The influence of childhood nature experience on attitudes and tolerance towards problem-causing animals in Singapore

Ngo, Kang Min; Hosaka, Tetsuro; Numata, Shinya

2019

Ngo, K. M., Hosaka, T., & Numata, S. (2019). The influence of childhood nature experience on attitudes and tolerance towards problem-causing animals in Singapore. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 41, 150–157. doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2019.04.003

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/143897>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2019.04.003>

© 2019 Elsevier GmbH. All rights reserved. This paper was published in *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* and is made available with permission of Elsevier GmbH.

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 20:30:30 SGT

Title: The influence of childhood nature experience on attitudes and tolerance towards
problem-causing animals in Singapore

Authors: Kang Min NGO^{1,2,*}, Tetsuro HOSAKA^{1,3}, Shinya NUMATA¹

Affiliation:

¹ Department of Tourism Science, Graduate School of Urban Environmental Sciences, Tokyo
Metropolitan University, 1-1 Minamiosawa, Hachioji, Tokyo, Japan 192-0397

* Corresponding author: ngokangmin@gmail.com

² Asian School of the Environment, Nanyang Technological University, 50 Nanyang Avenue,
Singapore 639798

³ Graduate School for International Development and Cooperation, Hiroshima University, 1-
5-1, Kagamiyama, Higashihiroshima, Japan 739-852

Highlights

- Human-wildlife conflicts are common in cities with abundant green areas
- Singapore residents have low wildlife affinity and tolerance
- Wildlife attitudes were strongly correlated with childhood nature experience
- Tolerance of problem wildlife decreased with increasing severity of damage caused
- Childhood nature experience has long-lasting consequences on wildlife tolerance

1 **Abstract**

2 Low vegetation cover in cities result in urbanites generally receiving less exposure to nature
3 compared to people living in rural areas. Consequently, childhood experiences in a city tend
4 to be less nature-oriented, leading to a detachment from nature in adulthood. However, some
5 cities may have pockets of green spaces that harbour wildlife, and interactions between
6 people and the wildlife around them may have an influence on wildlife conservation
7 attitudes. To investigate the relationships between childhood nature experience and attitudes
8 towards wildlife, we carried out a survey on 1004 Singapore residents about their attitudes
9 and tolerance towards three types of wildlife commonly encountered in Singapore. Structured
10 equation models (SEMs) were used to model the relationship between childhood experience,
11 attitudes towards wildlife, and tolerance levels in three scenarios of increasing damage
12 severity to humans. We found that most respondents had low childhood nature experience,
13 and had neutral / negative attitudes towards all three types of wildlife. Childhood experience
14 was the strongest predictor of wildlife attitude, which varied with age, gender, education
15 level and type of wildlife. Attitude towards wildlife was the strongest predictor of tolerance
16 in all scenarios, while tolerance decreased with increasing severity of damage. Our findings
17 point to the importance of childhood nature experience in shaping adult perceptions of
18 wildlife and their willingness to coexist with wildlife. Given that Singapore is continually
19 developing on forested land for residential and commercial purposes, wildlife encounters are
20 predicted to increase in the future. With proper planning and education, residents near
21 wildlife habitats can learn to live with and appreciate the wildlife around them.

22 *Keywords:* coexistence with wildlife, structured equation modelling, urban wildlife, wildlife
23 aversion

Introduction

As cities expand, wildlife habitats on city fringes are reduced, leading to increased human-wildlife interactions and conflicts. Media reports on human-wildlife conflicts are common in many cities, and may reflect the frequency, severity, and attitudes of the general public towards wildlife. However, peoples' perceptions towards wildlife are also influenced by their prior experiences and encounters with them (Røskoft et al., 2003; Kretser et al., 2009; Pinheiro et al., 2016).

The public's attitude and tolerance towards wildlife has a large influence on the management of problem-causing animals in cities. A survey done in ten metropolitan areas in the U.S. found that urban residents spent considerable time and money not only on repairing damage done by wildlife, but also on encouraging wildlife around their homes (Conover, 1997). Attitudes of urban residents towards wildlife were generally positive (Harrison, 1998; Dowle & Deane, 2009; McDonald et al., 2012), although bad experiences with animals may promote doministic and negative attitudes (Houston et al., 2010; Jonker et al., 2006). While the physical management of wildlife, such as containment within park boundaries, culling of wildlife etc. are direct methods to control wildlife numbers and their spread, understanding the human dimensions in human-wildlife interactions is equally important in creating an effective wildlife management programme, because it is ultimately human preferences that determine the way conflicts are resolved (Manfredo & Dayer, 2004). Effective wildlife management is dependent on minimizing negative impacts on wildlife while meeting people's expectations on how wildlife should be managed (Decker & Purdy, 1988; Lute & Attari, 2017). Public expectations may differ between countries and cultures, so what works for one social group may be ineffective for another group (Manfredo & Dayer, 2004).

48 As urban areas worldwide expand, people's exposure to wildlife and nature is expected to
 49 decrease, and generations increasingly live without constant contact with nature. 'Nature' is a
 50 word that has many interpretations. With regards to children and childhood, 'nature' has
 51 often been portrayed as being separate from 'culture' (Taylor, 2011; Taylor & Giugni, 2012).
 52 Young people themselves have described 'nature' as landscapes outside human influence
 53 (von Benzon 2018). Here we use a wide definition of 'nature' and associate it with words like
 54 'outdoors', 'greenery', and 'wilderness'. In urban environments, nature would include semi-
 55 natural environments such as urban parks, gardens and farms.

56 People who are exposed to nature and animals from a young age would have had to deal with
 57 uncomfortable and conflicting feelings when coming into contact with nature, such as worms,
 58 ants, shadows and dirt (Milligan & Bingley 2007; Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw, 2015; 2017).
 59 The human instinct of caring for animals is also usually cultivated from young (Myers et al.
 60 2004). Such interactions instill a sense of awareness about the world we share with other
 61 creatures and 'decentre the human as the sole learning subject' (Taylor & Pacini-Ketchabaw,
 62 2015). Therefore we believe that early exposure to nature increases affinity to wildlife and
 63 cultivates tolerance towards problem-causing animals among urban residents. Children's
 64 nature experience has been shown to influence their intention to participate in nature-based
 65 activities in future (Cheng & Monroe, 2012) and their knowledge of (Chipeniuk, 1995) and
 66 willingness to conserve biodiversity (Soga et al., 2016). Childhood nature experience has also
 67 been shown to have a positive relationship to environmental attitudes and behaviors (Wells &
 68 Lekies, 2006; Chawla, 2007).

69 Singapore is a highly urbanized city that has developed rapidly in the past six decades
 70 (Gupta, 1992). More than 99% of the original forest cover has been cleared, although there is
 71 currently about 20% forest cover that is predominantly secondary growth (Yee et al., 2011).

72 In Singapore, urban wildlife species are usually those that can withstand disturbed habitats,
 73 such as secondary forests and open areas (Corlett, 1992). Common species include the Javan
 74 Mynah (*Acridotheres javanicus*), Long-Tailed Macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*), Wild Boar
 75 (*Sus scrofa*), Plantain Squirrel (*Callosciurus notatus*) etc. Some of these species cause
 76 problems when they turn aggressive on humans, rummage through garbage bins or steal food
 77 from homes (Sha et al., 2009). Reports about animals causing problems in cities are not
 78 uncommon (e.g. Houston et al., 2010; Cassidy & Mills, 2012), with complaints about wildlife
 79 increasing every year in Singapore (Fig. S1). However, it is unclear whether these increases
 80 are caused by a rise in wildlife abundance, or whether tolerance towards wildlife has
 81 decreased.

82 Residents in Singapore typically receive very low exposure to natural landscapes and
 83 experiences (Kong et al., 1999). A qualitative study on nature perspectives of youths in
 84 Singapore found that they had low interest and affinity for nature, due to their upbringing in a
 85 highly urbanised environment, over-protective parents, and an abundance of other
 86 entertainment options (Kong et al., 1999). Another survey found that although most adults in
 87 Singapore were supportive of biodiversity conservation, they preferred manicured landscapes
 88 such as parks and gardens even though such landscapes do least in supporting biodiversity
 89 (Khew et al., 2014). Their responses were likely driven by aesthetic preferences and
 90 childhood exposure to such landscapes (Khew et al., 2014). Previous surveys about wildlife
 91 attitudes and preferences in Singapore tended to focus on the Long-Tailed Macaque, and
 92 were both qualitative (Yeo and Neo, 2010) and quantitative (Sha et al., 2009; Liu, 2018). Sha
 93 et al. (2009) conducted face-to-face surveys on both residents and visitors at parks where
 94 Long-Tailed Macaques frequented, and found that resident attitudes towards macaques were
 95 significantly more negative than visitors attitudes, given that residents experience more
 96 frequent negative interactions with macaques. However, both residents and visitors believed

that macaques should be conserved and preferred education-based solutions over eradication (Sha et al., 2009). Nevertheless, their findings may be biased towards nature-lovers and may not represent the average Singapore resident. Taken together, these studies showed that knowledge about wildlife was low among Singapore residents, and that tolerance for problem-causing animals depended on the kind of animals and the people interviewed (Liu, 2018).

This study aims to understand the attitudes and tolerance of Singapore residents towards three common problem-causing animals and the relative effects of the factors that influence them. To our knowledge, no such survey has been done in Singapore before, although studies with a similar theme have been done in the US and UK (e.g. Palmer & Suggate, 1996; Wells and Lekies, 2006; Thompson et al., 2008; Asah et al., 2012), and one in Japan (Hosaka et al., 2017). We believe that our study contributes to Asian perspectives of wildlife attitudes amongst the predominantly American / European perspectives reported in the literature. We constructed a structural equation model to analyse relationships between childhood nature experience, attitudes and tolerance towards wildlife (Fig. 1). We hypothesized that childhood nature experience (Experience) has a positive effect on affective attitudes (Attitude) towards problem-causing animals, and that Attitude in turn has a positive effect on tolerance (Tolerance). Experience may also have a direct positive effect on Tolerance (Fig. 1). Following findings from previous studies, we hypothesized that males will have higher tolerance than females (Butler et al., 2003; Campbell and Lancaster, 2010), and that respondents with children will have lower tolerance (Hosaka et al., 2017), but will increase with education level (Kellert, 1984; Bjerke & Østdahl, 2004). In addition, we hypothesized that older respondents, especially those born before independence (before widespread conversion of forest to urban centres; age ≥ 50), would have more positive attitudes and higher tolerance towards problem-causing animals.

301
302
303
304 122
305
306
307 123 **Methods**
308
309
310 124 *Study site*
311
312
313 125 We conducted a questionnaire survey in Singapore, a highly urbanised tropical country with
314
315 126 5.6 million inhabitants (Singapore Department of Statistics, 2017). With a population density
316
317 127 of about 7800 persons per km², Singapore is the third densest country in the world (World
318
319 128 Bank, 2018). The Singapore government has drafted a national ‘Green Plan’ since 1992 to
320
321 129 tackle resource consumption and waste generation (Moiz, 1993). Nature conservation was
322
323 130 included in the plan, but this occurred after the early phases of infrastructure development
324
325 131 had been accomplished, during which two mangrove reserves were cleared and pressure
326
327 132 mounted on the existing reserves (Anon., 1992). National Parks Board, the government
328
329 133 agency that oversees public green spaces, currently has numerous national programmes to
330
331 134 enhance and connect urban greenery, such as the Park Connector Network (NParks, 2018a).
332
333
334 135 This may be a result of the government’s 10-year Master Plan for city development, in which
335
336 136 two key foci are recreation and public spaces, where green spaces and nature were
337
338 137 prominently featured (URA, 2018).
339
340
341
342 138
343
344
345 139 *Questionnaire*
346
347
348 140 We designed a series of questions that covered the attitudes and tolerance of respondents
349
350 141 towards three common nuisance animals – long-tailed macaque, hornets, and pythons. The
351
352 142 online questionnaire was administered to 1004 Singapore residents aged 18-69 years by an
353
354 143 Internet research company (Macromill, Inc.). We collected equal numbers of responses for
355
356
357
358
359
360

144 each gender group (502 males and 502 females) and comparable numbers for each age group
 145 (e.g. 63 of 18-19 year-olds, 100 of 20-24 year-olds, 114 of 25-29 year-olds, etc.), although
 146 there were fewer respondents in the groups ≥ 55 years old (Table S2). The survey was entirely
 147 online, and respondents were grouped into their respective gender and age groups until the
 148 target number of respondents was reached for each group. This method ensures an even
 149 sampling from different age and gender groups. We were also able to get a large sample size
 150 within a short period of time. Potential disadvantages include having a sample that may be
 151 biased towards those who were more internet-savvy (Hosaka et al., 2017). The data were
 152 rendered anonymous when we received it, so there is no potential risk to individual privacy.

153 Attitude was quantified by asking respondents to rate their affective attitude (like or dislike)
 154 towards each of these animals on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (dislike) to 5 (like), with 3 as
 155 a neutral point. Tolerance was assessed by measuring the level of acceptance associated with
 156 different degrees of management actions in three scenarios for each animal (Table 1). The
 157 scenarios for encountering macaques (M1-M3), hornets (H1-H3), and pythons (P1-P3) were
 158 in increasing severity of damage. For all scenarios, five possible management actions were
 159 listed: (m1) do nothing, (m2) monitor the situation, (m3) alert the public, (m4) translocate the
 160 animal or nest, (m5) trap and eliminate the animal. For each of the five management actions,
 161 respondents chose a level of tolerance on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (totally
 162 unacceptable) to 5 (totally acceptable), with 3 as a neutral point.

163 Experience was quantified from a question about the frequency of green space use and
 164 another about frequency of participation in nature-related activities in their childhood (≤ 12
 165 years of age). Green spaces included parks, forests, farms/plantations, and rivers/beaches,
 166 while nature-related activities included insect-catching, fishing, collecting flowers and fruits,
 167 bird-watching, tree-climbing, and swimming in the river/ocean. Respondents answered on a

5-point scale, ranging from 1 (never; no experience) to 5 (very often; almost every day), with 3 being sometimes (about once a month). Although such retrospective self-reporting may not provide high accuracy of actual childhood nature experience (Hardt & Rutter, 2004), we still used this method as it is difficult to obtain reliable objective data.

Data analysis

We used the mean scores of m1-m3 for each scenario as a measure of tolerance, because the scores represented the acceptability of the animals without removal. The Cronbach's alpha for m1-m3 were higher than the recommended 0.8 reliability (Lance et al. 2006) for all the scenarios: 0.87 (M1), 0.85 (M2), 0.86 (M3), 0.84 (H1), 0.85 (H2), 0.87 (H3), 0.87 (P1), 0.87 (P2), 0.86 (P3). Experience was calculated as the mean scores of all the items in the two Experience questions (Cronbach's alpha = 0.91). Differences in attitudes towards the three nuisance animals were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test.

For sociodemographic parameters, we used age, gender (1 – male, 2 – female), formal education level and whether or not respondents had children, because they have been shown to affect wildlife affective attitudes (Kellert, 1984; König, 2008; Hosaka et al., 2017). The full model consists of experience and the four sociodemographic parameters having direct effects on Tolerance, as well as mediated effects on Tolerance via Attitude (Fig. 1). The standard errors of the mediating effects were calculated using the Delta method. SEM fitness was checked using the χ^2 goodness-of-fit statistic and the p-value, the comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardised root mean square residual (SRMR; Table S3). All SEM analyses were done in R (R Core Team, 2018) using the lavaan package (lavaan 0.6-2).

191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213

Results

Experience was low among Singapore residents - 55.3% of respondents seldom / never played in natural environments or engaged in nature-related activities in their childhood (Fig. 2). Only 15.5% of respondents reported frequent visits to and played in natural environments in their childhood (Fig. 2).

Attitudes towards macaques were more positive than for snakes and hornets (Fig. 3; Kruskal-Wallis $\chi^2 = 435.64$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$). 52% of respondents had negative feelings towards hornets and snakes, while only 14% of respondents had negative feelings towards macaques (Fig. 3). Female respondents had significantly more negative attitudes towards the three animals compared to males (Fig. S4).

Tolerance was generally low for all animals, with most respondents choosing animal translocation as the most acceptable management solution (Fig. 4). However, killing of the animal was less acceptable than translocation, except in scenario H3. The python was the least tolerable of the three animals in all three scenarios, followed by the hornet and macaque. As the severity of damage done by animals increased, the acceptance of passive management decreased.

SEMs showed that attitude was the strongest predictor of tolerance in all scenarios except M3, where age was the strongest predictor (Fig. 5). The effect of attitude on tolerance decreased with increasing severity of damage (M1 to M3), remained similar from P1 to P3, while it increased from H1 to H2, and then decreased from H2 to H3. Age, gender, and experience were the next most important predictors of tolerance, while education and presence of children were significant predictors in 4 out of the 9 scenarios (Fig. 5).

214 Experience had positive and the strongest effect on attitude towards macaques and hornets,
 215 while gender had negative and the strongest effect on attitude towards pythons (Fig. 5).
 216 Education had a significant positive effect on attitude towards hornets, with lower-educated
 217 respondents showing proportionately more negative attitudes (Fig. S4), while age did not
 218 affect hornet attitudes. The opposite was found in the macaque and python models – age but
 219 not education had a significant negative effect on attitudes. The model fitness indices
 220 indicated good fits for all models (Table S3; model $\chi^2 p$ value > 0.05; CFI $\geq$ 0.95; RMSEA <
 221 0.07; SRMR < 0.08; Hooper et al. 2008).

222

223 Discussion

224 Our results show that exposure to nature among Singapore residents was low, while attitude
 225 towards common problem-causing wildlife were largely neutral or negative. From surveys in
 226 Scotland and Japan (urban), the proportion of respondents who seldom / never participated in
 227 nature-related activities were 33% and 35% respectively (Thompson et al., 2008; Soga et al.,
 228 2018), compared to 55.3% in this study. From surveys on urban residents in the US, Wells &
 229 Lekies (2006) found a mean score of 2.78 for all nature participation items, based on a 4-
 230 point scale ranging from ‘never’ to ‘often’, showing that on average people were more ‘often’
 231 engaged in nature-related activities. In addition, our findings support the hypothesis that
 232 childhood nature experience has positive effects on attitudes and tolerance towards problem-
 233 causing animals. Low levels of childhood nature experience was correlated with negative
 234 attitudes and low tolerance.

235 The terms ‘nature deficit disorder’ (Louv 2005) and the ‘extinction of experience’ (Miller,
 236 2005; Soga & Gaston, 2016) have often been used to express the widening gulf between

237 humans and nature. It describes a self-reinforcing cycle where children that grow up in cities
 238 with little greenery having little exposure to nature, and eventually becoming estranged from
 239 nature as adults. Numerous studies on children's interactions with nature found that children
 240 generally held positive imagery of nature (Simmons, 1994; Billmann-Mahecha & Gebhard,
 241 2009), but children from urban backgrounds tended to have more fears of natural elements
 242 such as wildlife and falling trees (Simmons, 1994; Bixler & Floyd, 1997). Direct
 243 participation in nature activities was found to be effective in fostering connections with
 244 nature (Mikels-Carrasco, 2010; Giusti et al., 2014; Barthel et al., 2018; von Benzon, 2018),
 245 and even vicarious experiences like reading books or watching TV programmes about nature
 246 help encourage such connections to nature (Soga et al., 2016 [IJERPH]).

247 Not surprisingly then, childhood nature experience has been linked to affinity towards nature
 248 (Tanner, 1980; Chawla, 1998; Kals et al., 1999) and active care for the environment in
 249 adulthood (Wells & Lekies, 2006; Chawla, 2007). Nature experience forms a foundation for
 250 environmental knowledge and perceptions that can lead to support for sustainable
 251 development (Bögeholz, 2006) and animal conservation (Zhang et al., 2014). People who
 252 have negative perceptions of problem-causing wildlife may feel that wildlife, or nature in
 253 general, are outside of their lives, i.e. humans are said to be alienated from nature, or from the
 254 environment (Vogel 1988; Stone 2014). Although humans have tamed and manipulated
 255 nature to an extent far greater than any other species (Sanderson et al., 2002), the erratic and
 256 unpredictable movements of wildlife may be a cause of distress for some people, especially
 257 when the animals are in close proximity.

258 The landscape of Singapore has changed dramatically over the past 50 years – forests and
 259 farms were cleared, giving way to high-rise residential apartments, factories, roads, and other
 260 infrastructure (Savage, 1992). Consequently, natural landscapes were reduced to a few nature

261 forest reserves, the largest one being part of a system of water reservoirs in the central part of
 262 the island country. The lack of natural landscapes in Singapore mirrors the low level of
 263 childhood nature experience of Singapore residents. A qualitative survey found that youths in
 264 Singapore had little interest in and affinity for nature (Kong et al., 1999). One common image
 265 these youths had was that ‘nature’ was orderly and well-maintained (Kong et al., 1999), a
 266 characteristic of parks and gardens in Singapore. Trees and shrubs in parks and gardens are
 267 often planted widely-spaced apart, and are regularly pruned, while grasses are regularly
 268 mowed. A study about landscape preferences of Singapore residents found that manicured
 269 parks were the most favoured landscape (Khew et al., 2014). Fear of animals was also
 270 reflected in a statement by one youth - “you never know if the insect is going to bite you and
 271 whether it’s going to cause a swelling or [cause you to] need an injection” (Kong et al.,
 272 1999). Those who felt safe and enjoyed being in nature either had plenty of childhood nature
 273 experience in other countries, or enjoyed exercising control over small animals such as
 274 insects and pets (Kong et al., 1999). This may be a sign that human-nature relationships in
 275 Singapore tend to be negativistic and doministic (Kellert 1984).

276 In addition, Singaporean children are put under tremendous pressure to excel academically
 277 from a young age. Many parents enrol their children in after-school tuition classes (Teng
 278 2016), and Singapore teenagers spend an average of 9.4 hours on homework per week, about
 279 twice as much as the global average (Teng 2014). Singaporean children also spend more time
 280 online than the global average, with the most time spent on watching videos and playing
 281 online games, followed by using social media apps (Hio 2018). These are predominantly
 282 indoor activities, and are evidence that children in Singapore generally spend little time
 283 outdoors.

284 From our results, although macaques were the most well-liked animal among the three,
285 translocating them was the most acceptable response, followed by education (Fig. 4, M1).
286 This was the opposite result from Sha et al. (2009), who found that at the parks where
287 macaques frequented, residents near the parks and the visitors largely preferred education
288 about co-existence with macaques (63.6% of respondents) over eradication and removal from
289 parks and urban areas (36.4%). This was surprising given that the overall proportion of
290 respondents who showed strong or mild liking for macaques in their study was 32.9%, lower
291 than in this study (39.4%). It may be interesting in future to study how attitudes may change
292 when respondents are exposed to different environments.

293 Over 50% of respondents expressed dislike towards hornets and pythons, perhaps reflecting
294 the negative images that these animals conjure. In a qualitative survey of elementary and high
295 school students, causes of distress by hornets were described as ‘sting’ and ‘buzz’, while
296 distress by snakes were described as ‘slimy’, ‘wiggle’, and ‘poisonous’ (Woolever, 1953).
297 These fears, some of which were unfounded, were likely passed from parents to children
298 without actual experiences with the animals (Woolever, 1953; Crane, 1976; Bixler & Floyd,
299 1997). For some people, the phobia for these animals may be so great that the terror caused
300 by these fears overcome the actual physiological reactions, as in the case of a 28-year-old
301 computer mathematician who died from heart failure mistakenly believing that he had been
302 stung by a wasp (Crane, 1976). As with other kinds of fears, constant exposure to the cause
303 of the fear in small steps, in this case nature and wildlife, can help to rationalise peoples’
304 feelings towards animals.

305 Contrary to our predictions, older people did not have more positive attitudes and tolerance
306 towards wildlife, but instead had a higher intolerance and dislike towards wildlife. This may
307 be due to the majority of the population being concentrated in the then colonial town, a plan

that was drawn up more than a century prior to independence (Savage, 1992). In 1966, 61% of the population resided in 16% of Singapore's area (Neville, 1969). The crowded living conditions and a proliferation of squatter settlements may not have allowed for much nature experience when the older respondents were growing up. Decreasing tolerance for wildlife with increasing age was also found in other cities (Butler et al., 2003; Campbell & Lancaster, 2010; Hosaka et al., 2017), so this observation may be a norm rather than an exception.

Our study found that males have more positive attitude and tolerance for problem-causing wildlife than females, similar to findings from other studies in USA (Kellert, 1985), Norway (Bjerke & Østdahl, 2004), Tanzania (Kaltenborn et al. 2006), China (Zhang et al., 2014) and Japan (Hosaka et al., 2017). This suggests that such inter-gender differences are common across different cultures. Although our study was not to elucidate the underlying mechanism of the differences, some previous studies reported that women often display higher levels of disgust sensitivity than men (Haidt et al., 1994) and specific phobias are far more common among women than men (Smith & Davidson, 2006). However, gender alone does not explain individual variation in attitudes (Herzog et al., 1991) and childhood nature experience had much greater effects on attitude and tolerance toward macaque and hornets than gender (Fig. 5).

The low affinity to nature of Singapore residents is also reflected in highly built-up cities of other countries, such as in Saudi Arabia (Seddon & Khoja, 2003) and Pakistan (Qureshi et al., 2013). The scarcity of nature areas in cities, coupled with indoor sedentary lifestyles of urban dwellers (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Wong, 2009; Peltzer & Pengpid, 2016), often lead to reduced human-nature interactions. Besides a potential loss of health benefits associated with nature exposure (Takano et al., 2002; Maas et al., 2006), the declination of time spent with nature may result in disaffection towards nature, and result the "extinction of experience"

(Miller, 2005; Soga & Gaston, 2016) mentioned earlier. Such a phenomenon may lead to reduced public support for biodiversity conservation (Miller, 2005). It is interesting to note that wildlife-related complaints in Singapore increased sharply from 2013 to 2015, followed by an equally sharp decrease (Fig. S3). It is not clear why the number of complaints increased in 2013, but the decrease that followed was due to more intensive culling of animals by authorities in response to the complaints (Lee, 2016).

Despite the low tolerance of wildlife, people prefer to avoid killing animals even when they cause problems (Fig. 4). Similar findings of preferences for non-lethal wildlife management have been reported from other studies (Reiter et al., 1999; Sha et al. 2009; Massei et al., 2010). Hosaka et al. (2017) found that urban and suburban residents in Japan preferred to eliminate hornets even if they were just sighted, while our survey respondents preferred not to kill animals if they had not done any harm yet, possibly indicating a slightly higher tolerance for wildlife. However, translocating animals received the most support from respondents, even if the animals were only sighted and were not causing problems. This may be due to perceived risks being higher than actual risk (Delfosse, 2005; Slimak & Dietz, 2006), with fear and misunderstanding driving potential actions (Hadidian, 2015). In Singapore, reports about animal roadkills are common (e.g. Anon., 2017; Lam, 2017a, 2017b; Tan, 2018), while human fatalities from wildlife are relatively rare, showing that certain fears about wildlife are unfounded. Therefore there is potential for residents to coexist with wildlife given the right understanding of animal behaviour and risks.

Amidst the scarcity of natural habitats in Singapore, the government has tried to maintain some existing green spaces, such as the Rail Corridor, an old railway track that spans 24 km from the north to south end of Singapore (NParks, 2018b). However, there are upcoming development that will result in a net loss of secondary forest cover, such as the Tengah

356 residential housing project (Yeo, 2016). This may reduce wildlife habitat and increase
357 human-wildlife conflict in the future, but if planned properly, could provide residents plenty
358 of opportunities to engage with nature.

360 **Conclusions**

361 We found that childhood nature experience had a significant effect on adult attitude and
362 tolerance towards problem-causing animals in a tropical urban population in Singapore.
363 Residents in Singapore generally had low childhood nature experience, and consequently had
364 neutral or negative attitudes towards wildlife and low tolerance for them. Recent land
365 development projects led by the government aim to incorporate greenery into residential
366 areas, but these greenery are either artificial or are the result of forest removal, and has the
367 ironic effect of reducing biodiversity. This is because habitat areas for wildlife are reduced,
368 especially for large animals such as wild boar, macaques, and sambar deer, which require
369 large areas of forest to roam and live. Nevertheless, there are pockets of ‘wild’ nature
370 remaining in Singapore - small patches of primary forest and substantial areas of mature
371 secondary forest. These wild habitats harbour a different kind of wildlife than the ‘pest’
372 species that live amongst humans, such as the Javan Mynahs that pick food scraps from
373 leftovers, and Rock Pigeons that defecate on building ledges and vehicles. Rare plant and
374 animal species have been found only in these wilder forests (Turner et al., 1994; Castelletta et
375 al., 2005; Lane et al., 2006), so there is an obvious value in preserving them instead of
376 ‘manicuring’ them. Indeed, perhaps it is time to start ‘rewilding’ green lawns, based on a
377 survey that found that people in Singapore do not mind slightly wilder natural growth around
378 them (Hwang et al., 2019).

380 There are efforts by government (Community in Bloom by National Parks Board) and non-
381 governmental organisations (Every Singaporean a Naturalist by Nature Society Singapore) to
382 engage Singaporeans in getting closer to nature. The Animal Concerns Research and
383 Education Society (ACRES) has a 24-hour wildlife rescue hotline for the public to report
384 wildlife that they do not know how to handle, as well as resources and volunteer
385 opportunities to care for rescued wildlife. The above-mentioned programmes are among the
386 scores of options that exist for those who are interested in organised nature-related activities.
387 If ‘rewilding’ does occur, it would be important to follow up with surveys of flora and fauna
388 in those areas, as well as more detailed surveys on how much time children spend outdoors in
389 nature areas. A longitudinal study on nature and wildlife attitudes will contribute significantly
390 to understanding peoples’ relationships with nature.

392 **Acknowledgements**

393 This study was supported by the Advanced Research Program of the Asian Human Research
394 Fund of the Tokyo Metropolitan Government. We thank Dr. Koun Sugimoto (Tokyo
395 Metropolitan University) for his help with the questionnaire survey.

397 **Authors’ contributions**

398 TH and SN conceived the ideas and designed methodology; KMN analyzed the data and led
399 the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final
400 approval for publication.

References

- Anon., 2017. Wild boar causes 2-vehicle accident along PIE; no reported injuries. The Straits Times.
- Anon., 1992. Singapore's National Report for the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development Preparatory Committee. Singapore.
- Asah, S.T., Bengston, D.N., Westphal, L.M., 2012. The influence of childhood: Operational pathways to adulthood participation in nature-based activities. *Environment and Behavior* 44, 545–569.
- Bixler, R.D., Floyd, M.F., 1997. Nature is scary, disgusting, and uncomfortable. *Environment and Behavior* 29, 443–467.
- Bjerke, T., Østdahl, T., 2004. Animal-related attitudes and activities in an urban population. *Anthrozoos* 17, 109–129.
- Bögeholz, S., 2006. Nature experience and its importance for environmental knowledge, values and action: recent German empirical contributions. *Environmental Education Research* 12, 65–84.
- Butler, J.S., Shanahan, J., Decker, D.J., 2003. Public attitudes toward wildlife are changing: a trend analysis of New York residents. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 31, 1027–1036.
- Campbell, M., Lancaster, B.-L., 2010. Public Attitudes toward Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) and Cougars (*Puma concolor*) on Vancouver Island. *Society and Animals* 18, 40–57.
- Cassidy, A., Mills, B., 2012. “Fox tots attack shock”: Urban foxes, mass media and boundary-breaching. *Environmental Communication* 6, 494–511.
- Castelletta, M., Thiollay, J.M., Sodhi, N.S., 2005. The effects of extreme forest fragmentation on the bird community of Singapore Island. *Biological Conservation* 121, 135–155.
- Chawla, L., 2007. Childhood experiences associated with care for the natural world: A theoretical framework for empirical results. *Children, Youth and Environments* 17, 144–170.
- Chawla, L., 1998. Significant life experiences revisited: A review of research on sources of environmental sensitivity. *Journal of Environmental Education* 29, 11–21.
- Cheng, J.C.-H., Monroe, M.C., 2012. Connection to nature: Children's affective attitude toward nature. *Environment and Behavior* 44, 31–49.
- Chipeniuk, R., 1995. Childhood foraging as a means of acquiring competent human cognition about biodiversity. *Environment and Behavior* 27, 490–512.

- Conover, M.R., 1997. Wildlife management by metropolitan residents in the United States: practices, perceptions, costs, and values. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 25, 306–311.
- Corlett, R.T., 1992. The changing urban vegetation, in: Gupta, A., Pitts, J. (Eds.), *Physical Adjustments in a Changing Landscape*. Singapore University Press, Singapore, pp. 190–214.
- Crane, E., 1976. The range of human attitudes to bees. *Bee World* 57, 14–18.
- Decker, Daniel J., Purdy, K.G., 1988. Toward a concept of wildlife acceptance. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 16, 53–57.
- Delfosse, E.S., 2005. Risk and ethics in biological control. *Biological Control* 35, 319–329.
- Dowle, M., Deane, E.M., 2009. Attitudes to native bandicoots in an urban environment. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 55, 45–52.
- Fitzgerald, M., Joseph, A.P., Hayes, M., O'regan, M., 1995. Leisure activities of adolescent schoolchildren. *Journal of Adolescence* 18, 349–358.
- Gupta, A., 1992. The urban environment of a tropical city: Study of a physical ecosystem, in: Gupta, A., Pitts, J. (Eds.), *Physical Adjustments in a Changing Landscape*. Singapore University Press, Singapore, pp. 417–423.
- Hadidian, J., 2015. Wildlife in U.S. Cities: Managing unwanted animals. *Animals* 5, 1092–1113.
- Haidt, J., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., 1994. Individual differences in sensitivity to disgust: A scale sampling seven domains of disgust elicitors. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 16, 701–713.
- Hardt, J., Rutter, M., 2004. Validity of adult retrospective reports of adverse childhood experiences: Review of the evidence. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry Allied Discip.* 45, 260–273.
- Harrison, R.L., 1998. Bobcats in residential areas: Distribution and homeowner attitudes. *The Southwestern Naturalist* 43, 469–475.
- Herzog, Jr., H.A., Betchart, N.S., Pittman, R.B., 1991. Gender, Sex Role Orientation, and Attitudes Toward Animals. *Anthrozoos* 4, 184–191.
- Hio, L., 2018. Children here spend more time online than global average: Poll. *The Straits Times*.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., Mullen, M.R., 2008. Structural Equation Modelling : Guidelines for Determining Model Fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods* 6, 53–60.
- Hosaka, T., Sugimoto, K., Numata, S., 2017. Effects of childhood experience with nature on tolerance of urban residents toward hornets and wild boars in Japan. *PLoS One* 12, e0175243.

- Houston, M.J., Bruskotter, J.T., Fan, D., 2010. Attitudes toward wolves in the United States and Canada: A content analysis of the print news media, 1999-2008. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 15, 389–403.
- Hwang, Y.H., Zi En Jonathan, Y., Seow Kang, L., Hee Hiong Victor, T., 2019. It's OK to be wilder: Preference for natural growth in urban green spaces in a tropical city. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greenery* 38, 165–176.
- Jonker, S., Muth, R.M., Organ, J.F., Zwick, R.R., Siemer, W.F., 2006. Experiences with beaver damage and attitudes of Massachusetts residents toward beaver. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34, 300–306.
- Kals, E., Schumacher, D., Montada, L., 1999. Emotional affinity toward nature as a motivational basis to protect nature. *Environment and Behavior* 31, 178–202.
- Kaltenborn, B.P., Bjerke, T., Nyahongo, J.W., Williams, D.R., 2006. Animal preferences and acceptability of wildlife management actions around Serengeti National Park, Tanzania. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 15, 4633–4649.
- Kellert, S.R., 1984. Urban American perceptions of animals and the natural environment. *Urban Ecology* 8, 209–228.
- Kellert, S.R., 1985. Attitudes toward animals: Age-related development among children. *Journal of Environmental Education* 16, 29–39.
- Khew, J.Y.T., Yokohari, M., Tanaka, T., 2014. Public perceptions of nature and landscape preference in Singapore. *Human Ecology* 42, 979–988.
- Kong, L.L.L., Yuen, B., Sodhi, N.S., Briffett, C., 1999. The construction and experience of nature: Perspectives of urban youths. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 90, 3–16.
- König, A., 2008. Fears, attitudes and opinions of suburban residents with regards to their urban foxes: A case study in the community of Grünwald - A suburb of Munich. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 54, 101–109.
- Kretser, H.E., Curtis, P.D., Francis, J.D., Pendall, R.J., Knuth, B.A., 2009. Factors affecting perceptions of human-wildlife interactions in residential areas of northern New York and implications for conservation. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 14, 102–118.
- Lam, L., 2017. Police shoot wild boar that was rampaging in Punggol. *The Straits Times*.
- Lam, L., 2017. Motorcyclist and passenger injured in accident involving wild boar near Tuas Checkpoint. *The Straits Times*.
- Lance, C.E., Butts, M.M., Michels, L.C., 2006. The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods* 9, 202–220.
- Lane, D.J.W., Kingston, T., Lee, B.P.Y.H., 2006. Dramatic decline in bat species richness in Singapore, with implications for Southeast Asia. *Biological Conservation* 131, 584–593.

- Lee, G.S., 2016. One-third of monkeys being culled each year “too much”: MP Louis Ng. Channel NewsAsia 8, 1–5.
- Liu, W.T., 2018. Positioning native wildlife in Asian cities: Human-wildlife interactions in Singapore. National University of Singapore.
- Lute, M.L., Attari, S.Z., 2017. Public preferences for species conservation: choosing between lethal control, habitat protection and no action. *Environmental Conservation* 44, 139–147.
- Maas, J., Verheij, R.A., Groenewegen, P.P., De Vries, S., Spreeuwenberg, P., 2006. Green space, urbanity, and health: How strong is the relation? *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60, 587–592.
- Manfredo, M., Dayer, A.A., 2004. Concepts for exploring the social aspects of human – wildlife conflict in a global context. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 9, 317–328.
- Massei, G., Quay, R.J., Gurney, J., Cowan, D.P., 2010. Can translocations be used to mitigate human–wildlife conflicts? *Wildlife Research* 37, 428.
- McDonald, M.A.H., Rea, R. V., Hesse, G., 2012. Perceptions of moose-human conflicts in an urban environment. *ALCES* 48, 123–130.
- Miller, J.R., 2005. Biodiversity conservation and the extinction of experience. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 20, 430–434.
- Milligan, C., Bingley, A., 2007. Restorative places or scary spaces? The impact of woodland on the mental well-being of young adults. *Health & Place* 13, 799–811.
- Moiz, A., 1993. The Singapore Green Plan - Action Programmes. Ministry of the Environment, Singapore, Singapore.
- Myers Jr *, O.E., Saunders, C.D., Garrett, E., 2004. What do children think animals need? Developmental trends. *Environmental Education Research* 10, 545–562.
- Neville, W., 1969. The distribution of population in the post-war period, in: Ooi, J.-B., Chiang, H.D. (Eds.), *Modern Singapore*. University of Singapore, Singapore, pp. 52–68.
- NParks, 2018a. Park Connector Network. Retrieved July 11th, 2018 from <https://www.nparks.gov.sg/gardens-parks-and-nature/park-connector-network>.
- NParks, 2018b. Celebrating Biodiversity and Heritage of our Rail Corridor (Central). Retrieved November 17th, 2018 from <https://www.nparks.gov.sg/railcorridor>.
- Palmer, J.A., Suggate, J., 1996. Influences and experiences affecting the pro-environmental behaviour of educators. *Environmental Education Research* 2, 109–121.
- Peltzer, K., Pengpid, S., 2016. Leisure time physical inactivity and sedentary behaviour and lifestyle correlates among students aged 13–15 in the association of southeast asian

- nations (ASEAN) member states, 2007–2013. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 13, 1–16.
- Pinheiro, L.T., Rodrigues, J.F.M., Borges-Nojosa, D.M., 2016. Formal education, previous interaction and perception influence the attitudes of people toward the conservation of snakes in a large urban center of northeastern Brazil. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 12, 1–8.
- Qureshi, S., Breuste, J.H., Jim, C.Y., 2013. Differential community and the perception of urban green spaces and their contents in the megacity of Karachi, Pakistan. *Urban Ecosystems* 16, 853–870.
- Reiter, D.K., Brunson, M.W., Schmidt, R.H., 1999. Public attitudes toward wildlife damage management and policy. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 27, 746–758.
- Røskoft, E., Bjerke, T., Kaltenborn, B., Linnell, J.D.C., Andersen, R., 2003. Patterns of self-reported fear towards large carnivores among the Norwegian public. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 24, 184–198.
- Sanderson, E.W., Jaiteh, M., Levy, M.A., Redford, K.H., Wannebo, A. V., Woolmer, G., 2002. The human footprint and the last of the wild. *Bioscience* 52, 891–904.
- Savage, V.R., 1992. Landscape change: From kampung to global city, in: Gupta, A., Pitts, J. (Eds.), *Physical Adjustments in a Changing Landscape*. Singapore University Press, Singapore, pp. 5–31.
- Sebba, R., 1991. The landscapes of childhood: The reflection of childhood’s environment in adult memories and in children’s attitudes. *Environment and Behavior* 23, 395–422.
- Seddon, P.J., Khoja, A.R., 2003. Youth attitudes to wildlife, protected areas and outdoor recreation in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Ecotourism* 2, 67–75.
- Sha, J.C.M., Gumert, M.D., Lee, B.P.Y.H., Jones-Engel, L., Chan, S., Fuentes, A., 2009. Macaque-Human interactions and the societal perceptions of macaques in Singapore. *American Journal of Primatology* 71, 825–839.
- Singapore Department of Statistics, 2017. *Yearbook of Statistics Singapore*. Singapore.
- Slimak, M.W., Dietz, T., 2006. Personal values, beliefs, and ecological risk perception. *Risk Analysis* 26, 1689–1705.
- Smith, M., Davidson, J., 2006. ‘It Makes My Skin Crawl...’: The Embodiment of Disgust in Phobias of ‘Nature.’ *Body Soc.* 12, 43–67. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.434548>
- Soga, M., Gaston, K.J., 2016. Extinction of experience: The loss of human-nature interactions. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 14, 94–101.
- Soga, M., Gaston, K.J., Kubo, T., 2018. Cross-generational decline in childhood experiences of neighborhood flowering plants in Japan. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 174, 55–62.

- Soga, M., Gaston, K.J., Yamaura, Y., Kurisu, K., Hanaki, K., 2016. Both direct and vicarious experiences of nature affect children's willingness to conserve biodiversity. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 13, 529.
- Stone, A., 2014. Alienation from Nature and Early German Romanticism. *Ethical Theory & Moral Practice* 17, 41–54.
- Takano, T., Nakamura, K., Watanabe, M., 2002. Urban residential environments and senior citizens' longevity in megacity areas: The importance of walkable green spaces. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 56, 913–918.
- Tan, A., 2018. Three rare native mammals found as roadkill in Mandai, near works to build new zoos. *The Straits Times*.
- Tanner, T., 1980. Significant life experiences: A new research area in environmental education. *Environmental Education* 11, 20–24.
- Taylor, A., 2011. Reconceptualizing the “nature” of childhood. *Childhood* 18, 420–433.
- Taylor, A., Giugni, M., 2012. Common worlds: Reconceptualising inclusion in early childhood communities. *Contemp. Issues Early Child.* 13, 108–119.
- Taylor, A., Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., 2015. Learning with children, ants, and worms in the Anthropocene: towards a common world pedagogy of multispecies vulnerability. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society* 23, 507–529.
- Taylor, A., Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., 2017. Kids, raccoons, and roos: awkward encounters and mixed affects. *Children's Geographies* 15, 131–145.
- Teng, A., 2014. Singapore ranks third globally in time spent on homework. *The Straits Times*.
- Teng, A., 2016. Tuition industry worth over \$1b a year. *The Sunday Times*.
- Thompson, C.W., Aspinall, P., Montarzino, A., 2008. The childhood factor: Adult visits to green places and the significance of childhood experience. *Environment and Behavior* 40, 111–143.
- Turner, I.M., Tan, H.T.W., Wee, Y.C., Ibrahim, A.B., Chew, P.T., Corlett, R.T., 1994. A study of plant species extinction in Singapore: Lessons for the conservation of tropical biodiversity. *Conservation Biology* 8, 705–712.
- URA, 2018. Master Plan. Retrieved April 29th, 2018 from <https://www.ura.gov.sg/Corporate/Planning/Master-Plan>.
- Vogel, S., 1988. Marx and alienation from nature. *Social Theory & Practice* 14, 367–387.
- von Benzon, N., 2018. Discussing Nature, ‘Doing’ Nature: For an emancipatory approach to conceptualizing young people's access to outdoor green space. *Geoforum* 93, 79–86.

- 609 Wells, N.M., Lekies, K.S., 2006. Nature and the life course: Pathways from childhood nature
610 experiences to adult environmentalism. *Children, Youth and Environments* 16, 1–24.
- 611 Wong, K.K., 2009. Urban park visiting habits and leisure activities of residents in Hong
612 Kong, China. *Managing Leisure* 14, 125–140.
- 613 World Bank, 2018. Population density. Retrieved December 17th, 2017 from
614 https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.DNST?year_high_desc=true.
- 615 Woolever, J.D., 1953. Animals and why children fear them. *The American Biology Teacher*
616 15, 121–123.
- 617 Yee, A.T.K., Corlett, R.T., Liew, S.C., Tan, H.T.W., 2011. The vegetation of Singapore - an
618 updated map. *Gardens Bulletin Singapore* 63, 205–212.
- 619 Yeo, J.-H., Neo, H., 2010. Monkey business: human–animal conflicts in urban Singapore.
620 *Society and Cultural Geography* 11, 681–699.
- 621 Yeo, R., 2016. Masterplan for HDB’s upcoming Tengah town unveiled. *The Business Times*.
- 622 Zhang, W., Goodale, E., Chen, J., 2014. How contact with nature affects children’s biophilia,
623 biophobia and conservation attitude in China. *Biological Conservation* 177, 109–116.
- 624 Zinn, H.C., Pierce, C.L., 2002. Values, gender, and concern about potentially dangerous
625 wildlife. *Environment & Behavior* 34, 239–256.
- 626

Figure legends

Figure 1. Model of the hypothesized relationships between tolerance, attitudes, childhood nature experience and various sociodemographic factors.

Figure 2. Levels of childhood nature experience among 1004 Singapore residents.

Figure 3. Attitudes of respondents towards macaques, hornets, and snakes.

Figure 4. Acceptance and tolerance of actions associated with animal encounters (M = macaque, H = hornet and P = python) of varying damage severity (1 = animal sighted/living near residence, 2 = animal caused light damage; 3 = animal caused severe damage).

Figure 5. Path coefficients of the SEM for attitude and tolerance towards macaque, hornet and pythons in three scenarios of increasing damage severity, after removal of non-significant paths. Line thickness represents significance levels in increasing order: $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.001$.

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

Figure 5.

Table 1. Human-wildlife interaction scenarios with increasing severity of problem for each animal.

No.	Scenario
H1	Hornets have flown to a park near your house. There is a chance that park visitors will encounter them.
H2	Hornets have made a nest in a park near your house. There is a chance that park visitors will get stung by them.
H3	Hornets nesting in a park near your house have attacked and severely injured a park visitor.
M1	A troop of macaques lives in a park near your house. There is a chance that park visitors will encounter them.
M2	A troop of macaques living in a green space near your house have disturbed gardens and damaged fruits and vegetables.
M3	A troop of macaques living in a park near your house have attacked and severely injured a park visitor.
P1	Pythons live in a park near your house. There is a chance that park visitors will encounter them.
P2	Pythons living in a park near your house has killed your pets.
P3	Pythons living in a park near your house have attacked and severely injured a park visitor.

Supplementary information

Figure S1. Number of wildlife-related reports to the Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority of Singapore (AVA Annual Reports 2002-2017). Other wildlife may include snakes, wild boar, or birds.

Table S2. Number of respondents in each age group.

Age group	Number of respondents
18-19	63
20-24	100
25-29	114
30-34	111
35-39	91
40-44	147
45-49	114
50-54	106
55-59	79
60-64	50
65-70	29

Table S3. SEM fitness indicators for each model.

Scenario	χ^2	df	p	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
M1	4.238	2	0.120	0.986	0.034	0.013
M2	2.698	1	0.101	0.989	0.042	0.013
M3	0.000	0	-	1.000	0.000	0.000
H1	2.610	3	0.456	1.000	0.000	0.011
H2	2.796	3	0.424	1.000	0.000	0.010
H3	0.963	2	0.618	1.000	0.000	0.006
P1	0.000	0	-	1.000	0.000	0.000
P2	2.701	1	0.100	0.992	0.041	0.012
P3	2.891	1	0.089	0.992	0.044	0.013

Figure S4. Attitudes towards the three animals grouped by a) gender, b) age, and c) education level.