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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
Social Values

• Social values are key – cognitive foundation
• Fundamental, stable human goal structures
  • Shape how people orient to the world
• Research has identified wildlife values as a construct
  • Reliably measured
• Wildlife values shown to effectively predict a person’s position across issues
• Value differences among people are the foundation for conflict over issues in fish and wildlife management
Wildlife Value Orientations are...

Enduring beliefs regarding wildlife

Wildlife Value Orientations

Traditionalist

World View “Ideal World”

Mutualist

Principles for Wildlife Treatment
Value Dimensions

TRADITIONALISTS / Utilitarian (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
Value Dimensions

**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
Outline

• Provide highlights of National Public Survey study results
  • Comparing National to WA State results
  • WDFW specific questions

• Overview of Agency Culture Results

• Won’t be able to cover all the data today
• National and WA Survey Reports are available and laid out with descriptives, graphs, and geographic distribution of results by County
State Fish and Wildlife Agency Participation

Public Survey

Agency Culture Survey
Summary of Study Methods

Data

- 2004 *Wildlife Values in the West* (19 states, n > 12,000)
- 2009 *People and Places* (4 states)
- 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 Culture Survey – e-mail administered to agency employees (n = 10,669)
NATIONAL PUBLIC SURVEY AND WA RESULTS
WA residents – Fall 2017/Spring 2018
18 years of age or older
Sampling unit: County
n = 18,492; response rate = 15.4% (2,755)
90% CI ± 9-11% error for each county*
Data weighted by race, gender, age, F&W recreation
DISTRIBUTION OF WILDLIFE VALUE TYPES IN THE U.S.
America's Wildlife Values - Pluralists (%)
America's Wildlife Values - Distanced (%)
MODERNIZATION AND SHIFTING WILDLIFE VALUES
Rate of Change in Traditionalists in the West, 2004-2018
Rate of Change in Mutualists in the West, 2004-2018
Wildlife Value Types in Washington: 2004 to 2018

- Traditionalist
- Mutualist
- Pluralist
- Distanced
WILDLIFE VALUES RELATE TO AND AFFECT ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who agree that wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed

Percent Who Agree that Wolves that Kill Livestock should be Lethally Removed

Percent Mutualists in State

r = -0.888
Percent who agree that wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed
Support for lethal removal of wolves that prey on livestock in Washington in 2009

Question on Survey:

“Is it unacceptable or acceptable for WDFW to capture and lethally remove a wolf if it is known to have caused loss of livestock.”
Support for lethal removal of wolves that prey on livestock in Washington in 2018

Question on Survey:

“Wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed”
Trust in different levels of government across the U.S. by wildlife value orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Traditionalists</th>
<th>Mutualists</th>
<th>Pluralists</th>
<th>Distanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fish &amp; Wildlife Agency</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust in different levels of government (WA)

- Federal Government: 20%
- State Government: 43%
- Fish & Wildlife Agency: 61%
Public trust in State Fish & Wildlife Agency
Trust in different levels of government by wildlife value orientation (WA)

- **Federal Government**
  - Traditionalist: 26%
  - Mutualist: 15%
  - Pluralist: 24%
  - Distanced: 19%

- **State Government**
  - Traditionalist: 30%
  - Mutualist: 49%
  - Pluralist: 49%
  - Distanced: 49%

- **Fish & Wildlife Agency**
  - Traditionalist: 58%
  - Mutualist: 58%
  - Pluralist: 56%
  - Distanced: 75%
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who trust their state fish and wildlife agency

$r = -0.448$
National preferences for state fish and wildlife agency funding

- Entirely by Hunting & Fishing License Fees: 14%
- Equally by Hunting & Fishing License Fees & Public Tax Funds: 54%
- Entirely by Public Tax Funds: 4%
Percent Mutualists in state by percent who prefer a funding model that prioritizes public taxes
Current & future funding for F&W management (WA)

Perceptions of Current Funding (a)
- Mostly License Fees: 83%
- License Fees & Public Taxes: 9%

Preference for Future Funding (b)
- Mostly License Fees: 74%
- Mostly Public Taxes: 15%
- License Fees & Public Taxes: 10%
WASHINGTON STATE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS
Summary of WA Item Development

• One page for WDFW specific items

• Identified 6 management issues and selected:
  • How different types of habitat protection support fish and wildlife and quality of life
  • Non-consumptive/non-game funding opportunities
Q9. Your state fish and wildlife agency, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), has a variety of responsibilities when it comes to conserving the state’s fish and wildlife resources and providing residents with fish and wildlife-related recreation opportunities. Below are examples of actions that WDFW may take for these purposes. Given limited funds, we’re interested in your opinions about the importance of these actions. Please select one answer for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Incentives to private landowners who restore fish and wildlife habitat (example: tax breaks, reimbursement for expenses)</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Quite Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Programs that help local governments plan for protection of open space and fish and wildlife populations in urban areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Acquiring new land areas to protect fish and wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Acquiring new land areas for outdoor recreation opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Restoring or enhancing existing land areas for fish and wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Limiting public access to certain land areas to protect fish and wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Limiting the types of outdoor recreation on certain land areas that may negatively impact fish and wildlife habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16. What do you consider to be the most important actions identified above? Write one letter, A – G, for each:

1st most important
2nd most important
3rd most important
Q11. In Washington, there are insufficient funds to pay for conservation of fish and wildlife that are not hunted or fished (non-game). Below are several possible sources for additional funding that have been suggested. We’re interested in how you feel about these sources of funding for non-game. Please select one answer for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Highly Unacceptable</th>
<th>Moderately Unacceptable</th>
<th>Slightly Unacceptable</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Acceptable</th>
<th>Moderately Acceptable</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use a portion of the state revenue presently being collected from taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriated by the state legislature?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the state sales tax?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase federal taxes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a separate state lottery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside a portion of sales tax on outdoor equipment (e.g., hiking boots,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tents, binoculars, etc.)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a real estate transfer tax (percentage of each real estate transaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goes into a fund)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a surcharge to tourist visitation in Washington (e.g., car rental or hotel/RV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park stay)?</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of WDFW Priorities

Incentives to private landowners for habitat restoration

Programs that help local governments plan for urban open space

Acquiring new land for habitat protection

Acquiring new land for outdoor recreation

Restoring existing fish and wildlife habitat

Limiting public access to certain land areas for protection

Limiting types of outdoor recreation on certain land areas

[Bar chart showing percentages for each priority with circled percentages for: Acquiring new land for outdoor recreation (28% quite, 17% extremely), Restoring existing fish and wildlife habitat (35% quite, 38% extremely), Limiting types of outdoor recreation on certain land areas (30% quite, 30% extremely).]
Restoring existing lands for fish and wildlife habitat
Acquiring new lands for outdoor recreation
Ranking WDFW management priorities as one of the top three most important.

- Incentives to private landowners for habitat restoration: 42%
- Programs that help local governments plan for urban open areas: 45%
- Acquiring new land for habitat protection: 44%
- Acquiring new land for outdoor recreation: 65%
- Restoring existing fish and wildlife habitat: 19%
- Limiting public access to certain land areas for protection: 36%
- Limiting types of outdoor recreation on certain land areas: 43%
# Acceptability of Potential Future Funding Sources for Non-Game

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use portion of current state revenue from taxes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase federal taxes</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the state sales tax</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a separate state lottery</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set aside portion of sales tax on outdoor equipment</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a real estate transfer tax</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a surcharge to tourist visitation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Set aside portion of sales tax on outdoor equipment
Create a separate lottery
ADDITIONAL ITEMS OF INTEREST
WA
Percent of individuals by group who believed they shared values with agency (WA)

- **All Respondents**: 60%
- **Wildlife Value Orientation Type**:
  - Traditionalist: 56%
  - Mutualist: 57%
  - Pluralist: 74%
  - Distanced: 59%
- **Non-Hunter/Angler**:
  - Hunter/Angler: 59%
  - All Respondents: 66%
Percent of individuals who believed they shared values with agency
Participation and interest in wildlife-related recreation (WA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Past Participation</th>
<th>Current Participation</th>
<th>Future Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Viewing</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage values represent the percentage of respondents interested in the respective activities.
Participation and interest in wildlife-related recreation by value orientation (WA)

**Fishing**
- Fish Ever:
  - Traditionalist: 82%
  - Mutualist: 62%
  - Pluralist: 48%
- Fish Currently:
  - Traditionalist: 25%
  - Mutualist: 9%
  - Pluralist: 6%
- Fish Interest:
  - Traditionalist: 73%
  - Mutualist: 51%
  - Pluralist: 54%

**Hunting**
- Hunt Ever:
  - Pluralist: 32%
  - Distanced: 10%
- Hunt Currently:
  - Pluralist: 7%
  - Distanced: 1%
- Hunt Interest:
  - Pluralist: 43%
  - Distanced: 15%
Fish and Wildlife Management Issues (WA)

- Protection/Growth (a): 68%
- Property/Wildlife (b): 21%
- Local Control (c): 51%
- Climate Change (d): 68%
- Wolves Lethal (e): 29%
- Bears Lethal (f): 32%
- Coyotes Lethal (g): 38%
Fish and Wildlife Management Issues (WA)

- Protection/Growth (a): 46% Traditionalist, 69% Mutualist, 61% Pluralist, 7% Distanced
- Property/Wildlife (b): 37% Traditionalist, 28% Mutualist, 17% Pluralist, 7% Distanced
- Local Control (c): 63% Traditionalist, 42% Mutualist, 30% Pluralist, 7% Distanced
- Climate Change (d): 40% Traditionalist, 73% Mutualist, 70% Pluralist, 7% Distanced
Private property rights are more important than protecting declining or endangered species.
Local communities should have more control over the management of fish and wildlife.
Fish and Wildlife Management Issues (WA)

Lethal Removal of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Event</th>
<th>Traditionalist</th>
<th>Mutualist</th>
<th>Pluralist</th>
<th>Distanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolves that kill livestock (e)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears that attack humans (f)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyotes that kill pets (g)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent who exhibit tendencies of anthropomorphizing wildlife by state
Summary from National Survey……..

• Results illustrate the challenges managers will face amid a shift in values

• However, given WA slower rate of change in VOs, it might be easier to keep pace and adapt to change
  • E.g., Increased pluralists

• Importance of Agency priorities
  • Restoring fish and wildlife habitat, funding sources
Summary from National Survey……..

- Important information to consider in future decision-making and implementation of management actions by WDFW

- Knowing geographic distribution and VO allows targeted marketing/messaging and/or action

- Results can be used to inform legislators and the legislative process

- Agency Culture Survey…….
AGENCY CULTURE SURVEY
Summary of Study Methods

Data

- 2004 *Wildlife Values in the West* (19 states, n > 12,000)
- 2009 *People and Places* (4 states)
- 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 Culture Survey – e-mail administered to agency employees (n = 10,669)
State Fish and Wildlife Agency Participation

Public Survey

Agency Culture Survey

Map showing state participation levels.
F&W Culture Survey for WDFW

- Survey looked at:
  - Characteristics of WDFW
  - Management priorities of WDFW
  - Processes for public & stakeholder inclusion in decision-making
  - Employee perspectives on management and culture
  - Wildlife Value Orientations of employees
- Same survey across all participating States
Online survey in July and August of 2018

All permanent full-time WDFW employees were offered the opportunity to participate

In total, **930** usable responses were obtained:
- 59% response rate
AGENCY CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF VALUE SHIFT
Unifying Mission

• Across States, employees of state fish and wildlife agencies share a unified vision of their agency’s mission

• Centers around:
  • protecting natural resources (95%AA; 91%WDFW),
  • serving as management experts (94%AA; 89%WDFW),
  • enforcers of natural resource law (89%AA; 89%WDFW),
  • promoting stewardship (82%AA 72%WDFW), and
  • showing compassion toward wildlife (87%AA; 81%WDFW)
Differences in Fish and Wildlife Governance Style

• Continuum......

• One end, employees view their agency placing priority:
  • Clientele model of management, centering around
    • Attending to stakeholders and providing recreational opportunities

• Other end, employees view their agency placing priority:
  • Expert model of management, centering around
    • Sound science and meeting needs of fish and wildlife
Types of Models of Wildlife Management

Agency places greater priority on:

Expert Model
- Science
- Innovation
- Meeting the Needs of Wildlife Resources
- Protecting Habitat
- Focusing on the Future
- Being Proactive

Clientele Model
- Politics
- Tradition
- Meeting the Needs of the Public
- Providing Recreational Opportunities
- Focusing on the Present
- Being Reactive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Expert Model</th>
<th>Clientele Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Composition

• How value composition may influence perceptions of different approaches to management

• Average mutualism score (1-7) relates to the percent of employees who view agency as prioritizing expert model

• While no agency average was on the positive side of a mutualism score, agencies with higher mutualism scores have more employees viewing their agency as prioritizing an expert model
Mutualist by Expert Model

Percent who View their Agency as Prioritizing an Expert Model of Management

Agency Mean Score on Mutualism

r = 0.459
Adaptability, Accountability, and Public Engagement

- How different management models (Expert v. Clientele) affect employee perceptions of an agency’s:
  - adaptability,
  - accountability, and
  - engagement with the public
Adaptability, Accountability, and Public Engagement

• Agency with prioritization of expert model
  • Employees are more likely to see their agency as adaptable and accountable

• Agency with prioritization of clientele model
  • Employees see need to increase engagement with public and stakeholders

• Where employees view their agency along this model spectrum,
  • Shapes employee perceptions of the agency as being adaptive in the face of change & accountable and transparent to the public
Expert Model by Adaptability

$r = 0.665$
Expert Model by Accountability

Percent who View their Agency as Accountable

Percent who View their Agency as Prioritizing an Expert Model of Management

$r = 0.727$
Expert Model by Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making

Percent who Believe that Paying Stakeholders Should be More Involved in Decision-Making

Percent who View their Agency as Prioritizing an Expert Model of Management

\( r = -0.490 \)
Composition of Values in Agency Compared to Public

- Does the value profile of the public affect the character of the agency?
- How the composition of wildlife values in the agency compares with that of the public
- While mutualist views become more prominent among members of the public,
- Agencies still comprised primarily by utilitarian (domination) values
  - 87% either of Traditionalist or Pluralists
Composition of Values in All Agencies Compared to Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalists</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutualists</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distanced</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition of Values in Agency Compared to Public

• As States become more mutualist, the values gap between public and agency widens

• Composition of the agency does not appear to readily reflect the changing values of the public
Mutualists in state by % of agency personnel who agree the views of the public in their state are changing

\[ r = -0.632 \]
Mutualists in state by % of agency personnel who view the agency as prioritizing being proactive over being reactive

\[ r = -0.396 \]
Mutualists in state by % of agency personnel who agree their employment is central to their identity
Mutualists in state by % of agency personnel who agree it is important that they fit in with the culture of their agency

Percent who Agree that it is Important to Them that they Fit in with the Culture of the Agency

Percent Mutualists in State

$r = -0.341$
Exploring Diverse Audiences

• Governance models that are not in concert with contemporary societal needs or address only limited special interests, risk having the wildlife management enterprise lose relevance to society (Organ et al. 2012)

• Good wildlife governance models will seek and incorporate multiple and diverse perspectives (Decker et al. 2016)
Exploring Diverse Audiences

• While diversity continues to grow across U.S.,

• Wildlife profession continues to be dominated by white (91%AA; 84%WDFW) males (72%AA; 65%WDFW)

• Key to engaging more diverse audiences begins with understanding and honoring diverse ideals of human-wildlife relationships (Peterson & Nelson 2017)

• Compare the wildlife values and wildlife-related recreation behaviors of minority and non-minority groups
Comparing wildlife values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Traditionalists</th>
<th>Mutualists</th>
<th>Pluralists</th>
<th>Distanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing race/ethnicity by agencies and the public

- White: 90.8% (Agency), 60.5% (Public)
- Black/African American: 0.7% (Agency), 12.2% (Public)
- Hispanic/Latino: 2.5% (Agency), 17.8% (Public)
- Asian: 0.5% (Agency), 6.3% (Public)
- American Indian/Alaska Native: 0.8% (Agency), 0.8% (Public)
Conclusions

Insight into perception of WDFW governance model

- Understand values of WDFW and values of the public
  - Difference in values between WDFW and public

- Opportunity to use this information
  - Where on the model spectrum does WDFW want to be?
  - Use information to address areas of change (e.g., adaptability, accountability, pro-activeness)
  - Recognize culture and character of WDFW (e.g., identity)
  - Organizational values – a strength but also hard to change
Next Steps

**Actions:**

- Use data from AWV to inform strategic planning, management, outreach and education, and awareness of agency culture
- Outreach of AWV information to WDFW staff for use
  - Develop an action plan on how to use this information
    - Example: To explore opportunities to maximize hunting and fishing participation, Pluralist rich areas are focus areas for Marketing outreach
- Key messages for external audience and use of study information outside the agency
- Opportunity for longitudinal look at results from 2004 – 2009 – 2018 study results ~ working with CSU on additional analyses
THE OTHER COAST

LOOK, A DEER IN THE WOODS!

SHE'S BEAUTIFUL. LET'S BUILD A HOUSE HERE!

LOOK, A DEER IN YOUR FLOWER GARDEN.

SHOOT IT.