

## Wildlife Value Orientations of University Students

*Sevilay Dervişoğlu*

Education Faculty, University of Hacettepe, Ankara, Turkey

---

**Abstract:** In this study the value orientations of university students has been revealed. Semi-structured interview is done with 24 university students. As the result of the study nine different wildlife orientations found. From these orientations “caring, mutualism, concern for safety and attraction/interest” are the most common value orientations. Mutualism is a more dominant value orientation for students than materialism.

**Key words:** Students · Wildlife value orientations · Emotions

---

### INTRODUCTION

According to Inglehart as the result of industrialization and socio-economic development a social change happened through post-materialist values [1, 2]. While economic stability and security is important in materialist value system; in post-materialist value system quality of life, belongings and self-realization attract attention. These change reflected to the environmental perceptions of people. Manfredi, Teel and Henry claimed that the change through modernizing and post-materialist values effect the ideas of people about the ideas for wild animals and this effect the interaction of human and wildlife [3]. According to this assumption there is a shift at the wildlife value orientations from materialism to mutualism at social level [3-5]. The mutualism value orientation symbolize the idea about this: a relationship based on trust can be constructed between wildlife and people, wildlife have rights like people and they are the piece of a wide family. At the base of materialist value orientations a pragmatic or dominant point of view takes place about wild animals. According to this, wild animals are created for the people usage and satisfaction of people is more important than wildlife. People with high mutualism value orientations have fewer tendency to support the activities suffer wildlife [4]. Wildlife value orientations effect the attitudes and behaviors about wildlife and the structure of social conflicts about them. So, the change told about wildlife value orientations will direct the studies that will be done to save the wildlife [4, 5].

For revealing the wildlife value orientations used emotions as a tool [6]. They demonstrated a strong relation between emotions and value orientations [7]. According to this by measuring the emotional reactions given to some definite scenarios specific value orientations can be revealed [6, 8]. Because of the emotions are international and understood in all cultures same Dayer and others used it as a tool to measure the wild life value orientations at multicultural level [6].

“Human-wildlife conflict” happens when the purposes of people and the needs of wild animals effect each other negative [9]. The conflict of human-wildlife create a danger on continuation of a generation and threat the wealth and health of people, create economical and social problems [9, 10, 11]. In Turkey as biological variety hot region [12] people-wild life conflict is one of a most serious danger for species [13]. For saving the biological variety Turkey is an important place and here a basic task is given to education [14]. Researches [15, 16] show that value orientations effect positively the commitment of youths to protect the biological variety. According to this revealing the value orientations of youths in Turkey will help to improve the educational programmes about protecting the biodiversity.

Aim of this study is revealing whether at Turkish young people the wildlife value orientations that can be seen in different societies could be observed or not and which of these are wide. Also understanding that whether the change through mutualism value orientation is valid for Turkish students.

---

**Corresponding Author:** Sevilay Dervişoğlu, Assistant Professor Departments of Dervişoğlu,  
University of Hacettepe, Faculty of Education,  
Education of High School About Science and Maths 06800, Beytepe - Ankara, Turkey.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

In this research data is collected by semi-structured interview way. Sample of the study consist of 24 undergraduate students. Students are chosen randomly from the students who attend school in University of Hacettepe at Ankara who came from different regions of Turkey. During the interview<sup>1</sup> students are wanted to tell stories about the experiences they live about wild animals they relate with four basic feelings (happiness, sadness, anger and fear). Here students are wanted to explain the reasons why they felt these feelings [6]. At the rest of the study two different examples to the conflict of human-wild life are presented. In the first conflict the topic is the brown bears that damage the farms and apiaris of the farmers who live in the mountain villages of the Black Sea. These places are the living areas of brown bears. Here students are asked for what the farmers should do. In the second example news from a newspaper is showed to students. In this news wolf come to near the villages and create danger in winter are handled and killing them is told. Students are asked for whether they support that solution (killing wolf or not) or not and their own solutions are asked. For each example students are wanted to say their own reasons. In interview –whether they didn’t tell spontaneously– the ideas of students about hunting are asked. Interviews lasted 15-30 minutes.

For determining to the value orientations qualitative content analysis is used [17]. By taking into consideration the wild life value orientations described by Dayer *et al.* in table 1 and with the help of these categories data is analyzed [6]. Some passages are put into value categories more than one. Material of data is coded independently by two people and after discussing the differences necessary changes are done.

**FINDINGS**

**Wildlife Value Orientations:** As the result of the study 9 different value orientations (mutualism, materialism, caring, safety, attraction/interest, environmentalism, rational, respect, religious) are investigated. General this is seen: particular emotions are found related with specific value orientations. For example happiness triggered the sentences about “mutualism” orientation and sadness triggered “caring” orientation. On the other hand there are examples to that: an emotion would reveal different value orientations. For example “caring and attraction/interest” orientations about wildlife is found related with happiness.

As an interesting situation most of students reflected experiences about “safety” value orientations without any emotional direction (at the beginning of the interview). Just a little of students told stories here that reflect “attraction/interest” value orientations. The other value orientations are told after emotional direction.

**Materialism:** Materialism orientation is investigated in 13 students. Sentences reflect materialism orientation generally told after the questions about hunting and conflict examples. Only 2 students told wild animals damage the products or create danger for people about “anger”. For example a student told this for the reason why he/she doesn’t like wild boars: *“Boars create damages more than benefits. I think this way. Boars are harmful for our farms, products, trees and everything. They spread illness everywhere permanently. I don’t know, but I think I have antipathy.”* (Interview-19).

Materialism orientation is investigated most in the sentences that students evaluated the conflicts. In these sentences the rule of men is revealed as a basic belief.

Table 1: Wildlife Value Orientations [6]

Materialism	Wild animals are living for the usage of people; people’ welfare is more important than the one of wild animal’.
Mutualism	Wild animals can have a relation based on trust with people, wild animals have rights like people, they are the piece of the big family.
Caring	Having an emotional commitment with wild animals and desire to help them.
Attraction/Interest	Interest with wild animals and feeling that wild animals are improving the life experiences of people.
Concern for safety	Concerning with the probable damages of interaction with wild animals.
Environmentalism	A general concern that include protecting wild animals about environment, feeling that people damage the environment with various activities.
Scientific (Ecomodernization)	Believe in that: environment problems can be solved by using science and technology.
Respect	A basic value; respecting to wild animals and their living areas and finding it valuable.
Rational/Scientific	Explaining the operational of nature and behaviors of animals in a rational and scientific way.
Spiritual/Religious	Nature and wild animals are created by a big power and controlled, mechanism of nature’ operation is explained with a spiritual and religious point of view.

<sup>1</sup>see interview protocol in Dayer, Stinchfield and Manfred, 2007.

For example a student told his/her ideas about bear conflict as: *"Whether the farm can be protected with wire netting... But farms are enormous can't be protected. Actually when I compare people and animals I am always on the side of people. I probably think the same [killing the bear] with them [farmers]."* (Interview-3).

In the context of materialism orientation students told their ideas about hunting only when it is asked. Most of students said that: they are against to hunting of animals. Some of them are thinking that: wild animals can be hunted without consuming the generation. In the sentences of a student about hunting of wild animals "environmentalism, materialism and respect orientations are nested: *"As I said [about hunting] I think it as a sport directly. But in moderation by knowing the limitations, for example some limitations can be defined; [Hunting] is forbidden in these seasons and free in these seasons, the limitation of number is this. Whether the reason hunting is logical and something beyond just killing, like eating the meat of deer and using its letter, [hunting wild animals] it is something appropriate, I can say I would like to try it (Materialism). But as I said taking into consideration that it is also alive, must be hunted without creatin pain an the thing Ifound important about hunt is its aim. (Respect)"* (Interview-2).

**Mutualism:** 22 students told sentences that reflect mutualism orientation. It is revealed related with happiness, conflicts or general questions. Different mutualism types are found. In one of them personalization can be seen. Here students referred people features to wild animals. Especially animals like monkey, chimpanzee are resembled to people because of their behaviors: *"For example monkeys were spitting out us like people [...] when we have gone to the zoo. [Monkey] react normally because you are interested with [it] too much. It is too nice. You can feel that it can think."* (Interview-5). Also some of students told that they think wild animals like people: *"I think animals like people. I don't know but thinking the emotions [of a turtle] is an interesting thing. It looks like happy. When I hold it [the turtle], I want to think that it gets happy when I played with it, but I know this at the same time I disturb it."* (Interview-8).

In an other mutualism style wildlife seen as they have the same rights. This point of view has existed related with conflict examples: *"I don't think directly killing an animal can be a choice. As a result that place is the living area of it [bear]". So you will find a choice by taking into considiration this."* (Interview-10).

One other mutualism type, the idea of people and animals can live without damaging each other and in peace is dominated: *"Actually we can live together [with wild animals]. We should know how to compromise. Also loving nature is important. We don't know how to compromise and we eradicate. But we don't know that we are eradicating ourselves. I think that. Whether we know how to compromise neither us, nor them [wild animals] will be damaged. We will go on living together as it must be."* (Interview-12). Similarly an example given by a student describe a mutualist living with wild animals: *"In our villages in our houses and coops there used to be snakes inside straw. They used to eat our eggs and other foods, but we wouldn't kill them. As the result they were eating mouse and cleaning our houses. Unless they are harmful, we did nothing harmful."* (Interview-19).

The mutualism style that is told most is the one about having relations with wildlife that is constructed in trust. This point of view, especiallytald as an indirect experience that is indirectly. Most of the student said that they want communicate with wild animals like domestic animals: *"For example I would like to tame a wolf cub. Well...I think that they can't be tamed. I would like to tame. I would like to overcome the afraid that I live, when it is too young by gattin closer. I would like to feed it [wolf] like a dog, I would like to be the friend of a wolf."* (Interview-19).

**Caring:** "Caring" orientation as a sub-dimension of mutualism, is revealed most related with "sadness and anger" emotions. For all of students at least 1 statement is investigated about this value orientation. Students told their emotions about the animals that is hurt, bad behaved or killed: *"But for example seing a lion in irons, in a cage disturb me. Because they [in the cage] look like they want to move but because they can't they are turning around a circle permanantly that make me feel they can only spend the energy they have by making this. Or some of them look like given drug because of calm mood they are in because they are always asleep. They can't live in a naturel way. So I got unhappy."* (Interview-7).

Caring orientation existed about helping wildlife related with happiness. Students told that they would be happy when they save injured and in a bad mood animals: *"I got happy when events happen like saving whales and dolphins from hitting the land. They make me happy."* (Interview-10).

**Attraction/Interest:** Attraction/interest about wildlife exist itself or related with happiness and investigated in

22 students. Students here told that they got happy and excited with the experiences like observing wildlife in nature: *"Yes, I have seen bat and I have heard their sound also. Well... I found it excited and interesting, it attracts my attention. Because seeing them, feeling them close and knowing about their entity without documentaries is a great thing."* (Interview-8). Collecting data about wildlife, introducing them and investigating are described as an experience that makes them happy.

**Concern for Safety:** Safety is found as one of the most common value orientation (24 students). The sentences about this value orientation are told by most of the students spontaneously or related with "fear" emotion. Sentences that reflect safety orientation are told as related with anger by a few students. Here wild animals are seen as dangerous and not trustable. Snake is the animal that is said most about this topic. Except this, from predators to sea creatures and insects so many species are seen as invader or source of illness. *"I think that snake is shy when I evaluate it from the view of people' features. It isn't possible to know that where is it going to come from? It can bite suddenly. Whether it is poisoned you can die."* (Interview-14).

**Environmentalism:** Environmentalism is told by 16 students related with rational/scientific orientation. This value orientation is told as creating anger experience about wildlife or related with hunting. Students are worried about extinction as the result of hunting and damaging the ecosystems as the result of this. Here the behaviors of people harmful for environment are told. Environmentalism orientation has existed related with materialism also. For example a student thinks that unless creating extinction wild animals can be hunted: *"Whether the ones with restricted generation aren't hunted, I don't care with the others. Okey, rabbit is a good animal, it is lovely. Whether they don't have risk about extinction, they would be used. But they might be special terms like propagation. I mean by obeying the rules hunting might be a good job that is done inside of the nature and it is a good kind of experience. But with the rule of staying far from the animals with extinction risk."* (Interview-7).

**Respect:** A basic value called respect is investigated with 19 students. Respect to wildlife and their living areas is told as related with conflicts and hunting. Also it is found as related with anger also. Respect orientation existed as related with mutualism and caring orientations: *"we should learn living together without interference to their*

*[wild animals] life, by respecting their freedom."* (Interview-8). Another student emphasized to the interaction based on respecting each other: *"I think that people must behave more respectful to wild animals. But when people can't see respectful manner from them [wild animals], they might be aggressive."* (Interview-9).

In the sentences that reflect the respect orientation are evaluated ethically: *"Killing animal wrongfully and carelessly disturb me. While a species of an animal has the risk of extention, people killing animals for their own pleasure. This really disturbs me."* (Interview-17).

A student told that wild animals shouldn't be killed unnecessarily and they should be behaved respectfully: *"Killing them [wild animals] is normal but aim is different. Actually I adopt the idea of Indians: if you have to kill them in a respectful way."* (Interview-27).

At the process of evaluating the behaviors toward wildlife respect to life generally has been the topic. For example a student told his ideas about hunting wild animals like that: *"[Hunting] is wrong. They have right to live. They will also live."* (Interview-20).

**Rational/Scientific:** Rational orientation is investigated in the sentences that related with environmentalism which explain the importance of species in ecosystem (21 students). One of students explained her ideas about bear conflict in a scientific way: *"[Because] that bear is also a species of that environment. I think that killing them will disrupt the balance. This would be the reason of increase or the decrease of the species that live with the help of bear or the ones that bear feed with. This will also effect the balance. Maybe one day that farmer (in there) would be in a mood that he can't go on agriculture activities."* (Interview-24).

Some of students explained the behaviors of animals with scientific reasons at conflict examples: *"That animal doesn't try to take your sheep because of wantonness [because it has] or making fun for. [Animal] is hungry. This is an instinct. It has the feeling of hunting. There is nothing else it can make to change this desire."* (Interview-18).

**Spiritual/Religious:** Only 4 of students explained his/her ideas about wild animals with religious reasons. This orientation exists when hunting wild animals or killing them is spoken. For example a student explained why the bear shouldn't be killed while they were talking about bear conflict: *"Because [bear] is an alive creature. God has created it, too. Shooting an alive creature is a sin, this is not necessary."* (Interview-20).

**Conflict:** Students found solutions about bear and wolf conflict. All of students created solutions in which animals aren't damaged. In this context, the suggestion said most are: feeding wild animals and prevent the entry of wild animals by limiting the agricultural or residential areas. For example a student evaluated conflict with a mutualist point of view: *"As I said before, by making the life areas of brown bears national park these areas can be protected and prufied from people. So the luxury of killing such a bear there shouldn't be given. Because actually the occupy the life area of the brown bear is the farmer. This region was its [bear'] region actually. If they want to live together they will try to subsistence together. He [the farmer] will take measure, will block the bear for not to steal and its entrance to the field. For example when you shoot through the air bears aren't coming. So behaving like watchman or establishing alarm system would work. Or the place will become national park and people won't enter."* (Interview-5).

Almost one of three students said that they support the solutions cause to the death or damaging of wild animals. But most of these students emphasized that people can damage the wild animals only when they have to defend themselves or there is nothing else to do: *"It changes according to the condition. Not killing the bear only for self pleasure. Whether a condition like a bear would damage a person (like killing it) it might be killed. But teh bear is coming to my field can't be a reason. It can be blocked by finding a logical way. If he can't block and enormous damages happening [bear] can be killed."* (Interview-20).

## DISCUSSION

As the result of this study, 4 basic emotions are found successful about determining the value orientations. Wild life value orientations investigated in different countries [6, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22] are also found for the students in Turkey. From these mutualism, caring, safety, attraction/interest, environmentalism, rational-scientific and respect are the ones seen the most.

According to the result of this study, mutualism is a real common value orientation; sentences reflect materialism orientation are told related with conflicts mostly. As a similar finding [23] reported that Turkish university students are desired to live in an harmony with environment and people don't have right to rule the environment. Because of the sample of this study can't symbolize all population passing through mutualism can't be told certainly. But the findings of this study can be interpreted as materialism is more dominant value

orientation than mutualism at the university level youth. Most of students said that conflicts can be solved in a way that animals aren't damaged and they are against to hunt animals. This finding is in accordance with mutualism orientation is common.

For some of students wild animals reminded dangerous and scary experiences. Here afraid and hate about rippers addition to snakes is prominent. Negative attitudets of Turkish youth for snakes is revealed in researches [24, 25]. The first-hand experience about wild animals will increase the positive attitudes and decrease the afraid [26, 27]. According to this in Turkey directly experiences with wild animals and more education experiences about the lives of wild animals and their behaviors is really important fore more effective biology education.

## REFERENCES

1. Inglehart, R., 1997. Modernization and postmodernization. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
2. Inglehart, R., 1990. Culture shift in advanced industrial societies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
3. Manfredo, M.J., T.L. Teel and A.D. Bright, 2003. Why are public values toward wildlife changing? Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 8(4): 285-304.
4. Teel, T.L., M.J. Manfredo and H.M. Stinchfield, 2007. The need and theoretical basis for exploring wildlife value orientations cross-culturally. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 12(5): 297-305.
5. Manfredo, M.J., T.L. Teel and K.L. Henry, 2009. Linking Society and Environment: A Multilevel Model of Shifting Wildlife Value Orientations in the Western United States. Social Sci. Quarterly, 90(2): 407-427.
6. Dayer, A.A., H.M. Stinchfield and M.J. Manfredo, 2007. Stories about wildlife: Developing an instrument for identifying wildlife value orientations cross-culturally. Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 12(5): 307-315.
7. Fisher, A.H., A.S.R. Manstead and P.M.R. Mosquera, 1999. The role of honor-based versus individualistic values in conceptualizing pride, shame and anger: Spanish and Dutch cultural prototypes. Cognition and Emotion, 13: 149-179.
8. Manfredo, M.J., 2008. Who Cares About Wildlife? Social Science Concepts for Exploring Human-Wildlife Relationships and Conservation Issues. Springer.

9. Distefano, E., 2005. Human-wildlife conflict worldwide: Collection of case studies, analysis of management strategies and good practices. Rome: SARD Initiative Report.
10. Conover, M., 2002. Resolving human-wildlife conflicts: The science of wildlife damage management. Boca Raton, FL: Lewis Publishers.
11. Woodroffe, R., S. Thirgood and A. Rabinowitz, 2005. The impact of human-wildlife conflict on natural systems. In R. Woodroffe, S. Thirgood and A. Rabinowitz (Eds.) *People and wildlife: Conflict or coexistence?*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge U. K.
12. Mittermeier, R.A., P. Robles Gil, M. Hoffmann, J. Pilgrim, T. Brooks, C.G. Mittermeier, J. Lamoreux and G.A.B. da Fonseca, 2004. *Hotspots Revisited*. Mexico: CEMEX.
13. Ambarli, H. and C. Bilgin, 2008. Human-Brown Bear Conflicts in Artvin, Northeastern Turkey: Encounters, Damage and Attitudes. *Ursus*, 19(2):146-153.
14. CBD- Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992. Rio de Janeiro: World Conference on Sustainable Development.
15. Menzel, S. and S. Bögeholz, 2010. Values, Beliefs and Norms That Foster Chilean and German Pupils' Commitment to Protect Biodiversity. *International J. Environ. and Sci. Edu.*, 5(1): 31-49.
16. Dervişoğlu, S., 2007. *Biyolojik Çeşitliliğin Korunmasına Yönelik Eğitim İçin Öğrenme Ön Kosulları*. [Learning Pre-Conditions for Protecting the Biodiversity]. Doctorate Thesis, University of Hacettepe Institute of Science, Ankara.
17. Mayring, P., 2000. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. 7. Aufl., Deutscher Studien Verlag, Weinheim.
18. Zinn, H.C. and X.S. Shen, 2007. Wildlife value orientations in China. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(5): 331-338.
19. Tanakanjana, N. and S. Saranet, 2007. Wildlife value orientations in Thailand: Preliminary findings. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(5): 339-345.
20. Raadik, J. and S. Cottrell, 2007. Wildlife value orientations: An Estonian case study. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(5): 347-357.
21. Jacobs, M., 2007. Wildlife value orientations in the Netherlands. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(5): 359-365.
22. Kaczynsky, P., 2007. Wildlife value orientations of rural Mongolians. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 12(5): 317-329.
23. Sahin, E., H. Ertepinar and G. Teksöz, 2009. Implications for a green curriculum application toward Sustainable development. *Hacettepe University J. Edu.*, 37: 123-135.
24. Yorek, N., 2009. The only good snake is a dead snake: Secondary school students' attitudes toward snakes. *Biotechnology and Biotechnological Equipment*, 23(2): 31-35.
25. Prokop, P., M. Özel and M. Uşak, 2009. Cross-Cultural Comparison of Student Attitudes toward Snakes. *Society and Animals*, 17(3): 224-240.
26. Dettmann-Easler, D. and J. Pease, 1999. Evaluating the effectiveness of residential environmental education programs in fostering positive attitudes toward wildlife. *The J. Environ. Edu.*, 31(1): 33-39.
27. Roskaft, E., T. Bjerke, B.P. Kaltenborn, J.D.C. Linnell and R. Andersen, 2003. Patterns of self-reported fear towards large carnivores among the Norwegian public. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24(3): 184-198.