Human intolerance of wildlife is often associated with negative interactions (i.e., conflict) between humans and wildlife. While many studies of these conflicts focus on which species are involved and the extent of damage caused, few studies focus on understanding the psychological factors that shape how people talk about or “frame” such negative interactions. This investigation seeks to understand how situational-specific factors (e.g., the nature, extent, and frequency of previous interactions) and underlying psychological factors, such as wildlife value orientations, impact an individual’s framing of reported problems with wildlife. Using data from a survey of residents living in Washington state, we performed a mixed-methods analysis of 1,852 responses to an open-ended question asking participants to describe the problems they have experienced with wildlife near their homes. Environmental context played a role in the types of species and interactions that an individual identifies. Additionally, there is evidence that demographic and psychological factors impact what interactions may be the most salient to an individual. These results also indicate nuisance interactions may be the most commonly experienced across groups. Other studies have found that nuisance interactions have greatest potential for social conflict over appropriate management decisions and acceptability of lethal control. Experience and engagement in attempts to mitigate problems with wildlife may explain some of this variability.