America's Wildlife Values

Oklahoma State Report

WAFWA
Western Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies

Colorado State University

The Ohio State University

Responsive Management

Acknowledgements

This project was administered by the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) and the Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA). The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) sponsored the project under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 2015 Multistate Conservation Grants Program (Grant number: F15AP00726). Additional funding support was provided by contributions from participating state fish and wildlife agencies. The authors would like to thank the following individuals for their contributions to this effort: Dean Smith, Larry Kruckenberg, Deb VonDeBur, Cathy Campbell, Carolyn Boyd, Andrea Criscione, and Alison Lanier, with a special thanks to Corey Jager of the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation.

We would also like to thank the following individuals who assisted with preparing various materials (e.g., tables, figures) for the many reports generated as part of the overall project: Stacy Armbruster (Colorado State University) and Shelby Carlson (The Ohio State University).

America's Wildlife Values Study Team

Lead Investigators:

Michael Manfredo and Tara Teel, Colorado State University
Alia Dietsch, The Ohio State University

Co-investigators:

Jeremy Bruskotter, The Ohio State University
Mark Duda, Responsive Management: Mail Survey Data Collection
Andrew Don Carlos, Colorado State University: Project Manager for Public Survey
Leeann Sullivan, Colorado State University: Project Manager for Agency Culture Survey

Project Advisers:

David Fulton, U.S. Geological Survey and University of Minnesota
Lou Cornicelli, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Loren Chase, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Suggested Citation

Dietsch, A.M., Bright, A. D., Don Carlos, A.W., Manfredo, M. J., Teel, T. L., & Sullivan, L. (2018). State report for Oklahoma from the research project entitled "*America's Wildlife Values*." Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources.

Cover photo credit: Jeremy Bruskotter

Executive Summary

The information contained in this summary highlights findings from a survey of residents living in the state of Oklahoma as part of the project entitled "America's Wildlife Values: Understanding Trends in Public Values toward Wildlife as a Key to Meeting Current and Future Wildlife Management Challenges." This multi-state project sought to explore the values, attitudes, and beliefs of residents across the U.S. in relation to fish and wildlife management. Such information can help agency decision-makers to understand more about the public's interest in fish and wildlife-related issues and their perspectives on management of the state's fish and wildlife.

Specific findings from this report include:

- In total, Oklahoma received 546 responses to the survey. Of those responses, 210 were from mail surveys (7% response rate) and 336 were from web-based panels.

- The breakdown of wildlife value orientations in your state is as follows[1].
    - Traditionalist: **36%**
    - Mutualist: **27%**
    - Pluralist: **25%**
    - Distanced: **12%**

- Nearly **59%** of respondents reported feeling that they share many of the same values as your state fish and wildlife agency regarding the management of fish and wildlife.

- Survey respondents held the following beliefs about funding for your state fish and wildlife management agency:
    - **18%** view current funding as primarily coming from hunting and fishing license sales.
        - **27%** of respondents believed this should be the funding model used in the future.
    - **75%** view current funding as coming from a mix of hunting and fishing license sales and public tax dollars.
        - **67%** of respondents believed this should be the funding model used in the future.
    - **7%** view current funding as primarily coming from public tax dollars.
        - **6%** of respondents believe this should be the funding model used in the future.

- A majority of respondents **(65%)** expressed trust in your agency to do what is right for fish and wildlife in the state.

Additional information on each of these findings and more can be found within this report. Detailed frequencies for each survey item by wildlife value orientations and by current participation in hunting and fishing during the 12 months prior to respondents taking the survey are also included in the report. Information about the comparison of your state to other states and information about trends in your state can be found separately in the *Multistate Report on Wildlife Values in America*, to be available October, 2018.

[1] For definitions of these terms, see page 1 of the attached report.

Table of Contents

Wildlife Value Orientations

Wildlife value orientations represent the different overarching themes in a person's patterns of thought about wildlife, and can be used to identify different "types" of people (Bright et al., 2000). Characterizing segments of the public in this manner allows for a better understanding of the diversity of publics that exists as well as anticipation of how different groups of people will respond to proposed management strategies and programs.

These orientation types are calculated based on responses to a variety of survey items that represent four belief dimensions: (1) social affiliation and (2) caring, which form the mutualism orientation, and (3) hunting and (4) use of wildlife, which form the domination orientation. Means for all items within the mutualist and domination orientation are computed and respondents are segmented into one of four value orientation types by comparing their scores on domination and mutualism simultaneously (high scores were defined as ≥ 4.50 whereas low was defined by a score of < 4.50). For more information on the calculation of wildlife value orientations, see Teel & Manfredo (2009).

When applied to people as a classification,

Traditionalists:

- Score high on the domination orientation and low on the mutualism orientation
- Believe wildlife should be used and managed for human benefit

Mutualists:

- Score high on the mutualism orientation and low on the domination orientation
- Believe wildlife are part of our social network and that we should live in harmony

Pluralists:

- Score high on both the domination and mutualism orientations
- Prioritize these values differently depending on the specific context

Distanced individuals:

- Score low on both the domination and mutualism orientations
- Often believe that wildlife-related issues are less salient to them

Below is a detailed account of wildlife value orientation types in your state using our measurements (available in Appendix B to this report). Throughout this report, responses to additional items such as attitudes, trust, and participation in fish and wildlife-related recreation will be explored by your state's current wildlife value orientation types to give you a feel for how these value types differ in their views on fish and wildlife management.[2]

[2] We also measured respondents' views on three additional scales: 1) social values including whether they hold materialist (i.e., financial security) or post-material (i.e. social affiliation) values; 2) the extent to which they anthropomorphized animals (i.e., attributed human traits to animals); and 3) the degree to which they perceived other people in their state as ascribing to a strict set of social norms (i.e., respect of socially agreed-upon practices). These data will be explored across states in relation to wildlife value orientations in our Multistate Report.

Figure 1: Wildlife value orientations in your state



Figure 2: Percent of each wildlife value orientation type who are current hunters/anglers



Figure 3: Wildlife value orientations by gender



Figure 4: Wildlife value orientations by age groups



Figure 5: Wildlife value orientations by income groups



Figure 6: Wildlife value orientations by education



Figure 7: Percent of individuals by group who believed they shared values with agency



Fish and Wildlife-Related Recreation

Having up-to-date information about fish and wildlife-related recreation is vitally important for fish and wildlife management professionals to understand the interests of the public in their states. On this survey, we asked residents from your state to indicate whether they had ever participated in hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing and if they had participated in these same activities during the past year. Additionally, we asked residents if they had any interest in participating in these activities in the future. Responses to these questions are provided below.

Figure 8: Participation and interest in fish and wildlife-related recreation



Figure 9: Fishing participation and future interest by wildlife value orientation



Figure 10: Hunting participation and future interest by wildlife value orientation



Figure 11: Wildlife viewing participation and future interest by wildlife value orientation



Recruitment and Reactivation

Many state fish and wildlife agencies are interested in recruiting more people to participate in fish and wildlife-related recreation, and reactivating those who are not current participants but have participated in such activities in the past. Below is the percent of respondents from these two categories who have expressed interest in future participation in fish and wildlife-related recreation.

Fishing

66% of respondents are interested in **fishing** in the future. Of those,

- **38%** actively participate in fishing.
- **49%** have fished but not in the past year.
- **13%** have never fished before.

Hunting

36% of respondents are interested in **hunting** in the future. Of those,

- **22%** actively participate in hunting.
- **37%** have hunted but not in the past year.
- **40%** have never hunted before.

Wildlife Viewing:

77% of respondents are interested in **wildlife viewing** in the future. Of those,

- **26%** actively participate in wildlife viewing.
- **29%** have participated in wildlife viewing but not in the past year.
- **44%** have never participated in wildlife viewing before.

Issue-Specific Attitudes

Respondents' attitudes towards different fish and wildlife management issues were also measured in this survey. For each statement, respondents were asked to rate their agreement from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Below are charts indicating agreement with each of these statements by wildlife value orientation type and current hunting/fishing participation. Detailed frequencies for this data can be found at the end of this report.

Figure 12: Agreement with statements about fish and wildlife management



Statement Texts:

a. Protection/growth: We should strive for a society that emphasizes environmental protection over economic growth.
b. Property/wildlife: Private property rights are more important than protecting declining or endangered fish and wildlife.
c. Local control: Local communities should have more control over the management of fish and wildlife.
d. Climate change: The earth is getting warmer mostly because of human activity such as burning fossil fuels.
e. Wolves Lethal: Wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed.
f. Bears Lethal: If a black bear attacks a person, that bear should be lethally removed regardless of the circumstances.
g. Coyotes Lethal: Coyotes that kill pets in residential areas should be lethally removed.

Figure 13: Agreement with statements about fish and wildlife management by wildlife value orientation



Figure 14: Agreement with statements about management by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 15: Agreement with statements about lethal removal by wildlife value orientation



Figure 16: Agreement with statements about lethal removal by current hunting/fishing participation



Funding for Fish and Wildlife Management

Respondents also provided their views on how fish and wildlife management is currently funded, and how management should be funded in the future on a 7-point scale ranging from entirely funded by hunting and fishing license fees (license fees) to equally funded by license fees and public tax funds (public taxes) to entirely funded by public taxes. Here we provide a 3-category reduced summary of how each item was answered by respondents with different wildlife value orientations and by current hunting and angling participation so that "mostly" represents the 2 points on either tail of the 7-point scale, and the midpoint represents the 3 middle response options.

Figure 17: Current and future funding for fish and wildlife management



Figure 18: Funding for fish and wildlife management by wildlife value orientation



Figure 19: Funding for fish and wildlife management by current hunting/fishing participation



Public Trust

Public trust in government is an important indicator for understanding public perceptions. In the United States, trust at all levels of government has been declining since the 1960s, which may be indicative of broad changes in how people view government and governing agencies (Chanley et al., 2000). We asked residents from your state to rate their trust in the federal government to do what is right for your country, state government to do what is right for your state, and state fish and wildlife agency to do what is right for fish and wildlife management in your state on a scale ranging from "almost never" to "almost always." The figures below indicate the percentage of respondents who expressed trust in these governing bodies "most" or "all" of the time.

Figure 20: Trust in federal and state government and state fish and wildlife agency



Figure 21: Trust in government by wildlife value orientation



Figure 22: Trust in government by hunting/fishing participation



Support for Hunting as a Source of Local, Organic Meat

Residents were given the following prompt: "Recently, there has been increased attention to the idea that hunting can provide a good way for people to obtain antibiotic-free, organic meat from a local source. We'd like to know if this idea is at all related to your current views about hunting and participation in the activity." Respondents were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to indicate if this idea was related to their current views about and participation in hunting. Responses to the prompt are presented below for all residents, by wildlife value orientation, and by current hunting/fishing participation.

Figure 23: Support for hunting as a source of local, organic meat



Figure 24: Support for hunting as a source of local, organic meat by wildlife value orientation



Figure 25: Support for hunting as a source of local, organic meat by current hunting/fishing participation



Relative Importance of Water Uses in Oklahoma

There are many competing uses for the water in Oklahoma's rivers and lakes. Respondents in Oklahoma were asked to indicate, on a 5-point scale, how important each of several current uses of water were when making decisions about using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes. The figures below present the extent to which respondents felt each activity was of low importance (not at all or slightly important), moderate importance, or high importance (quite important or extremely important). Each figure provides results for all study respondents from Oklahoma as well as comparisons by current hunting/fishing participation and by wildlife value orientation.

The specific text for the survey statements for the following three graphs were:

A. *Oklahoma's agricultural crops*
B. *Out-of-state agricultural crops*
C. *Barge and boat travel*
D. *Recreational boating and fishing*
E. *Fish populations (for example, bass, sunfish, minnows)*
F. *Aquatic invertebrate populations (for example, mussels, crayfish)*
G. *Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns*
H. *Household water in out-of-state cities and towns*
I. *Oklahoma's industries and factories*
J. *Out-of-state industries and factories*
K. *Generation of electricity*

Figure 26: Importance of uses of water in Oklahoma



Figure 27: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's agricultural crops by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 28: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state agricultural crops by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 29: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for barge and boat travel by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 30: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for recreational boating and fishing by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 31: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for fish populations by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 32: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for aquatic invertebrate populations by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 33: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 34: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in out-of-state cities and towns by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 35: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's industries and factories by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 36: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state industries and factories by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 37: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for generation of electricity by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 38: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's agricultural crops by wildlife value orientation



Figure 39: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state agricultural crops by wildlife value orientation



Figure 40: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for barge and boat travel by wildlife value orientation



Figure 41: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for recreational boating and fishing by wildlife value orientation



Figure 42: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for fish populations by wildlife value orientation



Figure 43: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for aquatic invertebrate populations by wildlife value orientation



Figure 44: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns by wildlife value orientation



Figure 45: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in out-of-state cities and towns by wildlife value orientation



Figure 46: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's industries and factories by wildlife value orientation



Figure 47: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state industries and factories by wildlife value orientation



Figure 48: Importance of using water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for generation of electricity by wildlife value orientation



Respondents were also asked to rank the three most important uses of water in Oklahoma's rivers and lakes, of the 11 presented in this section. Results of this ranking are reported using the Relative Importance statistic, or RI_j statistic (Leuschner, Gregoire, & Buhyoff, 1988). This statistic is appropriate to use when the number of ranks requested, in this case three, is less than the number of items to be ranked, in this case 11. It is more accurate and easily interpretable than mean rank in such a situation. RI_j is interpreted as the percent of all ranking weights assigned to a particular item and allows for comparison of the strength of the rankings across all items. For example, an $RI_j = 20$ for a particular item means that 20% of all weights were assigned to that item, and that the item was ranked twice as high as another item with an $RI_j = 10$. The RI_j statistic for an individual item ranges from 0.0 to 100.0, and the sum of all RI_j statistics across all ranked items equals 100.0. Figures below present findings using this statistic.

Figure 49: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for all respondents



Figure 50: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 51: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Traditionalist and Mutualist



Figure 52: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Pluralist and Distanced



Perceptions of the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation

Respondents indicated their beliefs about several aspects of the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation (ODWC) on a 4-point scale from "never" to "always", with an additional response option of "unsure". The figures below provide results for all study respondents from Oklahoma as well by current participation in hunting/fishing and wildlife value orientation

The specific text for the survey statements for the following three graphs were:

A. *The ODWC manages fish and wildlife in a scientifically sound manner,*
B. *The ODWC provides accurate information on fish and wildlife management issues,*
C. *The ODWC provides adequate opportunities for public participation in fish and wildlife management decisions,*
D. *ODWC personnel provide high-quality service to the public, and*
E. *The ODWC represents my views on how fish and wildlife should be managed in Oklahoma.*

Figure 53: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC does each of several management activities



Figure 54: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC manages fish and wildlife in a scientifically sound manner by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 55: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC provides accurate information on fish and wildlife management issues by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 56: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC provides adequate opportunities for public participation in fish and wildlife management decisions by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 57: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC personnel provide high-quality service to the public by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 58: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC represents my views on how fish and wildlife should be managed in Oklahoma by current hunting/fishing participation



Figure 59: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC manages fish and wildlife in a scientifically sound manner by wildlife value orientation



Figure 60: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC provides accurate information on fish and wildlife management issues by wildlife value orientation



Figure 61: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC provides adequate opportunities for public participation in fish and wildlife management decisions by wildlife value orientation



Figure 62: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC personnel provide high-quality service to the public by wildlife value orientation



Figure 63: Beliefs about the extent to which Oklahoma DWC represents my views on how fish and wildlife should be managed in Oklahoma by wildlife value orientation



Descriptive Tables for Items by Wildlife Value Orientation and Current Hunting/Fishing Participation

The information contained in the following tables below provides a more detailed look at the findings in the figures above. Responses to each item are provided below, and a copy of the survey instrument used to measure each of these items is available in Appendix B.

Table 1: Percent of respondents who believed that they shared similar values to their state fish and wildlife agency

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	5.5%	7.8%	27.6%	33.1%	26.0%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	6.4%	8.4%	33.8%	31.8%	19.6%
Hunters/Anglers	3.3%	6.0%	11.3%	36.4%	43.0%
Traditionalists	4.6%	5.6%	23.4%	37.6%	28.9%
Mutualists	7.4%	14.9%	33.1%	30.4%	14.2%
Pluralists	1.5%	3.7%	14.1%	37.0%	43.7%
Distanced	12.3%	6.2%	55.4%	16.9%	9.2%

Table 2: Percent of respondents who believed that we should strive for a society that emphasizes environmental protection over economic growth

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	5.0%	12.1%	19.6%	30.1%	33.3%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	5.6%	11.4%	18.5%	31.0%	33.5%
Hunters/Anglers	4.0%	13.9%	21.9%	27.8%	32.5%
Traditionalists	6.6%	24.0%	26.5%	25.5%	17.3%
Mutualists	2.0%	3.4%	12.2%	31.1%	51.4%
Pluralists	4.5%	5.2%	14.2%	35.8%	40.3%
Distanced	6.3%	10.9%	26.6%	29.7%	26.6%

Table 3: Percent of respondents who believed that private property rights are more important than protecting declining or endangered fish and wildlife

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	27.2%	27.8%	18.7%	16.5%	9.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	29.9%	26.9%	18.8%	15.0%	9.4%
Hunters/Anglers	19.7%	30.3%	18.4%	20.4%	11.2%
Traditionalists	12.1%	25.1%	21.1%	24.6%	17.1%
Mutualists	50.0%	29.7%	9.5%	8.8%	2.0%
Pluralists	23.0%	28.9%	21.5%	14.8%	11.9%
Distanced	30.3%	28.8%	25.8%	13.6%	1.5%

Table 4: Percent of respondents who believed that local communities should have more control over the management of fish and wildlife

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	6.5%	14.8%	25.3%	36.5%	16.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	6.3%	13.7%	26.9%	36.3%	16.8%
Hunters/Anglers	7.3%	17.9%	21.2%	37.1%	16.6%
Traditionalists	6.5%	15.6%	22.1%	36.2%	19.6%
Mutualists	8.2%	13.6%	29.3%	36.1%	12.9%
Pluralists	4.5%	8.3%	24.2%	39.4%	23.5%
Distanced	6.2%	27.7%	29.2%	33.8%	3.1%

Table 5: Percent of respondents who believed that the earth is getting warmer mostly because of human activity such as burning fossil fuels

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	14.6%	11.2%	18.2%	19.2%	36.7%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	12.4%	10.9%	19.5%	17.0%	40.1%
Hunters/Anglers	19.7%	11.8%	15.1%	25.0%	28.3%
Traditionalists	25.8%	15.2%	22.7%	17.2%	19.2%
Mutualists	4.1%	4.1%	12.2%	24.3%	55.4%
Pluralists	9.6%	15.6%	15.6%	23.7%	35.6%
Distanced	13.8%	6.2%	24.6%	4.6%	50.8%

Table 6: Percent of respondents who feel that wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	22.0%	23.9%	16.2%	21.3%	16.6%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	25.1%	24.8%	16.5%	20.8%	12.9%
Hunters/Anglers	14.1%	21.5%	15.4%	22.8%	26.2%
Traditionalists	9.6%	17.3%	16.8%	25.4%	31.0%
Mutualists	40.9%	28.9%	16.8%	11.4%	2.0%
Pluralists	21.5%	25.2%	11.1%	23.7%	18.5%
Distanced	16.7%	30.3%	24.2%	25.8%	3.0%

Table 7: Percent of respondents who believed that if a black bear attacks a person, that bear should be lethally removed regardless of the circumstances

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	19.3%	27.2%	14.9%	21.5%	17.1%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	21.6%	26.1%	14.2%	21.8%	16.2%
Hunters/Anglers	13.2%	29.8%	16.6%	21.2%	19.2%
Traditionalists	12.1%	24.6%	9.5%	28.1%	25.6%
Mutualists	35.6%	34.2%	12.8%	14.1%	3.4%
Pluralists	14.9%	27.6%	17.2%	17.9%	22.4%
Distanced	13.8%	18.5%	29.2%	26.2%	12.3%

Table 8: Percent of respondents who believed that coyotes that kill pets in residential areas should be lethally removed

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
All Respondents	17.0%	18.7%	11.0%	26.5%	26.9%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	18.6%	18.3%	11.7%	27.0%	24.4%
Hunters/Anglers	13.2%	19.7%	9.2%	25.0%	32.9%
Traditionalists	9.1%	13.6%	7.1%	31.8%	38.4%
Mutualists	31.8%	24.3%	13.5%	19.6%	10.8%
Pluralists	13.4%	22.4%	7.5%	23.9%	32.8%
Distanced	13.6%	13.6%	22.7%	31.8%	18.2%

Table 9: Percent of respondents who believed that current funding for fish and wildlife management is provided entirely by hunting and fishing license fees vs. public tax dollars

	Entirely by hunting & fishing license fees			Both license fees & public taxes			Entirely by public tax funds
All Respondents	13.2%	5.0%	12.6%	53.0%	9.0%	3.7%	3.5%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	11.8%	3.3%	11.8%	56.8%	9.0%	3.1%	4.3%
Hunters/Anglers	17.1%	9.2%	14.5%	43.4%	9.2%	4.6%	2.0%
Traditionalists	14.0%	4.0%	16.5%	50.0%	10.5%	4.0%	1.0%
Mutualists	11.5%	6.1%	13.5%	54.7%	6.8%	4.1%	3.4%
Pluralists	15.3%	5.3%	9.9%	50.4%	7.6%	2.3%	9.2%
Distanced	10.4%	6.0%	4.5%	61.2%	11.9%	4.5%	1.5%

Table 10: Percent of respondents who believed that future funding for fish and wildlife management should be provided entirely by hunting and fishing license fees vs. public tax dollars

	Entirely by hunting & fishing license fees			Both license fees & public taxes			Entirely by public tax funds
All Respondents	19.9%	6.9%	6.8%	53.9%	6.4%	3.0%	3.1%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	20.9%	6.6%	5.9%	54.2%	5.6%	2.8%	4.1%
Hunters/Anglers	17.9%	7.3%	9.3%	53.0%	8.6%	3.3%	0.7%
Traditionalists	20.5%	7.0%	10.0%	53.0%	5.5%	2.0%	2.0%
Mutualists	17.8%	6.2%	2.7%	55.5%	5.5%	5.5%	6.8%
Pluralists	18.7%	7.5%	5.2%	57.5%	9.0%	1.5%	0.7%
Distanced	25.8%	7.6%	7.6%	43.9%	6.1%	4.5%	4.5%

Table 11: Percent of respondents who trust their federal government

	Almost never	Only some of the time	Most of the time	Almost always
All Respondents	20.7%	52.7%	23.8%	2.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	20.9%	52.4%	24.2%	2.5%
Hunters/Anglers	20.5%	53.0%	23.2%	3.3%
Traditionalists	17.7%	55.1%	24.2%	3.0%
Mutualists	28.6%	55.8%	14.3%	1.4%
Pluralists	21.1%	43.6%	32.3%	3.0%
Distanced	10.8%	56.9%	27.7%	4.6%

Table 12: Percent of respondents who trust their state government

	Almost never	Only some of the time	Most of the time	Almost always
All Respondents	28.4%	48.1%	19.7%	3.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	29.8%	47.7%	18.9%	3.6%
Hunters/Anglers	24.5%	49.0%	22.5%	4.0%
Traditionalists	19.6%	52.3%	23.1%	5.0%
Mutualists	46.9%	42.2%	8.2%	2.7%
Pluralists	23.5%	46.2%	28.8%	1.5%
Distanced	23.1%	52.3%	16.9%	7.7%

Table 13: Percent of respondents who trust their state fish and wildlife agency

	Almost never	Only some of the time	Most of the time	Almost always
All Respondents	5.4%	29.8%	50.4%	14.5%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	6.1%	34.6%	49.9%	9.4%
Hunters/Anglers	3.3%	17.2%	51.7%	27.8%
Traditionalists	3.5%	23.7%	54.0%	18.7%
Mutualists	10.1%	42.6%	40.5%	6.8%
Pluralists	3.0%	21.8%	54.1%	21.1%
Distanced	6.2%	33.8%	53.8%	6.2%

Table 14: Percent of respondents who were more supportive of hunting because of game being a source of local, organic meat

	No	Yes
All Respondents	85.6%	14.4%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	86.3%	13.7%
Hunters/Anglers	83.8%	16.2%
Traditionalists	87.8%	12.2%
Mutualists	90.5%	9.5%
Pluralists	74.2%	25.8%
Distanced	90.8%	9.2%

Table 15: Percent of respondents who recently started hunting because of game being a source of local, organic meat

	No	Yes
All Respondents	97.8%	2.2%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	98.7%	1.3%
Hunters/Anglers	95.3%	4.7%
Traditionalists	97.4%	2.6%
Mutualists	100.0%	0.0%
Pluralists	95.4%	4.6%
Distanced	98.5%	1.5%

Table 16: Percent of respondents who do not hunt now but are interested in hunting in the future because of game being a source of local, organic meat

	No	Yes
All Respondents	89.7%	10.3%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	92.1%	7.9%
Hunters/Anglers	83.4%	16.6%
Traditionalists	90.8%	9.2%
Mutualists	93.2%	6.8%
Pluralists	81.4%	18.6%
Distanced	93.8%	6.2%

Table 17: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's agricultural crops

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	0.7%	3.4%	16.4%	42.7%	36.7%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	0.6%	3.7%	18.9%	41.6%	35.2%
Hunters/Anglers	1.0%	2.0%	10.4%	45.8%	40.7%
Traditionalists	1.0%	1.6%	15.3%	40.7%	41.4%
Mutualists	0.0%	4.3%	13.2%	52.7%	29.8%
Pluralists	0.0%	0.7%	18.3%	30.8%	50.2%
Distanced	3.1%	12.3%	23.5%	50.5%	10.6%

Table 18: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state agricultural crops

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	13.0%	25.0%	21.9%	24.1%	16.0%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	11.3%	25.4%	21.4%	26.6%	15.2%
Hunters/Anglers	16.3%	23.9%	23.1%	18.4%	18.4%
Traditionalists	14.4%	26.8%	22.2%	23.6%	13.1%
Mutualists	14.1%	27.3%	20.4%	23.4%	14.8%
Pluralists	11.0%	19.4%	19.7%	26.1%	23.8%
Distanced	10.4%	25.5%	29.0%	23.5%	11.6%

Table 19: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for barge and boat travel

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	11.4%	21.9%	31.3%	22.0%	13.3%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	10.4%	23.8%	33.6%	18.9%	13.2%
Hunters/Anglers	13.6%	17.7%	25.2%	30.6%	12.9%
Traditionalists	10.2%	21.4%	29.6%	24.7%	14.1%
Mutualists	12.4%	28.5%	29.3%	22.1%	7.6%
Pluralists	9.7%	15.7%	29.1%	22.8%	22.6%
Distanced	15.9%	21.1%	46.0%	12.0%	4.9%

Table 20: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for recreational boating and fishing

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	6.1%	21.1%	30.8%	25.1%	16.9%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	7.9%	24.9%	34.7%	19.4%	13.2%
Hunters/Anglers	1.5%	11.8%	19.9%	40.7%	26.1%
Traditionalists	4.4%	17.1%	34.9%	24.6%	19.0%
Mutualists	10.2%	33.4%	28.4%	20.4%	7.6%
Pluralists	3.0%	9.6%	23.2%	32.2%	31.9%
Distanced	8.2%	28.9%	38.9%	22.8%	1.2%

Table 21: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for fish populations

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	1.0%	4.7%	18.3%	36.9%	39.2%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	1.4%	5.2%	21.0%	38.2%	34.1%
Hunters/Anglers	0.0%	3.3%	11.1%	33.3%	52.3%
Traditionalists	1.4%	4.1%	20.9%	39.3%	34.3%
Mutualists	1.3%	3.3%	15.3%	38.2%	41.9%
Pluralists	0.0%	1.1%	8.3%	30.1%	60.0%
Distanced	2.5%	15.7%	37.4%	40.0%	5.4%

Table 22: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for aquatic invertebrate populations

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	4.9%	13.1%	24.4%	28.7%	29.0%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	5.8%	13.3%	27.2%	27.2%	26.4%
Hunters/Anglers	2.6%	11.6%	17.6%	32.8%	35.4%
Traditionalists	6.7%	13.7%	31.3%	31.7%	16.6%
Mutualists	1.4%	10.4%	17.5%	31.9%	38.8%
Pluralists	1.3%	11.9%	17.6%	22.7%	46.5%
Distanced	14.6%	19.3%	32.8%	24.8%	8.5%

Table 23: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	0.6%	2.0%	7.2%	18.0%	72.1%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	0.6%	2.2%	8.3%	18.6%	70.3%
Hunters/Anglers	0.7%	1.7%	4.6%	15.9%	77.1%
Traditionalists	0.8%	1.6%	5.2%	15.8%	76.6%
Mutualists	0.0%	1.3%	7.6%	18.1%	73.1%
Pluralists	0.0%	1.1%	5.8%	12.9%	80.2%
Distanced	3.1%	7.0%	15.4%	35.0%	39.6%

Table 24: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for household water in out-of-state cities and towns

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	11.5%	17.2%	18.6%	17.7%	35.1%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	10.3%	17.0%	20.2%	17.5%	35.0%
Hunters/Anglers	14.8%	17.6%	14.9%	17.6%	35.1%
Traditionalists	12.5%	23.1%	17.4%	14.9%	32.1%
Mutualists	12.2%	14.2%	17.0%	16.8%	39.8%
Pluralists	10.5%	14.2%	15.3%	19.2%	40.8%
Distanced	8.9%	12.0%	32.3%	25.1%	21.7%

Table 25: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for Oklahoma's industries and factories

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	2.2%	10.5%	26.5%	31.1%	29.6%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	2.0%	11.8%	27.4%	31.5%	27.3%
Hunters/Anglers	2.3%	7.5%	24.4%	30.3%	35.5%
Traditionalists	1.2%	5.7%	23.3%	37.0%	32.9%
Mutualists	2.3%	18.2%	26.5%	28.3%	24.9%
Pluralists	1.7%	8.2%	27.2%	26.2%	36.7%
Distanced	6.3%	12.9%	35.0%	29.7%	16.1%

Table 26: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for out-of-state industries and factories

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	18.7%	24.1%	24.6%	18.3%	14.2%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	16.8%	25.4%	24.9%	18.7%	14.1%
Hunters/Anglers	22.4%	21.1%	24.5%	17.2%	14.8%
Traditionalists	20.2%	23.4%	21.5%	18.9%	15.9%
Mutualists	19.7%	25.5%	23.9%	18.0%	12.8%
Pluralists	16.4%	21.6%	24.5%	19.0%	18.5%
Distanced	16.8%	27.8%	35.8%	16.0%	3.6%

Table 27: The importance of using water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for generation of electricity

	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Quite important	Extremely Important
All Respondents	1.6%	6.1%	14.4%	29.8%	48.2%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	1.9%	6.6%	16.3%	28.2%	46.9%
Hunters/Anglers	0.7%	4.9%	9.6%	32.1%	52.7%
Traditionalists	1.9%	3.7%	13.1%	31.6%	49.7%
Mutualists	0.7%	8.1%	15.3%	32.0%	44.0%
Pluralists	0.8%	2.5%	9.2%	24.0%	63.6%
Distanced	4.3%	16.3%	26.8%	31.1%	21.5%

Table 28: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes for all Oklahoma respondents

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	31.3
• Generation of electricity	25.3
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	20.4
• Fish populations	8.3
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	3.1
• Recreational boating and fishing	3.0
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	3.0
• Barge and boat travel	2.0
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	1.8
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	1.6
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.2
	100.0

Table 29: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by current hunting/fishing participation; Non-Hunters/Anglers

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Non-Hunters/Anglers	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	31.7
• Generation of electricity	25.3
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	20.5
• Fish populations	7.7
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	3.5
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	3.3
• Recreational boating and fishing	2.3
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	2.0
• Barge and boat travel	1.9
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	1.6
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.2
	100.0

Table 30: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by current hunting/fishing participation; Hunters/Anglers

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Hunters/Anglers	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	30.7
• Generation of electricity	25.4
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	20.2
• Fish populations	9.2
• Recreational boating and fishing	4.1
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	2.5
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	2.5
• Barge and boat travel	2.1
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	1.6
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	1.3
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.4
	100.0

Table 31: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Traditionalists

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Traditionalists	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	31.9
• Generation of electricity	26.1
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	22.0
• Fish populations	6.4
• Recreational boating and fishing	4.0
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	3.8
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	2.4
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	1.2
• Barge and boat travel	1.1
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	0.9
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.2
	100.0

Table 32: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Mutualists

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Mutualists	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	32.0
• Generation of electricity	25.2
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	18.8
• Fish populations	9.6
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	3.6
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	2.9
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	2.3
• Recreational boating and fishing	2.1
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	1.8
• Barge and boat travel	1.3
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.4
	100.0

Table 33: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Pluralists

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Pluralists	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	28.8
• Generation of electricity	23.1
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	19.4
• Fish populations	11.0
• Barge and boat travel	3.7
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	3.5
• Recreational boating and fishing	3.2
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	3.0
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	2.5
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	1.4
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.4
	100.0

Table 34: Relative Importance (RI_j) of uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes by wildlife value orientation; Distanced

Uses of water taken from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes	RI_j
Distanced	
• Household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns	33.3
• Generation of electricity	28.0
• Oklahoma's agricultural crops	20.7
• Fish populations	5.6
• Household water in out-of-state cities and towns	3.8
• Barge and boat travel	3.2
• Oklahoma's industries and factories	3.2
• Out-of-state agricultural crops	1.1
• Recreational boating and fishing	0.5
• Aquatic invertebrate populations	0.5
• Out-of-state industries and factories	0.1
	100.0

Table 35: Beliefs that the Oklahoma DWC manages fish and wildlife in a scientifically sound manner

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
All Respondents	1.4%	10.3%	42.0%	14.6%	31.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	1.7%	11.4%	38.9%	11.1%	36.9%
Hunters/Anglers	0.5%	7.7%	49.4%	23.0%	19.4%
Traditionalists	0.9%	9.6%	46.0%	18.5%	25.0%
Mutualists	0.5%	14.2%	38.2%	7.0%	40.1%
Pluralists	3.0%	5.8%	47.2%	23.5%	20.6%
Distanced	1.5%	13.1%	27.4%	1.2%	56.8%

Table 36: Beliefs that the Oklahoma DWC provides accurate information on fish and wildlife management issues

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
All Respondents	1.8%	12.3%	35.9%	21.4%	28.6%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	2.1%	12.2%	34.4%	17.3%	34.0%
Hunters/Anglers	1.2%	12.6%	38.8%	32.1%	15.3%
Traditionalists	1.7%	7.3%	38.5%	26.4%	26.2%
Mutualists	0.5%	17.7%	33.1%	16.3%	32.4%
Pluralists	3.7%	10.1%	37.7%	27.7%	20.7%
Distanced	1.5%	13.1%	27.4%	1.2%	56.8%

Table 37: Beliefs that the Oklahoma DWC provides adequate opportunities for public participation in fish and wildlife management decisions

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
All Respondents	4.0%	18.9%	27.6%	12.7%	36.8%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	4.1%	16.4%	25.8%	11.2%	42.7%
Hunters/Anglers	2.4%	25.4%	33.1%	16.5%	22.6%
Traditionalists	5.1%	15.9%	28.9%	14.2%	35.8%
Mutualists	3.9%	22.1%	23.9%	9.5%	40.6%
Pluralists	2.2%	17.6%	31.3%	16.6%	32.3%
Distanced	4.3%	23.1%	24.6%	7.2%	40.9%

Table 38: Beliefs that the Oklahoma DWC personnel provide high-quality service to the public

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
All Respondents	2.3%	12.2%	34.2%	21.0%	30.2%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	2.8%	12.6%	32.0%	17.0%	35.6%
Hunters/Anglers	1.2%	11.0%	39.5%	31.2%	17.1%
Traditionalists	2.4%	11.3%	35.0%	24.7%	26.7%
Mutualists	2.9%	16.5%	30.4%	14.3%	35.9%
Pluralists	2.2%	8.8%	37.7%	27.9%	23.5%
Distanced	1.5%	12.6%	33.7%	10.4%	41.9%

Table 39: Beliefs that the Oklahoma DWC represents my views on how fish and wildlife should be managed in Oklahoma

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
All Respondents	3.4%	14.4%	35.2%	11.0%	35.9%
Non-Hunters/Anglers	3.5%	15.1%	32.8%	6.9%	41.8%
Hunters/Anglers	3.2%	12.7%	40.4%	22.1%	21.6%
Traditionalists	3.0%	9.3%	43.0%	9.3%	35.5%
Mutualists	4.7%	23.8%	23.8%	6.3%	41.4%
Pluralists	2.0%	12.8%	41.5%	21.5%	22.1%
Distanced	4.3%	12.5%	24.9%	5.3%	53.1%

References Cited

Bright, A. D., Manfredo, M. J., & Fulton, D. C. (2000). Segmenting the public: An application of value orientations to wildlife planning in Colorado. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, *28*(1), 218-226.

Chanley, V. A., Rudolph, T. J., & Rahn, W. M. (2000). The origins and consequences of public trust in government: A time series analysis. *Public opinion quarterly*, *64*(3), 239-256.

Leuschner, W. A., Gregoire, T. G., & Buhyoff G. J. (1988). RI_j; A statistic for reporting ranked responses. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *20*(3), 228-232.

Teel, T. L., & Manfredo, M. J. (2009). Understanding the diversity of public interests in wildlife conservation. *Conservation Biology*, *24*(1), 128-139.

APPENDIX A
Methodology

Data for this study were collected using a self-report survey. The survey instrument is included in Appendix B. The mode of data collection was selected following the review of results from two separate pilot studies during which telephone, mail and email panel methods were tested and compared. A mail survey with an online option was chosen for the final data collection. Mail surveys were administered in all 50 U.S. states between 2017 and 2018. To account for lower than expected response rates for the mail survey, sampling in each state was supplemented using an email panel survey. The email panel method showed similar results to the mail survey method in our pilot studies. Upon completion of the first email panel, analysis showed significant underrepresentation of certain racial and ethnic categories. As a result, one final email panel round of data collection was conducted in an effort to boost response in underrepresented categories. Both email panels were conducted in the Spring of 2018. For final analysis, mail and email panel data were merged for a state and then weighted to better reflect the state's population. Each state was weighted separately with variables including age categories, gender, race/ethnic category and participation in hunting and angling. If a state had opted for a stratified geographic sample, state population estimates were weighted to reflect the relative proportion of the state's population in each stratum. A detailed description of the study methodology can be found at www.wildlifevalues.org.

Data Collection Details for Oklahoma

For the mail survey, a random sample of 3,347 households in Oklahoma was obtained from a commercial sampling firm (Survey Sampling International LLC). Sampled households received three mailings: a full survey questionnaire and cover letter (with an option to complete the survey electronically using a unique identification code); a follow-up reminder postcard; and a second full mailing including the survey questionnaire and cover letter. In an attempt to achieve relatively equal representation of males and females, the cover letter requested that the questionnaire be completed by the adult (age 18 or over) in the household who had the most recent birthday. Our sampling design also over-sampled those under age 35 and under-sampled those age 55 and older to help correct for the disproportionately high response rates typical among those over 55. A total of 210 usable questionnaires were received (185 paper and 25 online) from respondents contacted by mail. The Post Office returned 349 surveys marked as non-deliverable yielding an overall adjusted response rate of 7% for the mail survey.

An email panel sample of 336 Oklahoma respondents was recruited by a commercial sampling firm (Qualtrics LLC). Respondents were recruited via email invitation. Screening criteria were employed to ensure that the sample was representative of gender and age proportions within the Oklahoma population.

Data Weighting Procedure

Upon the completion of data collection, responses were weighted to better reflect the state's population characteristics, including:

1) **Race/Ethnicity Categories** using estimates compiled by the Henry J. Kaiser Foundation based on the U.S. Census Bureau's 2016 American Community Survey
2) **Participation in fish and wildlife-related recreation** using estimates obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's 2011 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation;
3) **Gender** using estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2016 American Community Survey; and
4) **Age Category** using estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2016 American Community Survey.

APPENDIX B
Survey Instrument

Management of Fish and Wildlife in the United States

This survey is for all citizens of your state. Even if you know little about fish and wildlife, your opinions are needed!

If preferred, this survey may be completed online at warnercnr.colostate.edu/fish-wildlifesurveys

Access Code: 00000.

In this survey, when we refer to "fish and wildlife", we do not mean animals kept as pets or those raised for other domestic purposes (e.g., farm animals). Please keep this in mind when responding.

Q1. Below is a series of statements about fish and wildlife and the environment. There are no right or wrong answers. Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree by *selecting one answer for each statement*.

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
With respect to the management of fish and wildlife, I feel that my state fish and wildlife agency shares similar values to me.	○	○	○	○	○
Wolves that kill livestock should be lethally removed.	○	○	○	○	○
We should strive for a society that emphasizes environmental protection over economic growth.	○	○	○	○	○
If a black bear attacks a person, that bear should be lethally removed regardless of the circumstances.	○	○	○	○	○
Private property rights are more important than protecting declining or endangered fish and wildlife.	○	○	○	○	○
Local communities should have more control over the management of fish and wildlife.	○	○	○	○	○
The earth is getting warmer mostly because of human activity such as burning fossil fuels.	○	○	○	○	○
Coyotes that kill pets in residential areas should be lethally removed.	○	○	○	○	○

Q2. The following statements refer to your state as a whole. Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree by *selecting one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
In this state, if someone acts in an inappropriate way, others will strongly disapprove.	○	○	○	○	○
In this state, there are clear expectations for how people should act in most situations.	○	○	○	○	○
People agree upon what behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate in most situations in this state.	○	○	○	○	○

Q3. People sometimes talk about what the aims of this country should be for the next ten years. Below are some of the goals that different people would give top priority. Which two of these would you, yourself, consider most important? *Please check TWO boxes*.

Maintaining order in the nation.	☐
Giving people more say in important government decisions.	☐
Fighting rising prices.	☐
Protecting freedom of speech.	☐

Q4. Below are statements that represent a variety of ways people feel about fish and wildlife. Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree by *selecting one answer for each statement.*

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
Humans should manage fish and wildlife populations so that humans benefit.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Animals should have rights similar to the rights of humans.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
We should strive for a world where there's an abundance of fish and wildlife for hunting and fishing.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I view all living things as part of one big family.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Hunting does not respect the lives of animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I feel a strong emotional bond with animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The needs of humans should take priority over fish and wildlife protection.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I care about animals as much as I do other people.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Fish and wildlife are on earth primarily for people to use.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I take great comfort in the relationships I have with animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I believe that wildlife have intentions.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is acceptable for people to kill wildlife if they think it poses a threat to their property.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
We should strive for a world where humans and fish and wildlife can live side by side without fear.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is acceptable for people to kill wildlife if they think it poses a threat to their life.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I value the sense of companionship I receive from animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
People who want to hunt should be provided the opportunity to do so.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wildlife are like my family and I want to protect them.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I believe that wildlife have minds of their own.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It is acceptable for people to use fish and wildlife in research even if it may harm or kill some animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
It would be more rewarding for me to help animals rather than people.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Hunting is cruel and inhumane to the animals.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
I believe that wildlife appear to experience emotions.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q5a. How do you think your state fish and wildlife agency is currently funded?
Select one point on the scale below to indicate your response.

Entirely by Hunting & Fishing License Fees			*Equally by Hunting & Fishing License Fees & Public Tax Funds*			*Entirely by Public Tax Funds*
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q5b. How should your state fish and wildlife agency be funded in the future?
Select one point on the scale below to indicate your response.

Entirely by Hunting & Fishing License Fees			*Equally by Hunting & Fishing License Fees & Public Tax Funds*			*Entirely by Public Tax Funds*
○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q6. Please respond to the following questions about the extent to which you trust certain forms of government. *Select one answer for each question.*

Overall, to what extent do you trust...	Almost Never	Only Some of the Time	Most of the Time	Almost Always
… your federal government to do what is right for your country?	○	○	○	○
… your state government to do what is right for your state?	○	○	○	○
… your state fish and wildlife agency to do what is right for fish and wildlife management in your state?	○	○	○	○

Q7. We would like to learn about your fish- and wildlife-related recreation activities. *Please select one option for each question below.*

	Yes	No
Have you ever participated in recreational (non-commercial) fishing?	○	○
Did you participate in recreational (non-commercial) fishing in the past 12 months?	○	○
Have you ever participated in recreational (non-commercial) hunting?	○	○
Did you participate in recreational (non-commercial) hunting in the past 12 months?	○	○
Have you ever taken any recreational trips for which fish or wildlife viewing was the primary purpose of the trip?	○	○
Did you take any recreational trips in the past 12 months for which fish or wildlife viewing was the primary purpose of the trip?	○	○

Q8. Please respond to the following three questions about your interest in participating in fish- and wildlife-related recreation in the future. *Select one answer for each question.*

	Not at all Interested	Slightly Interested	Moderately Interested	Strongly Interested
How interested are you in taking recreational fishing trips in the future?	○	○	○	○
How interested are you in taking recreational hunting trips in the future?	○	○	○	○
How interested are you in taking recreational trips in the future for which fish or wildlife viewing is the primary purpose of the trip?	○	○	○	○

Q9a. There are many competing uses for the water in Oklahoma's rivers and lakes. We are interested in how important you find the following water uses when making decisions about taking water from Oklahoma's rivers and lakes. ***Select one answer for each question.***

	How important is/are...	Not at all Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Quite Important	Extremely Important
A	… Oklahoma's agricultural crops?	○	○	○	○	○
B	… out-of-state agricultural crops?	○	○	○	○	○
C	… barge and boat travel?	○	○	○	○	○
D	… recreational boating and fishing?	○	○	○	○	○
E	… fish populations (for example, bass, sunfish, minnows)?	○	○	○	○	○
F	… aquatic invertebrate populations (for example, mussels, crayfish)?	○	○	○	○	○
G	… household water in Oklahoma's cities and towns?	○	○	○	○	○
H	… household water in out-of-state cities and towns?	○	○	○	○	○
I	… Oklahoma's industries and factories?	○	○	○	○	○
J	… out-of-state industries and factories?	○	○	○	○	○
K	… generation of electricity?	○	○	○	○	○

Q9b. Please tell us which of the above uses of Oklahoma's water is the most important to you? ***Write the letter (A – K) corresponding to which use, in your opinion, is the first most important use, the second most important use, and so on.***

_____ *1st most important use of Oklahoma's water*

_____ *2nd most important use of Oklahoma's water*

_____ *3rd most important use of Oklahoma's water*

Q10. Please indicate whether you believe the following statements about your state fish and wildlife agency, the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation (ODWC), are true never, sometimes, usually, or always (or mark if you are "unsure"). ***Select one answer for each statement.***

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always	Unsure
The ODWC manages fish and wildlife in a scientifically sound manner.	○	○	○	○	○
The ODWC provides accurate information on fish and wildlife management issues.	○	○	○	○	○
The ODWC provides adequate opportunities for public participation in fish and wildlife management decisions.	○	○	○	○	○
ODWC personnel provide high-quality service to the public.	○	○	○	○	○
The ODWC represents my views on how fish and wildlife should be managed in Oklahoma.	○	○	○	○	○

The following background information will be used to help make general conclusions about the residents of this state. Your responses will remain completely confidential.

Q1. Are you…? ○ Male ○ Female

Q2. What year were you born? _____

Q3. How many people under 18 years of age are currently living in your household? _____

Q4. Do you have any pets in your household? ***(Select all that apply.)***

☐ Dog ☐ Cat ☐ Other type of pet(s) ☐ No pets

Q5. Recently, there has been increased attention to the idea that hunting can provide a good way for people to obtain antibiotic-free, organic meat from a local source. We'd like to know if this idea is at all related to your current views about hunting and participation in the activity. ***Please select one option for each statement below.***

	Yes	No
I have recently become more supportive of hunting than I was in the past because of this idea.	○	○
I have recently started hunting because of this idea.	○	○
I do not hunt now but am interested in hunting in the future because of this idea.	○	○

Q6. What is your annual household income before taxes? ***(Select one.)***

○ Less than $10,000
○ $10,000 to less than $25,000
○ $25,000 to less than $50,000
○ $50,000 to less than $100,000
○ $100,000 to less than $250,000
○ $250,000 or more

Q8. Are you…? ***(Select one or more categories.)***

☐ White
☐ Black or African American
☐ Hispanic or Latino
☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
☐ Asian
☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
☐ Other *(please specify)*:_____

Q7. What is the highest level of education you have completed? ***(Select one.)***

○ Less than high school
○ High school diploma or equivalent (e.g., GED)
○ 2-year associate's degree or trade school
○ 4-year college degree
○ Advanced degree beyond 4-year college degree

Q9. How would you describe your current residence or community? ***(Select one.)***

○ Large city with 250,000 or more people
○ City with 100,000 to 249,999 people
○ City with 50,000 to 99,999 people
○ Small city with 25,000 to 49,999 people
○ Town with 10,000 to 24,999 people
○ Town with 5,000 to 9,999 people
○ Small town or village with less than 5,000 people
○ A farm or rural area

Decision makers are often interested in gathering input from the public on a variety of fish and wildlife issues. **If you are interested in providing input through secure online communication,** ***please provide your email below*** (or write it on a sheet of paper and return with the survey). By doing so, you consent to participate and may or may not be contacted for future follow-up studies.

Please write in your 5-digit zip code below.

Thank you for participating in this study.
Your input is very important.

Since 1922, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) has advanced conservation in western North America. Representing 23 western states and Canadian provinces, WAFWA's reach encompasses more than 40 percent of North America, including two-thirds of the United States. Drawing on the knowledge of scientists across the West, WAFWA is recognized as the expert source for information and analysis about western wildlife. WAFWA supports sound resource management and building partnerships at all levels to conserve wildlife for the use and benefit of all citizens, now and in the future.