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Introduction - Hunting

- Most hunters are introduced by father
- Influenced by a rural upbringing
- Traditional ways of recruitment may be changing
- 1 million waterfowl hunters in US annually
Introduction – Media Exposure

![Graph showing media exposure by age range.](image-url)
Introduction – Media’s Influence

- Attitudes
- Social behavior and reality
- Cultural Norms
- Identity
- Normative behaviors
Introduction – Hunting Media

- Effects of hunting videos on hunters
  - Increased tolerance toward hunting
  - Trophy preference
- Frequent use by waterfowl hunters
DUCK DYNASTY

MONEY. FAMILY. DUCKS.
Introduction - Objectives

- What messages are being conveyed through the videos?
  - Actions
  - Expectations
  - Harvest preference
  - Ethics
  - Reactions
Methods – Variables recorded

- Shots/shooting scene (categorical)
- Birds harvested/shooting scene (categorical)
- Birds harvested with leg bands
- % of movie spent shooting
- Number of words spoken
- Specific words spoken (complete transcription)
Methods - Video Transcription

- Time stamped each scene, event and sentence
- Converted all spoken words to text
- Listen 10 times then coded “inaudible”
- Converted slang to dictionary words
- Separated Contractions
Methods - Shooting

- Timed shooting scenes
- Counted number of shots fired and birds harvested
- Counted number of birds harvested with legbands
Methods - Shooting
Results – Number of Shots per Scene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Shots/Scene</th>
<th>Video 1</th>
<th>Video 2</th>
<th>Video 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\chi^2 = 22.46, p < .001, V = .17$)
Results – Number of Birds Harvested/Scene

(\chi^2 = 23.02, p < .01, V = .17)
## Results – Words Spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video 1</th>
<th>Video 2</th>
<th>Video 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kill</td>
<td>Kill</td>
<td>Ducks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>“Inaudible”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Inaudible”</td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>Shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>Awesome</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions – Video 1

- 100% duck hunting
- Least talkative
- Most scenes were 1-3 shots, 1-3 birds falling
- Only video with >10 harvested in a scene
- 1 banded bird
Conclusions – Video 2

- 50% duck hunting
- Most talkative
- Most scenes were 4-10 shots, 1-3 birds falling
- 15 banded birds
Conclusions – Video 3

- 75% duck hunting
- Moderate level of talking
- Most scenes were 1-3 shots, 1-3 birds falling
- 2 banded birds
Discussion

- 53% IL hunters harvest 6 birds
- Odds of getting a band
- % of inaudible words
- Most spoken word “kill”
Further Research

- How many hunters watch the videos?
- Demographics of hunters who watch these videos?
- Can we predict which hunters are watching videos?
- Is there a relationship between changing hunters’ attitudes and video watching?
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