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The many challenges of wildlife management in a changing society...
ISSUES ROOTED IN CULTURAL SHIFT

Reflected in *Social Values*

Values Are Motivational Goals That Direct Behavior
Values Are Formed Early in Life and Do Not Change in an Individual
Values Are Embedded in Everything Around Us
Values Adapt Us to Our Social and Environmental World
UNDERLYING QUESTIONS

• How do agencies adapt and remain relevant, in the face of societal change, to an increasingly diverse constituency?

• What are ways for them to more effectively engage new audiences while still being responsive to the needs of traditional stakeholders?

• How can they garner broad-based support to ensure sustainable funding exists in the future?
Conditions of Modernization ➔ Changing Social Life ➔ Changing Values & Behavior
VALUE DIMENSIONS

DOMINATION

- Wildlife are subordinate
- Wildlife should be used in ways that benefit humans
- Using animals in research and hunting are two ways these benefits accrue
- Wildlife should be killed if they threaten safety or to protect property
- Vision where there are abundant populations of fish and wildlife for hunting and fishing
MUTUALISM - Wildlife are seen as part of an extended social network of life
- Wildlife are viewed as family or companions
- Care for wildlife as they might for humans
- Wildlife are deserving of rights like humans
- Vision of humans and wildlife living side by side without fear
WILDLIFE VALUE “TYPES”

- **Traditionalist** – Score High on Domination, Low on Mutualism
- **Mutualist** – Score High on Mutualism, Low on Domination
- **Pluralist** – Score High on both Domination and Mutualism
- **Distanced** – Score Low on both Domination and Mutualism
Figure 1. Cross-Level Model of The Effect of Social Change on Wildlife Management

Post WWII

- Modernization: Increased Wealth, Urbanization, Education
- Migration
- Emergent Effects: Attitudes Shift & Increased Conflict, Advocacy Group Formation, Pressure on Governance Institutions
- Intergenerational Replacement
- Shift in Social-Ecological Context
- Shift Toward Mutualist Wildlife Values
- Affected Cognitive Processes: Wildlife removed from daily life, Unblocked Anthropomorphic Thinking, Increased Need for Self-Expression and Affiliation
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Group and Institutional Level
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SUMMARY OF STUDY METHODS

Data
- 2004 Wildlife Values in the West (19 states, n > 12,000)
- 2018 America’s Wildlife Values (50 states)
- 2018 Agency Culture Survey (30 States)

2018 Survey Methods
- Two extensive pilot tests to compare and test phone, mail, and e-mail
- Public – combined mail & e-mail panel (2 waves, one for boosting numbers overall, one targeting diverse populations; total n = 43,949)
- Agency – e-mail administered to agency employees (n = 10,669)
State Fish and Wildlife Agency Participation

Public Survey

Agency Survey
DISTRIBUTION OF WILDLIFE VALUE TYPES IN THE U.S.
America's Wildlife Values - Pluralists (%)
Percent Mutualists in state by percent with income above the national mode

National mode = $50,000 to less than $100,000

Percent Mutualists in State

\[ r = 0.599 \]
Percent Mutualists in state by percent residing in a mid to large-sized city

Mid to large-sized city = city with 50,000 or more inhabitants
Rate of Change in Traditionalists in the West, 2004-2018
Rate of Change in Mutualists in the West, 2004-2018
Rate of Change in Distanced in the West, 2004-2018
WILDLIFE VALUES RELATE TO AND AFFECT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who agree that we should strive for a society that emphasizes environmental protection over economic growth

\[ r = 0.762 \]
Percent Traditionalists in state by percent who agree that private property rights are more important than protecting declining or endangered fish and wildlife.
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who agree that coyotes that kill pets in residential areas should be lethally removed

Correlation coefficient: $r = -0.891$
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who agree that wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed
Carnivore Management: Wolves in California

Percent Traditionalists by Region

Legend
- Traditionalists
  - 12.2% - 15.9%
  - 24.7% - 28.5%
  - 32.4%
  - 34.7% - 35.7%

Percent Support for Wolf Recolonization

Legend
- % Accepting
  - 61.8%
  - 64.5% - 66.2%
  - 69.5%
  - 74.2%
Trust in different levels of government by wildlife value type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Government</th>
<th>State Government</th>
<th>State Fish &amp; Wildlife Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of People Who Express Trust in...</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutualists</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who trust their state fish and wildlife agency

$r = -0.448$
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who prefer a funding model that prioritizes public taxes

$r = 0.614$
Percent Mutualists in state by percent of *active* hunters (those who had hunted in the past and in the last 12 months)

\[
r = -0.801
\]
ARE AGENCIES AND THE PUBLIC CO-EVOLVING?
Comparison of wildlife values in agencies and the public for 30 U.S. States
Towards Value Pluralism in Agencies?

Percent of the Public Classified as Mutualist

Percent of the Agency who Hold Mutualism Values (Mutualist & Pluralist)

$r = .407$
A Strong Unifying Mission and Commitment

Uphold Values of the Agency

- Advocates
- Expert Scientists
- Enforcers of Law
- Model Employee

Wildlife Protectors

Compassionate
UNDERSTANDING DIVERSE AUDIENCES
Percent Traditionalist By Race/Ethnic Category

- White: 33.3%
- Hispanic/Latino: 15.5%
- Asian: 17.1%
- Black: 25.8%
- Native American: 23%
Percent Mutualist By Race/Ethnic Category

White: 31.6  
Hispanic/Latino: 49.9  
Asian: 42.5  
Black: 27.8  
Native American: 27.6
State Level Reports

Detailed Findings For All 50 States And Governance/Agency Culture For 30 States Are Available Via The Interactive Map.

Click the state you wish to access reports for.