

Communication of flagship species in conservation: lessons from invasive management projects

Article

Accepted Version

Melero, Y. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4337-1448> (2017) Communication of flagship species in conservation: lessons from invasive management projects. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 26 (12). pp. 2973-2978. ISSN 1572-9710 doi: 10.1007/s10531-017-1389-6 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/83098/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1389-6>

Publisher: Springer

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Communication of flagship species in conservation: lessons from invasive management**
2 **projects**

3 Yolanda Melero¹

4 ¹CREAF, Cerdanyola del Vallés 08193, Spain

5 E mail: y.melero@creaf.uab.cat, Phone: +34 935814677

6

7 **Running title:** Communication with the public in conservation

8 **Keywords:** Communication, Flagship species, Invasive species, Management, Volunteers

9 **Type of article:** Policy Perspective

10 **Number of words in abstract:** 127

11 **Total number of words (including abstract but excluding references):** 1903

12 **Number of references:** 30

13

14 **Abstract**

15 With the increase of public awareness and involvement in conservational projects, flagship
16 species have become a common tool to appeal to people's motivations. Yet, the effectiveness
17 of these species depends on a proper communication of their conservational importance.

18 Using two projects aiming to control the invasive species American mink, I illustrate how
19 communication can positively or negatively impact on succeeding at involving the public; and
20 consequently on the projects. The Scottish mink initiative project managed to increase the
21 number of volunteers involved by selecting flagship species and their communication adapted
22 to the public needs. Meanwhile, in the Spanish project, while no volunteers are yet involved,
23 there has been an increase of public awareness via using the European mink as native flagship
24 species. However, as its nativeness reaming unconfirmed I suggest there is a high risk of
25 potential miss-communication with the public that can negatively impact on their perception.

26 **Introduction**

27 Public awareness and participation in management projects aiming to safeguard biodiversity
28 have become key to bring support, funds and success. The reason behind people awareness or
29 involvement in conservation projects is a complex compound of personal, social and
30 environmental factors (Smith and Sutton 2008; Beirne and Lambin 2013); among which
31 empathy, self and community benefit, and sense of responsibility about biodiversity loss
32 have been reported as key motivational drivers (Hart & Larson 2014; Verissimo et al. 2011).
33 To promote public awareness and participation, scientists and managers need to connect these
34 motivational drivers with the objective behind management. Confronted with the difficulty of
35 dealing with numerous personalized interactions between them and the network of citizens,
36 generalized motivational arguments such as the protection of flagship species are of common
37 use (Caro 2010).

38

39 The idea behind the use of flagship species is that management focused on one or a few
40 species will benefit an entire ecosystem. Thus, frequently the selection of these species is
41 based on ecological factors including (but not exclusively) their role in the ecosystem or on
42 their vulnerable status (Simberloff 1998; Kalinkat et al. 2016). Besides, among the potential
43 set of species those most charismatic and appealing to the target audience are frequently
44 selected (Verissimo et al. 2011; Veríssimo et al. 2014) because they better enhance public
45 awareness and participation (Smith and Sutton 2008). Yet, the effectiveness at driving people
46 motivation highly depends on properly communicating the reasons behind this selection. To
47 make projects and the ecological concepts accessible to a wide audience of citizens,
48 communication is sometimes simplified. However, citizen knowledge is an important
49 component of their involvement and resilience (Hou 2016), and therefore transmitting proper
50 information can be crucial for the long term viability of the project. Where scientist and
51 managers fail at proper communicating with citizens the latest may lose awareness, and if
52 involved in participation, their motivation and commitment, potentially dropping out from the
53 project.

54
55 The appropriate selection of flagship species and the communication strategy is especially
56 important in projects aiming to reduce or eradicate invasive animal species via removal since
57 this type of project is generally less attractive by the general public than those dealing directly
58 with species protection; yet, the support and, frequently, involvement via volunteer
59 participation in projects managing invasive species is essential for assuring success at a
60 significant spatial scale, especially when dealing with highly dispersive species (e.g., Delaney
61 et al. 2008; Oliver et al. 2016).

62
63 Here I illustrate the importance of the selection of the flagship species and of the proper
64 communication of the reasons behind their selection for the management of invasive species.
65 To do so I use the successful example of a management project aiming to control the invasive
66 American mink (*Neovison vison*) in Scotland based on volunteer involvement. Then, I use the
67 example of the Spanish management project, which recently started to work on public
68 awareness via the use of (unconfirmed native) flagships species and the potential future
69 caveats this could face. I've been actively involved as project scientist in both and, in the first
70 case, also as volunteer. I explain here their respective communication strategies and how they
71 affected or may affect public awareness and participation.

72
73 **The American mink control in Scotland**
74 The American mink control in Scotland, one of the largest mammal control project in Europe,
75 was initiated in 2006 centered on the Cairngorms National Park covering 3,800 km² (CNP
76 57°0'N 3°3'W; NE Scotland) and gradually expanded over time to ca. 20,000 km² in 2012
77 supported by ca. 400 volunteers (Bryce et al. 2011). Starting with 186 volunteers involved
78 during the first years of the project, the number raised to 450 ca. in 2014, mostly composed of
79 local residents, non professional naturalists and wildlife professionals; which have been key
80 in the success of the project (Beirne & Lambin, 2013; Bryce et al. 2011).

81

82 The project started using the water vole (*Arvicola terrestris*) as flagship species to protect
83 native species affected by American mink. Water voles are key stones in the ecosystem
84 functioning but in the UK they suffered near catastrophic declines of over 80% partly
85 attributed the predation to mink predation (Aars et al. 2001). The selection of the water vole
86 as kick start flagship species for the project primary responded to ecological factors given its
87 declining status and its role in ecosystem functioning (Aars et al. 2001; Bryce 2006). Besides,
88 the species has a charismatic value within the general public in the UK, since it has been
89 symbolised for generations of children by the character Ratty (though actually a water vole)
90 in Kenneth Grahame's tale "The Wind in the Willows" (1908); which provides a cultural
91 attachment and familiarity to species, traits positively related to citizens' motivation (Bowen-
92 Jones and Entwistle 2002; Jepson and Barua 2015). When expanding, the project evolved to
93 incorporate other flagship species depending on the public interests in the area. For example,
94 using native birds in the coastal West Scotland and salmonids in the East because their
95 ecological and economical value in nature-based and fishing-based tourism (e.g., Fraser et al.
96 2014).

97

98 Communication about the species and the project itself, has been focused on the ecological,
99 economical and cultural value of the flagship species; recurrently done using different set of
100 media, from one to one interactions with citizens to public talks, newsletters, automated
101 feedback to those citizens being volunteers (e.g., Tintarev et al. 2012) and local and national
102 press and TV news (e.g., <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-19503827>).

103

104 The success of the control project at reducing American mink densities (e.g., Melero et al.,
105 2015; Oliver et al., 2016), the ability to adapt the project to the different public needs and a
106 customised and recurrent communication helped at ensuring the public support ad well as the
107 recruitment and the long term retention of volunteers (Beirne & Lambin 2013; Fraser et al.
108 2014).

109

110 **The American mink control in Spain**

111 Most of the regional and national scale American mink control projects in Spain started in the
112 decade of the 1990s with little success in controlling or reducing the species (e.g., Melero et
113 al. 2010). The wide distribution of the species, with most populations still expanding, and the
114 continuous and drastic reductions in funding have limited the successful control of mink
115 populations. Besides, the public awareness has been for long poor and the participation close
116 to null. (e.g., ca. < 5 volunteers in the population at NE Spain in 2007, > 20000km²; Melero
117 2007).

118

119 Notwithstanding, during the last years project scientist and managers have worked on
120 increasing public awareness. In NW Spain, awareness is raised towards the impacted breeding
121 birds of special conservational and touristic interest (Velando & Munilla, 2008; Barros et al.
122 2016). In central and NE Spain, the American mink poses a threat to the endangered
123 Pyrenean desman (*Galemys pirenaicus*) but it is rarely used as flagship species because it is
124 yet a poorly known species between the general public despite the scientific recognition of its
125 high value for biodiversity and evolution due to its relic and narrow endemic character
126 (Nowak 1999). The biggest part of the communication strategy, both regional (North Spain)
127 and national, relies on the effect of the American mink on its counterpart the European mink
128 (*Mustela lutreola*).

129

130 As in the case of the Scottish project, communication is done using different media from
131 public talks (e.g. in civic centers and schools) to dissemination of media videos in the social
132 media (see e.g. <https://youtu.be/lkPXLmDSBHs>) and local or national news. There are not
133 recurrent newsletters but there is an active involvement with the local communities via public
134 activities (see eg. <http://lifelutreolaspain.com/en/education-awareness>). The main message of
135 this communication is the need to conserve the native European mink from the introduced
136 American mink. Overall, it seems communication is effectively increasing public awareness
137 on the presence and risks of the American mink related to the conservational status of the

138 European mink. However, this message confronts with the current ongoing debate on the
139 nativeness of the European mink population in the area among scientist (Clavero, 2015;
140 Clavero, 2014; Zuberogoitia et al. 2016). Defenders of the species' nativeness claim that the
141 populations in the is the result of constrictions of its native distribution who left the
142 population on the western France and northern Spain isolated (e.g. Zuberogoitia et al. 2016);
143 but the late detection of the species (1831 and 1955 for France and Spain; Saint-Girons 1994)
144 and its low genetic variability compared to the populations in Russia and the Danube points to
145 human mediated introductions (Michaux et al. 2005). Without entering in this debate but
146 aware of its existence, a logical concern follows in relation to the communication strategy:
147 What would happen if the human mediated introduction hypothesis was eventually
148 confirmed?

149
150 At least two processes will be directly impacted, the motivational reason for its conservation
151 and the public perception. In the first case, scientist, managers and conservationists would
152 need to decide whether continuing working towards the conservation of the population or
153 shift towards its control based on its introduced non native status. This last, in my opinion, is
154 unlikely to occur since the critically endangered situation of the species and its endemic
155 character in Europe (Maran et al. 2016) makes any remaining population worth to conserve
156 for the global benefit of the species and biodiversity. Therefore, the motivational argument
157 for the conservation of the species in Spain (and France) would need to change towards
158 safeguarding an endangered species rather than because its nativeness. However, the impact
159 on the public perception might be harder to shift after public awareness linked to the
160 conservation importance of the species as a native facing the invasion of the introduced
161 American.

162
163 Under the face of this possibility one may wonder why communication on the European mink
164 as a flagship species is not generally focus on its overall importance as endangered endemic
165 species in Europe, instead of its unconfirmed nativeness; and why communication is based on

166 this species only rather than expanding it to other species of confirmed nativeness and interest
167 such as the Pyrenean desman. Even supporters of its nativeness could consider to follow this
168 “conservative approach” when communicating given the impact on public perception that
169 could occur if the introduction is confirmed.

170

171 **Conclusions**

172 The two projects presented here illustrated how similar strategies on communicating the
173 selection of flagship species may have different impact on people’s perception and interest on
174 management initiatives. Beyond potential cultural differences, the success of volunteers’
175 involvement in the Scottish project is linked to the success of its strategy to appeal to the
176 public interest by adaptive the selection and communication of flagships species to their
177 background. Meanwhile, the Spanish project is mostly focused on the importance of the
178 nativeness of a single species, rather than using a wider range of available species of interest
179 or fully explaining the controversy behind this selection. As such, while public awareness is
180 increasing, there is a high risk of people’s rejection if the main message (the species
181 nativeness) is confirmed to be wrong.

182

183 **References**

184 Aars J, Lambin X, Denny R, Griffin AC (2001) Water vole in the Scottish uplands:
185 distribution patterns of disturbed and pristine populations ahead and behind the
186 American mink invasion front. *Anim Conserv* 4:187–194. doi:
187 doi:10.1017/S1367943001001226

188 Beirne C, Lambin X (2013) Understanding the Determinants of Volunteer Retention Through
189 Capture-Recapture Analysis: Answering Social Science Questions Using a Wildlife
190 Ecology Toolkit. *Conserv Lett* 6:391–401. doi: 10.1111/conl.12023

191 Bowen-Jones E, Entwistle A (2002) Identifying appropriate flagship species: the importance
192 of culture and local contexts. *Oryx* 36:189–195. doi: 10.1017/S0030605302000261

193 Bryce R, Oliver MK, Davies L, et al (2011) Turning back the tide of American mink invasion

194 at an unprecedented scale through community participation and adaptive management.

195 Biol Conserv 144:575–583. doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.10.013

196 Bryce RL (2006) The ecosystem engineering and trophic effects of the water vole : species

197 loss and ecosystem processes. University of Aberdeen

198 Caro T (2010) Conservation by proxy: indicator, umbrella, keystone, flagship, and other

199 surrogate species. Island Press, Washington, D.C.

200 Clavero M (2015) Non-Native species as conservation priorities: response to Díez-León et al.

201 Conserv Biol. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12524

202 Clavero M (2014) Shifting Baselines and the Conservation of Non-Native Species. Conserv

203 Biol n/a-n/a. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12266

204 Delaney DG, Sperling CD, Adams CS, Leung B (2008) Marine invasive species: validation of

205 citizen science and implications for national monitoring networks. Biol Invasions

206 10:117–128. doi: 10.1007/s10530-007-9114-0

207 Fraser EJ, Macdonald DW, Bryce R, Lambin X (2014) Controlling invasive species by

208 empowering environmental stakeholders: ecotourism boat operators as potential

209 guardians of wildlife against the invasive American mink. Oryx 48:605–612. doi:

210 10.1017/S003060531300046X

211 Garcia P (2012) Situación actual del desmán ibérico, *Galemys pyrenaicus* (E. Geoffroy Saint

212 Hilaire, 1811), en la provincia de Salamanca. University of Salamanca

213 Grahame K (1908) The Wind in the Willows.

214 Hart PS, Larson BMH (2014) Communicating About Invasive Species: How “Driver” and

215 “Passenger” Models Influence Public Willingness to Take Action. Conserv Lett 7:545–

216 552. doi: 10.1111/conl.12109

217 Hou D (2016) Divergence in stakeholder perception of sustainable remediation. Sustain Sci.

218 doi: 10.1007/s11625-015-0346-0

219 Jepson P, Barua M (2015) A Theory of Flagship Species Action. Conserv Soc 13:95. doi:

220 10.4103/0972-4923.161228

221 Kalinkat G, Cabral JS, Darwall W, et al (2016) Flagship umbrella species needed for the

222 conservation of overlooked aquatic biodiversity. *Conserv Biol.* doi: 10.1111/cobi.12813

223 Manfredo MJ, Teel TL, Dietsch AM (2016) Implications of human value shift and persistence

224 for biodiversity conservation. *Conserv Biol* 30:287–296. doi: 10.1111/cobi.12619

225 Maran T, Skumatov D, Gomez A, et al (2016) *Mustela lutreola*. The IUCN Red List of

226 Threatened Species 2016.

227 Melero Y, Palazón S, Bonesi L, Gosálbez J (2010) Relative abundance of culled and not

228 culled American mink populations in northeast Spain and their potential distribution: are

229 culling campaigns effective? *Biol Invasions* 12:3877–3885. doi: 10.1007/s10530-010-

230 9778-8

231 Melero Y, Robinson E, Lambin X (2015) Density- and age-dependent reproduction partially

232 compensates culling efforts of invasive non-native American mink. *Biol Invasions*

233 17:2645–2657. doi: 10.1007/s10530-015-0902-7

234 Michaux JR, Hardy OJ, Justy F, et al (2005) Conservation genetics and population history of

235 the threatened European mink *Mustela lutreola*, with an emphasis on the west European

236 population. *Mol Ecol* 14:2373–2388. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02597.x

237 Nowak RM (1999) *Walker's mammals of the world*. The Johns Hopkins University Press,

238 Baltimore

239 Oliver M, Luque-Larena JJ, Lambin X (2009) Do rabbits eat voles? Apparent competition,

240 habitat heterogeneity and large-scale coexistence under mink predation. *Ecol Lett*

241 12:1201–1209. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01375.x

242 Oliver MK, Piertney SB, Zalewski A, et al (2016) The compensatory potential of increased

243 immigration following intensive American mink population control is diluted by male-

244 biased dispersal. *Biol Invasions*. doi: 10.1007/s10530-016-1199-x

245 Saint-Girons MC (1994) Wild mink (*Mustela lutreola*) in Europe. *Nature and environment* 54.

246 Strasbourg

247 Simberloff D (1998) Flagships, umbrellas, and keystones: Is single-species management

248 passé in the landscape era? *Biol Conserv* 83:247–257. doi: 10.1016/S0006-

249 3207(97)00081-5

250 Smith AM, Sutton SG (2008) The Role of a Flagship Species in the Formation of
251 Conservation Intentions. *Hum Dimens Wildl* 13:127–140. doi:
252 10.1080/10871200701883408

253 Tintarev N, Melero Y, Sripada S, et al (2012) MinkApp: Generating Spatio-temporal
254 Summaries for Nature Conservation Volunteers. In: *Proceedings of the International*
255 *Conference of Natural Language generation*. Association for Computational Linguistics,
256 Utica, Illinois, pp 17–21

257 Velando A, Munilla I (2008) Plan de Conservación del Cormorán moñudo en el Parque
258 Nacional de las Islas Atlánticas. Vigo

259 Veríssimo D, Fraser I, Girão W, et al (2014) Evaluating Conservation Flagships and Flagship
260 Fleets. *Conserv Lett* 7:263–270. doi: 10.1111/conl.12070

261 Verissimo D, MacMillan DC, Smith RJ (2011) Toward a systematic approach for identifying
262 conservation flagships. *Conserv Lett* 4:1–8. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-263X.2010.00151.x

263 Zuberogoitia I, Pôdra M, Palazón S, et al (2016) Misleading interpretation of shifting baseline
264 syndrome in the conservation of European mink. *Biodivers Conserv* 25:1795–1800. doi:
265 10.1007/s10531-016-1156-0

266