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“…the hunter ordinarily has no gallery to applaud or disapprove of his conduct. Whatever his acts, they are dictated by his conscience… It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of this fact.”

- Aldo Leopold
  A Sand County Almanac (1949)
TB in Deer: Management Interventions

- Restrictions on feeding and baiting
- Liberalized hunting regulations
Determinants of Compliance

- Deterrence vs. illegal gains
  - Cost = risk of being caught and punished
  - Benefit = additional profit or opportunities associated with non-compliance

- Normative influence: sense of internal duty
  - Moral obligation
  - Social norms
  - Legitimacy of regulations, responsibility to authorities

Enforcement and Deterrence

• Conservation Officers: 140 statewide
• 680,000 deer hunters: approx 4,800 per CO
• Maximum possible baiting fine = $500
Hunter Baiting Use and Acceptance

Several surveys have evaluated use and acceptance of bait by Michigan deer hunters...
Perceived Gains from Using Bait

- Distracter: 47.6%

Bait on a natural trail to distract deer as a shot is taken.

Frawley 2000
Perceived Gains from Using Bait

- Distracter: 47.6%
- Attracter: 28.7%

Change movements of deer to draw them to hunting location.

Frawley 2000
Perceived Gains from Using Bait

- Distracter: 47.6%
- Attracter: 28.7%
- Concentrator: 18.5%

Extended use of bait to draw and hold deer in a hunting area.

Frawley 2000
Moral Norms and Baiting

- Ban baiting because it is unethical: 22.4%
- Never restrict: 16.5%
- Regulate only to protect herd health: 49.6%

Frawley 2000
Social Norms and Baiting

“Do you hunt deer over bait?”

- HUNT WITH BAIT

“Do you approve of other people hunting deer over bait?”

- APPROVE OF BAIT

Frawley 2000
Determinants of Compliance
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Enforcement and Deterrence

- Compliance
- Deterrence
- Enforcement

- $500 maximum baiting fine
- 4,800 deer hunters per Officer

Beliefs and perceptions of risk may not match reality.
Perceived Gains from Using Bait

Compliance

Illegal Gains

- Nearly half of hunters seek to distract deer
- Over half intend to influence deer movements
- Nearly 20% wish to concentrate deer over extended period

The value of these perceived gains are unknown.
Moral and Social Norms

Compliance

• Over 20% of hunters feel baiting is unethical
• Use and approval increased over time
• A majority approved of other hunters use of bait
What About Legitimacy?

Compliance

Deterrence

Illegal Gains

Normative Influence

Enforcement

Moral

Social

Legitimacy

Sunshine and Tyler 2003, Sutinen and Kuperan 1999
Determinants of Compliance

- Compliance
  - Deterrence
  - Illegal Gains
  - Normative Influence
    - Moral
    - Social

These factors are difficult and/or expensive to influence.

Sunshine and Tyler 2003, Sutinen and Kuperan 1999
Concepts of Legitimacy

- Normative influence: duty to comply established through legitimate exercise of authority
- Procedural justice: legitimacy is built based on fair processes
  - Formal policies and procedures
  - Treatment by authorities
“Though they are charged with the responsibility of controlling crime, [the police] only partially control the factors that lead people to become criminals, and the resources... may not exist for... effective strategies of crime control...”

Sunshine and Tyler 2003:524
“...They do, however, have some degree of control over how they exercise their authority when dealing with members of the public.”

This does not apply only to law enforcement – agency staff and administrators also exercise authority dealing with the public.

Sunshine and Tyler 2003:524
Components of Procedural Justice

- Participation: opportunity to have input regarding the resolution of conflicts or problems
- Neutrality: perception of honesty, impartiality, and objectivity of authorities
- Trustworthiness: linked to judgments about particular authorities; their explanation of alternatives considered and justification for decisions
- Treatment with dignity and respect: dignity as individuals and members of society
Compliance, Cooperation, and Legitimacy

Compliance
- Deterrence
  - Enforcement
- Illegal Gains

Cooperation
- Normative Influence
  - Moral
  - Social
  - Legitimacy

Sunshine and Tyler 2003, Sutinen and Kuperan 1999
Deer Harvest Estimates

5-County Bovine TB Area Deer Harvest Estimates
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Deer Population Estimates

5-County Bovine TB Area Deer Population Estimates
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Research Approach

• Evaluate influence of key parameters on compliance and cooperation
  – Perceptions of risk of being caught and punished
  – Value of perceived gains from non-compliance
  – Components of procedural justice: participation, neutrality, trustworthiness, treatment with dignity and respect

• Evaluate separately for key groups in TB area

• Face-to-face questionnaire and interviews this summer and fall
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