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Wildlife conflict – attitudinal intransigence?
Research on attitudinal dynamics?
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953 households
539, 56.5% returned
230 from same households
230 re-sampled households
Negative attitudes - responsive

- Neutral: 9 respondents
- Positive: 45 respondents
- Negative: 35 respondents

- Attitude unchanged
- Attitude moderated by 1
- Attitudinal change
Extreme attitudes – intransigent?

χ² = 7.6, P<0.05.
Our attitudes are responsive…

ANOVA: $F_{3,82} = 11.6, P < 0.001, R^2 = 0.27$; \( \Delta \) Deer feeding: $F_{2,82} = 3.4, P = 0.037$. 
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.. but not to deer numbers

ANCOVA: $F_{3,85} = 9.4, \ P < 0.001, R^2 = 0.22$; $\Delta$Deer numbers: $F_{2,85} = 2.5, \ P = 0.28$. 
Conclusions

- Attitudinal dynamics research - AWOL
- Attitudes dynamics are object-specific
- Attitudes can appear intransigent, unless...
  - investigated w.r.t. changing attitude object
  - by same people (agents)
Urban deer in decline?