Abstract

In 1998, the Queensland Labor Party replaced the sitting Coalition (Liberal/National) Government in a landslide victory. The newly appointed Labor-led Queensland Government also signalled a new beginning for environmental protection in this State through the amalgamation of all government departments involved in environmental protection into one core government agency – the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In the process, the Queensland Department of National Parks and Wildlife became a division of the EPA called the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS).

The Queensland Government, in the EPA’s inaugural Corporate Plan, announced that they were going to revitalise the visitor education capacity of the QPWS. No reason was provided for this policy initiative, nor direction on how the revitalisation would occur or be measured to gauge when the revitalisation had been achieved. For the Queensland Government to publicly state as a policy intent that they were going to revitalise the visitor education capacity of the QPWS raised many questions about the visitor education policies in place and the ability of the QPWS to deliver on these policies at the time. Visitor education is the principal means by which protected area agencies around the world educate people about an area’s natural and cultural features, minimise recreational impacts, enhance visitor safety, and publicise the role of the agency in managing the natural and/or cultural resource. It is an effective tool on its own and in combination with other park management techniques such as site-hardening strategies to rationalise resource use and regulation.

This thesis examines the period leading up to and during the life of the Queensland Government’s 1999–2001 Corporate Plan for the Environmental Protection Agency to determine the management framework and priority placed on visitor education to achieve particular nature conservation outcomes. It evaluates the organisational policies and structures underpinning the planning and delivery of visitor education services and activities, and the opinions of interpreters and park managers to determine the role, value, use and acceptance of visitor education as a park management tool during this period.

Institutional problems such as a lack of resourcing, high work loads and a negative organisational culture are identified as the main reasons why visitor education was failing to be an integral part of protected area management in Queensland. However,
poor communication among interpreters and between interpreters and park managers, and the failure of the existing departmental interpretation and education strategy to clearly link the intentions of government and the actions required at an operational level to achieve the Queensland Government’s nature conservation agenda are also identified as significant barriers. The identification of these institutional problems and barriers supports assumptions as to why the Queensland Government stated as policy that they wanted to revitalise the visitor education capacity of the QPWS.

This thesis also identifies the actions and preferred strategies required to enhance the acceptance and use of visitor education as a park management tool in protected area agencies such as QPWS. These include better promotion of visitor education as a park management tool, improvement of internal communication, the development of achievable visitor education policy, and the securing of adequate funding and resources. The adoption of these actions and strategies by agencies such as the QPWS will ensure visitor education remains a critical aspect of park management worldwide and assist protected areas achieve the goal for which they are established: the conservation of biological diversity.
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