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Abstract

Currently youth are the future generations of the country, their awareness on the values of wildlife is critical in determining if they will follow the footsteps of the current generation in conserving natural resources (wildlife). This study was conducted in Wuparo and Balyerwa community conservancies, to assess learners’ level of awareness on wildlife-based ecosystem services. The knowledge and awareness processes that introduce information about wildlife resources and their benefits plays a critical role in shaping life-long attitudes, values, and patterns of behavior of learners toward wildlife. Questionnaires were used in data collection and the target population consisted of learners with the inclusion of teachers (control group) resulting to a sample size of 145 respondents which was randomly selected from eight indiscriminately selected schools within the two randomly selected conservancies. The results showed that learners were aware that wildlife has values (ecosystem services). Moreover, they are highly aware of tangible benefits
(provisional services) compared to other ecosystem services. There was no significant association between awareness and gender ($P = 0.259$), age ($P = 0.374$), level of education ($P = 0.129$). There was a positive correlation ($R^2 = 0.9995$) between level of awareness and level of education. The availability of wildlife related subjects, location of school, lack of environmental clubs and ignorance towards wildlife were the major factors reported to influence awareness of learners. Increased support for natural resources-focused education among the youth and improved support for environmental and wildlife clubs can be beneficial to wildlife and environmental conservation.
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Introduction

The range of products and services provided by wildlife resources are important to the livelihoods of local communities that are close to those resources (Chivian & Bernstein, 2008). The sustainability of wildlife-based ecosystem goods and services depends on the knowledge and concern for conservation of the local communities on these goods and services (Chardonnet et al., 2002). However, local people’s awareness on the importance of wildlife services to their livelihoods is limited and hence possibly hindering effective ecosystem services based conservation effort (Chan et al., 2012), leading to lack of concern for wildlife conservation by these communities (Gandiwa et al., 2014). Sustainability of wildlife-based goods and services on the involvement of the youth as they are the future scientists, policymakers and regulators of the environment. These gaps in knowledge calls for effective wildlife education among school students for better understanding and improved conservation of wildlife-based goods and services (Tesfai et al., 2016). These should include an interaction between indigenous knowledge and knowledge from schools on wildlife values (Bitanyi et al., 2012).

The basic understanding, knowledge and perceptions on ecosystem services differs widely from country to country and among different segments of population (MEA, 2005). Youth in community-based conservation areas (thereafter referred to as conservancies) are expected to know the types of wildlife values that contribute to their livelihoods. To achieve that, they need to be aware of the values (ecosystem services) wildlife. Understanding the value of wildlife, learners can develop a positive attitude towards wildlife
conservation. Currently, wildlife conservation in conservancies is not adequate, because some conservancy members are not aware of the values and contribution of wildlife to their livelihoods. Poor or lack of understanding of the ecological values of wildlife could be one of the factors contributing to poor or limited wildlife conservation measures in community conservancies (Hariohay et al., 2018). Young people are the future wildlife conservationist, it is thus important to know the extent (gap in knowledge) to which they are aware of the values of wildlife.

There exist variations in learners’ attitudes and behaviours towards the environment-based conservation (Thapa, 1999; Tehrani et al., 2010). Learners who had improved education on environment related topics (nature conservation) had been reported to be more aware of wildlife services than those with less or without education. Thus, it is believed that environmental literacy is often linked with learners’ awareness, sensitivity and understanding of changing environmental matters (Hariohay et al., 2018). Learners ‘awareness has been reported to be influenced by many factors, including gender (Taskin, 2009; Tesfai et al., 2016), environmental education (Selby, 2004; Ajiboye & Silo, 2008) and age (Tesfai et al., 2016). Different results have been reported on the influence of gender on learners’ awareness. Results from Taskin (2009) study in Turkey showed that female participants were more positive and show greater concern towards environmental issues than their male counterparts. On the other hand, MacDonald & Hara (1994), reported that male respondents are more sensitive to environmental disputes than female respondents. A study by Yilmaz et al., (2004), found no influence of gender on the awareness of learners. According to Tuncer et al. (2005), there was a statistically
significant effect of gender and school type attendance towards environmental attitudes of young people in Turkey, with girls achieving higher scores than boys.

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) identified education and public awareness of biodiversity as important tools in achieving biodiversity conservation (Environmental Education). In addition, Chapter 36 of the Agenda 21 is dedicated to promoting education, public awareness and training of youth (United Nations Committee, 1992). Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) parties adopted a program of work for Communication, Education and Public Awareness (CEPA) which among others aims to communicate the scientific and technical work of the Convention in a language that is accessible to many different groups, integrate biodiversity into their education systems and raise public awareness of the importance of biodiversity to their livelihoods. The CBD Secretariat and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are jointly mainstreaming biodiversity through various dimensions of biodiversity education for Sustainable Development, including highlights on all the biodiversity educational initiatives that targeted children and the youth.

Namibia is signatory to various international conventions such as the CBD and UNESCO which recognize that awareness is an important aspect of ensuring the protection of Biodiversity (MEA, 2005). To fulfil this obligation, the government of Namibia, through article 95 of its constitution, emphasizes the promotion of the people’s livelihoods through sustainable use of wildlife resources (Government Republic of Namibia, 1990). In 1999
the Ministry of Education (MoE), with the assistance of the Namibia Environmental Education Network (NEEN), developed a National Environmental Education that promoted the inclusion of environmental education into the formal education across all subjects (Natural and Social Sciences). Studies have been conducted to assess the inclusion of environmental education in some specific subjects and the ability and capability of teachers to teach them. However, fewer studies have been conducted to assess learners’ awareness of environmental issues. This study’s main objective was to assess the level of awareness of learners on the value (services) of wildlife, with three specific objectives as follows: a) To assess the level of awareness among learners on the provisional ecosystem services generated from wildlife conservation; b) To assess the level of awareness among learners on the cultural ecosystem services generated from wildlife conservation and c) To assess the level awareness among learners on the supporting/regulatory ecosystem services generated from wildlife conservation.

Methods and Materials

Study area

The study was conducted in two (2) community conservancies, Balyerwa and Wuparo conservancies within Mudumu South Complex in the Zambezi Region, Namibia (Figure 1). The target population were learners in primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary schools from Balyerwa and Wuparo community conservancies. Within the two (2) community conservancies,
eight (8) schools were selected, four (4) schools in Balyerwa community conservancy and four (4) schools in Wuparo community conservancy.
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**Figure 1:** Map of the study area where (a) is Zambezi Region, and (b) is Wuparo and Balyerwa community conservancy.

**Sampling procedure**

The study population was 145 (including eight teachers) from three phases of schools (primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary). A list of all schools in two conservancies was acquired from the Ministry of Education, and random sampling method was used to select the eight (8) schools of study as follows: Sangwali Senior Secondary school, Sangwali Combined School, Samudono Primary School, and Mukurofu Primary School in Balyerwa conservancy, whereas in Wuparo conservancy, the selected
schools were Simataa Senior Secondary School, Sauzuo Combined School, Mbambazi Primary School, and Lianshulu Primary School. From each selected school, six (6) learners were randomly selected per grade on a 15% ratio (1 teacher:35 learners) making a total sample of one hundred and forty five (145) respondents. In case of many classes per single grade (for instance 6A, 6B), there was a random selection of one class among the three classrooms.

**Sample size**

Since the maximum number of learners allowed in every single class is 35, this led to calculations resulting in seventy two (72) learners sampled at primary level for all the conservancies, forty four (44) learners from the junior secondary level, and then twenty one (21) learners from the senior secondary level. Two (2) grades from each single primary school were sampled (grade 6 and 7), similarly applied to senior secondary level (grade 11 and 12), and from the junior secondary level three classes were sampled (grade 8, 9, and 10). Additionally, eight (8) teachers were randomly sampled from eight (8) different schools. Therefore, a total number of 137 learners were interviewed, thus N=145 (including teachers as the control group of the study and to correlate their knowledge with that of the learners) sampling population for both two conservancies.

**Study design and Data collection**

The study adopted a mixed method approach which employed both quantitative and qualitative methods, and utilized a range of data collection techniques. The questionnaires comprised of both open-ended and closed
ended questions with the inclusion of Likert scale questions. Data was collected through administration of questionnaires, the questionnaire was divided into five major sections i.e. personal details (demographic), and four sections of provisional services, cultural services, supporting and regulating services, and lastly general knowledge section of respondents. Unfortunately, the questionnaires were not pre-tested due to limited time allocation for conducting the thesis. This simply means that as the research was being conducted, the researcher had to attend classes at the same time. Thus, there was limited time for pre-testing.

**Data analysis**

Qualitative and quantitative data techniques were used in data analysis. The first step employed was to transform qualitative data into quantitative data through the use of Likert scale, and this involved cleaning, organizing and coding in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) windows 2010 version 20 software by creating categories using numeric values. The data was then entered into spreadsheets and analysed using SPSS software windows 2010 version 20 to analyse quantitative data (including the transformed quantitative data into codes) to generate descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, percentages and standard deviations for all the objectives.

Inferential Statistical analysis involved the use of Pearson chi-square tests to find and associate the relationships between the factors influencing the levels of awareness of wildlife values (ecosystem services) and learners’ level of awareness and, thus establish the effective factors influencing learners’ response and perceptions towards wildlife values. In addition, regression
correlation was used to test the significant relationship between primary, junior secondary, senior secondary school learners, and teachers by comparing the levels of awareness among the respondents, and lastly graphs (for all the objectives) where formulated using Microsoft excel 2016.

**Results & Discussions**

**Socio-demographic profile of the respondents**

**Table 1**: Summarized social-demographic profile of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter (N=145)</th>
<th>Frequency (n)</th>
<th>Proportion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaches</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balyerwa</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuparo</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: 10 – 15 years old</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: 16 – 21 years old</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: 22 + years old</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 145 respondents (137 learners, 8 teachers) involved in the study, 70 (48.3%) respondents were from Balyerwa conservancy, while 75 (51.2%) were from Wuparo conservancy. In terms of gender representation, 78 (53.8%) respondents were male, while 67 (46.2%) were female, thus males were more compared to female respondents. In terms of levels of education, the majority (n=72) of respondents were primary school learners (49.7%) due to the fact that more primary schools were selected compared to other categories. 30.3% of the respondents were from junior secondary phase, 14.5% (n=21) were from senior secondary schools and only 5.5% (n=8) of the total respondents were teachers. With the age groups, the majority (49%) of respondents were aged between 10 to 15 years old, with 42.8% (n=62) aged between 16 to 21 years old, 4.8% (n=7) aged between 22 to 27 years old, and only 5 participants (3.4%) were aged above 28 years (Table 1).

**Level of awareness of the concept wildlife among learners**

When asked whether they (learners) were aware of the term wildlife without being given a definition, 81% of learners were aware of the concept “wildlife” and only 19% of all the learners involved in the study were not aware (Table 2).

Since the results elaborated that the majority (81%) of learners attending schools in conservancies were knowledgeable and familiar with the concept “wildlife”, the possible reason for this finding is the location of schools, whereby all the schools are built in community conservancies. This gives learners high probabilities of knowing and familiarizing with the concept. A study on learners’ environmental attitudes and behaviours by Müderrisoğlu & Altanlar (2011) supports these findings as it stated that students and
learners from rural areas have more sophisticated environmental awareness than those from urban areas, thus the place of residence can also influence learners’ awareness significantly.

**Table 2:** The level of awareness among learners on the term "wildlife", and the association between genders, level of education with the level of awareness of the concept (wildlife).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA_ Question: Are you aware of the term wildlife?</th>
<th>P = 0.259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>111 (81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another factor that was reported in this study as playing a major role in the awareness of learners was the provision of wildlife related activities such as environmental clubs in some schools as this aids in environmental education through the subjects offered in schools such as Natural Science, Life Science and Biology. Thus environmental education through environmental clubs is an effective way of familiarizing learners with wildlife and its values. In relation to Woodworth *et al.* (2011), and Moseley (2000), their studies found that increased and responsible environmental actions were the end results of environmental education given to students.
From the 111 respondents who said yes, 62 (55.9%) counts were male and only 49 (44.1%) were females (Table 2). Males were found to be more knowledgeable than females. This simply means that males had access to different activities that engages them in wildlife related issues. MacDonald & Hara (1994), argue that males were more sensitive to environmental disputes than females. However, some studies argue and reported that females were more positive and showed greater concern towards environmental issues than males (Taskin, 2009).

There were no significance association between awareness and gender (Pearson chi-square value: $P = 0.259$), age ($P = 0.374$), and level of education ($P = 0.129$) among learners. In case of the teachers who were involved in the study, all males ($n= 4, 100\%$) and females ($n= 4, 100\%$) were knowledgeable about the concept wildlife (Table 2). In support of Yilmaz, Boone, & Andersen (2004), they found that there was no significant difference between males and females. However, Tuncer et al. (2005), argue that their results indicated that there was a statistically significant effect of gender and school type attendance towards environmental attitudes of young people in Turkey, with girls achieving higher scores than boys.

**Association and correlation between level of awareness of the concept wildlife and level of education**

There was no significant difference between learners from junior and secondary schools’ awareness of wildlife and the two groups were treated as one group (Secondary school). The study denoted that 75 % of all the learners from primary schools, 88 % from secondary schools were aware of the concept wildlife (Figure 2). In contrast, all teachers in the study were aware
(100%). Ordering level of education (primary = 1, secondary = 2, and teachers = 3), there was a strong positive correlation between level of awareness and level of education (correlation: $R^2 = 0.9995$), thus the level of awareness increased with the level of education (Figure 2).

**Figure 2:** Association and correlation between the learners and teachers’ level of awareness of the term "wildlife" and the level of education.

**Level of awareness on valuing wildlife**

The levels of awareness were given in Likert scale of five levels (Highly Agree, Agree, Not Sure, Disagree and Highly Disagree) which converted data from qualitative to quantitative (use of mean scores between the levels of education) (Table 3).
Table 2: Level of awareness of respondents on wildlife as a valuable asset, using Descriptive statistics (Key: Mean; 1 = Highly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Not Sure; 4 = Disagree; 5 = Highly Disagree).

**Question: Wildlife has values?** Likert scale to Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary S</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior S</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior S</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average mean</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td><strong>1.51</strong></td>
<td>.055</td>
<td><strong>1.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, learners and teachers were aware that wildlife has values (Average Mean = 1.51) (Table 3).

The general observations of the study findings indicated that both learners and teachers were aware and had the knowledge that wildlife has values. Reasons for that were the creations of environmental clubs in schools, in this case all the schools involved in the study had environmental clubs such the Go Green Club (at Sangwali Primary School) and the Big Five Club (at Simataa Senior Secondary School). The former allows learners to learn about the importance of plants and they engages them tree planting activities, on the other hand, the latter engage learners into wildlife safari trips (game viewing) within different nearby protected areas (Mudumu National Park). Environmental clubs help provide a back ground of wildlife with its related
values. Availability of topics related to environmental aspects or wildlife related chapters such as “Types of Ecosystems” in Natural Science, Life Science, and Biology also played an important role in the level of awareness. In addition, the love learners had for nature (interest towards animals and plants) was also one of the reported factors supplementing their knowledge.

In support by Pashby & Weis (2002), their concluded that school programmes and environmental clubs had a significant impact in improving children’s environmental consciousness and their levels of awareness. Additionally, Selby (2001), stated that environmental conservation programmes attempt to stop the disconnection between nature and humans by influencing the level of knowledge and attitudes. On the other hand, some learners argued that wildlife had no values due to negative thoughts they had towards wild animal, specifically in relation to cases of human wildlife conflicts. Gender and ignorance also were reported as the major barriers affecting learners’ level of awareness.

**Level of awareness on Ecosystem Services in general**

This elaborated on the level of awareness on provisional (tangible benefits), cultural (benefits related to religion, leisure, or educational purposes), and supporting or regulating ecosystem services. Different themes were used to easily specify and give an overview on the main provisional (food, medicine, building materials, clothing, firewood, furniture, and crafts), cultural (income or foreign currency, tourism, job creation, and education), supporting or regulating (shelter, oxygen, pollination, seed dispersal, and soil
fertility) ecosystem services within the conserved area, they also helped in avoiding repetition of related individual benefits. Due to the fact that individual participant had chances to mention more than one benefit, the sum of all the proportions of the themes exceeds 100% (Figure 3).

**Figure 3:** Different themes denoting a) Provisional ecosystem services, b) Cultural ecosystem services, and c) Supporting/Regulating ecosystem services listed by learners and teachers in general.

**Level of awareness on Provisional Ecosystem Services**

Learners in primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary schools were knowledgeable that food and medicine were the main tangible services generated from wildlife (all ranging more than 80% in all levels of education) (Figure 3; a)). In terms of other themes the values fluctuated below 75% for all respondents except teachers (clothing, building materials, firewood, furniture, and crafts), therefore awareness or knowledge increased with the level of education, such that senior secondary school learners were more knowledgeable compared to primary school learners, but almost equally
proportional with junior secondary learners in most cases. Additionally, teachers were highly aware in all cases (Figure 3; a)).

Specifically with learners only, the study showed that a majority of the respondents were able to state food as the main provisional service generated from wildlife (n=130, 95%). It further showed that most stated that plants and animals can be used to treat sick people (n= 98, 72%), 40 respondents mentioned furniture (29%) which included chairs and doors, 39 stated that plants can be used for crafts (29%), 61 (45%) said plants were used as building materials for houses especially in local villages, 64 (47%) were confident that animal skin and other plant parts could be processed into clothes, and lastly 51 (37%) participants mentioned use of plants as firewood.

**Level of awareness on Cultural Ecosystem Services**

Learners in primary, junior secondary, and senior secondary schools as well as teachers were knowledgeable that wildlife generates cultural services, however the majority stated income and foreign currency as the main cultural service (figures in all levels of education ranging above 50%). In terms of tourism, job creation, and education, the result denoted that the level of awareness increased with the level of education such that senior secondary school learners were more knowledgeable compared primary and junior secondary school learners and literally the figures ranged below 50% in all cases (themes) except for teachers (Figure 3; b)).

Specifically with learners, the study denoted that a majority of the respondents (n=80, 58 %) were able to state that money (income/foreign currency) was the main cultural services. It further showed that only 19
(14%) respondents were able to state that wildlife create jobs (both for self and employed jobs), whereas 36 respondents mentioned tourism (26%), and only 2 participants (2%) were able to value wildlife on an educational basis.

**Level of awareness on Supporting / Regulating Ecosystem Services**

The level of awareness in some themes (shelter and oxygen) increased with the level of education (Figure 3, c)). The majority of the respondents (figures ranging below 30 % in all themes) were not aware of the supporting and regulating ecosystem services generated from wildlife such that only teachers were aware (figures ranging above 50 % in most cases). However, different learners from different levels of education valued wildlife as ecosystem supporters and regulators differently, such that learners from secondary schools had an idea and partially knowledgeable than learners in primary schools (Figure 3; c)).

Specifically with learners only, the study denoted that only 15 % of respondents possessed knowledge that wildlife provides shelter in nature (n=21). It further elaborated that 12% of the participants (n=16) valued plants as a source of oxygen (through photosynthesis), 11% (n=15) mentioned that insects were responsible for the process of pollination, 7% of learners valued wildlife as resources that adds nutrients to the soil, and only 6% (n= 8) of the respondents mentioned that animal and plant species plays an important role in the dispersal of seeds.
Overall level of awareness on Ecosystem Services

This elaborated learners’ overall awareness on ecosystem services (summarised content of awareness), gave an overview of the category which were highly known and least known by learners and teachers.

![Bar chart showing the level of awareness on Ecosystem Services among learners and teachers]

**Figure 4:** The overall overview of learners and teachers' level of awareness on Ecosystem Services.

The figure above indicates that among the respondents (with the exclusion of teachers), the majority were highly aware of tangible benefits (provisional ecosystem services) from wildlife (70 %). It further denoted that only 10 % of the learners were aware of supporting or regulating ecosystem services, meaning learners were least aware of these benefits compared to cultural ecosystem services (20 % of respondents) and provisional ecosystem services. In contrast, teachers were diversely and equally aware of all the ecosystem services. This basically means that learners had little or lack knowledge in terms of supporting/regulating ecosystem services compared to provisional and cultural ecosystem services.
All in one on provisional, cultural, supporting, and regulating ecosystem services, the study scientifically denoted that learners in conserved areas were aware of ecosystem services. However, they were highly aware of tangible benefits which are provisional services, and least aware of supporting ecosystem services compared to cultural (benefits that are non-tangible but regulates, controls, or supports ecosystems with its biotic and abiotic factors and process) and provisional ecosystem services. The reason behind the findings was that learners highly value wildlife in terms of direct (tangible) benefits generated rather than indirect benefits.

In support of this study, an article by Xun et al. (2017), on farmers’ awareness of ecosystem services and the associated policy implications concluded that farmers were concerned with ecosystem service functions that directly benefit them, however they did not sufficiently understood the ecosystem’s ecological security maintenance or cultural landscape functions. The results of this study also indicated that there was a positive correlation between level of education and level of awareness, such that the awareness of ecosystem services increased with the level of education. This was the case because knowledge towards wildlife in schools increased with grades and wildlife related subjects, in primary schools the available subjects that offer wildlife related topics were limited compared to secondary schools and higher institutions.

In support of this study, Thapa (1999) and Tehrani et al. (2010), observed the same aspects on some variations in student’s attitudes and behaviours towards the environment based on their educational background. They concluded that learners who had improved education on environmental
related topics were more aware of environmental services than those with less or without education. Thus, environmental literacy was often linked with learners’ awareness, sensitivity and understanding of changing environmental matters. However, some authors argued that environmentally responsible choices towards wildlife values that local members make are based on lessons learned in their youth either formally, informally and non-formally (Eagles & Demare, 1999).

Tesfai et al. (2016), on perceptions of secondary school students’ towards environmental services argued that both educated and poor people valued forest ecosystem services more than uneducated people due to conservation education being offered in areas of residence, thus concluded that education had an influence on the level of awareness on the values of wildlife.

**Effects of raising awareness in schools**

Raising awareness involved the process of teaching or educating learners about the importance of wildlife through campaigns, excursion or even verbally through teaching subjects related to wildlife in schools. The results of the study showed that raising awareness in schools helps improve the understanding of learners on wildlife values. They gain knowledge about wildlife and its interactions with the ecosystem and local people, by so doing they engage themselves in the conservation of wildlife species. However, the study induced that even if raising awareness helped learners gain knowledge and engage themselves in wildlife conservation, they were not able to educate other local members in their communities, thus skills were not shared which led to increased levels of poaching among local members within conserved areas.
In support of this study findings, Eagles & Demare (1999), concluded that both formal and informal environmental conservation programs in conserved and non-conserved areas minimizes the disconnection between nature and humans.

Additionally, Navjot et al. (2010), stated conservation endeavors are only successful when local people are provided with alternative sustenance opportunities and basic education in addition to environmental outreach to reduce reliance on wildlife.

Since this study found that raising awareness in schools helps boost learners’ level of awareness, Bitanyi et al. (2012) and Tesfai et al. (2016), supports the findings by recommending that improved education programs were needed as well as provision of alternative livelihood opportunities that may decrease dependence on wildlife resources, meaning that provision of wildlife conservation education can boast the level of awareness of local and strongly supported the need for more environmental education and awareness campaigns in schools, as well as engaging students in outdoor environmental activities.

**Conclusions**

The study concluded that learners were knowledgeable that wildlife has values (generates ecosystem services), however secondary school learners were highly aware of the benefits compared to primary school learners, and males were more knowledgeable than females. It further indicated that there were no significant association between gender, age, level of education with
learners’ awareness of the concept wildlife and the values generated. However, there was a positive correlation between level of education and level of awareness such that the awareness of the values and the concept of wildlife increased with the level of education. In addition, the study denoted that learners were knowledgeable that wildlife generates tangible and cultural ecosystem services, and least aware of the supporting and regulating ecosystem services, the reason was that they value direct benefits of wild animals and plants than non-direct benefits. It further concludes that in these services, learners in secondary schools were knowledgeable compared to learners in primary schools, although teachers were highly aware of all the services. These people (respondents) highly valued wildlife as a source of food and medicine (provisional), income and foreign currency (cultural), and shelter (supporting).

Factors that influenced learners’ level of awareness on valuing wildlife were the availability of subjects related to wildlife, level of education, environmental clubs in some schools, as well as the location of schools (in conserved areas), thus they were the major role players in boosting their awareness of wildlife values. Although they were aware, there were certain barriers that prevented some of the individuals in schools in terms of valuing wildlife. These were lack of interest in partaking in environmental clubs, negative thoughts towards wildlife (cultural factors) by having the mentality that animals leads to human wildlife conflicts. Despite this study being a by-product of another study, the study demonstrated that novel knowledge can be generated from such data.
Acknowledgement

The successful completion of this thesis involved valuable contributions from many people and since it will not be possible to enumerate all of them, I will just name but a few. First and foremost, I would like to thank the Almighty God for giving me the health and a sound mind throughout my academic sessions that enabled me to attain my long awaited goals and objectives in academic circles. Secondly, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Rutina Lucas for accepting to be my supervisor and for his guidance in proposal writing. I would also wish to express my sincere and profound gratitude to my mother Mrs. Kamwi Rosemary for being there for me in good and bad times during my entire study at the university. Thirdly, I pay special tribute to the respondents (learners and teachers from all the schools in the study area) who graciously availed their time to give me audience. Indeed, if they had not volunteered information, there would have been no data to write this report. Lastly, am grateful to my driver for data collection (Brolin Sanjahi), classmates Justin Moya, Alex Simenda and Angula Tuwilika, and the entire university fraternity including the library staff who issued me with books, articles and journals. God bless all who have contributed to the success of this report.

Disclosure Statement

No conflict of interest was reported by authors.

Notes on contributors

Joseph Kabanze is a Bachelor of Science graduate from the Department of Wildlife Management and Ecotourism at Katima Mulilo Campus, University
of Namibia (UNAM). His research interests concern awareness ecosystem services among learners in conserved areas.

Reference


Balfanz, R. &. (2012). *Chronic absenteeism: Summarising what we know from nationally available data.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University center for social organisation of schools.


https://www.britannica.com/animal/leopard#ref1247521


DOBE, & Policy, S. (2014). *Guidelines to ensure quality education and support in Special Schools and Special School resource Centres*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education.


Gandiwa, E., Gandiwa, P., Muboko, N., Libombo, E., Mashapa, C., & Gwazani, R. (2014). Local People’s Knowledge and Perceptions of


Kuntze. (1886, June 19). *Pechuel-Loeschea leubnitziae (Kuntze 1886) O.Hoffm. in Namibia*. Retrieved 25 September, 2015, from J. Irish,
Namibia Biodiversity Database:


recruiting, F. (2015, June 6). How to create a positive learning environment.


190


Shareena, P., & Mahammad, S. (2020). It is difficult to monitor a worker's effort at home, especially when occasionally being interrupted by private responsibilities and family members. *GJRA - GLOBAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH ANALYSIS, 9*(5). doi:10.36106/gjra


XOBNI. (2010). There is no such as aday off for Americans and Brits.
