



# Values Clarification

*Three activities help students identify values related to wildlife.*

## SECTION 5 Finding Solutions

### **Subjects:**

*reading skills,  
public speaking,  
sociology*



### **Approximate lesson time:**

*2 to 3 hours*



### **Materials:**

*Paper and pencil,  
Values Barometer  
Question Sheet,  
Most Important  
Things Worksheet,  
Opinion Analysis  
Worksheet*

### **STUDENT OBJECTIVES:**

At the end of this lesson, the students should be able to:

1. Identify and articulate values they hold.
2. Dissect arguments made in opinion statements.

### **VOCABULARY:**

value • opinion • belief

### **TEACHER BACKGROUND:**

Value systems are at the root of beliefs, attitudes and, ultimately, actions. Often the value systems held by parents are passed on to their children, and their children after them. Students may not think much about their values or realize how deeply their values influence their everyday actions.

Analysis of values is a very personal venture. These activities should be conducted in an open, accepting atmosphere where everyone has the chance to think, express and be unique.

### **ACTIVITIES:**

#### **1. Values Barometer**

Choices that students make in their lives reveal the values they hold. In this activity, the teacher will read a statement. If a student strongly agrees with the statement, he or she stands on the right side of the classroom. If they strongly disagree,

they stand on the left side of the classroom. If they are between these extremes, they stand somewhere in the middle, relative to their level of agreement or disagreement. Ask for volunteers to explain why they chose to stand where they did. Be sure to be clear that there are no right or wrong answers in this activity, just a range of opinions and values.

#### **2. The Most Important Things**

Sometimes we don't realize the value of something until it is gone. In this activity, students will rate a number of items with 1 being the most important and 10 being the least important. They will also write a sentence explaining their ratings. Collect and tabulate the answers. Discuss the class's values and why some things were rated highly and some rated lower.

#### **3. Opinion Analysis**

By analyzing a person's opinion statements, we get a window into his or her values, since opinions and beliefs grow from the values we hold. In this activity, students read newspaper editorial articles and fill out the Opinion Analysis Worksheet. Each group will give a short presentation about the opinions and values that they infer from the articles.



## National Science Education Standards

### Unifying Concepts and Processes

Evidence, models, and explanation

### Science as Inquiry

Abilities necessary to do scientific inquiry

Understanding about scientific inquiry

## ASSESSMENT:

Worksheets may serve as the assessment for these activities.

## Values Barometer Questions

### 1. Wolves are an important part of the environment.

*Discussion points: Are you thinking of the ecological environment or the economic environment? Lots of ecosystems that used to have wolves now exist without them, so how important are they?*

### 2. I have sufficient knowledge of wolves to formulate an opinion about them.

*Discussion points: How much knowledge is enough? How much knowledge does it take to formulate an opinion? What do you say to people who say they know more than they would like to know about wolves?*

### 3. I want to live in wolf country.

*Discussion points: Why is wilderness appealing or not appealing to people? Why are wolves appealing or not appealing to people?*

### 4. I want to live in a region where there are wild turtles.

*Discussion point: Why are some animals more appealing than others?*

### 5. Livestock owners should be compensated (paid by the government) for livestock killed by wolves.

*Discussion points: Whose fault is it if a wolf eats a cow? What if the wolf is protected and the livestock owner can't take action to protect his/her assets?*

### 6. Livestock owners should be allowed to kill a wolf if they see one.

*Discussion point: What rights should livestock owners have? Is this affected by how many wolves there are?*

### 7. Farmers should be compensated for crop losses due to Canadian geese.

*Discussion points: Nature often causes problems for agriculture. Should we help farmers overcome these problems, or should they have to buy insurance to anticipate problems?*

### 8. I should be able to let my pet run free in rural areas.

*Discussion points: Should people have to watch their pets every second? If a wolf kills a dog, who is responsible?*

### 9. I have a right to raise livestock anywhere, including wolf country.

*Discussion points: Should a livestock owner have to move his or her business and family if wolves are coming back? How much have humans changed the environment?*

### 10. It is safe to live in wolf country.

*Discussion point: How can we know if wolves are dangerous?*

### 11. I have the right to kill an animal if I believe it has the potential to hurt me or my pets.

*Discussion point: Are individual rights more important than the good of the environment or society?*

### 12. Humans are in charge of the environment

*Discussion points: Whose view of the world is right? Is there a way to blend the divergent values?*

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_



## Most Important Things

Rate the following items on a scale of 1-10:

1 = very important and 10 = not very important

- \_\_\_\_\_ a car to drive
- \_\_\_\_\_ a vacation somewhere special
- \_\_\_\_\_ time to spend with friends
- \_\_\_\_\_ the chance to play on a sports team
- \_\_\_\_\_ a walk in the woods or a camping trip
- \_\_\_\_\_ time to shop in a mall
- \_\_\_\_\_ free passes to movies
- \_\_\_\_\_ time to watch your favorite TV show
- \_\_\_\_\_ having urban wildlife (squirrels, rabbits, songbirds) nearby
- \_\_\_\_\_ having rural wildlife (deer, wolves, moose, herons) nearby
- \_\_\_\_\_ time to play computer games or surf the Internet
- \_\_\_\_\_ free CDs and time to listen to them
- \_\_\_\_\_ family
- \_\_\_\_\_ time to read books
- \_\_\_\_\_ being able to decide what to do for a vacation
- \_\_\_\_\_ having a job and making money
- \_\_\_\_\_ going to college or other higher education program
- \_\_\_\_\_ getting exercise
- \_\_\_\_\_ eating whatever you want
- \_\_\_\_\_ spending time with family



## APPENDIX III

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS, JUNE 21, 2004

## LET'S WELCOME THE WANDERING WOLVES

### State must devise balanced management plan

Reprinted with permission of the Rocky Mountain News.

For many Coloradans, wolves are a symbol either of all that should be protected and preserved in the wild or of aggressive government intrusion threatening all that is good about rural life. Between the two, middle ground can be tough to find. But that's precisely what the state's wolf-management panel should be aiming for.

The panel met for the first time recently after the discovery of the first gray wolf in Colorado in nearly 70 years—a single dead female from Yellowstone National Park found on I-70 30 miles west of Denver. But there was little agreement as to whether the state should accommodate naturally migrating wolves, catch them and relocate them, or kill them on sight.

As policy, the last option isn't as implausible as you might think. Earlier this year, Wyoming officials decided to turn most of their state into a wolf free-fire zone. Perhaps that's what Les Hampton, a rancher and Moffat County commissioner, had in mind when he told his panel colleagues: "We need a plan because I have a whole bunch of neighbors who will produce their own if you don't."

But most Coloradans would reject such a solution. If it's inevitable wolves are coming to Colorado, the panel ought to submit a rational plan before the Fish & Wildlife Service removes the animals from federal protection and turns management over to the states. Any such plan would accommodate the views of conservationists, scientists and land managers while protecting the interests of ranchers and the peace of mind of urban residents.

The problem is, delisting has ground to a halt thanks to Wyoming, where politicians chose symbolism over common sense. The Fish & Wildlife Service had approved Idaho and Montana's plans to maintain 15 wolf packs each. But it rejected Wyoming's, which allowed wolves to be shot on sight outside Yellowstone and Grand Teton national parks and adjacent wilderness areas. The dispute has since headed to court.

If an open-season-on-wolves plan is beyond the pale in Colorado, a catch-and-release strategy has its own problems. "A costly, logistical nightmare," is how one expert put it. That leaves the third option: sensible accommodation. Stockgrowers must be compensated for their losses and allowed to protect their livestock without fear of penalty. Game managers must be able to cull problem wolves. And wolves that wander too close to urban populations must be hunted or relocated, much like mountain lions and black bears are managed under current state law.

One thing is for certain, Yellowstone wolves are not waiting for Coloradans to resolve their differences. Sooner or later a breeding pack will be roaming the state.

Surely there's a workable compromise between the extremes of the save-every-wolf environmentalists and the anti-wolf-niks for whom the only good wolf is a dead wolf. There must be, and the panel must provide it.

**THE MISSOULIAN, MARCH 31, 2003**

## **LABEL CHANGE FOR WOLVES IS GOOD NEWS** **Undeniable success toward restoring this high-profile species is reason to celebrate.**

www.missoulia.com Reprinted with permission.

Public reaction has been muted and confused following a March 18 move by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to upgrade the status of gray wolves to “threatened,” a substantial improvement over their “endangered” status since 1974. That’s too bad, because the change reflects great progress and cause for celebration.

The change reflects reality. Wolves no longer can be accurately considered on the brink of extinction in the lower 48 states. Dozens of wolf packs totaling close to 700 animals now roam the Northern Rockies, while thousands more are thriving in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan. Changing their legal status to “threatened” allows greater flexibility in managing wolves and their habitat while maintaining substantial protection under the Endangered Species Act. This change puts wolves on the same level of protection as Montana’s grizzly bears.

Wolf advocates should be cheering. If anything, wolf recovery has proved more successful than they predicted, especially in this part of the country. Too many environmentalists, however, allow success to be overshadowed by mistrust of the government—suspecting that the reclassification somehow signals retreat in the commitment to protect wolves.

Ranchers and others who fought for so long against wolf-recovery efforts should be cheering, too. Their dire predictions of ruinous livestock losses have been proved wrong. Sen. Conrad Burns’ famous warning that wolves would kill children if reintroduced to Yellowstone turned out to be hyperbolic. Aren’t they glad they were wrong? They should be.

The change from “endangered” to “threatened” applies over a broad landscape, including areas where wolves could live but haven’t been restored. The change could slow the momentum toward broader wolf recovery; a lower risk of extinction changes the sense of urgency, legally and politically. But in the long run, the best way to foster wolf recovery in other regions probably is to complete the job where they already exist—that is, where wolves currently roam, work to get these critters off the threatened-and-endangered-species list altogether. We’ve already learned how to restore populations of these large predators. These lessons can be applied elsewhere. Showing that we can successfully manage wolves here over the long run, in balance with people and other wildlife, will do much to win support for wolves elsewhere in the West.



IDAHO STATE JOURNAL, JULY 27, 2004

## WOLF PACK WAS SACRIFICED AS PART OF REINTRODUCTION DEAL

<http://www.journalnet.com/articles/2004/07/27/opinion/opinion01.txt>  
Reprinted with permission.

The feds took out a nine-member wolf pack last week near McCall after failed attempts to convince the critters to remove sheep from their diet. By the resounding “Hallelujah!” heard around Idaho, you’d have thought the state sales tax had up and expired.

Truthfully, the demise of the Cook Pack—which over the last two summers killed in the neighborhood of 200 sheep—isn’t one which wolf restoration advocates should mourn. And for the anti-wolf crowd, it’s not one to cheer, either.

Gunning down all nine of these wolves from a helicopter is the kind of control the government must exercise if its efforts to keep wolves a part of the wild landscape of Idaho are to have any kind of validity. Granted, sheep just might be the least equipped of domestic livestock to deal with a pack of hungry wolves. Ed Bangs, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service wolf recovery coordinator, had this to say about sheep in last year’s Idaho State Journal: “Sheep are susceptible to just about any predator, whether it walks, runs or flies—they’re just looking for a place to die.”

Nevertheless, grazing sheep is an established land use in Idaho, and not one the government is going to reduce or further regulate, no matter how many wolves roam the countryside. The only option for wolf recovery officials is to occasionally exercise some lethal control. In effect, the Cook Pack took one for the team.

Oddly enough, that’s the way it’s supposed to work. If efforts fail to convince a pack of wolves to change its collective diet, there’s

usually only one thing left to do. In this instance, for the benefit of the entire Northern Rockies wolf population, a pack of nine animals had to be sacrificed. Simple as that.

And the rancher who owns the sheep? Because the sheep were clearly killed by wolves, the rancher can apply for financial relief through the Defenders of Wildlife’s Bailey Wildlife Foundation Wolf Compensation Fund. The existence of this fund is one of the many factors that convinced the government to undertake wolf reintroduction in the Northern Rockies in 1995.

For nearly a decade, Defenders of Wildlife has lived up to its title. It has paid thousands of dollars to farmers and ranchers who can prove wolves have unfortunately culled their herds. That fund has helped take some of the sting out of the reintroduction of one of the West’s native predators.

Is the system perfect? Not by a long shot. But removing a troublesome pack that did not respond to other means of control was the right decision. If the ecosystem is to be as close to complete as possible, wolves are a necessary ingredient, even if they occasionally have be checked. And while we’ll never see a pristine Rocky Mountain landscape, such as the one greeted by the first European-American explorers to venture into the Northwest 200 years ago, we can ensure the wilderness we have left is truly wilderness.

Nine wolves is a small price to pay for that.

WYOMING WILDLIFE MAGAZINE, JANUARY 2004

## WOLVES: AN OUTFITTER'S VIEW ON WYOMING'S WOLF REINTRODUCTION PLAN

By Maury Jones Reprinted with permission.

Most Wyoming hunters opposed the introduction of the Canadian Gray Wolf and continue to oppose its protection. The primary reason for this opposition is very simple; wolves compete for the huntable surplus of game.

Historically, more animals are born than are needed to replace natural mortality. This recruitment enables the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to issue permits to hunters, producing revenue to pay for game management. Game populations are kept in balance through regulated hunting, and Wyoming hunters are able to get meat for the freezer to help feed their families. This system has worked for several decades.

Many outfitters don't believe wolves only kill the weak, sick and old of a herd.

Enter the Canadian Gray Wolf, courtesy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and those who push the anti-hunting, pro-predator agenda. They introduced this non-native wolf under the guise of "restoring historical balance to the Yellowstone ecosystem," even though strong evidence shows that wolves rarely entered Yellowstone in the 77 years prior to 1913 (National Park Service Documents, "The Wolves of Yellowstone" Weaver 1978).

Also, an official government document, Yellowstone Animal Census, 1912, lists various animals and their numbers, but under Gray Wolves the total is listed as NONE (Hornaday, Our Vanishing Wildlife, pg 336).

Canadian Grays are NOT the original wolf that was in Wyoming. The original Rocky Mountain Wolf was much smaller and did not run in packs. The only conclusion we hunters can make is that ending sport hunting is the major objective and not the recovery of an endangered species.

We believe the Canadian Gray Wolf is a MAJOR wildlife disaster in the making.

Our Wyoming big game populations are not evolved to deal with the predation of this huge non-native wolf, and it shows in the impact the wolf is making.

It is significant that both Alaska and British Columbia, which have thousands of wolves, have recently initiated wolf reduction programs in some areas to "increase numbers of ungulates for subsistence hunting."

Wyoming hunters don't necessarily hate wolves, but many of us strongly object to any efficient predator being imposed on our wildlife without adequate population control.

Other misinformation says a wolf will kill only the weak, the sick, the old, and will only kill what it needs. Facts refute that claim. On the Camp Creek Elk Feedground in 2002, a lone wolf killed five calf elk in one night, eating less than ten pounds of meat. Quite a number of elk, including some large bulls, have been killed on the Gros Ventre feedgrounds, and many of them have had just the lips and noses eaten. Wolves have not returned to these kills



## Wolves: An Outfitters View

*(continued)*

no matter how little they have eaten of the carcass. Several mutilated elk have had to be put out of their misery.

Some claim the wolf is filling a vacant niche in the ecosystem and wolves will self-regulate their population to stay in balance with the prey base. Wyoming hunters don't believe it. Wolf populations will expand as long as they have something to eat. Wolf populations will not decline even when their prey base is scarce because then they will prey on livestock. Big game populations will soon be below the surplus level needed to sustain our historical hunting opportunities.

The wolf population is growing approximately 30% per year, according to USFWS figures. Biologists tend to be cautious (deceptive?) regarding wolf impact by just counting the numbers of wolves and the prey they consume; the results are becoming painfully obvious.

Using official USFWS statistics, the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem has approximately 271 wolves as of December 2002, and each wolf kills approximately 1.9 elk per month. Therefore, about 514 elk are killed each month, more than 6,000 elk killed each year by wolves. These are the figures given by those in charge of wolf "management." (NOTE: Monitoring wolves does not constitute "management." Population control to keep them in balance with their prey base would be management.)

Those 6,000 elk could have been "sold," via hunting permits, thus generating millions of dollars for game departments and yielding over one million pounds of elk meat for families of hunters. Wyoming hunters feel it is unacceptable to feed that resource to non-native wolves. This "experimental non-essential population" of wolves has already reduced some of our hunting permits, contrary to projections, and will probably eliminate some hunts.

In conclusion, Wyoming hunters don't necessarily hate wolves, but many of us strongly object to any efficient predator being imposed on our wildlife without adequate population control.

Outfitter Maury Jones has run a hunting camp in Wyoming since 1978. He has served as the president of the Jackson Hole Outfitters and Guides Association and is currently on the board of the Wyoming Outfitters and Guides Association, where he serves on the wolf committee.

[http://espn.go.com/outdoors/conservation/columns/guest\\_columnist/1687894.htm](http://espn.go.com/outdoors/conservation/columns/guest_columnist/1687894.htm)