## Supplementary Materials

## S1: Questionnaire Transcript

## Participant ID =

## Participant Information Sheet (PIS) and Consent Form

I am a PhD student at Royal Holloway, University of London and the Institute of Zoology (Zoological Society of London), working with the British Trust for Ornithology. I really appreciate your help and time taking part in the questionnaire. The interview will take about 15 minutes to complete. Please do not look up information from records prior to, or during the questionnaire. All answers should be your own, based on personal knowledge, experience and opinion. Your answer will be anonymous, and it will be impossible for you to be identified after the data are collected. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. You can choose to stop the interview at any time. If you agree to participate in this study, please indicate at the beginning when prompted to do so.

You may contact me, Lizzie Jones, at any time for more information:
Lizzie Jones, Royal Holloway University of London.
Contact phone number: (+44) 0-7548-103657
Email: lizzie.jones.2017@live.rhul.ac.uk

1. [Single choice] Are you willing to participate in this survey: $\square$ Yes $\square$ No
2. [Single choice] Voice-recording the interview would help us transcribe the interview into a complete text version and provide valuable context. Do you consent for me to record the interview? The recordings will not be disclosed to a third party and will be deleted after the transcription work:

3. [Text] Reserve of interest during interview: $\qquad$
4. [Text] Date of interview: $\qquad$
5. [Select choice] Interview method: Phone/Video call

## SECTION 1 - About you

## Organisation and role

1. [Text] Which organisation do you currently work for? (e.g. BTO): $\qquad$
2. [Text] What is your job title/role within the organisation? $\qquad$
3. [Number] How long have you worked in that role? $\qquad$
4. [Number] How long have you worked in environmental management/conservation?

## Work

5. [Text] Which reserve do you primarily work in? $\qquad$
6. [Number] How long have you worked in the reserve mentioned above? $\qquad$
7. [Number] What proportion of your time working on the reserve do you spend interacting with nature, as opposed to working inside/in the office? $\qquad$
8. [Text] When was your first visit to the reserve? $\qquad$

## Demographics, experience and knowledge

9. [Number] How old are you? $\qquad$
10. [Single choice] What is your gender? Male/Female/Prefer not to say/Other
11. [Multiple choice] How often do you go birding/watch birds? Daily/Once a week/Once a month/Once a year/Never
12. [Open-ended] Over your lifetime, how/from where do you think you have gained most of your birding knowledge? $\qquad$

## SECTION 2 - Future conservation targets (run through all 3 questions per species) -

[Spoken by interviewer] "Please have a pen and paper to hand to write down the following species names for reference - Skylark, Marsh tit, Nightingale, Blackcap, Nuthatch, Buzzard. For continuity I will ask you to refer to summer populations for each species."

## Species 1 = Skylark

1. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Skylark (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Skylark in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\qquad$ Pairs $\qquad$ $\square$ Individuals $\square$ $\square$ Territories
[Context] $\qquad$
2. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
3. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## Species 2 = Marsh tit

4. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Marsh tit (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Marsh tit in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\square$ Pairs $\square$ Individuals $\square$ Territories
[Context] $\qquad$
5. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
6. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## Species 3 = Nightingale

7. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Nightingale (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Nightingale in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\qquad$ Pairs $\qquad$ Individuals $\square$ Territories [Context] $\qquad$
8. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
9. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## Species 4 = Blackcap

10. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Blackcap (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Blackcap in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\qquad$ Pairs $\qquad$ Individuals $\square$ Territories [Context] $\qquad$
11. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
12. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## Species 5 = Nuthatch

13. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Nuthatch (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Nuthatch in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\qquad$ Pairs $\qquad$ Individuals $\square$ Territories [Context] $\qquad$
14. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
15. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## Species 6 = Buzzard

16. [Number] If your local reserve were managed specifically for Buzzard (i.e. management tailored for one species specifically), what would be the maximum summer abundance you might expect for Buzzard in your reserve?
[Number] $\qquad$ Unit of measure: $\qquad$ Pairs $\qquad$ Individuals $\square$ Territories [Context] $\qquad$
17. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion, what is the current population compared to that maximum possible population stated in Q1?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$
18. [Percent/Proportion] Either as a raw number or as a proportion of that maximum possible population stated above, what would be the most desirable population for this species at this reserve, in balance with other species and ecological processes also occurring?
[Number] $\qquad$
[Context] $\qquad$

## SECTION 3 - Species memories and perceptions since first visit to reserve

1. [Multiple choice] Since your first experience of the reserve to now, do you think each of these species have: Increased, declined or stayed the same in your local area? Or please state if the species was/is not present, or if you don't know.

Skylark - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
Marsh tit - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
Nightingale - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
Blackcap - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
Nuthatch - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
Buzzard - increasing / stable / declining / not present / not sure
2. [Multiple choice] Please rank the six species in order of how much conservation priority you think each species should receive on your reserve in an ideal scenario ( $1=$ highest priority, $6=$ lowest priority)

Skylark $\square$ $\qquad$
Marsh tit $\quad \square$ $\qquad$
Nightingale $\square$ $\square$
$\qquad$
Blackcap $\square$ $\qquad$
Nuthatch $\square$
$\qquad$
Buzzard
$\qquad$
[Other notes] $\qquad$

## SECTION 4 - Reflection on targets

1. Having talked about species population trends, would you like to change your answers to any of the conservation target questions for any species?

Table S1: Question outline in order found in the questionnaire, with data format, rationale and an outline of the analysis for each question.

| Question <br> Category | Question/ data collected | Data format | Question rationale | Analysis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interview consent and info | Willingness and recording | Binary - Yes/No | Consent required | Anyone stating 'no' will not be interviewed |
|  | Location/Reserve | Short answer text | Enables t-test matching | Convert to numeric to ensure anonymity |
|  | Date of interview | Date format (dd/mm/yyyy) |  |  |
| Occupational Experience and Demographics | Years working in bird conservation | Continuous (years) | Cumulative conservation work experience throughout lifetime | Exploratory statistics based on outcome of paired t -tests. <br> If age difference is revealed then could plot/ run correlations between greater population estimates and age, years of experience, different roles, organisations etc. <br> Could also run mixed models to explore parameter estimates. |
|  | Current organisation | Short answer text (e.g. RSPB) | Group participants by organisation |  |
|  | Current role | Categorical options (e.g. Student) | Group participant by role |  |
|  | Years in current role | Continuous (years) | Measure of experience in current role |  |
|  | Years on reserve | Continuous (years) | Measure of experience working in reserve |  |
|  | Years since first memory of reserve | Continuous (years) | Measure of total experience of reserve and approximate position of 'baseline' memory |  |
|  | Age | Continuous (years) | Lifetime experience |  |
|  | Gender | Categorical - M/F/Prefer not to say | May impact experience or role |  |
|  | Education | Categorical (e.g., Undergraduate) | Indicator of knowledge/seniority |  |
| Birding experience/ knowledge | Birding experience frequency | Likert scale ( $0=$ never, $5=$ everyday ) | Measure of exposure to current local bird populations |  |
|  | Knowledge source | Short answer text | Self-evaluation of knowledge - interesting to compare ambitiousness with personal experience |  |
| Management perceptions (section repeated per species) | Maximum possible abundance | Continuous - number of pairs/territories | Measure of overall ambitiousness and willingness to consider hypothetical targets | Paired t-tests comparing older and younger, or more and less experienced groups per species metrics collected (e.g. current, target and maximum possible abundance) |
|  | Current proportion of maximum | Proportion (percentage or fraction acceptable) | Difference between current and maximum gives 'current ambitiousness' (potentially also accuracy if reserve level data available) |  |
|  | Desirable proportion of maximum | Proportion (percentage or fraction acceptable) | Difference between desirable and maximum gives 'future ambitiousness' (potentially also accuracy if reserve level data available) |  |
| Perceptions of conservation priority + reflection | Trend perception | Categorical (Increased, decreased, remained the same, not sure) | Perception of long-term species trends on the local reserve | Compare management estimates and trend accuracy measures |
|  | Rank by conservation priority | Ranking (1=highest, 6=lowest. Force one rank per species) | Perception of relative species conservation need/priority | Compare management estimates and conservation priority estimates |
|  | Reflection: Change targets | Short answer text | Measures effect of question ordering - have people considered trends and priority when making abundance management decisions? | Compare likelihood of different age groups choosing to change targets given previous question |

Table S2. Correlation matrix of the pairwise correlation values between all experience-based continuous predictors (including age, years in current role, years working on current reserve/site, years since first visit to reserve/site (baseline) and years working in conservation) for all paired participants ( $\mathrm{n}=36$ ).
Abbreviations: Cons. $=$ Conservation, Res. $=$ Reserve.

|  | Age | Baseline Years | Years in Cons. | Years on Res. | Years in Role |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age |  | $0.79^{* * *}$ | $0.87^{* * *}$ | 0.78 *** | 0.66 *** |
| Baseline Years |  |  | $0.81{ }^{* * *}$ | 0.78 *** | $0.67{ }^{* * *}$ |
| Years in Cons. |  |  |  | 0.83 *** | $0.70^{* * *}$ |
| Years on Res. |  |  |  |  | $0.84^{* * *}$ |
| Years in Role |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S3. Summary statistics for paired participant perceptions of maximum, current and target abundance (number of pairs) per species, separated into high and low number of years since first visit to the participant's focal reserve. Abbreviations: $\mathrm{n}=$ number of pairs, iqr $=$ inter-quartile range, $\mathrm{sd}=$ standard deviation, $\mathrm{se}=$ standard error, $\mathrm{ci}=$ confidence interval.

Summary statistics of perceptions of abundance per species

| Species | Group | variable | $n$ | min | max | median | $i q r$ | mean | $s d$ | se | ci |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Skylark | High | Max | 15 | 0.0 | 500 | 20.0 | 43.5 | 88.4 | 169.2 | 43.7 | 93.7 |
| Skylark | Low | Max | 15 | 0.0 | 570 | 20.0 | 24.0 | 77.6 | 161.4 | 41.7 | 89.4 |
| Skylark | High | Current | 15 | 0.0 | 500 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 43.7 | 128.7 | 33.2 | 71.3 |
| Skylark | Low | Current | 15 | 0.0 | 513 | 2.0 | 8.5 | 57.6 | 147.4 | 38.0 | 81.6 |
| Skylark | High | Target | 15 | 0.0 | 500 | 5.0 | 17.5 | 45.1 | 127.3 | 32.9 | 70.5 |
| Skylark | Low | Target | 15 | 0.0 | 513 | 5.0 | 17.5 | 50.0 | 133.6 | 34.5 | 74.0 |
| Marshtit | High | Max | 17 | 0.0 | 50 | 10.0 | 16.0 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 3.1 | 6.6 |
| Marshtit | Low | Max | 17 | 0.0 | 100 | 12.0 | 25.0 | 18.3 | 25.3 | 6.1 | 13.0 |
| Marshtit | High | Current | 17 | 0.0 | 20 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 3.1 |
| Marshtit | Low | Current | 17 | 0.0 | 20 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 5.5 | 1.3 | 2.8 |
| Marshtit | High | Target | 17 | 0.0 | 20 | 4.0 | 15.0 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 2.0 | 4.2 |
| Marshtit | Low | Target | 17 | 0.0 | 40 | 10.0 | 12.0 | 9.4 | 10.5 | 2.6 | 5.4 |
| Nightingale | High | Max | 14 | 0.0 | 150 | 7.5 | 21.2 | 24.4 | 40.2 | 10.7 | 23.2 |
| Nightingale | Low | Max | 14 | 0.0 | 150 | 13.5 | 15.0 | 27.6 | 43.0 | 11.5 | 24.8 |
| Nightingale | High | Current | 14 | 0.0 | 50 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 13.9 | 3.7 | 8.0 |
| Nightingale | Low | Current | 14 | 0.0 | 42 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 12.4 | 3.3 | 7.2 |
| Nightingale | High | Target | 14 | 0.0 | 100 | 5.5 | 15.5 | 14.5 | 26.0 | 6.9 | 15.0 |
| Nightingale | Low | Target | 14 | 0.0 | 45 | 5.5 | 9.5 | 10.6 | 13.7 | 3.7 | 7.9 |
| Blackcap | High | Max | 18 | 0.0 | 250 | 35.0 | 60.0 | 62.2 | 70.5 | 16.6 | 35.0 |
| Blackcap | Low | Max | 18 | 20.0 | 300 | 45.0 | 37.5 | 68.6 | 73.6 | 17.3 | 36.6 |
| Blackcap | High | Current | 18 | 0.0 | 100 | 18.0 | 27.5 | 26.3 | 25.6 | 6.0 | 12.7 |
| Blackcap | Low | Current | 18 | 8.0 | 200 | 20.0 | 15.0 | 35.8 | 45.5 | 10.7 | 22.6 |
| Blackcap | High | Target | 18 | 0.0 | 100 | 22.5 | 25.0 | 33.0 | 26.2 | 6.2 | 13.0 |
| Blackcap | Low | Target | 18 | 7.5 | 150 | 30.0 | 39.0 | 40.2 | 35.0 | 8.3 | 17.4 |
| Nuthatch | High | Max | 16 | 0.0 | 250 | 19.0 | 20.0 | 36.7 | 61.2 | 15.3 | 32.6 |
| Nuthatch | Low | Max | 16 | 2.0 | 150 | 27.5 | 45.8 | 44.6 | 42.7 | 10.7 | 22.8 |
| Nuthatch | High | Current | 16 | 0.0 | 40 | 7.0 | 12.2 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 2.5 | 5.4 |
| Nuthatch | Low | Current | 16 | 0.0 | 60 | 8.5 | 19.8 | 14.1 | 16.3 | 4.1 | 8.7 |
| Nuthatch | High | Target | 16 | 0.0 | 50 | 13.5 | 12.5 | 16.4 | 14.5 | 3.6 | 7.7 |
| Nuthatch | Low | Target | 16 | 0.0 | 120 | 11.0 | 17.5 | 20.9 | 29.6 | 7.4 | 15.8 |
| Buzzard | High | Max | 18 | 1.0 | 30 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 6.7 | 1.6 | 3.3 |
| Buzzard | Low | Max | 18 | 1.0 | 20 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 1.6 | 3.4 |
| Buzzard | High | Current | 18 | 0.0 | 10 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 1.5 |
| Buzzard | Low | Current | 18 | 0.0 | 15 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 1.9 |
| Buzzard | High | Target | 18 | 1.0 | 15 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Buzzard | Low | Target | 18 | 0.0 | 20 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 2.3 |

Abbreviations - Group $=$ Experience group, Max $=$ Maximum .

Table S4. Linear model results investigating the relationship between paired differences in years of experience and paired differences in perceptions of current, maximum and target abundance for each of the six species.

Linear model results for current, maximum and target abundance

|  | Maximum |  |  | Current |  |  | Target |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Predictors | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ | Estimates | $C I$ | $p$ |
| (Intercept) | 14.48 | $-21.36-50.32$ | 0.42 | -13.91 | $-52.60-24.78$ | 0.48 | -10.03 | $-57.70-37.63$ | 0.68 |
| Experience | -1.11 | $-2.61-0.39$ | 0.14 | 0.23 | $-1.39-1.85$ | 0.78 | 0.15 | $-1.85-2.15$ | 0.88 |
| Species [Buzzard] | -14.83 | $-65.52-35.85$ | 0.56 | 14.20 | $-40.51-68.92$ | 0.61 | 10.73 | $-56.68-78.13$ | 0.75 |
| Species [Marshtit] | -15.45 | $-66.28-35.38$ | 0.55 | 14.83 | $-40.04-69.71$ | 0.59 | 8.30 | $-59.30-75.90$ | 0.81 |
| Species [Nightingale] | -16.29 | $-67.91-35.34$ | 0.53 | 13.12 | $-42.61-68.85$ | 0.64 | 10.04 | $-58.61-78.70$ | 0.77 |
| Species [Nuthatch] | 20.23 | $-32.63-73.09$ | 0.45 | 12.32 | $-44.75-69.38$ | 0.67 | 11.97 | $-58.33-82.28$ | 0.74 |
| Species [Skylark] | -2.09 | $-54.91-50.72$ | 0.94 | -10.03 | $-67.04-46.99$ | 0.73 | -5.23 | $-75.47-65.01$ | 0.88 |
| Experience *Species <br> [Buzzard] | 1.04 | $-1.08-3.17$ | 0.33 | -0.29 | $-2.58-2.01$ | 0.80 | -0.22 | $-3.05-2.60$ | 0.88 |
| Experience * Species <br> [Marshtit] | 0.88 | $-1.24-3.01$ | 0.41 | -0.28 | $-2.58-2.01$ | 0.81 | -0.16 | $-2.99-2.66$ | 0.91 |
| Experience * Species <br> [Nightingale] | 1.02 | $-1.25-3.30$ | 0.37 | -0.18 | $-2.64-2.28$ | 0.89 | 0.09 | $-2.94-3.12$ | 0.95 |
| Experience * Species <br> [Nuthatch] | -1.05 | $-3.22-1.13$ | 0.34 | -0.36 | $-2.71-1.99$ | 0.76 | -0.48 | $-3.37-2.42$ | 0.74 |
| Experience * Species | 1.03 | $-1.17-3.22$ | 0.35 | 0.30 | $-2.07-2.66$ | 0.80 | 0.39 | $-2.53-3.31$ | 0.79 |
| [Skylark] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S5. Ordinal logistic regression model results and odds ratios investigating the relationship between paired differences in years of experience and paired differences in levels of agreement of perceived species trends ('total agreement', 'adjacent agreement' and 'no agreement') for each of the six species.

| Ordinal logistic regression model results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variable | Value | SD | t.value | P.value | OddsRatios | 2.5\% | 97.5\% |
| Experience | -0.013 | 0.031 | -0.406 | 0.685 | 0.987 | 0.926 | 1.050 |
| SpeciesBuzzard | -0.786 | 1.097 | -0.717 | 0.473 | 0.456 | 0.048 | 3.825 |
| SpeciesMarshtit | -1.297 | 1.490 | -0.870 | 0.384 | 0.273 | 0.009 | 4.293 |
| SpeciesNightingale | -0.409 | 1.391 | -0.294 | 0.769 | 0.664 | 0.035 | 10.488 |
| SpeciesNuthatch | -0.532 | 1.223 | -0.435 | 0.664 | 0.587 | 0.048 | 6.466 |
| SpeciesSkylark | 2.452 | 1.316 | 1.863 | 0.062 | 11.612 | 0.921 | 169.633 |
| Experience:SpeciesBuzzard | 0.001 | 0.048 | 0.027 | 0.978 | 1.001 | 0.908 | 1.100 |
| Experience:SpeciesMarshtit | 0.032 | 0.059 | 0.543 | 0.587 | 1.033 | 0.920 | 1.171 |
| Experience:SpeciesNightingale | 0.023 | 0.060 | 0.381 | 0.703 | 1.023 | 0.907 | 1.160 |
| Experience:SpeciesNuthatch | 0.047 | 0.050 | 0.929 | 0.353 | 1.048 | 0.951 | 1.161 |
| Experience:SpeciesSkylark | -0.040 | 0.054 | -0.742 | 0.458 | 0.961 | 0.863 | 1.068 |
| Total agreement\|Adjacent values | -0.172 | 0.741 | -0.232 | 0.817 |  |  |  |
| Adjacent valuesiNo agreement | 3.155 | 0.934 | 3.380 | 0.001 |  |  |  |

Table S6. Frequency of individual's perceived conservation priority for each species ( $\mathrm{n}=35$ ).

| Perceived conservation <br> priority level | Skylark | Marsh tit | Nightingale | Blackcap | Nuthatch | Buzzard |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High | 14 | 19 | 21 | 9 | 5 | 9 |
| Medium | 10 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 19 | 22 |
| Low | 11 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 4 |

Table S7. Cumulative link ordinal logistic regression analysis results, investigating the effect of participant experience and participant perceptions of long-term local species population trend (since first visit to the reserve) on perceptions of ranked species conservation priority for all species (Results Section 3.3.).

Cumulative link mixed model results

| Species | Variable | Estimate | SD | z.value | P.value |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Skylark | HighlMedium | -0.648 | 0.892 | -0.726 | 0.468 |
|  | MediumlLow | 1.165 | 0.869 | 1.341 | 0.180 |
|  | Experience | -0.003 | 0.037 | -0.085 | 0.932 |
|  | Trend (Same) | 0.384 | 1.084 | 0.354 | 0.723 |
|  | Experience:Trend (Same) | 0.044 | 0.053 | 0.841 | 0.400 |
| Nightingale | HighlLow | 3.756 | 2.903 | 1.294 | 0.196 |
|  | Experience (Not present) | 0.134 | 0.094 | 1.422 | 0.155 |
|  | Experience:Trend (Not present) | 0.032 | 0.121 | 0.267 | 0.789 |
|  | HighlMedium | -1.360 | 0.840 | -1.619 | 0.105 |
|  | MediumlLow | 0.993 | 0.649 | 1.529 | 0.126 |
|  | Trend (No change) | -0.001 | 0.028 | -0.033 | 0.974 |
|  | Experience:Trend (No change) | 0.002 | 0.037 | 0.064 | 0.949 |
|  | HighlMedium | -24.507 | 0.001 | -26380.981 | 0.000 |
|  | MediumlLow | 7.438 | 0.001 | 8089.985 | 0.000 |
|  | Experience:Trend (No change) | -0.019 | 0.001 | -13.567 | 0.000 |
|  | Trend (No change) |  |  |  |  |

Table S8. Odds ratios for cumulative link ordinal logistic regression analysis results, investigating the effect of participant experience and participant perceptions of long-term local species population trend (since first visit to the reserve) on perceptions of ranked species conservation priority for all species (Results Section 3.3.).

| CLMM - Odd Species | Ratios Variable | OddsRatios | 2.5\% | 97.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Skylark | HighlMedium | 0.523 | 0.091 | 3.004 |
|  | MediumlLow | 3.206 | 0.584 | 17.596 |
|  | Experience | 0.997 | 0.927 | 1.072 |
|  | Trend (Same) | 1.468 | 0.175 | 12.295 |
|  | Experience:Trend (Same) | 1.045 | 0.943 | 1.160 |
| Nightingale | HighlLow | 42.770 | 0.145 | 12654.754 |
|  | Experience | 1.144 | 0.951 | 1.376 |
|  | Trend (Not present) | 21.671 | 0.011 | 43423.396 |
|  | Experience:Trend (Not present) | 1.033 | 0.815 | 1.308 |
| Blackcap | HighlMedium | 0.257 | 0.049 | 1.331 |
|  | MediumlLow | 2.698 | 0.756 | 9.632 |
|  | Experience | 0.999 | 0.946 | 1.056 |
|  | Trend (No change) | 1.453 | 0.282 | 7.489 |
|  | Experience:Trend (No change) | 1.002 | 0.933 | 1.077 |
| Nuthatch | HighlMedium | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | MediumlLow | 1699.746 | 1696.686 | 1702.812 |
|  | Experience | 0.613 | 0.611 | 0.615 |
|  | Trend (No change) | 0.239 | 0.238 | 0.239 |
|  | Experience:Trend (No change) | 0.981 | 0.978 | 0.983 |

Table S9. Table of power to detect a significant relationship between experience groups for mean perceived maximum, current and optimal abundance at alpha $=0.05$ along a gradient of increasing sample size from $n=25$ to $n=250$ for each species.

| Abundance measurement | Species | Normality test | Power at Sample size ( n ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 25 | 50 | 75 | 100 | 125 | 150 | 175 | 200 | 225 | 250 |
| Maximum abundance | Skylark | Wilcoxon | 0.149 | 0.249 | 0.362 | 0.462 | 0.550 | 0.618 | 0.684 | 0.748 | 0.810 | 0.840 |
|  | Marsh tit | T-test | 0.169 | 0.300 | 0.425 | 0.536 | 0.632 | 0.712 | 0.777 | 0.830 | 0.871 | 0.903 |
|  | Nightingale | T-test | 0.157 | 0.277 | 0.391 | 0.496 | 0.589 | 0.669 | 0.736 | 0.792 | 0.837 | 0.873 |
|  | Blackcap | Wilcoxon | 0.078 | 0.100 | 0.138 | 0.160 | 0.189 | 0.218 | 0.258 | 0.276 | 0.300 | 0.328 |
|  | Nuthatch | T-test | 0.029 | 0.111 | 0.144 | 0.178 | 0.211 | 0.244 | 0.277 | 0.310 | 0.342 | 0.374 |
|  | Buzzard | T-test | 0.238 | 0.435 | 0.600 | 0.727 | 0.819 | 0.883 | 0.926 | 0.954 | 0.972 | 0.983 |
| Current abundance | Skylark | Wilcoxon | 0.077 | 0.116 | 0.124 | 0.172 | 0.209 | 0.239 | 0.268 | 0.303 | 0.343 | 0.362 |
|  | Marsh tit | T-test | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | Nightingale | T-test | 0.051 | 0.052 | 0.053 | 0.053 | 0.054 | 0.055 | 0.056 | 0.057 | 0.058 | 0.059 |
|  | Blackcap | Wilcoxon | 0.456 | 0.744 | 0.900 | 0.961 | 0.988 | 0.996 | 0.998 | 0.999 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Nuthatch | T-test | 0.341 | 0.610 | 0.788 | 0.892 | 0.948 | 0.976 | 0.989 | 0.995 | 0.998 | 0.999 |
|  | Buzzard | T-test | 0.238 | 0.435 | 0.600 | 0.727 | 0.819 | 0.883 | 0.926 | 0.954 | 0.972 | 0.983 |
| Optimal abundance | Skylark | Wilcoxon | 0.049 | 0.055 | 0.056 | 0.061 | 0.064 | 0.064 | 0.066 | 0.067 | 0.071 | 0.074 |
|  | Marsh tit | T-test | 0.139 | 0.239 | 0.337 | 0.430 | 0.515 | 0.591 | 0.658 | 0.717 | 0.767 | 0.809 |
|  | Nightingale | T-test | 0.176 | 0.315 | 0.445 | 0.559 | 0.657 | 0.736 | 0.800 | 0.850 | 0.889 | 0.918 |
|  | Blackcap | Wilcoxon | 0.404 | 0.692 | 0.854 | 0.935 | 0.977 | 0.990 | 0.996 | 0.998 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Nuthatch | T-test | 0.141 | 0.243 | 0.343 | 0.437 | 0.524 | 0.601 | 0.668 | 0.726 | 0.776 | 0.818 |
|  | Buzzard | T-test | 0.156 | 0.274 | 0.388 | 0.492 | 0.585 | 0.665 | 0.732 | 0.788 | 0.833 | 0.870 |

Figure S1. Histograms comparing the frequency of calculated differences between paired perceptions of species trends. 'Total agreement' represents full agreement within the pair, 'Adjacent values' represents a difference of one level (e.g., increasing vs. no change) and 'No agreement' represents the reporting of opposite trends were reported within a pair. 'NA' represents pairs in which either member of a pair perceived the species as 'not present' or 'don't know'.

Paired trend differences by species


Figure S2. Power curves of required sample size (number of reserves) against statistical power for each of the six species for; A. maximum abundance, B. current abundance and C. optimal abundance, grouping participants by experience. For full results see Table S8.



