

The Beast Within:

An exploration of Australian constructions of wildlife

Peter Howard

B.A., Grad Dip, Grad Dip Vet. Studies.

**This thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Australian
School of Environmental Studies, Griffith University, Australia.**

Submitted 22 November, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iii
Statement of Originality	iv
Preface	v
Chapter 1	1
Introduction: study context and common descriptions and definitions of wildlife	1
Introduction	1
The human dimensions approach to wildlife management	2
Objectives of this thesis	3
Definitions and meanings associated with wildlife	4
Public and official perceptions of pests	9
Thesis layout	18
Chapter 2	25
Demonstrating a need for re-evaluating Australian wildlife management	25
Introduction	25
Specific threats to Australia's biodiversity	30
Chapter 3	33
Traditional approaches to wildlife management	33
Leopold and game management	33
Early US wildlife conservation	36
Emergence of human dimensions in wildlife management	36
Leopold and human dimensions	40
Chapter 4	43
Wildlife management in Australia	43
The postcolonial use and management of Australian fauna	43
Recreational use of wildlife	46

The Commonwealth Scientific Industrial and Research Organisation (CSIRO)	48
Early recognition of declining biodiversity	48
A comparison of wildlife management approaches: Australia and the US	50
Land and the ownership of wildlife	51
Who owns wildlife?	53
Summary	54
Chapter 5	55
Values-based management and the role of values in wildlife conflicts	55
Human dimensions and wildlife conflicts	55
Animals and urbanisation / modernisation	58
Summary – past and present wildlife management and its relevance in Australia	62
Chapter 6	65
Reassessing values-based approaches to wildlife management	65
Differing meanings of values	65
Exploration of values – the sociological approach	67
The problem with “traditional” values	68
An attempted synthesis of meaning	71
The effect of values and attitudes on behaviour	72
Values based research in wildlife management - conclusions	73
Chapter 7	75
Developing a theoretical framework	75
Reality versus realities	75
Theoretical perspective	76
Methodological approach	78
Grounded theory as an appropriate method to study wildlife management	88
Methods used in the studies	88
Chapter 8	91
Preliminary investigations and Grounding studies	91
The use of wildlife conflicts as an entry point for the study of values ascribed to wildlife	91
Context - the research question and objectives for the grounding studies	92
Aims	92

Specific Objectives	93
Design	93
The grounding studies	95
Analysis	110
Results – the emergence of patterns in wildlife conflicts	116
Discussion and conclusions	122
Conclusions	125
Chapter 9	127
Development and application of thematic categories: an analysis of newspaper texts	127
Introduction	127
Review of previous work using textual analysis of the media	128
The use of textual analysis methods to generate quantitative data	128
Studies using textual analysis of wildlife and nature	129
Rationale for the study	130
Rationale for the method	131
Aims	131
Layout of the chapter	132
Study design	132
Data	133
Cleaning the dataset	133
The sample	134
Preliminary reading of the texts and the development of coding categories	135
Coding the dataset	136
Section 1 - General descriptors of the texts	136
Section 2 – Presence in the sample of thematic categories identified from the grounding	139
Section 3 – Coding thematic categories derived from the newspaper dataset	146
Section 4 – Coding thematic categories derived from Kellert's values typology	156
Exemplars of texts coded against categories derived from Kellert's values typology	159
Results	162
Discussion	166
Chapter 10	169
A qualitative study of a wildlife conflict: wildlife feeding in south-east Queensland	169
Introduction	169
Feeding practices and prevalence	171

Impacts associated with feeding wildlife	172
Context for the present study	172
Locality	173
Definitions and limitations	173
Theoretical approach	174
Key informant interviews	175
Coding and analysis	175
Places where feeding occurs	176
Types of feeding	177
Issues in wildlife feeding	177
Constructions of wildlife	178
Method	179
Results	181
Exploration of key thematic categories	186
Discussion and conclusions	194
Chapter 11	199
Closing categories and the emergence of theory	199
Introduction	199
Overview of findings	199
Framework for the synthesis of thematic categories	200
Concatenation of categories using coding category <i>dependency</i> as a worked example	202
Presentation of the emergence process	204
Clarifying terms used to describe conflicts over wildlife	216
Wildlife conflicts as trigger points for pre-existing tensions	217
Emergent Theory: complex conflicts often involve aspects of morality, ownership and social constructions wildlife (CMOSC)	219
Conclusions	222
Chapter 12	225
Application of theory - Part 1:	225
Introduction	225
Background	226
Fraser Island dingoes	226
Feeding and Fraser Island dingoes	227

Wildlife management antecedents: food-conditioning and carnivores in national parks	228
Theoretical framework	229
Method: Study 1	232
Analysis	236
Examining the newspaper dataset using the WCT	239
Conclusions	250
Chapter 13	253
Application of theory - Part 2:	253
Background to the present study	253
The contested histories of Fraser Island	254
The contested meanings of dingo	255
Application of the CMOSC Model	257
Layout of the chapter	258
Interviews	259
Statement regarding the use of shared data	259
Analysis and findings	260
Validation of data	282
The use of the CMOSC model	282
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	283
Taking dingoes off the agenda	283
Fraser Island epilogue	285
Chapter 14	289
Summary, discussion and conclusions	289
References	299
Appendices	323
Appendix 1 – Newspaper Study data entry pro forma – Epi6	323
Appendix 2 – Wildlife Feeding Survey Form	326
Appendix 3 Wildlife Feeding Study data entry pro forma – Epi6	327
Appendix 4 – List of Participants in the Fraser Island Study	333

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 10.1	Species respondents least wanted in their yards	182
Figure 10.2	Presence of thematic materials in texts	182
Figure 10.3	Reasons given for feeding	184
Figure 10.4	Benefits associated with feeding	184
Figure 10.5	Harm associated with feeding	185
Figure 11.1	Emergence of theory flow chart	200
Figure 11.2	Shared meanings of the category 'dependency'	203
Figure 11.3	Contested meanings of dependency collapsed around the concept of a moral imperative for the management of wildlife	204
Figure 11.4	Concept map of categories used to develop the core concept Moral Order	211
Figure 11.5	Differing constructions of wildlife	214
Figure 11.6	Concept map of categories used to develop the core concept ownership	216

TABLES

Table 1.1	Assessment of level of threat by agencies and the general public – ranked by level of threat	13
Table 2.1	Top 10 countries with highest numbers of animal species listed as Endangered, Critically Endangered and Vulnerable (sorted by Total)	28
Table 2.2	Top 10 countries with highest threats to biodiversity by conservation status	29
Table 2.3	Threatening process list ed under EPBC Act (1999)	31
Table 3.1	History of Game management	34
Table 6.1	Meanings associated with ‘values’	66
Table 7.1	Summary of methods used in the specific studies	89
Table 9.1	Total number of texts, sample and sample actually used by year	133
Table 9.2	Definitions used to develop coding categories based on Kellert’s values typology	156
Table 9.3	Frequency of text type occurring in the dataset	160
Table 9.4	Rating of texts positive or negative ranked by means	161
Table 9.5	Positive or negative ratings by species	162
Table 9.6	Mean number of categories by type of text	163
Table 9.7	Presence of themes by category type	166
Table 11.1	Collapsing categories around the concept of Moral Order	209
Table 11.2	Collapsing categories derived in the preceding chapters around the theme Anthropomorphism	213
Table 11.3	Presence of categories in the different studies	215
Table 11.4	Describing the completed studies in terms of their level of conflict	219
Table 12.1	Number of news texts by year	236
Table 12.2	Application of conflict typology model to Fraser Island dingoes	239

Abstract

The work presented here is a primarily qualitative examination of the meanings, values and perceptions ascribed to Australian wildlife and the influence and impact this has on its management. I argue that there is good reason to believe Australian wildlife management is fundamentally different from models based on game management as practiced in Europe and North America. Instead, Australian management models are grounded almost exclusively in the management of those species defined as pests.

The approach taken here was to use a grounded theory methodology during the data collection and analysis and a social constructionist analysis for higher order abstractions. The approach was adopted because of an identified need to re-evaluate some of the precepts of Australian wildlife management.

Although Australian fauna is generally intrinsically valued, such value appears not to have arrested its critical decline. With some exceptions, Australia's wildlife has not typically been valued as a resource although many of the "pest" species killed in this country are utilised as food elsewhere. A partial explanation of what makes a species edible or worth conserving or needing to be culled appears to lie within the constructions different social groups hold for wildlife. I reasoned that if evidence was found that different groups of people constructed wildlife differently then this diversity of perception would clearly emerge during wildlife conflicts.

There were three principle sources of data used in this thesis. The first was participant observations of a number of wildlife conflicts, the second was the textual analysis of newspaper texts that pertained to wildlife and the third were interviews with different stakeholders involved in a wildlife conflict.

The data suggested different groups will construct wildlife differently, with the "good" wildlife needing to be conserved while the "bad" had to be "managed." However, there was no apparent consensus on which species were good and which were bad.

Conflicts over wildlife often occur where a species is valued by one group and deplored by another. These conflicts can be simple, involving a single complainant and an individual of a species, or they can be community-wide, involving nuisance behaviours of sub-populations of a species, or they can be complex and reflect a range of deeper social tensions. In the studies presented here, these tensions included "values clashes"

between urban and rural groups, between groups who sought to nurture and protect wildlife and those who sought to manage risks associated with human-wildlife interactions. I argue that the way wildlife is constructed by the different groups, in addition to the values those groups ascribe to wildlife, often lies at the heart of a wildlife conflict - and that those constructions often reflect deeper differences than those relating to the treatment of wildlife itself.

Observations of 11 conflicts informed development of a wildlife conflict typology describing the process by which these conflicts escalated into wider, and often intractable, disputes. Analysis of newspaper texts and interview transcripts allowed development of a second model which identified complexity, moral imperatives, ownership and the differing constructions as being key factors influencing the development and resolution of wildlife based conflicts. Both models were successfully tested against a serious wildlife dispute over the management of dingoes on Fraser Island.

Based on these findings I conclude that in order to manage wildlife in a way which meets the expectations of Australians, wildlife professionals must recognise that there are a diversity of valid constructions and values ascribed to wildlife. Understanding these differing constructions will become a powerful tool for the resolution of wildlife conflicts that occur when the presence and behaviours of wildlife cause deterioration in relations between different social groups expressing an interest in that wildlife.

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the guidance and advice I received from my supervisors, Associate Professor Darryl Jones and Dr Bill Metcalf. I benefited enormously from Darryl's often humorous insights into animal behaviours and the meanings people attach to them. Bill assisted me in tying down much of the detail required when presenting a thesis that is primarily a qualitative work.

I warmly thank Jim Thompson, Bruno Griemel, Ric Natrass, Kate Kraschnefski for answering my seemingly unending questions regarding all aspects of wildlife management in Queensland. Early in my studies, fellow doctoral students Leonie Thomas and Sharon Wong shared with me some of their insights regarding wildlife conflicts occurring in Brisbane.

My friend and colleague, Leah Burns, aided me throughout this project and was an unflinching ally during fieldwork on Fraser Island – I know of no finer a person with whom to comprehensively bog a four-wheel drive. Ian Bytheway, Megan Douglas and Jennifer Rowe provided assistance, tea and sympathy and much more. I thank Sue Pace and Philip MacDonald for their excellent technical and library support and Jennifer and Sarah Dickson for their superb proofing, editing and formatting.

I acknowledge and thank the more than sixty participants who were interviewed in the course of this study. I also express my appreciation to Peter Brown, Peggy Eby Judith Little, Glynis Oogjes, Carole West, for their assistance during various aspects of the fieldwork.

And finally, I am deeply grateful to my wife Ann Larson, without her unwavering encouragement, support and love this work would have come to fruition.

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Preface

While working on this thesis I was a regular guest on a Brisbane AM radio station discussing with callers matters related to wildlife. At the time there were a number of conflicts both in the region and throughout Australia involving the presence of flying-fox colonies in urban areas so I felt it timely to promote a flying-fox information evening in a Brisbane park on dusk, around the time of the nightly fly out. I knew the station's target market was primarily retired and semi-retired listeners and, judging from the many calls I fielded and the broadcast content, it was clear it catered to a very conservative audience. For the information night I also invited a Brisbane-based wildlife manager to address the group. Prior to his talk I told him that he shouldn't assume everyone in his audience was comfortable with the concept of evolution. He replied, "Glad you told me that, mate. I'll give it to them in spades." He was true to his word and did not miss an opportunity to lecture his audience on the ecological importance of the species, saying in as many different ways as possible that flying-foxes had "co-evolved" with species of Australian trees. I had no problems with what he said but in terms of attempting to build greater tolerance in the community for flying-foxes, I suspect he failed to reach the hearts and minds of our audience. By linking evolution to the ecological importance of flying-foxes he had challenged his audience to surrender their faith and take a "scientific" view of nature. All I wanted from the meeting was to promote a better understanding of the role of flying-foxes in the landscape, not a religious conversion of sorts. Afterwards I questioned him on his approach and he said "They weren't ever going to get it until they left that creationist nonsense behind."

This example clarified for me, more than anything else, the different ways people viewed wildlife. I was also alerted to the fact that for some there was a *right* and *wrong* way to appreciate wildlife and embedded in these beliefs was the implication that some of the perspectives carried moral overtones. This meant that moderating wildlife conflicts was not so much about telling people why animals did what they did, and how to live with or manage those behaviours, but about fully understanding the causes and contexts of those conflicts. To this end, it is human attitudes and behaviours underscoring wildlife management that will be investigated here rather than any endeavour to expand the field of wildlife ecology. This thesis will explore the differing constructions Australians hold of wildlife and the role these constructions play in the evolution and resolution of human-wildlife conflicts.

