



HAL
open science

Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Bernarda Bele, Tomaž Skrbinšek, Chiara Ambrogini, Rachel Berzins, Christian Chioso, Nadia Faure, Irene Gambini, Felix Knauer, Žan Kuralt, Aleksandra Majić, et al.

► To cite this version:

Bernarda Bele, Tomaž Skrbinšek, Chiara Ambrogini, Rachel Berzins, Christian Chioso, et al.. Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps. LIFE WolfAlps EU. 2022. hal-04381948

HAL Id: hal-04381948

<https://ofb.hal.science/hal-04381948v1>

Submitted on 9 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Public Domain



Progetto LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972 - LIFE WolfAlps EU
“Coordinated Actions to Improve Wolf-Human Coexistence
at the Alpine Population Level”
Action D1

Technical Report
**PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD WOLVES AND WOLF CONSERVATION IN
AUSTRIAN, FRENCH, ITALIAN AND SLOVENIAN ALPS**

**Assessment of attitudes and perceptions about wolves among general
public and key stakeholder groups**

May 2022



Indication for citation: Bele, B., Skrbinšek, T., Ambrogini, C., Berzins, R., Chioso, C., Faure, N., Gambini, I., Knauer, F., Kuralt, Ž., Majić Skrbinšek, A., Mavec, M., Minola, L., Potočnik, H., Rossi, E., Ruco, V., Simon, R. N., Trombin, J., Vettorazzo, E., Walter, T., (2022), Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps, Technical report, Project LIFE 18 NAT/IT/000972 WOLFALPS EU.

Authors: Bernarda Bele, Tomaž Skrbinšek, Chiara Ambrogini, Rachel Berzins, Christian Chioso, Nadia Faure, Irene Gambini, Felix Knauer, Žan Kuralt, Aleksandra Majić Skrbinšek, Meta Mavec, Lucia Minola, Hubert Potočnik, Elisabetta Rossi, Valentina Ruco, Ricardo N. Simon, Jessica Trombin, Enrico Vettorazzo, Theresa Walter.

Acknowledgments: We thank all our respondents who without offering their opinions about wolves we would have no data.

Responsible for implementation of the action: Bernarda Bele, Biology Department, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Contributors:

CORE AREA 1

Contributors: Valentina Ruco (APAM - Aree Protette Alpi Marittime), Elisa Avanzinelli (Centro Grandi Carnivori), Francesca Marucco (UNITO - Università degli studi di Torino).

In cooperation with : guardiaparco e personale del Parco Naturale del Marguareis e del Parco Naturale Alpi Marittime; Presidenti e tecnici dei comprensori alpini CACN2, CACN3, CACN4, CACN5, Presidenti delle associazioni ambientaliste locali “Pro Natura Cuneo”, “Legambiente Cuneo” e “LIPU Cuneo”; ATL CUNEESE (Azienda Turistica Locale); Dirigenti scolastici e insegnanti di scienze degli istituti dell’area di studio; Redazioni testate giornalistiche locali; allevatori locali; Evelina Paravani (tirocinante UNISS, Università di Sassari) e Miryam Roella (UNITO, Università di torino); due volontarie dell’associazione “AMICO PARCO”.

CORE AREA 2

Contributors: Nadia Faure (APAC - Aree protette Alpi Cozie)

In cooperation with: Lorenzo Vinassa (UniTO student) - Beatrice Chaulet (student) - Comprensori Alpini CA TO1 - CA TO2 - CA TO3 e Aziende faunistiche (Albergian, Val Clarea e Vallancrò) del territorio Alpi Cozie – Dirigenti e insegnanti degli istituti scolastici del territorio delle Alpi Cozie e i Consorzi turistici (Turismo Torino e Provincia, Consorzio Bardonecchia, Sauze d’Oulx, Pinerolese, Cooperativa Culturalpe), Media e Ass. Ambientaliste (WWF ITALIA; WILDERNESS ITALIA; ProNatura; LIPU (Torino); Legambiente).

CORE AREA 3

Contributors: Lucia Minola

In cooperation with: Radames Bionda (Ente di gestione delle Aree Protette dell’Ossola); Cristina Movalli (Parco Nazionale Val Grande); presidenti e tecnici dei Comprensori Alpini VCO1, VCO2 e VCO3; Caf Coldiretti; dirigenti scolastici e professori degli Istituti scolastici della provincia del Verbano - Cusio - Ossola; delegazioni territoriali delle associazioni ambientaliste locali, WWF, Legambiente, Italia Nostra e FAI; ufficio GEA Piemonte e le sue guide; uffici IAT del Distretto Turistico dei laghi.

CORE AREA 4

Contributors: Elisabetta Rossi

CORE AREA 6

Contributors: Enrico Vettorazzo, Laura Arboit

In cooperation with: Giornalisti della stampa locale, Consorzio Dolomiti Prealpi, Valbelluna Green Net, Organizzazioni professionali agricole, Dirigenti scolastici dei Comuni del Parco, Presidenti delle Riserve Alpine di Caccia dei Comuni del Parco, Presidenti delle Associazioni venatorie, LIPU Lega Italiana Protezione Uccelli, Biblioteca comunale Pedavena, Biblioteca comunale Sospirolo.

CORE AREA 7

Contributors: Bernarda Bele, Meta Mavec, Aleksandra Majić Skrbinšek and Tomaž Skrbinšek (Biology Department, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana)

In cooperation with: Hunters Association of Slovenia (HAS), SURS

CORE AREA 8

Contributors: Irene Gambini, Luca Alpestre, Roberto Sobrero.

In cooperation with: Nucleo di Vigilanza Faunistico-Ambientale regionale, Parco regionale dell'Antola, Parco regionale delle Alpi Liguri, Parco regionale di Portofino, Parco regionale Montemarcello-Magra-Vara, Parco regionale del Beigua, Parco regionale dell'Aveto, Centri di Educazione Ambientale (CEA) del Parco dell'Aveto e del Parco di Montemarcello-Magra-Vara, Centri Esperienze (CE) del Parco dell'Antola e del Parco del Beigua, GAL VerdeMare Liguria, WWF Genova Città Metropolitana, Ambiti Territoriali di Caccia ATC GE1, ATC GE2, ATC IM, ATC SV1, ATC SV2, ATC SV3, ATC SP, Comprensori alpini CA IM, CA SV4, Docenti scolastici dei Comuni del territorio ligure, Aziende agricole e operatori turistici del territorio ligure, Guide Ambientali Escursionistiche (GAE) del territorio ligure.

CORE AREA 9

Contributors: Jessica Trombin, Giacomo Ferraro e Lorenzo Vay

In cooperation with: ambiti territoriali di caccia ATC AL3, ATC AL4, Consorzio Robiola Roccaverano, Consorzio Carne All'Erba, Consorzio Montebore, ARAP (Associazione Regionale Allevatori Piemonte); Dirigenti scolastici e docenti di materia scientifica degli Istituti comprensivi scolastici primaria e secondaria dei comuni del territorio in provincia di Alessandria; operatori turistici del territorio piemontese Legambiente Ovada, Legambiente Val Lemme, CAI Ovada, Acqui Terme, Tortona, Novi, Progetto Ambiente; redazioni e giornalisti delle testate locali della provincia di AL e dintorni.

CORE AREA 10

Contributors: Chiara Ambrogini, Paola Violino, Paola Bertotto

In cooperation with: Associazioni venatorie con sedi sul territorio, ATCTo1 e ATCTo5 che insistono nella core area, Associazione per la salvaguardia e gestione della fauna selvatica, Dirigenti Scolastici delle scuole primarie e secondarie di 1 grado presenti nella core area, guide turistiche operanti nella core area, ristoratori e albergatori presenti nella core area, tutte le testate giornalistiche locali e le redazioni locali delle testate giornalistiche nazionali, allevatori ovi caprini presenti nella core area, Sindaci dei Comuni della core area, Associazioni di protezione ambientale con sedi operative sul territorio.

CORE AREA 11

Contributors: Christian Chioso

In cooperation with: CELVA (Consorzio Enti Locali Valle d'Aosta), Comuni di Courmayeur, Pré-Saint-Didier, Morgex, La Thuile, Arvier, Gressan, Charvensod, Pollein, Saint-Christophe, Sarre, Vèrres, Challand-Saint-Victor, Challand-Saint-Anselme, Brusson, Ayas

CORE AREA 12

Contributors: Bernarda Bele, Meta Mavec, Aleksandra Majić Skrbinšek and Tomaž Skrbinšek (Biology Department, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana)

In cooperation with: Hunters Association of Slovenia (HAS), SURS

CORE AREA 13

Contributors: Rachel Berzins

In cooperation with: PNM colleagues: Clara Descamps, Léo Idczak, Eleonore Mourier, Manon Poncet, Erik Debarge, Thierry Gautruche, Elena Maselli, Marie Canut, Claire Crassous, Marie-France Leccia, Jean-Paul Mandine, Romain Lacoste, Stéphane Combeaud, Camille Cruz, Benoît Labigand, Florent Chapelut, Sophie Roux, Boris Opolka, Isabelle Lhommedet, Hervé Brosius, Mathieu Krammer.

CORE AREA 14

Contributors: Ricardo N. Simon, Hélène Fournet and Valentin Mege (OFB)

CORE AREA 15

Contributors: Theresa Walter, Felix Knauer (University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna)

In cooperation with: Leben am Limit, HBLFA Raumberg-Gumpenstein, Jagd Österreich, LIFEStockProtect, Nationalpark Gesäuse, Naturland NÖ, Naturschutzbund, Österreichische Landesjagdverbände, Österreichischer Bundesverband für Schafe und Ziegen, Rinderzucht Austria, Umweltdachverband, Verein Hirtenkultur, Vetmeduni Vienna

CORE AREA 16

Contributors: Theresa Walter, Felix Knauer (University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna)

In cooperation with: Leben am Limit, HBLFA Raumberg-Gumpenstein, Jagd Österreich, LIFEStockProtect, Nationalpark Gesäuse, Naturland NÖ, Naturschutzbund, Österreichische Landesjagdverbände, Österreichischer Bundesverband für Schafe und Ziegen, Rinderzucht Austria, Umweltdachverband, Verein Hirtenkultur, Vetmeduni Vienna

CORE AREA 17

Contributors: Theresa Walter, Felix Knauer (University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna)

In cooperation with: Leben am Limit, HBLFA Raumberg-Gumpenstein, Jagd Österreich, LIFEStockProtect, Nationalpark Gesäuse, Naturland NÖ, Naturschutzbund, Österreichische Landesjagdverbände, Österreichischer Bundesverband für Schafe und Ziegen, Rinderzucht Austria, Umweltdachverband, Verein Hirtenkultur, Vetmeduni Vienna

Contents

List of figures	9
Summary	12
Introduction	14
Methods	14
Study area	14
Questionnaires	16
Sampling and data collection	17
Data preparation	22
Analytical methods	23
Results	23
Data set description	23
Project visibility	24
Knowledge about wolves	24
Results by stakeholder groups and by country	26
Attitudes toward wolf	26
Fear of wolf	30
Acceptance of the wolf in the local environment	33
Wolf population management – size of the population and hunts	35
Damages	40
Hunting and beliefs regarding wolf impacts on game species	45
Value of the wolf for ecotourism	49
Education and sharing information about wolves	52
Trust in sources of information about wolves	55
Results by core area	56
Attitudes toward the wolf	56
Acceptance of the wolf in the local environment	58
Wolf population management – size of the population and hunts	59
Damages and damage prevention	62
Hunting and beliefs regarding wolf impacts on game species	63
Value of the wolf for ecotourism	64
Education and sharing information about wolves	66
Trust in sources of information about wolves	67

Discussion and conclusion	77
Annex 1: Questionnaires in English, French, German, Italian and Slovenian languages	80
Annex 2: Graphs on Trust in sources of information about wolves	131

List of figures

Figure 1: Study area of the public attitude survey	16
Figure 2: Reminder / Thank you! card was sent to potential respondents in order to increase the response rate.	20
Figure 3: Gender distribution in France/Austria/Slovenia/Italy.....	24
Figure 4: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in France	26
Figure 5: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	27
Figure 6: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	27
Figure 7: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria	28
Figure 8: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in France	29
Figure 9: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy.....	29
Figure 10: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia.....	30
Figure 11: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria	30
Figure 12: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	31
Figure 13: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	32
Figure 14: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	32
Figure 15: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	33
Figure 16: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in France...34	
Figure 17: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	34
Figure 18: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	35
Figure 19: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria...35	
Figure 20: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	36
Figure 21: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	37
Figure 22: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	37
Figure 23: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	38
Figure 24: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	39
Figure 25: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	39
Figure 26: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	40
Figure 27: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	40
Figure 28: Wolf cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	41
Figure 29: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	42
Figure 30: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	42
Figure 31: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	43
Figure 32: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in France	43

Figure 33: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy.....	44
Figure 34: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia.....	44
Figure 35: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria	45
Figure 36: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	46
Figure 37: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	46
Figure 38: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	47
Figure 39: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	47
Figure 40: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	48
Figure 41: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy	48
Figure 42: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia	49
Figure 43: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria.....	49
Figure 44: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in France	50
Figure 45: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy.....	51
Figure 46: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia.....	51
Figure 47: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria	52
Figure 48: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in France.....	53
Figure 49: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy.....	53
Figure 50: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia.....	54
Figure 51: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria	54
Figure 52: Feelings toward wolf – opinions of core areas	56
Figure 53: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of core areas	57
Figure 54: Unnecessary to have wolves because abundant populations already exist in other European countries – opinion of core areas	58
Figure 55: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of core areas.....	59
Figure 56: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of core areas.....	60
Figure 57: Already have enough wolves in my region – opinion of core areas.....	61
Figure 58: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of core areas.....	62
Figure 59: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of core areas	63

Figure 60: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of core areas64

Figure 61: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of core areas65

Figure 62: Wolf presence negatively impacts biodiversity of alpine meadows – opinion of core areas66

Figure 63: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of core areas67

Figure 64: How much do you trust Media – opinion of core areas68

Figure 65: How much do you trust Biologists – opinion of core areas69

Figure 66: How much do you trust Hunters – opinion of core areas.....70

Figure 67: How much do you trust Foresters – opinion of core areas71

Figure 68: How much do you trust Veterinarians – opinion of core areas72

Figure 69: How much do you trust Farmers (farmers mean livestock breeders) – opinion of core areas73

Figure 70: How much do you trust Environmental NGOs – opinion of core areas.....74

Figure 71: How much do you trust National nature conservation authority – opinion of core areas75

Figure 72: How much do you trust National agriculture authority – opinion of core areas76

Figure 73: How much do you trust Politicians – opinion of core areas77

Summary

The existence of large carnivores depends on successful coexistence with humans. Large carnivore conservation is also influenced by how they are perceived by particular stakeholder groups. To collect the opinions of stakeholders we have carried out an attitude survey. In this study of public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation, we've surveyed 7610 respondents from sixteen previously identified core areas for wolf conservation across Austria, France, Italy and Slovenia. Groups that were surveyed were residents of core areas (general public), hunters, farmers (we use the word farmers for presenting livestock breeders in this report), education professionals, tourism workers, members of environmental NGOs and journalists.

In the Italian, French and Slovenian core areas the majority of respondents described themselves as being in favour of wolves and also supporting their conservation. In Austrian core areas, large majorities of respondents described themselves as being against wolf and not supporting its conservation. However, contrary to most of the other core areas, Austrian core areas and one Italian core area were sampled only via online questionnaires while other areas used a mix of different sampling methods. The sampling methods could have caused a bias in the data. Moreover, in Austrian core areas the majority of answers come from farmers and hunters.

In France, Italy and Austria respondents from farmer and hunter stakeholder groups in majority described their feelings as being against the wolf. In Slovenia, only farmer respondents were in majority against the wolf, while hunters were in majority in favour of the canid. The general public, an important indicator of a society's "climate" towards wolf conservation, is in France, Italy and Slovenia overall cautiously supportive of the wolf and its conservation.

Human tolerance of the wolf is the most important factor that has a significant impact on maintaining wolf presence in our environments. Among stakeholder groups, hunter and farmer respondents in Italy and France and farmer respondents in Slovenia seem less tolerant to wolves living in nearby forests. In Austria only environmentalist respondents in majority answered that they would tolerate wolves living in nearby forests.

Public perceptions about the species' abundance play an important role in shaping public support or opposition to different management measures. It seems that farmer and hunter respondents in all the countries disagree with seeing wolf numbers increase in their regions, while respondents from most of the other stakeholder groups in France, Italy and Slovenia seem to mostly accept increasing wolf numbers. In Austria only the environmentalist respondents seem to mostly accept increasing wolf numbers, while respondents from all other stakeholder groups do not accept the increase.

Tolerance to the presence of large carnivores depends largely on the number of conflicts they have with humans. Among the stakeholder groups, farmers and hunters were the groups that most strongly agreed with the statement that wolves cause abundant damages to livestock.

Large carnivores are apex predators and might have an important role in the ecosystem. Through predation they affect numbers, distribution and behaviour of large herbivores and can limit mesocarnivores through intraguild competition/predation. However, conflict with hunters can arise due to competition for game (roe or red deer, chamois, wild boar...). The majority of hunters in our survey didn't acknowledge the possible wolf's role in keeping wild ungulate populations healthy. In addition, the majority of hunters in all countries also thought that wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible, which under certain conditions, rare but real, could actually happen.

Presence of large carnivores in the local environment can bring opportunities for the local community, mostly in the form of ecotourism. In France stakeholder groups mostly agreed that wolves attract tourists, while in Italy and Slovenia respondents were not so sure about that. In Austria the majority of stakeholder respondents disagreed with the statement that wolves attract tourists.

Education and information sharing can play an important role in the acceptance of large carnivores. All stakeholder groups in all countries agreed that there is a lack of education and sharing information about wolves. The same is also true for the core areas data, with respondents mostly agreeing that there is a lack of education and sharing information about the species.

Overall, the Austrian data seem to differ significantly from data from the other countries. Beside different attitudes in Austria, also a suspected bias in the data of the Austrian dataset of the general public, tourism workers, teachers and journalists might explain it, at least partly. It will need a deeper analysis to better understand these data.

In conclusion, the results of our study suggest that although in France, Italy and Slovenia residents of the core areas were overall supportive to wolf conservation, they need to be continuously reached through well planned information campaigns. Hunters as one of the key stakeholder groups are mostly opposed to complete wolf conservation. We should recognize their opposition to complete conservation of the wolf and acknowledge their interest to sustainably manage growing populations of wolves including removals, however with the remark that current national and EU legislation offers very limited possibilities for setting this in the near future. Farmers, the group that is the main focus of practically all wolf conservation projects in Europe, were mostly opposed to wolves across all the countries.

Introduction

Public awareness campaigns are often used as tools to improve human attitudes toward wildlife and wildlife management decisions. One of the main expected results of many large carnivore conservation projects, including LIFE WOLFALPS EU, is improved local public's, farmers' and hunters' acceptance of the large carnivore(s) in question in their regions. Especially in areas that are being recolonized by large carnivores, there is often a debate about how these large carnivores and their impacts should be managed. This debate occurs because different stakeholder groups hold different values and subsequently have different or even opposing management goals. Because of that, it is important that decision-makers and all those involved in large carnivore conservation understand those values and how values influence attitudes and consequently also support or oppose conservation goals. This study, besides its capacity to increase understanding of how different stakeholder groups in different areas of the Alps see wolves, also presents a baseline assessment which will allow for evaluation of the effectiveness of a public awareness campaign which is being implemented during the project. Baseline attitude and knowledge gap surveys will also allow for better adaptation and targeting of the public awareness campaign.

Methods

Study area

Study area for the public attitude survey includes sixteen core areas defined in the LIFE WOLFALPS EU project (Figure 1: [Study area of the public attitude survey](#)). Status of the wolf population in these core areas ranges from sporadically present (lone wolves / dispersing animals), recolonizing (recently established reproductive packs) to present for a couple of decades.

Core Area	Status of the wolf population
Maritime Alps	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Cottian Alps	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Ossola Valgrande	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there less than 10 years ago.
Italian Central Alps	Wolves have been only sporadically present since 2001 (solitary individuals).
Dolomites	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there less than 10 years ago.
Eastern Alps	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there

	less than 10 years ago.
Liguria	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Piedmont Apennine	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Torino	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there less than 10 years ago.
Aosta	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there less than 10 years ago.
Dinarics	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Mercantour	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Northern French Alps	Wolf packs have been permanently present for more than 10 years.
Tyrol	Wolves have been sporadically present for more than 5 years (solitary individuals).
Styria	Wolves have been sporadically present for more than 5 years (solitary individuals).
Upper/Lower Austria	Wolf packs are permanently present and have settled there less than 10 years ago.

Wolf Human Dimension - Core Areas 2021




Figure 1: Study area of the public attitude survey

Questionnaires

In surveys, answers are of interest not intrinsically but because they are in relationship to something they are supposed to measure. In that sense designing a question for a questionnaire is designing a measure, not a conversational inquiry. For the purpose of this study, a basic questionnaire in five languages (English, French, German, Italian and Slovenian) was designed (see Annex 1 – Questionnaires). Additional questions were added for some countries (i.e. Italy). Consistency within the different questionnaires was preserved as much as possible in order to allow comparisons between groups. In general, the following topics were included in the questionnaire:

- Attitudes toward wolves.
- Beliefs about wolves and a knowledge section made up of factual questions.
- Attitudes toward various management issues, such as livestock issues, hunting, trust on different sources of information and others.
- Personal experience with wolves.
- Familiarity with the LIFE WOLFALPS EU project.
- Socio-demographic information about each respondent.

The development of the questionnaires was based on online consultations with 68 experts and stakeholders.

In designing the questionnaire we've also partially used the questionnaires previously used in Italy and Slovenia. There are two main reasons for that:

- The questions used in the previous surveys were already tested and therefore we could largely omit additional pretesting of our questionnaire.
- Similar questionnaires would allow direct comparisons of the results from before the start of the LIFE WOLFALPS EU project with our data, thus we have also directed our research towards more longitudinal monitoring of the attitudes and beliefs.

Sampling and data collection

Due to the Covid pandemic different approaches to sampling were taken in different core areas. It was very difficult to perform face to face interviews, so personnel from several core areas published an online survey and consequently many questionnaires were filled in online. The target groups and their respective planned sample sizes per project area were: general public (100), hunters (50), farmers (we use the word farmers for presenting livestock breeders in this report) (50), tourism workers (50), education professionals (50), members of environmental NGOs (50) and journalists (50). These groups were identified as important in wolf conservation. Members of environmental NGOs and journalists were not planned in the project application, but were added later.

Due to Covid restrictions, the general public was sampled differently in different core areas. In some core areas, the sample of inhabitants was not random and therefore the results for the general public in those core areas are probably biased (Dolomites, Liguria, Piedmont Apennine and Austria). In Dolomites only the people coming as visitors to the park were sampled as members of the general public. In Liguria the link for the general public was shared on social pages of regional parks. In Piedmont Apennine the link was shared in their newsletter.

In Austria the general public was not purposely targeted, but was gathered through an online questionnaire, which was posted on the social media channels of the Veterinary University Vienna, sent to the Austrian centre bear wolf lynx and to several private individuals. All these sampling methods cause non-random samples. This needs to be considered when reading this report and interpreting the results presented in this report.

Core Area	General public sampling method
01 Maritime Alps	General public was randomly sampled with personal interviews done in the street or by randomly choosing the houses of potential respondents and asking them to answer

	<p>the survey. The number of respondents was fixed proportionally to the number of residents.</p>
02 Cottian Alps	<p>General public was intercepted opportunistically on the street in each place of the Core Area, fixing the number of respondents on the basis of number of residents.</p>
03 Ossola Valgrande	<p>Telephone method, face-to-face method and online questionnaire was used. The telephone method was conducted by choosing random numbers from the telephone list of cities. For the face-to-face method they visited alternating houses, of different streets, trying to distribute the collection evenly. To some people that were visited at their homes but didn't have time to answer the questionnaire face to face, the link to the online questionnaire was given.</p>
04 Italian Central Alps	<p>General public was sampled by random sampling from landline telephone numbers holding the relevant area codes = CATI.</p>
06 Dolomites	<p>General public questionnaires were collected with face-to-face interviews at the starting points of Park paths.</p>
07 Eastern Alps	<p>A sample of potential general public respondents was obtained from the register of inhabitants – a random stratified sample of adult (18 years and older) inhabitants. We've considered a minimal expected response rate using mail to be 20%, thus the number of questionnaires sent was adjusted accordingly. The questionnaires were mailed together with an additional envelope with prepaid postage for returning the filled questionnaire. Ten days after the mailing of the questionnaires, a reminder / thank you card was sent in order to increase the response rate.</p>
08 Liguria	<p>General public was sampled online, the link to the questionnaire was shared on FB pages of Regional Parks.</p>
09 Piedmont Apennine	<p>General public was sampled through an online questionnaire by email newsletter. Before the lockdown, homes were randomly visited, but afterwards the link to the questionnaire was sent to people by mail.</p>

10 Torino	General public was sampled through an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was disseminated by the municipalities of the core area and published on their websites or on the Facebook pages of the Administrations.
11 Aosta	General public was sampled through an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was disseminated by the municipalities of the core area through their social channels.
12 Dinarics	A sample of potential general public respondents was obtained from the register of inhabitants – a random stratified sample of adult (18 years and older) inhabitants. We've considered a minimal expected response rate using mail to be 20%, thus the number of sent questionnaires was adjusted accordingly. The questionnaires were mailed together with an additional envelope with prepaid postage for returning the filled questionnaire. Ten days after the mailing of the questionnaires, a reminder / thank you card was sent in order to increase the response rate.
13 Mercantour	General public was interviewed opportunistically in the street.
14 Northern French Alps	General public was targeted via flyers in their letterboxes. Flyers with the link to the online questionnaire were randomly distributed to mailboxes within the core area.
15 Tyrol	The general public was sampled through an online questionnaire. They advertised the online questionnaire on the social media channels of the Veterinary University Vienna, sent the link to the Austrian centre bear wolf lynx and to several private individuals .
16 Styria	The general public was sampled through an online questionnaire. They advertised the online questionnaire on the social media channels of the Veterinary University Vienna, sent the link to the Austrian centre bear wolf lynx and to several private individuals .
17 Lower Austria	The general public was sampled through an online questionnaire. They advertised the online questionnaire on the social media channels of the Veterinary University Vienna, sent the link to the Austrian centre bear wolf lynx and to several private individuals .

Data gathered from the general public comes from towns with less than 16.000 inhabitants, except for Dolomites and Torino core areas. In the Dolomites core area we have also included the town of Feltre, because there are small villages with farms surrounded by forest and hills where wolf predations have happened. In Torino core area there is actually a wolf pack living in the rural area of the towns, so that is why we have also included questionnaires coming from towns with more than 20.000 inhabitants.



Figure 2: Reminder / Thank you! card was sent to potential respondents in order to increase the response rate.

Other groups (hunters, farmers (we use the word farmers for presenting livestock breeders in this report), tourism workers, education professionals, journalists, environmentalists) were sampled in a more opportunistic manner. A combination of personal interviews, telephone interviews, postal mail and web-based surveys were used.

In the Maritime Alps, staff conducted personal interviews with farmers and sent the link to the online questionnaire in email to alpine districts, tourism associations, schools, NGO associations and editorial offices.

In the Cottian Alps they conducted personal interviews with farmers and sent a link to the online questionnaire to hunter associations, tourism associations, schools and environmental associations.

In Ossola Val Grande, staff conducted personal interviews, phone interviews and sent a link to the online questionnaire to reach farmers, hunters, environmentalists and tourism workers.

In the Italian Central Alps, farmer and hunter associations were initially contacted by telephone or through email and/or social media networking and interviews were made by telephone, whereas more technical professions such as education professionals and journalists were reached through CATI or through professional's lists.

In the Dolomites, the online questionnaire was shared with farmers, hunters, NGO, education professionals, tourism and journalist associations. Questionnaires were also gathered in paper form at the meetings organised for farmers.

In Liguria, staff sent the online questionnaire to hunter associations, G.A.L. institution (they have direct contacts with farmers), to regional parks of Liguria (they helped them send the online questionnaire to the tourism workers in the area) and to the Center of Environmental Education of Regional Parks (they helped them send the online questionnaire to the education professionals). In Liguria staff also conducted some phone interviews with hunters and while their staff visited farmers for predation damages, they also conducted some personal interviews with farmers.

In Torino an online meeting was organised to contact the hunters and gather the questionnaires, flyers were printed and distributed at hunter associations to promote the online questionnaire, which was also put online on the websites of hunter associations. A link to the online questionnaire was sent via email to farmers, mailing list of tourism operators, mailing list of schools and NGO associations. Since the response rate of farmers was very low, they were later also contacted via phone and phone interviews were conducted with them.

In Aosta, the online questionnaire was sent to farmer and hunter associations.

In both Slovenian core areas (Dinarics and the Eastern Alps) schools in the project area were sent an email, asking them to forward the link to the survey to their biology teachers. A reminder email was sent in three weeks. The Hunting association of Slovenia was notified about the survey and asked to remind hunting clubs to pass the surveys they received to their members. Surveys were sent together with thank you cards and return envelopes to the address of hunting clubs in the project area. Later a reminder email was sent with the request to remind the hunters about the survey. Farmers were contacted with the help of the dedicated ministry. We received the addresses of all registered livestock owners and randomly chose the specific number of people (250 from each project area). They received a survey questionnaire through the mail and a thank you card a week later. A link to the online questionnaire was sent to tourism associations, NGOs and media companies.

In the Northern French Alps, most hunters and farmers were contacted by telephone and telephone interviews were conducted with them. Some additional farmers and hunters were contacted through email with a link to the online questionnaire or through flyers containing a link to the online questionnaire. Other stakeholders such as media, tourism and education professionals, and NGOs, were contacted by email with a link to the online questionnaire.

In the Mercantour, hunters and farmers were called by phone and personal interviews were conducted with them. A link to the online questionnaire was sent by email to touristic operators, journalists, NGO associations and education professionals (the mailing list of PNM partners and other people outside the PNM network was used) and some personal interviews were also made with these stakeholders.

In Austria all the data was collected via an online questionnaire. The link to the questionnaire was initially shared with organisations belonging to stakeholder groups, but was later also spread on social media, etc. Farmer and breeder associations promoted this questionnaire as a way to "voice their opinion". In this way, people with strong attitudes might be overrepresented in the data and consequently cause a bias in the data of other stakeholder groups in Austria, since the same questionnaire was used to collect all the data. This needs to be considered when interpreting the results below.

Data preparation

The questionnaire data was recorded in the pre-agreed table format in each core area, and merged into a single database when the field surveys were completed.

Since some questionnaires had been shared online, we also received data from outside core areas. Those records were removed before the analysis.

In some core areas there were double or multiple entries of the same record; those multiplied records were removed from the dataset.

If a respondent in a record answered that he/she did not hear about the project but at the following question: "Where did you hear about the project?" gave an answer, then his/her answer to this last latter question was changed to "NA".

If a respondent answered that he/she is a member of an environmental NGO, but then at the following question wrote a name of an organisation that is not an actual environmental NGO (for example hunter or farmer associations), then his/her answer was changed to not a member of an NGO.

At the question about pets, if a respondent answered with sheep, goats, cows or horses (species of livestock), then this species of animals were recorded also at the question about livestock.

We checked the data for consistency, data-entry errors and missing data. The records with unacceptable amounts of missing data (more than 30 missing data points) were removed and stored in a different database, labelled as problematic cases and were not included in further analysis.

In Slovenia and Italy, respondents were assigned to the groups in which they were actually sampled. For example, a person sampled as hunter (and having also answered that he/she

is a hunter), was assigned to the hunter stakeholder group. Similarly, the general public consists of people who were sampled as members of the general public living in one of the defined core areas.

But in France and Austria, because of the way respondents were sampled, we have assigned them into stakeholder groups based on their answers to the questionnaire itself according to the following rules: if the respondent answered that he/she has livestock (sheep, goats, cows or horses), then he/she was assigned to the farmers stakeholder group, if the respondent answered that he/she does not have livestock but answered that he/she is a hunter, then the person was assigned to the hunter stakeholder group, if the person answered that he/she does not have livestock nor that he/she is a hunter but that he/she works in tourism, then the respondent was assigned to tourism workers stakeholder group, this method of assigning stakeholders continued and the stakeholder groups that followed were education professionals, journalists, environmentalists and finally general public. So the general public in France and Austria consists of everybody who by their answers does not belong to any other of the stakeholder groups. This method differs from Slovenia and Italy, where the general public consists also of representatives of other stakeholder groups, who were sampled as general public.

Analytical methods

Here, we only used descriptive statistics to present the collected data. In a future step, we will try to implement inferential statistics to better understand the dataset, and also the reasons for different attitudes between stakeholder groups and/or countries.

Results

Data set description

Altogether, we received 7.656 questionnaires. Some of these were completed online, by telephone interviews, by personal interviews or sent by post, and the data in them were sometimes missing, so they had to be removed. We have also removed questionnaires completed by persons under the age of 13. The final dataset for analysis included responses of 7610 respondents from different stakeholder groups and different core areas.

Overall, 62% of our respondents were males. Nevertheless, there were some variations at the country level. In Austria, for example, 72% of respondents were males. In Slovenia, France and Italy 63%, 59% and 54% of the respondents were males.




Figure 3: Gender distribution in France/Austria/Slovenia/Italy

On average respondents to our questionnaire were close to 48 years old. The oldest respondents were from Slovenia (median = 52), followed by France and Italy (median = 50) and the youngest respondents were from Austria (median = 44).

Project visibility

Overall 39% of our respondents reported hearing about our project (during the third year of project implementation). The highest share was recorded in Slovenia, 54%. In Italy, Austria and France 45%, 29% and 23% of respondents heard of the project, respectively. We further asked those that heard about the project to tell us where they heard about the project. The most frequent responses were that they had heard about the project through the media, through personal communication and through social media.

Knowledge about wolves

Questions on wolf biology and behaviour were used to assess respondents' general familiarity with wolves as a species. The one question where we documented considerable misconception was the one related to wolf introduction by people, as in Italy and Austria people mostly did not answer correctly and in France only half of the people answered correctly. Results for the knowledge items are presented in detail in Table 2. Overall, the highest level of knowledge was documented among French respondents, followed by Slovenian and Italian respondents. Somewhat lower levels of knowledge were documented among Austrian respondents.

Question	Possible answers
1. How much does an adult wolf weigh?	a) 15-30 kg. b) 31-45 kg. c) 46-60 kg. d) More than 60 kg. e) Not sure.
2. Wolves feed mainly on:	a) wild ungulates such as deer and chamois. b) carrion. c) domestic animals. d) Not sure.
3. Wolves generally live:	a) solitary. b) in pairs. c) in groups. d) Not sure.
4. Wolves have been introduced by people in IT/SL/AUT/FR.	a) Yes. b) No. c) Not sure.
5. The wolves are naturally coming back to areas where they were once extirpated.	a) Yes. b) No. c) Not sure.
6. Do you believe wolf numbers in IT/SL/AUT/FR is:	a) Increasing. b) Decreasing. c) Remaining the same. d) Not sure.

Table 1: Knowledge questions (the correct answers are highlighted with green colour)

	1. Question	2. Question	3. Question	4. Question	5. Question	6. Question	Average
Italy	72%	80%	88%	38%	55%	71%	68%
Slovenia	56%	86%	92%	63%	59%	66%	70%
Austria	40%	65%	90%	34%	50%	91%	62%
France	75%	84%	92%	50%	66%	72%	73%

Table 2: Percentage of correct answers within each country

Results by stakeholder groups and by country

Attitudes toward wolf

The first question asked respondents to describe their feelings toward the wolf, using a 5-point Likert-scale (completely in favour-completely against). If we look at the results based on country and the respondents' belonging to a stakeholder group, we see that in France and Italy (Figure 4 and Figure 5) the only groups not in favour of the wolf were farmers (we use the word farmers for presenting livestock breeders in this report) and hunters, while other stakeholders seem to be in favour of the canid. In Slovenia only farmers were mostly not in favour of the wolf (50% of them), while the majority of surveyed hunters was in favour of the wolf (Figure 6).

Data for Austria differ clearly from the other countries (Figure 7). In Austria, all stakeholder groups seem to be against the wolf, except for the environmentalists and education professionals respondents.




Figure 4: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 5: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 6: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 7: Feelings toward wolf – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

We asked respondents to tell us to what extent they agree with the statement “It is important to maintain wolves in IT/SL/AUT/FR for future generations.”. Each respondent was answering about his own country. From the graphs (Figure 8, Figure 9, Figure 10), we can see that respondents from most of the stakeholder groups overwhelmingly agreed that it is important to maintain wolves. In France, farmers and hunters are the groups in which large percentages of respondents disagreed with the statement that it is important to maintain wolves in their country. In Italy a large percentage of farmer respondents disagreed with the statement, while the share of hunter respondents who agreed and disagreed are very similar to each other. In Slovenia, on the other hand, a vast majority of hunter respondents stated that it is important to maintain wolves (78%), and even the majority of surveyed farmers also agreed that it is important to maintain wolves.

Data for Austria shows very different results (Figure 11), where only environmentalist respondents agreed with the statement that it is important to maintain wolves.




Figure 8: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 9: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 10: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 11: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Fear of wolf

Wolves normally avoid people and are not considered dangerous to them, which respondents from most of the stakeholder groups seem to be aware of, especially in France (Figure 12) and in Slovenia (Figure 14). From the Italian graph (Figure 13) we can see that 40% of farmer and 49% of hunter respondents declared that they would be afraid to hike in

the woods where wolves are present. We can notice that also 48% of the farmer respondents in Slovenia declared that they would be afraid to hike in the woods where wolves are present. Data for Austria shows very different results (Figure 15), where respondents from almost all the stakeholder groups, except for the environmentalists, journalists and education professionals, are in majority afraid to hike in the woods where wolves are present.




Figure 12: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 13: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 14: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 15: Not be afraid to hike – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Acceptance of the wolf in the local environment

Human tolerance of the wolf is the main factor that can have a significant impact on maintaining wolf presence in our forests. Strong negative attitudes can lead to poaching, which can threaten the survival of small populations.

We can see that the majority of French, Italian and Slovenian stakeholder groups agreed that they would tolerate wolves living in nearby forests of their municipality (Figure 16, Figure 17, Figure 18). Hunter and farmer respondents in Italy and France, however, seem less tolerant to wolves living in nearby forests. Among stakeholder groups respondents in Slovenia, farmers are the least tolerant group, while among the surveyed hunters, a larger share of respondents said that they would tolerate wolves.

Data for Austria again shows very different results (Figure 19), where respondents from none of the stakeholder groups (except for environmentalists) would tolerate wolves living nearby.




Figure 16: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 17: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 18: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 19: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Wolf population management – size of the population and hunts

Public perceptions about the species' abundance play an important role in shaping public support or opposition to different management measures.

We wanted to know whether respondents would agree with increasing wolf numbers in their region. Vast majorities of farmer and hunter respondents in all the countries disagreed with

increasing wolf numbers in their region. In Italy other stakeholders surveyed seem to mostly agree with increasing wolf numbers (Figure 21). In France, environmentalists, education professionals, tourism workers and general public were the ones that also mostly answered that they agree with increasing wolf abundance, but we can also notice that large shares of stakeholders chose the “Neutral/Don’t know” answer (Figure 20). In Slovenia, in addition to farmers and hunters respondents, the general public also mostly disagreed with increasing wolf numbers, while majorities of other stakeholder groups agreed with an increase in wolf abundance (Figure 22).

Data for Austria shows very different results (Figure 23), where respondents from none of the stakeholder groups (except for environmentalists) would agree with increasing wolf numbers.




Figure 20: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 21: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 22: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 23: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Good knowledge of the public's opinion is crucial for successful management of wolf populations. Wolf is a strictly protected species in most European countries. At the same time, in some countries culling is carried out. In Slovenia, the ministry responsible, based on population data, sightings and the number of wolves culled in the previous period, as well as based on damage to livestock and other data, can approve the exceptional cull of a predetermined number of animals. In France, an annual ceiling of 19% of the estimated average size of the wolf population at the end of winter can be culled each year under strict derogatory conditions to protect livestock from depredation.

With the question “Wolf hunts are needed in IT/SL/AUT/FR”, we wanted to get the public’s opinion on culling as a method to manage wolf populations. In France and Italy the majority of respondents from most of the stakeholder groups did not agree with the notion that wolf hunts are needed (Figure 24 and Figure 25), nevertheless hunter and farmer respondents in both countries have a different opinion and in majority agreed that wolf hunts are needed. In Slovenia respondents belonging to education professionals, environmentalists and tourism workers mostly disagreed with wolf hunts, while hunters, farmers, journalists and the general public mostly agreed that wolf hunts are needed (Figure 26).

Data for Austria shows very different results (Figure 27), where respondents from all the stakeholder groups (except for environmentalists) agreed that wolf hunts are needed.




Figure 24: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 25: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 26: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 27: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Damages

Tolerance to the presence of large carnivores depends largely on the number of conflicts they have with humans. In addition to the financial aspect, the emotions of those harmed can also play an important role. In a document prepared within the LIFE WolfAlps project

(Prevention of damages caused by large carnivores in the Alps) we can find the numbers of attacks in each of the surveyed countries for 2019: in Austria there were 22 attacks on sheep and cattle and 84 animals affected, in France there were 3.469 attacks on sheep and cattle and 11.569 animals affected, in Italy there were 333 attacks on sheep, goats and cattle and 1.552 animals affected, in Slovenia there were 328 attacks on sheep and cattle and 1.304 animals affected.

We have asked the respondents to decide to what extent they agree/disagree with the statement “Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock”. In France the respondents from all the stakeholder groups in large shares agreed with the statement (Figure 28). As we can see from the numbers listed above, France is indeed a country with a much higher number of attacks than any of the 3 countries participating in the project. In Italy hunters, farmers, the general public and tourism workers mostly agreed with the statement, while environmentalists disagreed (Figure 29). We can also notice that large shares of stakeholders in Italy chose the “Neutral/Don’t know” answer. In Slovenia most of the respondents from farmers, hunters, the general public and tourism worker groups agreed that wolves cause abundant damages to livestock, while environmentalists, journalists and education professionals mostly disagreed (Figure 30).

The Austrian graph shows different results (Figure 31), where respondents from all of the stakeholder groups agree that wolves cause abundant damages to livestock, even though in reality they had by far the lowest number of attacks (in 2019) of the 3 countries participating in this study.




Figure 28: Wolf cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 29: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 30: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 31: Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

We have asked the respondents to decide to what extent they agree/disagree with the statement “Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf depredation should be compensated”. And we can very clearly see that vast majorities of all stakeholder groups in all countries strongly support the compensation for livestock loss due to wolf depredation.




Figure 32: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 33: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 34: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 35: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Hunting and beliefs regarding wolf impacts on game species

Large carnivores are apex predators and might have an important role in the ecosystem. Through predation they affect numbers, distribution and behaviour of large herbivores and can limit mesocarnivores through intraguild competition/predation. However, conflict with hunters can arise due to competition for game (deer, chamois, wild boar...). We have assessed the extent of this issue by asking the respondents to answer two questions – one about the wolf’s role in keeping wild ungulate populations healthy and the other one regarding the impact of wolf predation on hunting.

In France and Italy most of the farmer and hunter respondents disagreed with the statement “Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals and thus keep wild ungulate populations healthy.”, while other stakeholder groups agreed with the statement, except the undecided journalists (Figure 36 and Figure 37). In Slovenia majorities of all stakeholder groups, except hunters, agreed with the statement. Hunters in Slovenia were divided among agree and disagree options (Figure 38).

Similar to the previous Austrian graphs, this one (Figure 39) also shows very different results compared to other countries. Namely, respondents from all of the stakeholder groups in Austria in majorities (except for the environmentalists and journalists) disagree that wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals.




Figure 36: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 37: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 38: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 39: Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

In Slovenia hunter and farmer respondents mostly agreed that wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible, while other stakeholder groups disagreed (Figure 42). In France and Italy only hunter respondents agreed with that

statement (Figure 40 and Figure 41).

In Austria the respondents from all of the stakeholder groups, except for environmentalists, education professionals and journalists, in majorities agreed with that statement (Figure 43).




Figure 40: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 41: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 42: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 43: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Value of the wolf for ecotourism

Presence of large carnivores in the local environment does not always mean financial loss and conflict, but can also be an asset for the local community. Changing social values have increased tolerance towards large carnivores, which has led to an improvement in the status of populations and an increase in their abundance. The wolf is often associated with pristine

nature, and its presence can represent an additional value for the area. Presence of large carnivores in the local environment can bring opportunities for the local community, mostly in the form of ecotourism.

We asked respondents to answer to what extent they agree/disagree with the statement “Wolves attract tourists.” Results show that among the general public, farmers and hunters in Italy and Slovenia, the wolf is less recognised as an opportunity to develop ecotourism (Figure 45 and Figure 46). Most of the large carnivore tourism offer in Slovenia is currently developed based on brown bear watching activities. In France all stakeholder groups mostly agree that wolf presence offers benefits to tourism (Figure 44). This might be explained by the fact that in the Mercantour is a national park and a tourism destination and so respondents from there are probably already conscious that fauna/flora are attractive to tourism.

In Austria the respondents from all of the stakeholder groups disagree with the statement that wolves attract tourists (Figure 47).




Figure 44: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 45: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 46: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 47: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Education and sharing information about wolves

Education and sharing information can play an important role in the acceptance of large carnivores. There is a known link between knowledge and fear, so with target education campaigns and information dissemination, the level of knowledge increases and the proportion of fear among the local inhabitants decreases.

From the results we can see that respondents from all stakeholder groups in all countries in majority agree that there is a lack of education and sharing of information about wolves (Figure 48, Figure 49, Figure 50 and Figure 51).




Figure 48: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in France




Figure 49: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Italy




Figure 50: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Slovenia




Figure 51: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of stakeholder groups in Austria

Trust in sources of information about wolves

We asked respondents how much they trust specific sources of information about wolves. We can say that in general in France and Slovenia the most trusted sources of information are biologists, followed by foresters and veterinarians. In Italy most trusted are foresters, veterinarians and biologists. In Austria the most trusted are veterinarians and foresters. By far the least trusted sources of information in all the countries are politicians. All the graphs for stakeholder's trust in sources of information are enclosed in the Annex 2 at the end of the report.

Results by core area

Attitudes toward the wolf

The first question asked respondents to describe their feelings toward the wolf (Figure 52) using a 5-point scale (completely in favour-completely against). In all Italian, French and Slovenian core areas the majority of respondents to the questionnaire described themselves as being in favour of the wolf. The share of those describing themselves as being neither in favour nor against seems to be higher in the Central Alps and in the Mercantour core areas. Vast majorities of respondents in all three Austrian core areas answered that they are against wolf.




Figure 52: Feelings toward wolf – opinions of core areas

Respondents in all 16 core areas assessed their agreement/disagreement to “It is important to maintain wolves in IT/SL/AUT/FR for future generations.” (Figure 53). Each respondent was answering about his own country. All core areas in France, Italy and Slovenia mostly agreed that it is important to maintain wolves.

Majorities of respondents in all three Austrian core areas answered that they disagree with the importance of maintaining wolves.




Figure 53: Important to maintain wolves – opinion of core areas

Majorities of respondents in all core areas in France, Italy and Slovenia disagreed with “It is unnecessary to have wolves in IT/SL/AUT/FR because abundant populations already exist in other European countries.” (Figure 54).

While in Austrian core areas the respondents mostly agreed that it is unnecessary to have wolves.




Figure 54: Unnecessary to have wolves because abundant populations already exist in other European countries – opinion of core areas

Overall results show that respondents from Italy, France and Slovenia generally have positive attitudes towards wolves and wish to preserve them in their countries.

Acceptance of the wolf in the local environment

We asked respondents to what extent they agreed with the statement “I would tolerate wolves living in nearby forests of our municipality”. Respondents in most core areas mostly agreed that they would tolerate wolves living in nearby forests (Figure 55). We notice that in the Eastern Alps the percentage of those who disagreed with the statement and the percentage of those who agreed with the statement are very close to each other. In Austrian core areas the respondents mostly answered that they wouldn’t tolerate wolves living nearby.




Figure 55: Would tolerate wolves living nearby – opinion of core areas

Wolf population management – size of the population and hunts

Public perceptions about the species' abundance play an important role in shaping public support or opposition to different management measures. We have used a series of statements to assess these perceptions.

Firstly we wanted to know whether the respondents would agree with increasing wolf numbers in their region. As we can see from Figure 56, their opinions were more divided than in the previous graphs. In the Dolomites and Aosta core areas, the shares of those agreeing and those disagreeing with increasing wolf numbers are quite similar. Among the Italian core areas, Ossola Valgrande is the only area in which the majority of respondents disagreed with increasing wolf numbers. This more negative opinion about increasing wolf numbers in Ossola could be a consequence of an ongoing active and organised protest because of the presence of the wolves, which is strongly supported by exponents of the local political world. In addition, the Verbano-Cusio-Ossola area looks with great interest at the example of management in nearby Switzerland, which operates wolf culling (with prior authorisation) with the aim of mitigating the impact on pastoral activities. Finally, wolves have colonised this area less than 10 years ago, so the presence of packs is new to the people living there.

In both Slovenian core areas (Dinarics and Eastern Alps), the majority of respondents said that they would not agree with increasing wolf numbers. In the Northern French Alps, the larger share of the respondents agreed with increasing wolf numbers, while in the Mercantour the larger share of the respondents disagreed with increasing wolf numbers. Respondents from Tyrol, Styria and Lower/Upper Austria largely disagreed with increasing wolf numbers in their region.




Figure 56: Would agree with increasing wolf numbers – opinion of core areas

Secondly, we asked respondents to decide how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statement that they already have enough wolves in their region. As we can see from Figure 57, many respondents chose the “Neutral/Don’t know” answer here, indicating that they maybe don’t know what the optimal numbers of wolves in their regions could be.




Figure 57: Already have enough wolves in my region – opinion of core areas

The wolf is a strictly protected species in most European countries. At the same time, in some countries wolf culling is carried out. With the question “Wolf hunts are needed in ITA/SL/AUT/FR”, we wanted to get the public’s opinion on culling as a method to manage wolf populations. Prevalent opposition to hunting wolves was documented in most core areas (Figure 57). The Eastern Alps, Dinarics and Piedmont are the three core areas where the majority of the respondents agreed that wolf hunts are needed in their respective countries.

Respondents from Tyrol, Styria and Lower/Upper Austria largely agreed with the need for wolf hunts in their country.




Figure 58: Wolf hunts are needed – opinion of core areas

Damages and damage prevention

Mitigation of conflicts associated with large carnivores due to damage to livestock is crucial for their conservation. Areas where wolves are returning after decades of absence and where people have abandoned husbandry practices, which prevented damage, can present the biggest conservation issue due to large economic losses and intense social conflicts. In Slovenia and France, livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf depredation receive compensation, which is paid by the government. In Italy and Austria, a unified national compensation system is absent, so compensation differs between regions/states as explained in a document prepared within the LIFE WolfAlps project (Prevention of damages caused by large carnivores in the Alps).

When asked to what extent they agreed with the statement “Livestock owners that lose

livestock due to wolf depredation should be compensated.”, respondents in all core areas largely supported compensation for livestock lost due to wolves (Figure 59).




Figure 59: Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated – opinion of core areas

Hunting and beliefs regarding wolf impacts on game species

The fact that wolves prey primarily on wild ungulates (such as deer and chamois) is often mentioned as a cause for the wolf being disliked by hunters. We have assessed the extent of this issue by asking respondents to answer a question regarding the impact of wolf predation on hunting (Figure 60).

Respondents in the Dinarics and in all Italian and French core areas mostly disagreed with the statement “Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible”. However, in the Eastern Alps the percentages of those who agreed and those who disagreed

with the statement were quite similar.

Respondents from Tyrol, Styria and Lower/Upper Austria mostly agreed with the statement that wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible.




Figure 60: Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible – opinion of core areas

Value of the wolf for ecotourism

Wolves usually prefer to avoid human presence and opportunities to see them are rare. This makes direct observations more difficult and therefore maybe less interesting for wildlife watching tourism.

When we look at the results of French, Italian and Slovenian core areas (Figure 61), we see that opinions about the statement “Wolves attract tourists” are quite divided. The Neutral/Don't know option represents quite a large percentage of respondents in those core areas. The French core areas of Mercantour and Northern French Alps are the areas where majorities seem to see the wolf as attractive for tourism. In Italy the core areas of Maritime Alps and Torino are the areas where they seem to recognise the value of the wolf for tourism. Respondents from Tyrol, Styria and Lower/Upper Austria mostly disagreed with the

statement that wolves attract tourists.




Figure 61: Wolves attract tourists – opinion of core areas

In French, Italian and Slovenian core areas, majorities disagreed with the statement “Wolf presence negatively impacts biodiversity of alpine meadows” (Figure 61). Respondents from Tyrol, Styria and Lower/Upper Austria mostly agreed with that statement.




Figure 62: Wolf presence negatively impacts biodiversity of alpine meadows – opinion of core areas

Education and sharing information about wolves

Education and sharing information can play an important role in the acceptance of large carnivores. Therefore, we also included a question about this topic. From the results we see that respondents from all core areas overwhelmingly agreed that there is a lack of education and sharing of information about wolves (Figure 63).




Figure 63: There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves – opinion of core areas

Trust in sources of information about wolves

We asked respondents how much they trust specific sources of information about wolves. As seen in the graphs below, the most trusted sources of information are foresters, veterinarians and biologists. The least trusted sources of information are by far politicians, followed by the media.




Figure 64: How much do you trust Media – opinion of core areas




Figure 65: How much do you trust Biologists – opinion of core areas




Figure 66: How much do you trust Hunters – opinion of core areas




Figure 67: How much do you trust Foresters – opinion of core areas




Figure 68: How much do you trust Veterinarians – opinion of core areas




Figure 69: How much do you trust Farmers (farmers mean livestock breeders) – opinion of core areas




Figure 70: How much do you trust Environmental NGOs – opinion of core areas




Figure 71: How much do you trust National nature conservation authority – opinion of core areas




Figure 72: How much do you trust National agriculture authority – opinion of core areas




Figure 73: How much do you trust Politicians – opinion of core areas

Discussion and conclusion

Before reading the discussion we advise you to read the Methods, since there are some differences on how the data has been collected.

Our results show influence of the county of residence and stakeholder group in attitudes towards wolves.

In general, farmer (that means livestock breeder) respondents were the most negative stakeholder group in their attitudes towards wolf and wolf conservation. They most likely have negative attitudes because they can often be strongly affected by the presence of wolves through depredation of livestock, which brings financial and emotional consequences for them. This can also be seen from the farmer's answers to the statement "Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock.", where large majorities of farmers in all 4 countries agreed with that statement.

Hunter respondents were also quite negative in their attitudes, except for Slovenia, where the majority of them was positive. Majorities of hunter respondents answered that they agree with the statement “Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible”, so we could argue that their negative attitudes towards the wolf come from their fear of the impact the wolves might have on ungulate populations. In Slovenia, hunter respondents in majority also seem to be afraid of wolf impact on ungulate populations, however they also seem to acknowledge the ecosystem role that wolves might have by preying on old and sick animals and thus keeping wild ungulate populations healthy. We could thus argue that their awareness (knowledge) of the possible importance of wolves in the ecosystem leads them to be more positive in their attitudes towards wolves.

As expected, environmentalists had the most positive attitudes towards the wolf and were also the most supportive to wolf conservation.

In Austria however, we can see that the majority of stakeholders was not supportive of the wolf and wolf conservation, but that can be due to the sampling method used in Austria (you can read more about data sampling in the Methods section of this report).

Among the core areas, respondents from 3 core areas in Austria seem very negative, with Tyrol being the most negative of them all. This could be partially explained by the sampling method used in Austria. Farmer and breeder associations also promoted this questionnaire as a way to “voice their opinion”. In this way, people with strong attitudes might be overrepresented in the data. Moreover, in Austria the general public was not purposely targeted, but gathered via the same online questionnaire, which was posted on the social media channels of the Veterinary University Vienna, sent to the Austrian centre bear wolf lynx and to several private individuals.

In France, respondents in the Northern French Alps have more positive attitudes toward wolf and wolf conservation than respondents in the Mercantour area.

In Slovenia there is a similar situation to other countries, yet with respondents having more positive attitudes towards wolf and wolf conservation in the Dinarics core area than in the Eastern Alps core area. However, in this case wolf packs have been present in the Dinarics area for many decades, while in the Eastern Alps they have started forming reproductive packs just in the last few years. Moreover, strong opposition towards wolf presence exists among sheep and goat breeders in the Eastern Alps, which could also affect other stakeholders in that area to some degree.

Overall, the Austrian data seem to differ significantly from data from the other countries. Beside different attitudes in Austria, also a suspected bias in the data of the Austrian dataset of the general public, tourism workers, teachers and journalists might explain it, at least partly. It will need a deeper analysis to better understand these data.

The results of our study suggest that although overall supportive of wolf conservation, residents of core areas in the Alps need to be continuously reached through well planned information campaigns. Hunters as one of the key stakeholder groups are mostly opposed to

complete wolf conservation. We should recognize their opposition to complete conservation of the wolf and acknowledge their interest to sustainably manage growing populations of wolves including removals, however with the remark that current national and EU legislation offers very limited possibilities for setting this in the near future. Farmers, the group that is the main focus of practically all wolf conservation projects in Europe, were mostly opposed to wolf conservation across all the countries. Further efforts are therefore needed to better understand wolf depredation of livestock, to better protect herds and to better address the concerns of livestock breeders in the Alps.

Annex 1: Questionnaires in English, French, German, Italian and Slovenian languages

Coordinated actions to improve wolf-human coexistence at the alpine population level



Project is co-financed by the European Union - Programme LIFE.



ATTITUDES TOWARD WOLF IN THE ALPS

In September 2019 a LIFE+ project entitled »Coordinated actions to improve wolf-human coexistence at the alpine population level« coordinated by Parco Naturale delle Alpi Marittime in participation with other project partners in Italy, Austria, France and Slovenia. The goal of the project is to improve wolf-human coexistence at the Alpine population level by implementing coordinating actions over the entire Alpine ecosystem. **For its long-term conservation, coexistence of wolves and humans is crucial.** That is why we would like to learn more about wolf area residents' attitudes toward wolf. Knowing and understanding public opinions about different management options is necessary for its successful implementation. Furthermore, governments are obliged to respect public opinion about the topics that concerns it.

We kindly ask you to take ten minutes of your time to answer following questions. Regardless of your attitudes toward the wolf, your opinion is valuable, so we encourage you to answer all the questions. Please, send back the filled out questionnaire in the envelope enclosed. The results of the survey will be published on <https://www.lifewolfalps.eu/> in 2021.

Please answer your questions openly and do not write your name. **The questionnaire is anonymous and your answers strictly confidential.**

For further information, please contact (*phone number and e-mail*). We thank you in advance for your participation in the survey!

Action coordinator,
Aleksandra Majić Skrbinšek

Interviewer,
Name of the interviewer

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'A. Majić'.



PART A: We will start with general statements about your attitude toward the wolf. Please choose the response that best describes your opinion from 1 to 5.

1. Which of the following best describes your feelings toward wolf?

- a) Completely against.
- b) Moderately against.
- c) Neither in favour nor against.
- d) Moderately in favour.
- e) Completely in favour.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
2. It is important to maintain wolves in IT/SL/AUS/FR for future generations.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is unnecessary to have wolves in I/S/A/F because abundant populations already exist in other European countries.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Wolves greatly reduce ungulate populations and make hunting impossible.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Wolves mainly prey on old and sick animals and thus keep wild ungulate populations healthy.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I would tolerate wolves living in nearby forests of our municipality.	1	2	3	4	5



	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
7. I would not be afraid to hike in the woods where wolves are present.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Wolves do not attack people.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Wolves attract tourists.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Wolf presence negatively impacts biodiversity of alpine meadows.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Wolf presence positively impacts biodiversity.	1	2	3	4	5

PART B: Next few questions are about general knowledge about wolf as a species. Please choose the response that you find the most appropriate or that the best describes your opinion.

1. How much does an adult wolf weigh?

- a) 15-30 kg.
- b) 31-45 kg.
- c) 46-60 kg.
- d) More than 60 kg.
- e) Not sure.



2. Wolves feed mainly on:

- a) wild ungulates such as deer and chamois.
- b) carrion.
- c) domestic animals.
- d) Not sure.

3. Wolves generally live:

- a) solitary.
- b) in pairs.
- c) in groups.
- d) Not sure.

4. Wolves have been introduced by people in IT/SL/AUS/FR.

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) Not sure.

5. The wolves are naturally coming back to areas where they were once extirpated.

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) Not sure.

6. Do you believe wolf numbers in IT/SL/AUS/FR is:

- a) Increasing.
- b) Decreasing.
- c) Remaining the same.
- d) Not sure.



PART C: Next statements are about wolf management. Please choose the response that you find the most appropriate or that the best describes your opinion.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	I don't know enough
1. Wolves cause abundant damages to livestock.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Livestock owners that lose livestock due to wolf should be compensated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. If a wolf killed livestock, I would agree with killing this problem animal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Livestock guarding dogs are an effective measure for preventing wolf attacks on livestock.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Electric fences used at pastures are an effective measure for preventing wolf attacks on livestock.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I would agree with increasing wolf numbers in my region.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. We already have enough wolves in my region.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Wolf hunts are needed in IT/SL/AUS/FR.	1	2	3	4	5	6



9. There is a lack of education and information sharing about wolves.	1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

PART D: Please, share your opinion about information sources.

1. How much you trust following sources of information about wolves?

	Do not trust at all	Do not trust	I cannot decide	Trust	Completely trust
Media	1	2	3	4	5
Biologists	1	2	3	4	5
Hunters	1	2	3	4	5
Foresters	1	2	3	4	5
Veterinaries	1	2	3	4	5
Livestock breeders	1	2	3	4	5
Environmental NGOs	1	2	3	4	5
Ministry responsible for nature preservation	1	2	3	4	5
Ministry responsible for agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Politicians	1	2	3	4	5

2. Have you ever heard of the project "Coordinated actions to improve wolf-human coexistence at the alpine population level" (short name WOLFALPS EU)?

a) Yes.

b) No.



3. If your answer is »Yes«, how did you hear about the project (multiple answers possible)?

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| a) Media. | e) Attended an event organized by the project. |
| b) Social media. | f) Participated in the project activities. |
| c) Project webpage. | g) I don't remember. |
| d) Personal communication. | h) Other: _____ |

PART E: We are interested also in your experience with wolves.

1. Have you ever seen live wolf in the wild?

- | | |
|---------|--------|
| a) Yes. | b) No. |
|---------|--------|

2. Have you ever seen a wolf in captivity?

- | | |
|---------|--------|
| a) Yes. | b) No. |
|---------|--------|

3. Have you ever had a damage caused by a wolf?

- | | |
|---------|--------|
| a) Yes. | b) No. |
|---------|--------|

PART F: To finish, we would like to know some information about you solely for the purpose of statistical analysis.

I. Gender: a) Female. b) Male.

II. Age: _____ years.



X. If you are a livestock owner, what type of livestock do you have? (multiple answers)

- | | |
|-----------|----------------------------|
| a) Sheep. | d) Horses. |
| b) Goats. | e) Other: _____ |
| c) Cows. | f. I don't have livestock. |

XI. If you are a livestock owner, do you use any specific protection measures to prevent large carnivore attacks? (multiple answers)

- a) Yes, I use electric fence/nets.
- b) Yes, I use livestock guarding dogs.
- c) Yes, shepherd is guarding my livestock
- d) Yes, other (please describe): _____
- e) No.

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Your opinion will importantly contribute to a better wolf management!

Actions coordonnées pour améliorer la coexistence entre les activités humaines et le loup à l'échelle de l'arc alpin



LIFE WOLFALPS EU



Projet cofinancé par l'Union Européenne - Programme LIFE



PARTIE A : Nous commencerons avec les aspects généraux concernant votre attitude envers le loup. Merci de choisir les réponses qui décrivent le mieux votre opinion sur une échelle de 1 à 5.

1. Parmi les propositions suivantes, laquelle décrit le mieux vos sentiments à l'égard de la présence du loup en France ?

- a) complètement contre
 b) modérément contre
 c) ni pour ni contre
 d) modérément en faveur
 e) complètement en faveur

	Pas du tout d'accord	Pas d'accord	Neutre	D'accord	Entièrement d'accord
2. Il est important de maintenir la présence du loup en France pour les générations futures.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Il n'est pas nécessaire d'avoir des loups en France car des populations abondantes existent déjà dans d'autres pays d'Europe.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Les loups réduisent fortement les populations d'ongulés et rendent la chasse impossible.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Les loups se nourrissent principalement d'animaux vieux et malades et maintiennent ainsi les populations d'ongulés sauvages en bonne santé.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Je pourrais tolérer que des loups vivent dans les bois avoisinants ma commune.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Je n'ai pas peur de randonner dans les forêts où les loups sont présents.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Les loups n'attaquent pas les gens.	1	2	3	4	5
9. La thématique du loup attire les touristes.	1	2	3	4	5
10. La présence du loup impacte négativement la biodiversité des prairies alpines.	1	2	3	4	5
11. La présence du loup a un impact positif sur la biodiversité en général.	1	2	3	4	5



PARTIE B : Les questions suivantes concernent vos connaissances générales sur le loup. Merci de choisir la réponse que vous trouvez la plus appropriée ou celle qui décrit le mieux vos connaissances et votre opinion (**une seule réponse possible par question**).

1. Combien pèse un loup gris adulte (loup européen des Alpes) ?

- a) 15-30 kg
- b) 31-45 kg
- c) 46-60 kg
- d) plus de 60 kg
- e) je ne sais pas

2. Les loups se nourrissent principalement :

- a) d'ongulés sauvages comme le cerf ou le chamois
- b) de cadavres
- c) d'animaux domestiques
- d) je ne sais pas

3. Les loups vivent généralement :

- a) en solitaire
- b) en couple
- c) en meute
- d) je ne sais pas

4. Les loups ont été réintroduits en France :

- a) oui
- b) non
- c) je ne sais pas

5. Les loups sont revenus naturellement dans des zones d'où ils avaient été éradiqués autrefois :

- a) oui
- b) non
- c) je ne sais pas

6. De manière générale, pensez-vous que le nombre de loups en France :

- a) augmente
- b) diminue
- c) est stable
- d) je ne sais pas



PARTIE C : Les prochaines questions concernent la gestion du loup. Merci de choisir pour chacune la réponse qui décrit le mieux vos connaissances et votre opinion.

	Pas du tout d'accord	Pas d'accord	Neutre	D'accord	Entièrement d'accord	Je ne dispose pas de suffisamment d'informations
1. Les loups causent d'importants dommages aux animaux d'élevage.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Les propriétaires d'animaux d'élevage qui perdent leurs animaux à cause du loup doivent être indemnisés.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Si un loup tuait un animal d'élevage, je serais d'accord avec le fait de tuer cet animal posant problème.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Les chiens de protection sont une mesure efficace de prévention pour éviter les attaques de loup sur le bétail.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Les clôtures électriques utilisées sur les pâtures sont une mesure efficace de prévention pour éviter les attaques de loup sur le bétail.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Je serais d'accord pour voir augmenter le nombre de loups dans ma région.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Nous avons déjà assez de loups dans ma région.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. La régulation de la population de loups en France par la chasse est nécessaire.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Il y a un manque d'éducation et d'informations partagées sur les loups.	1	2	3	4	5	6



PARTIE D : Merci de partager votre opinion sur ces différentes sources d'information.

1. A quel point faites-vous confiance aux sources d'informations suivantes sur le sujet du loup ?

	Pas confiance du tout	Pas confiance	Neutre	Confiance	Entièrement confiance
Médias	1	2	3	4	5
Biologistes	1	2	3	4	5
Chasseurs	1	2	3	4	5
Forestiers	1	2	3	4	5
Vétérinaires	1	2	3	4	5
Eleveurs	1	2	3	4	5
Associations de protection de la nature	1	2	3	4	5
Ministère de la Transition Ecologique	1	2	3	4	5
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Alimentation	1	2	3	4	5
Elus	1	2	3	4	5

2. Avez-vous déjà entendu parler du projet LIFE WOLFALPS EU « Actions coordonnées pour améliorer la coexistence entre les activités humaines et le loup à l'échelle de l'arc alpin » ?

a) oui

b) non

3. Si votre réponse est « Oui », comment avez-vous entendu parler du projet (*plusieurs réponses possibles*) ?

a) médias

b) réseaux sociaux

c) site internet du projet

d) communication personnelle

e) via un événement organisé par le projet

f) participation à une activité du projet

g) Je ne me souviens pas

h) autres : _____



VIII. Si vous avez des animaux - de compagnie, lesquels avez-vous ? (*plusieurs réponses possibles*)

a) chien

c) autre : _____

b) chat

d) je n'ai pas d'animaux de compagnie

IX. Pratiquez-vous la chasse ?

a) oui

b) non

X. Si vous avez des animaux d'élevage, lesquels avez-vous ? (*plusieurs réponses possibles*)

a) ovins

d) équins

b) caprins

e) autre : _____

c) bovins

f) je n'ai pas d'animaux d'élevage

XI. Si vous avez des animaux d'élevage, utilisez-vous des mesures de protection spécifiques pour éviter les attaques de grands carnivores ? (*plusieurs réponses possibles*)

a) oui, j'utilise des clôtures électriques/filets

b) oui, j'utilise des chiens de protection de troupeaux.

c) oui, un berger garde mes animaux

d) oui, autre (merci de décrire) _____

e) non

XII. En cas d'attaque sur vos troupeaux, faites-vous appel au dispositif d'indemnisation mis en place au niveau national ?

a) oui

b) non

c) je ne suis pas concerné

XIII. Si non, précisez pourquoi : _____

Nous vous remercions beaucoup pour votre coopération !



Autres commentaires sur le sujet ou en ce qui concerne le questionnaire :

Koordinierte Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Koexistenz von Wolf und Mensch auf Populationsebene in den Alpen



Das Projekt wird vom LIFE Programm der Europäischen Union kofinanziert.



EINSTELLUNGEN ZU WÖLFEN IN DEN ALPEN

Im September 2019 wurde ein LIFE+ Projekt mit dem Titel "Koordinierte Maßnahmen zur Verbesserung der Koexistenz von Wolf und Mensch auf Populationsebene in den Alpen" unter der Leitung des Parco Naturale delle Alpi Marittime (Naturpark Seealpen im Piemont, Italien) in Zusammenarbeit mit Projektpartnern in Italien, Österreich, Frankreich und Slowenien gestartet. Ziel des Projekts ist es, die Koexistenz von Wolf und Mensch in den Alpen zu verbessern, indem koordinierte Maßnahmen im gesamten alpinen Raum und angrenzenden Gebieten durchgeführt werden. Deshalb möchten wir mehr über die Einstellung der BewohnerInnen zum Wolf erfahren. Die öffentliche Meinung zu verschiedenen Managementoptionen zu kennen und zu verstehen, ist für deren erfolgreiche Umsetzung notwendig. Darüber hinaus können so öffentliche Meinungen für Regierungen und Entscheidungsträger sichtbar gemacht werden.

Wir bitten Sie, sich 15 Minuten Zeit zu nehmen, um die folgenden Fragen zu beantworten. Unabhängig von Ihrer Einstellung zum Wolf ist Ihre Meinung wertvoll, daher bitten wir Sie, alle Fragen zu beantworten. Sollten Sie eine Frage nicht beantworten wollen, können Sie diese einfach überspringen. Die Ergebnisse der Umfrage werden im Jahr 2021 auf <https://www.lifewolfalps.eu/> veröffentlicht.

Bitte beantworten Sie die Fragen offen und ehrlich. Der Fragebogen ist anonym und Ihre Antworten streng vertraulich. Für weitere Informationen wenden Sie sich bitte an Theresa Walter an der Veterinärmedizinischen Universität Wien (+43125077 7213, theresa.walter@vetmeduni.ac.at).

Wir danken Ihnen im Voraus für Ihre Teilnahme an der Umfrage!



Datenschutzrechtliche Hinweise:

Der Schutz Ihrer persönlichen Daten ist uns bei dieser Befragung ein besonderes Anliegen. Ihre Daten werden daher ausschließlich auf Grundlage der gesetzlichen Bestimmungen (§7 DSG, Art. 89 GDPR und FOG) erhoben und verarbeitet.

Die Daten können von den ProjektmitarbeiterInnen im Projekt LIFE WolfAlps EU eingesehen werden. Die Daten werden nicht an Dritte weitergegeben. Die erhobenen Daten dürfen gemäß Art 89 Abs 1 DSGVO grundsätzlich unbeschränkt gespeichert werden.

In den Umfrageantworten werden keine persönlichen Informationen über Sie gespeichert, es sei denn, in einer Frage wird explizit danach gefragt. Angegebene personenbezogene Daten werden pseudonymisiert und in aggregierter Form verarbeitet, sodass ein Rückschluss auf eine konkrete Person nicht möglich ist. IP-Adressen werden nicht gespeichert.

Als Betroffener der Verarbeitung haben Sie grundsätzlich das Recht auf Auskunft, Berichtigung, Löschung, Einschränkung der Verarbeitung, Datenübertragung und Widerspruch. Der Verantwortliche kann hierfür zusätzliche Informationen zum Zweck der Identifizierung verlangen. Ist eine Identifizierung nachweislich nicht möglich kann der Verantwortliche dem Begehren nicht nachkommen. Durch den Widerruf der Einwilligung wird die Rechtmäßigkeit der aufgrund der Einwilligung bis zum Widerruf erfolgten Verarbeitung der personenbezogenen Daten nicht berührt. Bitte beachten Sie jedoch, dass personenbezogene Daten im Sinne von Forschungsmaterial gemäß § 2b Abs 6 FOG weiterhin verwendet werden können!

Für grundsätzliche juristische Fragen im Zusammenhang mit der DSGVO/DSG und FOG wenden Sie sich an den/die Datenschutzbeauftragte/n der Vetmeduni Vienna (datenschutz@vetmeduni.ac.at). Zudem besteht das Recht der Beschwerde bei der Datenschutzbehörde (dsb@dsb.gv.at).



TEIL A: Wir beginnen mit allgemeinen Aussagen zu Ihrer Einstellung gegenüber dem Wolf. Bitte wählen Sie die Antwort, die Ihre Meinung am besten beschreibt, von 1 bis 5.

1. Was beschreibt am besten Ihre grundsätzliche Einstellung zum Wolf? Ich bin...

- a) Völlig dagegen.
- b) Moderat dagegen.
- c) Nicht dafür und nicht dagegen.
- d) Moderat dafür.
- e) Völlig dafür.

	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral, weiß nicht	Stimme eher zu	Stimme voll und ganz zu
2. Es ist wichtig, Wölfe in Österreich für zukünftige Generationen zu erhalten.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Es ist unnötig, Wölfe in Österreich zu haben, da es in anderen europäischen Ländern bereits große Populationen gibt.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Wölfe reduzieren die wildlebenden Huftierpopulationen stark und machen die Jagd unmöglich.	1	2	3	4	5



	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Stimme nicht zu	Neutral	Stimme zu	Stimme stark zu (ausdrücklich zu)
5. Wölfe erbeuten vor allem alte und kranke Tiere und halten so die Bestände wildlebender Huftiere gesund.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Ich kann damit leben, dass Wölfe in den Wäldern um unsere Ortschaft leben.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Ich würde mich nicht scheuen, in Wäldern zu wandern, in denen es Wölfe gibt.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Wölfe attackieren keine Menschen.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Wölfe sind für den Tourismus attraktiv.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Die Anwesenheit von Wölfen wirkt sich negativ auf die biologische Vielfalt von Almwiesen aus.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Die Anwesenheit von Wölfen wirkt sich positiv auf die biologische Vielfalt aus.	1	2	3	4	5



TEIL B: Bei den nächsten Fragen geht es um allgemeines Wissen über den Wolf als Tierart. Bitte wählen Sie die Antwort, die Sie am passendsten finden oder die Ihre Meinung am besten beschreibt.

1. Wie schwer ist ein erwachsener Wolf?

- a) 15-30 kg.
- b) 31-45 kg.
- c) 46-60 kg.
- d) Mehr als 60 kg.
- e) Nicht sicher.

2. Wölfe fressen hauptsächlich:

- a) wildlebende Huftiere wie Rehe, Rotwild und Wildschweine.
- b) Aas.
- c) Nutztiere.
- d) Nicht sicher.

3. Wölfe leben meistens:

- a) als Einzelgänger.
- b) paarweise.
- c) in Rudeln.
- d) Nicht sicher.

4. Wölfe wurden in Österreich vom Menschen ausgesetzt.

- a) Ja.
- b) Nein.
- c) Nicht sicher.



5. Die Wölfe kommen auf natürliche Weise in Gebiete zurück, in denen sie einst ausgerottet waren.

- a) Ja. c) Nicht sicher.
 b) Nein.

6. Glauben Sie, dass die Anzahl der Wölfe in Österreich:

- a) ansteigt. c) gleich bleibt.
 b) abnimmt. d) Nicht sicher.

TEIL C: Die nächsten Aussagen beziehen sich auf das Wolfsmanagement. Bitte wählen Sie die Antwort, die Sie am passendsten finden oder die Ihre Meinung am besten beschreibt.

	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral, weiß nicht	Stimme eher zu	Stimme voll und ganz zu	Ich weiß es nicht genau
1. Wölfe verursachen häufig Schäden an Nutztierbeständen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. NutztierhalterInnen, die durch den Wolf Nutztiere verlieren, sollten entschädigt werden.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Wenn ein Wolf Nutztiere tötet, wäre ich damit einverstanden, dieses Tier zu töten.	1	2	3	4	5	6



	Stimme überhaupt nicht zu	Stimme eher nicht zu	Neutral, weiß nicht	Stimme eher zu	Stimme voll und ganz zu	Ich weiß es nicht genau
4. Herdenschutzhunde sind eine effektive Maßnahme, um Wolfsangriffe auf Nutztiere zu verhindern.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Elektrozäune auf Weiden sind eine effektive Maßnahme, um Wolfsangriffe auf Nutztiere zu verhindern.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Ich würde einer Zunahme der Wolfsanzahl in meiner Region zustimmen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. In meiner Region leben schon genügend Wölfe.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Die Jagd auf den Wolf ist in Österreich notwendig.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Es gibt einen Mangel an Aufklärung und Informationsaustausch über Wölfe.	1	2	3	4	5	6



TEIL D: Bitte teilen Sie uns Ihre Meinung über unterschiedliche Informationsquellen mit.

1. Wie sehr vertrauen Sie den folgenden Informationsquellen beim Thema Wölfe?

	Vertraue ich überhaupt nicht	Vertraue ich nicht	Kann mich nicht entscheiden	Vertraue ich	Vertraue ich vollkommen
Medien	1	2	3	4	5
BiologInnen	1	2	3	4	5
JägerInnen	1	2	3	4	5
FörsterInnen	1	2	3	4	5
VeterinärmedizinerInnen	1	2	3	4	5
Umweltorganisationen	1	2	3	4	5
Umweltministerium	1	2	3	4	5
Landwirtschaftsministerium	1	2	3	4	5
LandwirtInnen	1	2	3	4	5
PolitikerInnen	1	2	3	4	5

2. Haben Sie schon einmal von dem Projekt "Koordinierte Aktionen zur Verbesserung der Koexistenz von Wolf und Mensch auf Populationsebene in den Alpen" (Kurzname WOLFALPS EU) gehört?

a) Ja.

b) Nein.



3. Wenn Ihre Antwort "Ja" lautet, wie haben Sie von dem Projekt erfahren (Mehrfachnennungen möglich)?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| a) Medien. | e) An einer vom Projekt organisierten Veranstaltung teilgenommen. |
| b) Soziale Medien. | f) An Projektaktivitäten teilgenommen. |
| c) Homepage des Projektes. | g) Ich erinnere mich nicht mehr. |
| d) Persönliche Kommunikation. | h) Andere: _____ |

TEIL E: Wir sind auch an Ihren Erfahrungen mit Wölfen interessiert.

1. Haben Sie jemals einen lebenden Wolf in freier Wildbahn gesehen?

- | | |
|--------|----------|
| a) Ja. | b) Nein. |
|--------|----------|

2. Haben Sie jemals einen Wolf in Gefangenschaft gesehen?

- | | |
|--------|----------|
| a) Ja. | b) Nein. |
|--------|----------|

3. Hatten Sie jemals einen Schaden, der durch einen Wolf verursacht wurde?

- | | |
|--------|----------|
| a) Ja. | b) Nein. |
|--------|----------|



TEIL F: Abschließend möchten wir ausschließlich zum Zweck der statistischen Auswertung einige Informationen über Sie wissen.

- I. Geschlecht:** a) Weiblich. b) Männlich.
- II. Alter:** _____ Jahre.
- III. Politischer Bezirk:** _____
- IV. Höchste abgeschlossene Ausbildung:**
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| a) keinen Schulabschluss. | c) Matura. |
| b) Hauptschulabschluss, Lehrabschluss | d) Universitäts- oder Fachhochschulabschluss. |
- V. Sind Sie Mitglied einer Umweltorganisation?**
- a) Ja.
- b) Nein.
- VI. Wenn ja, bei welcher/n Organisation/en:** _____
- VII. In welchem Bereich arbeiten Sie?**
- | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| a) Tourismus. | e) Forstwirtschaft. |
| b) Bildung. | f) Naturwissenschaftliche Forschung. |
| c) LandwirtIn im Haupterwerb. | g) Medien (Journalismus) |
| d) Wildtiermanagement. | h) Andere: _____ |



VIII. Wenn Sie ein Haustier/Haustiere haben, welche Tiere halten Sie?

- a) Hund. c) Andere: _____
b) Katze. d) Ich habe kein Haustier.

IX. Sind Sie JägerIn?

- a) Ja. b) Nein.

X. Wenn Sie Nutztiere haben, welche Tiere halten Sie?

- a) Schafe. d) Pferde.
b) Ziegen. e) Andere: _____
c) Kühe. f) Ich habe keine Nutztiere.

XI. Wenn Sie Nutztiere haben, wenden Sie spezielle Schutzmaßnahmen an, um Angriffe von großen Beutegreifern zu verhindern?

- a) Ja, ich verwende Elektroäune und/oder -netze.
b) Ja, ich verwende Herdenschutzhund.
c) Ja, ein/e Hirte/in ist bei meinen Nutztieren.
d) Ja, andere Maßnahmen (bitte beschreiben Sie diese):

e) Nein.



Wenn Sie weitere Kommentare zum Thema dieses Fragebogens oder zum Wolf im Allgemeinen haben, geben Sie diese bitte hier ein. Andernfalls klicken Sie bitte auf „Letzte Seite“.

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

Ihre Meinung ist ein wichtiger Beitrag für ein konfliktarmes Wolfsmanagement.

Projektkoordination:



Action-Koordination für AT:



LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972

Azioni coordinate per migliorare la coesistenza fra lupo e attività umane a livello di popolazione alpina



OPINIONI E ATTEGGIAMENTI NEI CONFRONTI DEL LUPO SULLE ALPI

Nel settembre 2019 è partito il progetto LIFE+ intitolato "Azioni coordinate per migliorare la coesistenza fra lupo e attività umane a livello di popolazione alpina" coordinato dalle Aree Protette delle Alpi Marittime e con la partecipazione di 19 altri partner di progetto Italiani, Austriaci, Francesi e Sloveni. Il progetto ha l'obiettivo di supportare la coesistenza tra la presenza del lupo e le attività economiche impattate, implementando azioni coordinate su tutto l'ecosistema alpino. La coesistenza tra lupi e attività economiche è un aspetto fondamentale per il successo degli obiettivi di conservazione sul lungo periodo. Ecco perché vorremmo conoscere meglio quali sono le opinioni della popolazione residente nelle aree coinvolte nei confronti del lupo. Per un'efficace gestione della specie è infatti indispensabile conoscere e comprendere le opinioni dell'opinione pubblica in merito. Le Amministrazioni sono infatti tenute a tenere in considerazione le opinioni dell'opinione pubblica rispetto alle questioni che la riguardano.

Le chiediamo cortesemente di dedicare dieci minuti del Suo tempo per rispondere alle seguenti domande. A prescindere dalle opinioni e atteggiamenti personali nei confronti del lupo, il Suo parere è importante. La invitiamo pertanto a completare tutte le domande. I risultati del sondaggio saranno pubblicati su <https://www.lifewolfalps.eu/> a fine 2021.

La preghiamo di rispondere alle domande in modo aperto e sincero, senza scrivere il suo nome. **Il questionario è anonimo e le risposte strettamente confidenziali.**

Per maggiori informazioni si prega di contattare *Valentina Ruco* (email: valentinaruco@gmail.com). La ringraziamo in anticipo per la vostra partecipazione a questo sondaggio!

Coordinatrice dell'azione di progetto,
Aleksandra Majić Skrbinšek

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato
dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE

PARTE A: Inizieremo con alcune affermazioni generali sul suo atteggiamento nei confronti del lupo. Scegli la risposta che meglio descrive la sua opinione su una scala da 1 a 5.

1. Quale delle seguenti affermazioni descrive meglio la sua opinione personale nei confronti del lupo?

a) Non mi piace per niente.

b) Non mi piace.

c) Mi è indifferente.

d) Mi piace.

e) Mi piace molto.

	Per niente d'accordo	In disaccordo	Indifferente/ Non so	D'accordo	Pienamente d'accordo
2. È importante conservare il lupo in Italia per le generazioni future.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Non è necessario conservare i lupi in Italia perché popolazioni abbondanti esistono già in altri Paesi europei.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I lupi riducono notevolmente le popolazioni di ungulati selvatici rendendo impossibile la caccia.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I lupi predano principalmente animali vecchi e malati mantenendo sane le popolazioni di ungulati selvatici.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Sono disposto/a a tollerare la presenza del lupo sul territorio del mio Comune.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Non ho paura di camminare nei boschi dove sono presenti i lupi.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I lupi non attaccano le persone.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I lupi attraggono i turisti.	1	2	3	4	5
10. La presenza del lupo ha un impatto negativo sulla biodiversità dei pascoli alpini.	1	2	3	4	5
11. La presenza del lupo ha effetti positivi sulla biodiversità.	1	2	3	4	5

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato
dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE

PARTE B: Le prossime domande riguardano la sua conoscenza generale del lupo. Per favore scelga la risposta che le sembra più appropriata o che descrive meglio la sua opinione.

1. Quanto pesa un lupo adulto?

- | | |
|--------------|------------------|
| a) 15-30 kg. | d) Più di 60 kg. |
| b) 31-45 kg. | e) Non so. |
| c) 46-60 kg. | |

2. I lupi si cibano principalmente di:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| a) Ungulati selvatici come caprioli e camosci. | c) Animali domestici. |
| b) Carcasse di animali. | d) Non so. |

3. I lupi generalmente vivono:

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| a) Solitari. | c) In branco. |
| b) In coppia. | d) Non so. |

4. I lupi sono stati reintrodotti in Italia.

- | | | |
|--------|--------|------------|
| a) Sì. | b) No. | c) Non so. |
|--------|--------|------------|

5. I lupi sono tornati naturalmente nelle zone da cui sono stati eliminati in passato.

- | | | |
|--------|--------|------------|
| a) Sì. | b) No. | c) Non so. |
|--------|--------|------------|

6. Pensa che il numero di lupi in Italia stia:

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| a) Aumentando. | c) Rimanendo stabile. |
| b) Diminuendo. | d) Non so. |

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato
dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE

PARTE C: Le seguenti domande e dichiarazioni si riferiscono alla gestione del lupo. Per favore scelga la risposta che meglio riflette la sua opinione o punto di vista.

	Per niente d'accordo	In disaccordo	Indifferente / Non so	D'accordo	Pienamente d'accordo	Non ne so abbastanza
1. I lupi causano ingenti danni al bestiame.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Gli allevatori che subiscono perdite al bestiame causate dal lupo devono ricevere un rimborso.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Sono favorevole all'abbattimento del lupo che uccide il bestiame.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I cani da guardiania sono una misura efficace per prevenire gli attacchi al bestiame.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Le recinzioni elettriche sono una misura efficace per prevenire gli attacchi al bestiame.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Non ho niente in contrario a un aumento di lupi nella mia Regione/Provincia.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Ci sono già abbastanza lupi nella nostra Regione/Provincia.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Si deve autorizzare la caccia al lupo in Italia.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. C'è una mancanza di educazione e condivisione di informazioni sul lupo.	1	2	3	4	5	6

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE

PARTE D: Per favore, ci dia la sua opinione sulle sue fonti d'informazione.

1. Quanta fiducia ha nelle seguenti fonti d'informazione sul lupo?

	Nessuna fiducia	Poca fiducia	Non so	Fiducia	Totale fiducia
Media	1	2	3	4	5
Biologi	1	2	3	4	5
Cacciatori	1	2	3	4	5
Forestali	1	2	3	4	5
Veterinari	1	2	3	4	5
Allevatori	1	2	3	4	5
Associazioni ambientaliste	1	2	3	4	5
Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio	1	2	3	4	5
Ministero delle Politiche Agricole Alimentari e Forestali	1	2	3	4	5
Amministrazioni pubbliche es. Province, Regioni	1	2	3	4	5
Politici	1	2	3	4	5

2. Ha mai sentito parlare del progetto "Azioni coordinate per migliorare la coesistenza fra lupo e attività umana a livello di popolazione alpina" (acronimo LIFE WOLFALPS EU)?

- a) Si. b) No.

3. Se «Sì», da quale fonte ha saputo del progetto (è possibile segnare più opzioni)?

- a) Media. e) Partecipazione a un evento organizzato dal Progetto.
 b) Social media. f) Partecipazione al Progetto.
 c) Pagina web del progetto. g) Non mi ricordo.
 d) Comunicazione personale. h) Altro: _____

PARTE E: Siamo interessati anche alle sue esperienze con i lupi.

1. Ha mai visto un lupo in natura?

- a) Si. b) No.

2. Ha mai visto un lupo in cattività?

- a) Si. b) No.

3. Ha mai avuto un danno causato dal lupo?

- a) Si. b) No.

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE

PARTE F: Per finire, le chiediamo alcune informazioni personali per le analisi statistiche.

I. Sesso: a) Donna. b) Uomo.

II. Et : _____ anni.

III. Comune di residenza _____.

IV. Provincia _____.

V. Titolo di studio:

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| a) Nessuno. | d) Diploma. |
| b) Scuole elementari. | e) Laurea. |
| c) Scuole medie. | |

VI. Lei   socio di qualche associazione ambientalista?

- a) SÌ. b) No.

VII. Se "SÌ", di quale?: _____.

VIII. Qual   la sua professione?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| a) Settore turistico. | f) Ricercatore nell'ambito delle scienze naturali. |
| b) Educazione. | g) Altro: _____. |
| c) Allevatore professionista. | |
| d) Gestione della fauna selvatica. | |
| e) Gestione forestale. | |

IX. Se lei ha animali da compagnia, di che tipo sono?

- | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|
| a) Cane. | c) Altro: _____. |
| b) Gatto. | d) Non ho animali da compagnia. |

X. Lei   un cacciatore / una cacciatrice?

- a) SÌ. b) No.

XI. Se lei   un allevatore / un'allevatrice, che tipo di bestiame alleva?

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| a) Ovini. | d) Equini. |
| b) Caprini. | e) Altro: _____. |
| c) Bovini. | f) Non sono un allevatore / un'allevatrice. |

LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Progetto co-finanziato
dall'Unione Europea - programma LIFE



LIFE18 NAT/IT/000972



Projekt izvajamo s podporo finančnega mehanizma Evropske komisije LIFE.



Spoštovani!

Skupaj s partnerji iz Avstrije, Italije in Francije izvajamo projekt imenovan **“Izvajanje usklajenih aktivnosti za izboljšanje sobivanja z volkovi na območju Alp”** (kratko ime LIFE **WolfAlps EU**). Cilj projekta je lajšanje sobivanja ljudi in volkov na evropski in pan-alpski ravni prek znanjšanja napadov volka na domače živali, vzpostavitve intervencijskih ukrepov na gorskih pašnikih, razvoja in spodbujanja ekoturizma, in priprave strategij za upravljanje z vrsto ter vzpostavitve dobrih praks, ki bodo uskladile aktivnosti ljudi s prisotnostjo volka.

Za dolgoročno ohranitev volka v Alpah je uspešno sobivanje z ljudmi ključnega pomena. Vse to, pa zahteva dobro poznavanje in razumevanje odnosa lokalnih prebivalcev do volka in različnih upravljavskih strategij. Zato ste vi in mnogi drugi odrasli prebivalci Slovenije vabljeni k sodelovanju v raziskavi o odnosu javnosti do volka in upravljanju s populacijo. Prosimo, da čim bolj v celoti odgovorite na vsa vprašanja in nam izpolnjen vprašalnik v priloženi kuverti s plačano poštnino čim prej vrnete.

Vaše sodelovanje pri izpolnjevanju vprašalnika je popolnoma anonimno, vaši odgovori bodo za namene analize združeni z odgovori drugih.

Če imate kakršnakoli vprašanja o raziskavi ali bi radi izvedeli kaj več o projektu, me lahko kontaktirate na: 01/ 320 3336 (med delavniki, 10:00–14:00) ali na meta.mavec@gmail.com. Rezultati raziskave bodo objavljeni na spletni strani projekta: <https://www.lifewolfalps.eu/> po avgustu 2021.

Za vaše sodelovanje se vam že vnaprej najlepše zahvaljujemo!

S spoštovanjem,
Meta Mavec, sodelavka na projektu
Biotehniška fakulteta, Univerza v Ljubljani



DEL A: Vprašalnik bomo začeli s splošnimi vprašanji in izjavami o vašem odnosu do volka. Prosimo, da med ponujenimi odgovori obkrožite tistega, ki najbolje odraža vaše stališče.

1. Kaj od spodaj naštetega najbolje opiše vaše stališče do volka?

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Popolnoma odklonilno. | d) Naklonjeno. |
| b) Odklonino. | e) Popolnoma naklonjeno. |
| c) Ne morem se opredeliti. | |

	Nikakor se ne strinjam	Deloma se ne strinjam	Ne morem se opredeliti	Deloma se strinjam	Popolnoma se strinjam
2. Volka je v Sloveniji pomembno ohraniti za prihodnje generacije.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Volka v Sloveniji ni potrebno ohraniti za prihodnje generacije, ker živi drugod po Evropi.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Volkovi močno zmanjšujejo število parklarjev (srnjadi, jelenjadi, kozorogov in gamsov) ter s tem onemogočajo lov na njih.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Volkovi večinoma plenijo stare in bolne živali in tako ohranjajo zdrave populacije parklarjev.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Prisotnost volka v gozdovih svoje okolice bi sprejel/a brez težav.	1	2	3	4	5



	Nikakor se ne strinjam	Deloma se ne strinjam	Ne morem se opredeliti	Deloma se strinjam	Popolnoma se strinjam
7. Ni ne strah sprehajati se po gozdovih, kjer so prisotni tudi volkovi.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Volkovi ne napadajo ljudi.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Volkovi privlačijo turiste.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Prisotnost volkov negativno vpliva na biodiverzitetu alpskih travnikov.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Prisotnost volkov pozitivno vpliva na biodiverzitetu.	1	2	3	4	5

DEL B: V nadaljevanju je nekaj splošnih vprašanj o volku kot vrsti. Prosimo, da obkrožite odgovor, ki se vam zdi najbolj ustrezen ali najbolje opiše vaše mnenje.

1. Koliko tehta povprečen odrasel volk?

- a) 15-30 kg.
- b) 31-45 kg.
- c) 46-60 kg.
- d) Več kot 60 kg.
- e) Nisem prepričan/a.



2. Kaj predstavlja večino prehrane volkov?

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| a) Prostoživeči parklarji (srnjad, jelenjad, divji prašič, gams). | c) Domače živali. |
| b) Mrhovina. | d) Nisem prepričan/a. |

3. Kako živijo volkovi?

- | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| a) Samotarsko. | c) V tropu. |
| b) V paru. | d) Nisem prepričan/a. |

4. Volkove so v Slovenijo pripeljali ljudje?

- | | |
|--------|-----------------------|
| a) Da. | c) Nisem prepričan/a. |
| b) Ne. | |

5. Volkovi po naravni poti poseljujejo območja, od koder so bili nekoč iztrebljeni.

- | | |
|--------|-----------------------|
| a) Da. | c) Nisem prepričan/a. |
| b) Ne. | |

6. Ali menite, da število volkov v Sloveniji:

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| a) narašča. | c) je stabilno. |
| b) upada. | d) Nisem prepričan/a. |



DEL C: V nadaljevanju je nekaj izjav o upravljanju volka. Prosimo, da obkrožite odgovor, ki se vam zdi najbolj ustrezen ali najbolje opiše vaše mnenje.

	Nikakor se ne strinjam	Deloma se ne strinjam	Ne morem se opredeliti	Deloma se strinjam	Popolnoma se strinjam	O tem ne vem dovolj
1. Volkovi povzročajo nesprejemljivo škodo na domačih živalih.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Pravilno je, da rejec za škodo po volku prejme odškodnino.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Če bi volk ubil domačo žival, bi se strinjal/a z odstrelom te "problematične živali".	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Zaščita pašnih živali s pastirskimi psi učinkovito zmanjšuje število napadov volkov.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Zaščita pašnih živali z elektro mrežami ali elektro ograjami, učinkovito zmanjšuje število napadov volkov.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Strinjal/a bi se s povečanjem števila volkov na območju, kjer živim.	1	2	3	4	5	6



7. Na območju, kjer živim je že sedaj dovolj volkov.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. V Sloveniji je odstrel volkov potreben.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. O volkovih in sobivanju je na voljo premalo informacij.	1	2	3	4	5	6

PART D: Naslednja vprašanja se nanašajo na vire od koder pridobite največ informacij o volku.

1. Koliko po vašem mnenju lahko zaupate naštetim virom informacij o volkovih?

	Nikakor ne zaupam	Ne zaupam	Ne morem se opredeliti	Zaupam	Popolnoma zaupam
Medijem	1	2	3	4	5
Biologom	1	2	3	4	5
Lovcem	1	2	3	4	5
Gozdarjem	1	2	3	4	5
Veterinarjem	1	2	3	4	5
Rejcem drobnice	1	2	3	4	5
Naravovarstvenikom	1	2	3	4	5
Ministrstvu za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano	1	2	3	4	5
Ministrstvu za okolje in prostor	1	2	3	4	5
Politikom	1	2	3	4	5



2. Ali ste že slišali za projekt "Izvajanje usklajenih aktivnosti za izboljšanje sobivanja z volkovi na območju Alp" (kratko ime LIFE WolfAlps EU)?

a) Da.

b) Ne.

3. V kolikor ste odgovorili z "Da", prosim odgovorite na naslednje vprašanje "Kje ste slišali za projekt?" (izberete lahko več odgovorov)

a) V medijih.

e) Na projektnem dogodku.

b) Na socialnih omrežjih.

f) Med sodelovanjem pri projektih aktivnostih.

c) Projektna spletna stran.

g) Ne spomnim se.

d) Za projekt sem slišal/a od znanca.

h) Drugo: _____

DEL E: Zanimajo nas tudi vaše izkušnje z volkovi.

1. Ali ste že videli volka v naravi?

a) Da.

b) Ne.

2. Ali ste že videli volka v ujetništvu (na primer v živalskem vrtu)?

a) Da.

b) Ne.

3. Vam je volk že kdaj povzročil škodo (napad na domače živali, škoda na vaši lastnini)?

a) Da.

b) Ne.



DEL F: Za konec bi za potrebe statistične obdelave podatkov radi izvedeli še nekaj podatkov o vas.

- I. Spol:** a) Ženski. b) Moški.
- II. Starost:** _____ let.
- III. Poštna številka:** _____
- IV. Izobrazba:**
- a) Nedokončana osnovna šola. c) Končana srednja šola.
b) Končana osnovna šola. d) Visokošolska izobrazba.
- V. Ali ste član katere naravovarstvene organizacije?**
- a) Da. b) Ne.
- VI. Če ste na prejšnje vprašanje odgovorili z "Da", prosimo odgovorite na naslednje vprašanje "Član katere naravovarstvene organizacije ste?":**
- _____
- VII. Ali ste zaposleni na katerem od naslednjih področij?**
- a) Turizem. e) Upravljanje z gozdom.
b) Izobraževanje. f) Raziskave na področju naravoslovja.
c) Kmetijstvo (primarni vir dohodka). g) Drugo: _____
d) Upravljanje s prostoživečimi živalskimi vrstami.



VIII. Če ste lastnik domačega ljubljencega, katero vrsto imate?

- a) Psa. c) Drugo: _____
b) Mačko. d) Nimam živali.

IX. Ali ste lovec?

- a) Da. b) Ne.

X. Če imate rejne živali, katero vrsto redite?

- a) Ovce. d) Konje.
b) Koze. e) Drugo: _____
c) Krave. f. Nimamo rejnih živali.

XI. V kolikor redite katero izmed rejnih vrst, prosimo odgovorite na naslednje vprašanje: Ali uporabljate katerega izmed naštetih načinov za zaščito domačih živali pred napadi zveri?

- a) Da uporabljam elektro mreže/ elektro ograje.
b) Da, uporabljam pastirske pse.
c) Da, moje živali varuje pastir.
d) Uporabljam druge metode (prosimo opišite): _____
f) Ne.





Najlepša hvala za sodelovanje!

Vaše mnenje bo pomembno prispevalo k uspešnejšem upravljanju z volkom.



Če imate še kakšne komentarje o tematiki ali pripombe na vprašalnik, jih prosim napišite tu:

Annex 2: Graphs on Trust in sources of information about wolves

The following 11 graphs are presenting the opinion of Italian stakeholders about each of the sources of information (Media, Biologists, etc.)::




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps



Veterinarians



Farmers




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps





Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

National agriculture authority




Public administrations in Provinces, Regions






The following 10 graphs are presenting the opinion of Slovenian stakeholders about each of the sources of information (Media, Biologists, etc.)::




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Biologists




Hunters




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Foresters




Veterinarians




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Farmers




Environmental NGOs





Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

National nature conservation authority




National agriculture authority






The following 10 graphs are presenting the opinion of Austrian stakeholders about each of the sources of information (Media, Biologists, etc.):




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Biologists




Hunters




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps



Foresters



Veterinarians




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps





Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

National nature conservation authority




National agriculture authority






The following 10 graphs are presenting the opinion of French stakeholders about each of the sources of information (Media, Biologists, etc.):




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Biologists




Hunters




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps

Foresters




Veterinarians




Public attitudes toward wolves and wolf conservation in Austrian, French, Italian and Slovenian Alps


Farmers



Environmental NGOs



National nature conservation authority



National agriculture authority

