <i>n/a</i>	31811 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	20150 <i>31.1%</i>	20150 <i>31.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5142 <i>n/a</i>	3244 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	17415 <i>35.4%</i>	14311 <i>39.2%</i>	3105 <i>85.5%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Environmental (e.g. water quality/levels)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1169 <i>n/a</i>	1169 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	1390 <i>n/a</i>	1390 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	7361 <i>n/a</i>	7361 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2126 <i>n/a</i>	2126 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	57714 <i>18.3%</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	39970 <i>21.9%</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	66775	66775	<i>n/a</i>	41868	41868

Table 46: Changes in Abalone Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY ABALONE USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1275	0	2130	0	0	1002	0	4407
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
2001/02 only	No.	0	1334	0	0	1166	392	0	2892
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Both years	No.	3979	0	0	0	0	0	0	3979
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Neither year	No.	322491	219058	194600	82115	68499	37313	19129	943204
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>5.4%</i>	<i>5.4%</i>	<i>7.8%</i>	<i>8.2%</i>	<i>12.2%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>10.9%</i>	<i>2.9%</i>
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 47: Changes in Other Shellfish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY OTHER SHELLFISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	20930	22337	12871	10184	828	4591	0	71741
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>33.3%</i>	<i>30.4%</i>	<i>45.6%</i>	<i>33.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>39.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>16.2%</i>
2001/02 only	No.	27432	37146	16518	7989	1810	4883	0	95777
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>28.9%</i>	<i>23.0%</i>	<i>40.1%</i>	<i>38.0%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>38.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>13.9%</i>
Both years	No.	30693	86486	36617	53756	6348	1879	0	215779
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>27.2%</i>	<i>13.6%</i>	<i>26.1%</i>	<i>12.1%</i>	<i>53.7%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>8.9%</i>
Neither year	No.	248691	74423	130724	10185	60681	27354	19129	571186
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>7.2%</i>	<i>15.1%</i>	<i>11.4%</i>	<i>33.4%</i>	<i>13.6%</i>	<i>12.0%</i>	<i>10.9%</i>	<i>4.7%</i>
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 48: Reasons for Change of Other Shellfish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	2297	2297	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	8261	8261	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>47.8%</i>	<i>47.8%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	4681	4681	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	1041	1041	0	1336	0	1336
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1382	0	1382	3515	1034	2481
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	5113	3588	1525	22343	21309	1034
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>30.3%</i>	<i>31.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	36304	34193	2111	44393	41017	3376
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>22.8%</i>	<i>23.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>21.2%</i>	<i>22.1%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No.	7572	5674	1898	11899	11899	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>41.9%</i>	<i>41.9%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	9944	6840	3105	5668	5668	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>43.5%</i>	<i>52.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	7464	7464	0	11114	11114	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>43.4%</i>	<i>43.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	1439	1439	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	61720	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	87550
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>17.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>14.6%</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	71741	71741	<i>n/a</i>	95777	95777

Error Table 49a: Main Reasons for Other Shellfish Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3105	4702	0	0	0	454	0	8261
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	47.8%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	2783	0	0	0	4681
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	1041	0	0	0	1041
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	1165	1104	0	0	0	1318	0	3588
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	13432	8963	5815	3164	0	2819	0	34193
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	50.9%	<i>n/a</i>	23.5%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	0	0	5674	0	0	0	0	5674
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	1330	1404	1382	1896	828	0	0	6840
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	52.5%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	0	6164	0	1300	0	0	0	7464
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	20930	22337	12871	10184	828	4591	0	71741

Error Table 49b: Main Reasons for Other Shellfish Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	2297	0	2297
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other 'access'-related (e.g. bought/sold boat)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	1034	0	0	0	0	0	0	1034
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	5930	12004	3376	0	0	0	0	21309
	RSE	62.1%	45.9%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	31.1%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	7953	17463	5007	6199	1810	2586	0	41017
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	37.1%	<i>n/a</i>	43.7%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	22.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	1399	1306	8135	1059	0	0	0	11899
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	41.9%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5668	0	0	0	0	0	0	5668
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	5449	4934	0	732	0	0	0	11114
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	43.4%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	27432	37146	16518	7989	1810	4883	0	95777

Error Table 50: Changes in Trout/Salmon Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY TROUT/ SALMON USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	3093	0	0	0	731	454	0	4277
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
2001/02 only	No.	0	4000	0	0	0	0	0	4000
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Neither year	No.	324652	216391	196731	82115	68935	38253	19129	946204
	RSE	5.4%	5.5%	7.7%	8.2%	12.2%	7.9%	10.9%	2.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 51: Changes in Saltwater Fish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY SALTWATER FISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	74123	12102	6991	2423	11237	3630	6597	117103
	RSE	16.7%	42.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	44.8%	29.8%	12.5%
2001/02 only	No.	57914	20944	24814	11957	9383	8273	3392	136678
	RSE	19.3%	31.5%	32.3%	30.6%	43.7%	28.3%	n/a	11.5%
Both years	No.	101340	110213	108521	28394	38314	21922	5455	414159
	RSE	13.9%	11.4%	13.2%	18.6%	19.2%	14.7%	33.7%	5.9%
Neither year	No.	94368	77132	56405	39340	10732	4881	3685	286543
	RSE	14.5%	14.7%	20.3%	15.1%	40.6%	38.1%	42.6%	7.5%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 52: Reasons for Change of Saltwater Fish Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	4119	3432	686
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	1111	1111	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	1700	0	1700	2297	2297	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	20179	20179	0	0	0	0
	RSE	31.8%	31.8%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	3994	0	3994
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	962	962	0	15640	13325	2316
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	35.1%	38.1%	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	0	0	13099	13099	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	38.4%	38.4%	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	68402	59722	8680	74700	70213	4487
	RSE	16.8%	18.1%	<i>n/a</i>	15.8%	16.3%	<i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No.	3150	3150	0	7378	7378	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	33766	30661	3105	5668	5668	0
	RSE	24.4%	25.6%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2429	2429	0	11165	11165	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	8989	8989	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No.	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	103618	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	125195
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	13.4%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	12.0%
Total	No.	n/a	117103	117103	n/a	136678	136678

Error Table 53a: Main Reasons for Saltwater Fish Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	8260	3857	0	0	6794	0	1269	20179
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	31.8%
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	0	0	0	0	838	124	962
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	35658	6563	5609	1848	4443	2159	3443	59722
	RSE	26.9%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	55.0%	44.7%	18.1%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2517	0	0	0	0	633	0	3150
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	25260	1683	1382	575	0	0	1761	30661
	RSE	32.8%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	25.6%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	2429	0	0	0	0	0	0	2429
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	74123	12102	6991	2423	11237	3630	6597	117103

Error Table 53b: Main Reasons for Saltwater Fish Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/ Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	3432	0	0	0	0	0	0	3432
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	0	0	0	0	0	0	1111
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Home/family-related	No.	0	0	0	0	0	2297	0	2297
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	3885	6316	0	0	643	0	13325
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	38.1%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	7180	0	2235	2480	0	0	1203	13099
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	38.4%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	15571	17059	13503	9477	7080	5334	2188	70213
	<i>RSE</i>	40.0%	35.7%	43.4%	35.0%	50.5%	38.2%	<i>n/a</i>	16.3%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	2316	0	2760	0	2303	0	0	7378
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5668	0	0	0	0	0	0	5668
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	11165	0	0	0	0	0	0	11165
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other	No.	8989	0	0	0	0	0	0	8989
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	57914	20944	24814	11957	9383	8273	3392	136678

Error Table 54: Changes in Freshwater Fish Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/ Territory of Residence

ANY FRESHWATER FISH USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	1898	3380	0	0	0	0	572	5850
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
2001/02 only	No.	1935	2689	1975	0	0	0	0	6599
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Both years	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Neither year	No.	323913	214322	194756	82115	69665	38706	18557	942034
	<i>RSE</i>	5.4%	5.6%	7.8%	8.2%	12.0%	7.8%	11.5%	2.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 55: Changes in 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'SOLD AS BAIT' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	44516	17331	23443	5548	14042	8230	4956	118066
	RSE	22.3%	34.9%	33.3%	45.9%	n/a	28.4%	35.7%	12.4%
2001/02 only	No.	41227	55231	31888	7715	8490	5106	834	150491
	RSE	23.2%	18.2%	28.1%	38.7%	46.1%	37.2%	n/a	10.9%
	%	12.6%	25.1%	16.2%	9.4%	12.2%	13.2%	4.4%	15.8%
Both years	No.	164452	22677	77654	9916	25359	2787	2749	305594
	RSE	10.1%	30.2%	16.6%	33.8%	25.0%	51.5%	n/a	7.2%
Neither year	No.	77551	125153	63746	58935	21774	22583	10589	380331
	RSE	16.3%	10.3%	18.8%	11.2%	27.3%	14.3%	21.1%	6.2%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 56: Reasons for Change of 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Personal Health/Fitness	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2769 <i>n/a</i>	2769 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	2191 <i>n/a</i>	2191 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	19730 <i>31.1%</i>	19730 <i>31.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	7146 <i>n/a</i>	5855 <i>n/a</i>	1291 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	1525 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	24798 <i>28.5%</i>	8564 <i>n/a</i>	16234 <i>35.3%</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	7848 <i>n/a</i>	3549 <i>n/a</i>	4299 <i>n/a</i>	25042 <i>28.3%</i>	25042 <i>28.3%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	6566 <i>n/a</i>	6566 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	18894 <i>32.7%</i>	13598 <i>38.7%</i>	5295 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	50921 <i>19.2%</i>	43765 <i>20.8%</i>	7156 <i>n/a</i>	59586 <i>18.1%</i>	50933 <i>19.6%</i>	8652 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	29091 <i>25.6%</i>	24620 <i>27.8%</i>	4471 <i>n/a</i>	18878 <i>32.7%</i>	16981 <i>34.5%</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	10072 <i>43.7%</i>	8459 <i>47.7%</i>	1613 <i>n/a</i>	2706 <i>n/a</i>	2706 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	9853 <i>44.2%</i>	9853 <i>44.2%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	18516 <i>33.1%</i>	18516 <i>33.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1439 <i>n/a</i>	1439 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	100526 <i>13.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i> <i>n/a</i>	117121 <i>12.5%</i>
Total	No.	<i>n/a</i>	118066	118066	<i>n/a</i>	150491	150491

Error Table 57a: Main Reasons for 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2005/06 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	3307	4885	5822	1613	2833	0	1269	19730
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	31.1%
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	0	1525	0	0	0	0	0	1525
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	0	1393	0	0	0	2156	0	3549
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	4384	0	2182	0	0	0	0	6566
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	18832	5255	8497	2446	2314	4399	2022	43765
	RSE	34.3%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	41.8%	<i>n/a</i>	20.8%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	11640	0	4085	0	8895	0	0	24620
	RSE	43.7%	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	27.8%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	5119	0	0	0	0	1674	1665	8459
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	47.7%
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	1234	4273	2858	1488	0	0	0	9853
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	44.2%
Other	No.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	RSE	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Total	No.	44516	17331	23443	5548	14042	8230	4956	118066

Error Table 57b: Main Reasons for 'Sold as Bait' Prawn/Shrimp Use in 2001/02 ONLY - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

REASON		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Personal Health/Fitness	No.	0	2769	0	0	0	0	0	2769
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Personal preference (not covered elsewhere)	No.	1111	1080	0	0	0	0	0	2191
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No.	5855	0	0	0	0	0	0	5855
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No.	1898	0	0	0	0	0	0	1898
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No.	4115	0	2894	0	1555	0	0	8564
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fishing quality/catch rates	No.	2481	7558	14012	0	663	0	328	25042
	RSE	n/a	57.4%	42.1%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.3%
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No.	6105	0	5079	1513	902	0	0	13598
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38.7%
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No.	5668	29164	4011	3863	3068	4653	506	50933
	RSE	n/a	27.4%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.6%
Availability of bait/etc	No.	9119	2293	2126	686	2303	454	0	16981
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34.5%
Experimenting/trying different things	No.	0	1053	0	1653	0	0	0	2706
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
No reason/nothing in particular	No.	4874	9875	3767	0	0	0	0	18516
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33.1%
Other	No.	0	1439	0	0	0	0	0	1439
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	41227	55231	31888	7715	8490	5106	834	150491

Error Table 58: Changes in 'Sold as Seafood' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'SOLD AS SEAFOOD' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	32229	3878	10614	0	5375	3234	0	55331
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>26.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>50.4%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>58.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>18.5%</i>
2001/02 only	No.	18401	8334	3376	810	4080	498	798	36296
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>35.6%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>23.0%</i>
Both years	No.	10005	0	9621	0	882	0	0	20508
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>48.7%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>30.8%</i>
Neither year	No.	267109	208179	173120	81305	59329	34975	18331	842347
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>6.7%</i>	<i>5.9%</i>	<i>8.9%</i>	<i>8.3%</i>	<i>13.9%</i>	<i>9.1%</i>	<i>11.7%</i>	<i>3.3%</i>
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 59: Reasons for Change of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawn/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	3560 <i>n/a</i>	3560 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other cost-related (e.g. fuel prices)	No. <i>RSE</i>	8861 <i>n/a</i>	6864 <i>n/a</i>	1997 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	6056 <i>n/a</i>	3282 <i>n/a</i>	2774 <i>n/a</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	11688 <i>41.5%</i>	8518 <i>48.7%</i>	3170 <i>n/a</i>	3116 <i>n/a</i>	3116 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	8162 <i>n/a</i>	6990 <i>n/a</i>	1172 <i>n/a</i>	13815 <i>41.9%</i>	10440 <i>48.9%</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	26847 <i>27.1%</i>	24219 <i>n/a</i>	2628 <i>n/a</i>	17126 <i>37.0%</i>	15285 <i>n/a</i>	1841 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4080 <i>n/a</i>	4080 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	43590 <i>21.0%</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	31080 <i>25.6%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	55331	55331	n/a	36296	36296

Error Table 60: Changes in 'Personally Caught' Prawn/Shrimp Usage (2005/06 vs 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY 'PERSONALLY CAUGHT' PRAWN USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
2005/06 only	No.	19597	12860	17989	594	1441	0	1509	53989
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>34.5%</i>	<i>40.8%</i>	<i>38.3%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>18.7%</i>
2001/02 only	No.	27802	8191	8132	1549	9626	1223	232	56756
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>28.7%</i>	<i>51.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>18.3%</i>
Both years	No.	1678	3372	35414	6400	1139	0	0	48003
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>26.5%</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>19.9%</i>
Neither year	No.	278669	195968	135195	73572	57460	37483	17388	795734
	<i>RSE</i>	<i>6.4%</i>	<i>6.4%</i>	<i>11.1%</i>	<i>9.2%</i>	<i>14.3%</i>	<i>8.2%</i>	<i>12.6%</i>	<i>3.5%</i>
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 61: Reasons for Change of 'Personally Caught' Prawns/Shrimp Use (2005/06 vs. 2001/02) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

REASON		2005/06 ONLY ...			2001/02 ONLY ...		
		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON	ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Social-related (e.g. friend changed)	No. <i>RSE</i>	9459 <i>n/a</i>	9459 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Location-related (e.g. moved to different area)	No. <i>RSE</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing quality/catch rates	No. <i>RSE</i>	12831 <i>n/a</i>	12831 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3608 <i>n/a</i>	3608 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Quality/function issues (e.g. ease of use)	No. <i>RSE</i>	11176 <i>n/a</i>	11176 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	1841 <i>n/a</i>	1841 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Different kinds of fishing/targets	No. <i>RSE</i>	4132 <i>n/a</i>	4132 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	8333 <i>54.3%</i>	4957 <i>70.9%</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>
Availability of bait/etc	No. <i>RSE</i>	3871 <i>n/a</i>	1973 <i>n/a</i>	1898 <i>n/a</i>	27235 <i>28.6%</i>	25395 <i>n/a</i>	1841 <i>n/a</i>
Experimenting/trying different things	No. <i>RSE</i>	10409 <i>43.6%</i>	7304 <i>52.1%</i>	3105 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No reason/nothing in particular	No. <i>RSE</i>	5218 <i>n/a</i>	5218 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	20956 <i>n/a</i>	20956 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd reason	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	48987 <i>19.7%</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	51539 <i>19.5%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	53989	53989	n/a	56756	56756

Error Table 62: Awareness of General Point-of-Sale Labelling Requirements (Imported vs. Local Seafood) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	149839	94579	134503	31822	39601	19207	11926	481476
	RSE	10.8%	12.8%	11.2%	17.4%	18.8%	16.3%	19.1%	5.3%
Some awareness	No.	22439	24253	27993	1449	5196	4210	1467	87007
	RSE	32.1%	29.1%	30.2%	n/a	n/a	41.3%	n/a	14.6%
No awareness	No.	155467	101560	34234	48844	24869	15290	5736	385999
	RSE	10.5%	12.1%	27.0%	13.0%	25.3%	19.2%	32.6%	6.2%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 63: Awareness of Specific Point-of-Sale Labelling Requirements (Country of Origin of Seafood) - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	93560	62721	99310	13084	33144	10538	7367	319724
	RSE	14.6%	16.8%	14.1%	29.1%	21.1%	24.5%	27.7%	7.0%
Some awareness	No.	36331	29139	18204	8531	1220	2787	3449	99661
	RSE	24.9%	26.3%	38.1%	36.7%	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.6%
No awareness	No.	197855	128531	79217	60499	35302	25381	8313	535098
	RSE	8.7%	10.1%	16.4%	11.0%	20.3%	12.9%	25.4%	4.9%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 64: Awareness of Any Advice Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

ANY AWARENESS ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Full awareness	No.	8564	5924	41720	0	9934	1336	1726	69204
	RSE	n/a	n/a	24.2%	n/a	42.4%	n/a	n/a	16.5%
Some awareness	No.	15470	20860	25424	798	4522	480	506	68061
	RSE	38.9%	31.6%	31.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.6%
No awareness	No.	303711	193607	129587	81316	55210	36890	16896	817217
	RSE	5.8%	6.5%	11.5%	8.3%	14.7%	8.4%	13.1%	3.4%
Total	No.	327745	220391	196731	82115	69665	38706	19129	954482

Error Table 65: Knowledge/Recall of Main Reason Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

MAIN REASON ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Disease Risk (essential detail understood)	No. <i>RSE</i>	11231 <i>81.6%</i>	13588 <i>56.8%</i>	60199 <i>23.6%</i>	798 <i>n/a</i>	6844 <i>69.7%</i>	1562 <i>n/a</i>	1443 <i>n/a</i>	95666 <i>21.4%</i>
Other/vague mention of 'disease'	No. <i>RSE</i>	4760 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	5789 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3992 <i>n/a</i>	254 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	14795 <i>41.8%</i>
'Incorrect' reason (e.g. buy Australian')	No. <i>RSE</i>	3687 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3687 <i>n/a</i>
No knowledge/recall	No. <i>RSE</i>	4355 <i>n/a</i>	13197 <i>n/a</i>	1155 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3620 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	789 <i>n/a</i>	23117 <i>34.6%</i>
Total	No.	24034	26784	67143	798	14456	1816	2233	137265

Error Table 66: Sources of Information - Advice Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ...		ANY MENTION	MAIN SOURCE	OTHER SOURCE
Fishing tackle shop (staff)	No. <i>RSE</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other fishers	No. <i>RSE</i>	25467 <i>33.3%</i>	17836 <i>38.6%</i>	7631 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing magazine	No. <i>RSE</i>	12730 <i>44.7%</i>	8004 <i>55.2%</i>	4726 <i>n/a</i>
Other print media	No. <i>RSE</i>	33002 <i>30.1%</i>	33002 <i>30.1%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Fishing show (TV/radio)	No. <i>RSE</i>	58144 <i>24.7%</i>	53887 <i>25.3%</i>	4257 <i>n/a</i>
Other electronic media	No. <i>RSE</i>	3092 <i>n/a</i>	3092 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
All government sources	No. <i>RSE</i>	4964 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	4964 <i>n/a</i>
Unsure/no recall	No. <i>RSE</i>	21443 <i>35.7%</i>	21443 <i>35.7%</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>
Other	No. <i>RSE</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>	0 <i>n/a</i>	3376 <i>n/a</i>
No 2nd source	No. <i>RSE</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	n/a <i>n/a</i>	112311 <i>20.5%</i>
Total	No.	n/a	137265	137265

Error Table 67: When Advice First Heard/Seen - Not to Use Imported Uncooked Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - 'Repeat' Recreational Fishers by State/Territory of Residence

WHEN ADVICE HEARD/SEEN ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
In the last few months	No.	8831	1453	27376	0	10980	0	2233	50874
	RSE	n/a	n/a	33.8%	n/a	61.5%	n/a	n/a	25.8%
In the last (3 to) 12 months	No.	12591	21972	19999	0	0	480	0	55042
	RSE	79.8%	47.3%	39.2%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.1%
More than a year ago	No.	2611	1248	17108	798	990	1336	0	24092
	RSE	n/a	n/a	42.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34.1%
Unsure/no recall	No.	0	2111	2661	0	2485	0	0	7257
	RSE	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	No.	24034	26784	67143	798	14456	1816	2233	137265

APPENDIX B: DATA TABLES FROM THE 2002 SURVEY

As discussed in Section 4.1 of this report, for primary analysis purposes, results from the 2006 survey should be routinely compared to equivalent results from the 2002 survey – i.e. for the ‘repeat’ fisher group. To this end, two separate data tabulations have routinely been included for each analysis in Sections 4 and 5 (i.e. the (a) 2006 and (b) 2002 tables). However, to provide an important perspective on the varying proportions that ‘repeat’ fishers comprise of the total estimates from the 2002 survey, corresponding tables have been included in this Appendix, for Tables 5 through 18 of the 2006 report. In each case, the Table No is suffixed by “c (2002 All)”

Table 5c (2002 All): Any Recreational Fishing¹ in the Previous 12 Months (2001/02) - Persons (aged 5 years or more)² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY FISHING ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	902856	519235	664423	240019	389719	106846	67626	2890723
	%	14.4%	11.9%	20.4%	17.4%	22.7%	25.0%	39.3%	16.4%
No	No.	5354028	3852459	2599185	1136451	1323401	320707	104362	14690594
	%	85.6%	88.1%	79.6%	82.6%	77.3%	75.0%	60.7%	83.6%
Total²	No.	6256883	4371694	3263609	1376470	1713120	427553	171988	17581317
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Recreational fishing is defined as any attempted harvesting of aquatic organisms for non-commercial purposes

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of residents aged 5 years or more ('Private Dwelling' basis only)

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 6c (2002 All): Any 'In-scope' Bait/Berley Usage¹ in Previous 12 Months - Recreational Fishers² by State/Territory of Residence

ANY BAIT USAGE ...		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Yes	No.	730013	451947	653439	189036	329990	76101	48517	2479043
	%	80.9%	87.0%	98.3%	78.8%	84.7%	71.2%	71.7%	85.8%
No	No.	172842	67288	10984	50982	59730	30745	19109	411680
	%	19.1%	13.0%	1.7%	21.2%	15.3%	28.8%	28.3%	14.2%
Total²	No.	902856	519235	664423	240019	389719	106846	67626	2890723
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ 'In-scope' bait/berley is defined as any kind of aquatic animal (i.e. plants and terrestrial animals are excluded)

² Table base: 2002 population estimate of all recreational fishers (aged 5 years or more)

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 7c (2002 All): Bait Types Used in Previous 12 Months - Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

BAIT TYPE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
1) Prawns/Shrimp	No.	575540	211753	442321	62625	220306	18285	20889	1551721
	%	78.8%	46.9%	67.7%	33.1%	66.8%	24.0%	43.1%	62.6%
2) Squid, Cuttlefish and Octopus	No.	237719	214513	288177	96601	179079	32174	39593	1087856
	%	32.6%	47.5%	44.1%	51.1%	54.3%	42.3%	81.6%	43.9%
3) Crabs	No.	43170	23660	21701	9817	10909	5320	901	115478
	%	5.9%	5.2%	3.3%	5.2%	3.3%	7.0%	1.9%	4.7%
4) Saltwater Crayfish	No.	0	4166	0	1756	2057	0	0	7979
	%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
5) Freshwater Crayfish	No.	45982	112299	46694	1558	0	703	0	207236
	%	6.3%	24.8%	7.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	8.4%
6) Abalone	No.	5646	1334	3174	0	1166	2592	0	13912
	%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	3.4%	0.0%	0.6%
7) Other Shellfish	No.	115212	307173	121019	153768	16591	16335	901	730999
	%	15.8%	68.0%	18.5%	81.3%	5.0%	21.5%	1.9%	29.5%
8) Trout and Salmon	No.	5124	4000	0	0	0	0	0	9125
	%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
9) Saltwater Fish	No.	359563	294051	367351	87700	247081	64341	32481	1452569
	%	49.3%	65.1%	56.2%	46.4%	74.9%	84.5%	66.9%	58.6%
10) Freshwater Fish	No.	7128	12108	11720	0	1300	0	0	32257
	%	1.0%	2.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
11) Sharks and Rays	No.	0	0	9945	663	4080	506	0	15192
	%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.4%	1.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%
12) Worms	No.	270184	107140	234931	48900	12304	2752	618	676828
	%	37.0%	23.7%	36.0%	25.9%	3.7%	3.6%	1.3%	27.3%
13) Saltwater Yabbies/Nippers	No.	90394	42593	230312	0	0	1223	1616	366139
	%	12.4%	9.4%	35.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	3.3%	14.8%
14) Other Aquatic Animals (e.g. barnacles, limpets and cunjevoi)	No.	34186	0	6136	818	1206	8388	0	50734
	%	4.7%	0.0%	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	11.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	245.2%	295.3%	272.9%	245.6%	210.9%	200.5%	199.9%	254.9%
Total Bait Users¹	No.	730013	451947	653439	189036	329990	76101	48517	2479043
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of recreational fishers using aquatic animals as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 8c (2002 All): Acquisition Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	No.	555322	201984	396296	45704	192633	16914	20091	1428944
	%	96.5%	95.4%	89.6%	73.0%	87.4%	92.5%	96.2%	92.1%
Sold as Seafood	No.	33020	11708	37580	810	17050	1371	3203	104742
	%	5.7%	5.5%	8.5%	1.3%	7.7%	7.5%	15.3%	6.8%
Personally Caught	No.	45614	23397	102797	16111	23466	1223	1133	213742
	%	7.9%	11.0%	23.2%	25.7%	10.7%	6.7%	5.4%	13.8%
Total²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	110.1%	112.0%	121.3%	100.0%	105.8%	106.7%	116.9%	112.6%
Total Prawn Users¹	No.	575540	211753	442321	62625	220306	18285	20889	1551721
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of all recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals may add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 9c (2002 All): Reasons for Purchasing Prawns/Shrimp from a 'Seafood Supplier' (vs. Bait Supplier) - Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

REASON		ANY MENTION	MAIN REASON	OTHER REASON
Choice - size	No. %	11132 10.6%	7825 7.5%	3307 3.2%
Freshness/quality	No. %	61852 59.1%	48085 45.9%	13768 13.1%
Price	No. %	17890 17.1%	16672 15.9%	1218 1.2%
Convenience/access issues	No. %	24205 23.1%	24205 23.1%	0 0.0%
Intention change (originally seafood)	No. %	12036 11.5%	7956 7.6%	4080 3.9%
Other (incl. choice of species, form and quantity)	No. %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
No 2nd reason	No. %	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	82370 78.6%
Total^{1,2}	No. %	n/a 121.4%	104742 100%	104742 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of all recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp that were 'Sold as Seafood', as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 10c (2002 All): Methods Used to Bait Hook with Prawns/Shrimp - Recreational Fishers¹ (All States/Territories)

METHOD		ANY MENTION	MAIN METHOD	2ND METHOD	3RD METHOD
Live	No.	102307	78297	20343	3667
	%	6.6%	5.0%	1.3%	0.2%
Whole (dead)	No.	1139855	1037907	93787	8161
	%	73.5%	66.9%	6.0%	0.5%
With the head off (some shell and flesh)	No.	606053	328271	271408	6374
	%	39.1%	21.2%	17.5%	0.4%
Peeled (no head or shell)	No.	275243	102556	121351	51336
	%	17.7%	6.6%	7.8%	3.3%
Other (i.e. head specifically used)	No.	10504	4690	5814	0
	%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%
No 2nd/3rd method	No.	n/a	n/a	1039016	1482183
	%	n/a	n/a	67.0%	95.5%
Total^{1,2}	No.	n/a	1551721	1551721	1551721
	%	137.5%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of all recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting in the 'ANY MENTION' column, the total adds to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 11c (2002 All): State/Territory of Usage of Prawns/Shrimp as Bait/Berley - Recreational Fishers¹ by State/Territory of Residence

STATE/TERRITORY OF ...			RESIDENCE						
USAGE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
NSW/ACT	No.	570596	34863	18031	663	2793	2903	143	629991
	%	99.1%	16.5%	4.1%	1.1%	1.3%	15.9%	0.7%	40.6%
VIC	No.	0	166967	0	0	1626	1576	0	170169
	%	0.0%	78.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	8.6%	0.0%	11.0%
QLD	No.	18738	18852	429554	3650	617	0	1056	472467
	%	3.3%	8.9%	97.1%	5.8%	0.3%	0.0%	5.1%	30.4%
SA	No.	0	8257	0	58975	0	0	0	67232
	%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	94.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
WA	No.	0	1439	5329	0	216897	0	0	223664
	%	0.0%	0.7%	1.2%	0.0%	98.5%	0.0%	0.0%	14.4%
TAS	No.	0	905	0	0	0	14509	0	15414
	%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	79.3%	0.0%	1.0%
NT	No.	0	2286	6728	0	0	0	19690	28704
	%	0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	94.3%	1.8%
Total ²	No.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	%	102.4%	110.3%	103.9%	101.1%	100.7%	103.8%	100.0%	103.6%
Total Prawn Users ¹	No.	575540	211753	442321	62625	220306	18285	20889	1551721
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: 2002 population estimate of all recreational fishers using prawns/shrimp as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02)

² Due to multiple reporting, totals may add to more than 100%

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 12c (2002 All): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by State/Territory of Residence

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	432111	90667	334898	14359	120822	4770	10285	1007912
	%	92.3%	95.4%	92.6%	98.2%	94.7%	99.2%	87.0%	93.0%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	35868	4391	26910	262	6731	36	1544	75742
	%	7.7%	4.6%	7.4%	1.8%	5.3%	0.8%	13.0%	7.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	467979	95058	361808	14621	127554	4806	11829	1083654
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Purchaser-Users²	No.	563846	203881	405795	46514	201770	18285	20889	1460981
Mean Kgs. Per Purchaser-User²	Kgs.	0.83	0.47	0.89	0.31	0.63	0.26	0.57	0.74

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only

² Excludes those who only used prawns/shrimp that were 'Personally Caught'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 13c (2002 All): Purchase Source of Prawns/Shrimp Used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE SOURCE		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Sold as Bait	Kgs.	443585	58067	344754	16808	130397	3986	10315	1007912
	%	92.3%	94.5%	92.8%	98.5%	95.2%	99.7%	87.0%	93.0%
Sold as Seafood	Kgs.	36996	3398	26889	262	6643	11	1544	75742
	%	7.7%	5.5%	7.2%	1.5%	4.8%	0.3%	13.0%	7.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	480581	61464	371642	17070	137040	3996	11859	1083654
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 14c (2002 All): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Bait' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by State/ Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	4481	259	1034	0	0	0	0	5773
	%	1.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Pre-packaged frozen (whole)	Kgs.	338679	57802	304662	16808	130397	3328	10114	861790
	%	76.4%	99.5%	88.4%	100.0%	100.0%	83.5%	98.0%	85.5%
Loose/unpackaged (whole)	Kgs.	100426	6	39058	0	0	349	201	140040
	%	22.6%	0.0%	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	2.0%	13.9%
With the head off	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	309	0	309
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	443585	58067	344754	16808	130397	3986	10315	1007912
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Bait'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 15c (2002 All): Form Purchased of Prawns/Shrimp 'Sold as Seafood' - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by State/Territory of Usage

PURCHASE FORM		NSW/ACT	VIC	QLD	SA	WA	TAS	NT	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead)	Kgs.	29843	1028	26889	262	6643	11	1544	66219
	%	80.7%	30.3%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	87.4%
With the head off	Kgs.	7153	1784	0	0	0	0	0	8937
	%	19.3%	52.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%
Shelled (incl. tail fans on)	Kgs.	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	25
	%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	0	560	0	0	0	0	0	560
	%	0.0%	16.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Total¹	Kgs.	36996	3398	26889	262	6643	11	1544	75742
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 16c (2002 All): Estimated Size of Whole Prawns/Shrimp - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Selected Source/ Purchase Forms (All States/Territories)

SIZE RANGE		SOLD AS BAIT (Loose/unpackaged)	SOLD AS SEAFOOD (Whole dead)	TOTAL
Less than 5cm	Kgs.	14168	16586	30755
	%	10.1%	25.0%	14.9%
5 to 9cm	Kgs.	117913	46003	163916
	%	84.2%	69.5%	79.5%
9 to 13cm	Kgs.	7960	3630	11589
	%	5.7%	5.5%	5.6%
More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total¹	Kgs.	140040	66219	206260
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... Purchased 'Whole (dead)' and either 'Sold as Bait' (but excluding pre-packaged frozen) or 'Sold as Seafood'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 17c (2002 All): Usage of Prawns/Shrimp by Water Body Type and Season - Annual Quantities Used¹ (Kgs) by Purchase Source (All States/Territories)

WATER BODY TYPE	SEASON		SOLD AS □ BAIT	SOLD AS SEAFOOD	TOTAL
Freshwater	Winter	Kgs. %	19080 1.9%	0 0.0%	19080 1.8%
	Summer	Kgs. %	58054 5.8%	2153 2.8%	60208 5.6%
Saltwater	Winter	Kgs. %	305403 30.3%	30822 40.7%	336225 31.0%
	Summer	Kgs. %	625375 62.0%	42766 56.5%	668142 61.7%
Total¹		Kgs. %	1007912 100%	75742 100%	1083654 100%

Notes:

¹ Table base: estimated total quantity of prawns/shrimp used (in any State/Territory) by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) ... from 'purchase sources' only. By design, quantities for 'Personally Caught' prawns/shrimp were not assessed in the survey

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3

Table 18c (2002 All): Import Potential¹ of 'Sold as Seafood' Prawns/Shrimp used as Bait/Berley - Annual Quantities Used² (Kgs) - Recreational Fishers (All States/Territories)

PURCHASE FORM		ANY IMPORT POTENTIAL ...		
		YES	NO	TOTAL
Live	Kgs.	n/a	0	0
	%	n/a	0.0%	0.0%
Whole (dead) ...				
(a) Less than 5cm	Kgs.	n/a	16586	16586
	%	n/a	25.0%	21.9%
(b) 5 to 9cm	Kgs.	n/a	46003	46003
	%	n/a	69.5%	60.7%
(c) 9 to 13cm	Kgs.	n/a	3630	3630
	%	n/a	5.5%	4.8%
(d) More than 13cm	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
(e) Total	Kgs.	(0)	(66219)	(66219)
	%	(0.0%)	(100.0%)	(87.4%)
With the head off	Kgs.	8937	n/a	8937
	%	93.9%	n/a	11.8%
Shelled (incl. tail <input type="checkbox"/> fans on) ...	Kgs.	25	n/a	25
	%	0.3%	n/a	0.0%
Just the heads or shells	Kgs.	0	n/a	0
	%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%
Purchased whole/etc, but only heads/shells used	Kgs.	560	n/a	560
	%	5.9%	n/a	0.7%
Total¹	Kgs.	9523	66219	75742
	%	100%	100%	100%

Notes:

¹ Purchase Forms involving whole prawns (live or dead) below the 13cm size class are classified as having no import potential (i.e. the first 4 categories in the above table). All remaining Purchase Forms are classified as potential imports

² Table base: estimated total prawns/shrimp used by all recreational fishers as bait/berley in the previous 12 months (2001/02) - where the purchase source was 'Sold as Seafood'

Also, standard error estimates are contained in Appendix A, with detailed study definitions/methodologies in Sects. 2 & 3