

## **A Note on Pedagogy: Humane Education Making a Difference<sup>1</sup>**

Piers Beirne and Meena Alagappan<sup>2</sup>

In the last decade Anglophone sociology has begun to remedy its lengthy neglect of the diverse social and cultural relationships between humans and nonhuman animals (henceforth, “animals”). Long subdued by Durkheim's imperialistic declaration in *The Rules of Sociological Method* that the social and cultural realms are autonomous from the biological, sociology currently displays an emerging, if still modest, interest in the interaction between humans and animals.

Evidence of this shift in attention can be found in several sites. These include papers on human-animal interaction delivered at scholarly conferences such as the American Sociological Association, the British Sociological Association and the American Society of Criminology; growing numbers of graduate student dissertations on the topic; new animal-centered journals such as *Anthrozöos* and *Society & Animals*, and the on-line *Between the Species*; and animal- or green-focused special issues of journals (e.g., *Qualitative Sociology* and *Theoretical Criminology*). Significantly, with more than the requisite minimum of 300 signatories, an Animals and Society section achieved full section status within the American Sociological Association in 2003.

In the past five years or so the level of sociological interest in human-animal studies has begun to match that in many other disciplines. This is especially the case with pedagogy. Thus, a recent survey of the United States has found that more than 110 university and college courses - representing over 20 academic disciplines - have “Animals and Society” as one of their themes (Alagappan, 2003; and see Balcombe, 1999), and that these courses are concentrated in law (87), philosophy (29), animal science (18) and sociology (24). The social sciences are still notoriously underrepresented as a whole, however, and there is only a smattering of such courses in each of psychology (9), anthropology (6) and criminology (1) (see Alagappan, 2003:8-9; Animal Legal Defense Fund, 2007 [www.aldf.org]; and the Center for Respect for Life and the Environment [www.crle.org]).

---

<sup>1</sup> This essay was originally presented as a paper at the fifth annual *Conference on Animal Liberation Affairs* (held by the Institute of Critical Animal Studies), held in Orono, Maine, in April 2007. The authors wish to thank Hal Herzog for his helpful comments on the use of the Animal Attitudes Scale instrument, and John Brunette and Rosemary Miller for their kindnesses.

<sup>2</sup> MEENA ALAGAPPAN is the Executive Director of HEART (Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers; website- www.TeachHumane.org), a non-profit organization dedicated to fostering compassion and respect for all living beings and the environment by educating youth and teachers in Humane Education. She is Chair-Elect of the American Bar Association's Animal Law Committee and former Chair of the New York City Bar Association's Committee on Legal Issues Pertaining to Animals.

PIERS BEIRNE is currently Liberal Arts Fellow in Sociology at the National University of Ireland, Galway. He is the author of *Inventing Criminology* (1993, SUNY-Press), *Criminology* (2006, with Jim Messerschmidt, Oxford University Press) and *Issues in Green Criminology: Confronting Harms Against Environments, Humanity and Other Animals* (2007, edited with Nigel South, Willan Press).

This brief study examines whether a rights-based course on the sociology of animal abuse might result in attitudinal and behavioral changes towards animal abuse among undergraduate criminology students (and see further, Beirne and South, 2006). Several studies have found that for both male and female students appropriate educational curricula can enhance sensitivity to the human-animal bond. Among these curricula are animal welfare in veterinary school at the University of Queensland, Australia (Blackshaw and Blackshaw, 1993); humane education in American pre-schools, elementary schools and middle schools (Ascione, 1997; Higgins and Choe, 2007; Thomas and Beirne, 2002; and Thompson and Gullone, 2003); and an undergraduate sociology class on animals and society at the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg (Flynn, 2003). By “pro-animal” we mean a perspective that seeks to develop empathy and compassion in relation to other living beings and which, through the development of critical thinking, seeks to affect students at the cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels. The course throughout stresses the development and importance of animal rights.

### **“Animal Abuse”: Course Development**

The brief history of the establishment of Animals and Society courses in the new millennium is not altogether unlike the early history of women’s studies courses in the early 1960s. Four decades ago, those who campaigned against gender inequities and those feminists who proposed new women’s studies courses were often accused of being too overtly political or too ideological (Nussbaum, 1997). The subject matter of women’s studies courses, it was also objected, was too diffuse or too interdisciplinary for it to comprise a field of knowledge *sui generis*. Similar charges have been leveled against those who campaign against speciesism, though with the interesting, if unfortunate, twist that those working in the animal protection community are sometimes accused by feminists of diverting attention from more serious social issues, (e.g., gender inequities).

Often only after considerable struggle, therefore, have new Animals and Society courses officially become part of university curricula (Alagappan, 2003; Flynn, 2003). In some cases the study of animals and society was not seen by other faculty as a legitimate intellectual endeavor. In others, either the would-be teachers of Animals and Society courses were untenured or junior faculty who lacked academic clout, or the proposals were bogged down and thwarted by questions of turf in their own or other Departments.

A new course on “Animal Abuse” at the University of Southern Maine (USM) fortunately experienced few such difficulties, and even attracted some outside support (a small pre-course development grant from the Clark Foundation for Animal Welfare in 1998 and, the first time it was offered in 1999, the “Best New Course in Animals & Society” award from the Humane Society of the United States).

Offered by a sociologist who is a senior Professor in USM’s Department of Criminology, the course proposal was supported enthusiastically by all faculty in his Department. The proposal was then put to routine administrative scrutiny by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Curriculum Review Committee, and finally approved as a regular course offering by the CAS Dean. At the time of the present study the course had been offered three times: in 1999 (17 students), in 2002 (28) and in 2003 (38). The course is increasingly popular, even though it is not required for criminology students, possibly because it serves as elective credit in a criminology program with a large number of student majors (285) and relatively few faculty.

## Course Aims and Content

The “Animal Abuse” course has two main aims. First, it provides a sociological introduction to the study of animal abuse. It does this in a number of ways. Like many other sociology courses that address the broad areas of crime, justice, and inequality, the course begins with how the key concepts of its subject matter (e.g., “animals”, “animal abuse” and “crime”) have been and are socially constructed. How animals have been socially constructed as Others and as objects of difference is illustrated with particular examples from Judaeo-Christian doctrine, the history of animal abuse legislation from the 1820s to modern times, and state/class/popular discourses about civility and public order. Special attention is paid to the cultural representation of animals as Others through and in cultural symbols and in the everyday speciesist words and phrases used to describe and denigrate animals (and also women and other minorities).

The course examines both individualized and institutionalized forms of animal abuse. The former include cruelty, neglect and sexual assault; among the latter are those committed in scientific research, zoos and aquaria, hunting, sport, entertainment and food production. Animal abuse is approached from several vantage points, including feminism, act utilitarianism and liberal-rights theory. Questions about the forms, incidence and seriousness of animal abuse are examined with information about victim characteristics (e.g., companion/livestock/feral; use and exchange values) and offenders’ social position (e.g., gender, age, social class, race, and access to animals). Attention is also given to some of the possible social and psychological causes of animal abuse and to the link(s) between animal abuse and interhuman violence. Parallels are repeatedly drawn between the structural powerlessness of animals, on the one hand, and women and children, on the other.

The second aim of the course is humane education, with special emphasis on critical thinking and the cultivation of compassion for animals. To this end it outlines what is known about animal consciousness and sentience and whether animals can feel pain - both physical and emotional - even at lower reaches of the phylogenetic scale. This knowledge is gleaned from both the required course readings and also several provocative films shown in class. Required course readings, which are drawn from sociology, criminology, moral philosophy, theology, and law comprise several books and fifteen or so scholarly journal articles. Among the former are Tom Regan’s (1983) *The Case for Animal Rights*, Carol Adams and Josephine Donovan’s (1995) *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*; Peter Singer’s (1990), *Animal Liberation*; and Steven Wise’s (2000) *Rattling the Cage*.

During the course students view several short films. These begin on a fairly gentle note with *Giant Horses*, a documentary directed by Gail Worster, and which focuses on horse-pulling at Maine country fairs. Set to country and bluegrass music, the film is structured around interviews with horse owners and with animal rights activists. This well-balanced film works well in provoking students to think through some of the complexities of deciding just what animal abuse might be. Is pulling something that horses love to do, as the owners insist, or is it, instead, a coercive practice that often results in injury? The second film, *Dead River Rough Cut*, depicts six months in the rural life of Maine woodsman Bob Wagg, a well-known beaver trapper who slaughters a pig, skins beavers, uses oxen to pull lumber, and hunts deer on camera. This film encourages students to consider not only whether such practices are abusive but also whether it is arrogant and misplaced for outsiders to condemn such traditional rural practices. A third film, the documentary *Animal Passions/Zoophilia* by the U.K.’s channel 4, is similar to the

preceding two in its apparent open-endedness which, in this case, worries whether bestiality is sexual assault or, as zoophiles claim, an acceptable, if somewhat unusual, expression of love between human and animal.

Issues of cultural relativism do not easily apply to the remaining two films, which are put together by the activist organization People for the Ethical Treatment for Animals. The PETA films include uniformly gut-wrenching footage of the agonizing deaths of mink in fur farms and the horrors inflicted on nonhuman primates in laboratories (counterposed with an American Medical Association “educational” film on the necessity of animal testing). Students are warned beforehand about the graphic nature of some of the images in these movies, and one or two in each class have chosen - without penalty - not to watch them.

### **Assessing the Effectiveness of the Course**

In 2004 the two authors of this paper tried to examine the utility and potential effects of the course on students’ attitudes towards animal abuse. Does the course encourage “pro-animal” attitudes of empathy and compassion? Can animal rights be taken seriously in a state (Maine) which is highly rural, somewhat conservative (both Senators are Republicans), quite dependent on income from the “harvesting” of fish and crustaceans, and whose population has a relatively large number of registered hunters?

### **Methods**

#### *Sample*

There were two samples, all of the respondents in which were USM undergraduate students enrolled during Fall semester, 2003. One sample was comprised of students enrolled in the Criminology Department’s “Animal Abuse” course (CRM 327) (hereinafter “the Sample”). The other sample, which functioned as a control group for this study, consisted of students enrolled in the Mathematics and Statistics Department’s Pre-Calculus course (MAT140D - hereinafter, “the Control group”). There were 31 students in the Sample and 11 students in the Control group. The rationale for using pre-calculus students as a control group was that all USM students are required to take a calculus or statistics course as part of a common core curriculum and therefore, we felt, they were probably a good sample of the whole student population.

#### *Procedure*

In early September, a pre-course questionnaire was administered to both the Sample and to the Control group. In mid-December, a second questionnaire, largely similar to the first, was administered to students at the end of both courses (see Appendix 1). The questionnaires were submitted to USM’s Institutional Review Board and found to be in conformity with its protocols for research on human subjects.

The study was a longitudinal one designed to track individuals’ responses to the same questions prior to and after instruction in their courses. It was hoped that this would allow determination of any significant attitudinal and behavioral changes towards animals.

In order to obtain candid responses and to dispel the notion that grades could be affected by their answers, students were assured complete anonymity. For both the animal abuse and pre-calculus classes, the initial questionnaires were already numbered. Students in each group

randomly received the initial questionnaire along with an unsealed envelope containing the second questionnaire. Their professors told them to write the same number they had on the first questionnaire on the top right-hand corner of the front of the second questionnaire. They were subsequently told to place the second questionnaire inside the envelope, seal it, and write their names on the front of the sealed envelopes. They were then requested to submit their completed first questionnaires and the sealed envelopes containing the second questionnaires. At the end of the semester the envelopes were finally returned to both groups of students, who were asked to complete their second questionnaires and hand them in without the envelopes. In this way it was possible to track individual responses “pre-course” and “post-course,” without requiring disclosure of students’ identities.

### *Questionnaires*

The questionnaires distributed in the study were expanded versions of Herzog’s Animal Attitudes Scale instrument. There were 25 questions in a scale format (i.e. strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree) about the acceptability of a range of subject matters, including hunting, trapping, fishing, consuming animals for food, using animals in medical research and cosmetic testing, factory farming, zoos, circuses, rodeos, oxen-pulling, dissection, animal rights, breeding pets, animal fighting, bestiality, and incarcerating animal abusers.<sup>3</sup> The questionnaires also asked for some background information on the students: gender; degree major; dietary habits; and whether they supported an animal rights or animal welfare organization, either with money or with time.

The pre-course and post-course questionnaires distributed to the Sample were identical except for the last question in the former, which said, “Please describe why you enrolled in this course,” while the final question in the latter said, “Please describe how this course has altered your attitudes to nonhuman animals and your actual interaction with them.” The questionnaires distributed to the Sample and the Control group, before and after instruction, were also similar, but the pre-course Control group questionnaire did not ask students why they had enrolled in the pre-calculus course.

### *Statistical Analysis*

The attitude scale responses in the questionnaires were tabulated using corresponding numbers: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = undecided; 4 = disagree; and 5 = strongly disagree. The means for the responses to these 25 attitude scale questions were determined for both pre-course and post-course questionnaires for both the Sample and Control group. An item-by-item analysis was then conducted, employing paired t-tests, in order to assess whether there were any statistically significant attitudinal changes (at a significance level of .05). Data were summarized on the

---

<sup>3</sup> . This questionnaire is an expanded version (i.e., nos.21-26) of the *Animal Attitudes Scale* questionnaire first used in Herzog, Betchart and Pittman (1991; and see Flynn, 2003:103). We should note that this study might be methodologically limited in at least one way, namely, that it may not have been entirely appropriate for us to perform arithmetic calculations (i.e., calculate means) for the ordinal data from the attitude scale questions. This is because the scale values do not necessarily represent equivalent intervals and respondents may not therefore have perceived the response options similarly.

gender, dietary habits, and academic majors of the students, as well as any student support for animal organizations, and discernible patterns in the anecdotal information provided were also noted.

## Results

### *Response Rate*

All the students in the animal abuse and pre-calculus classes completed questionnaires, but the sample sizes were smaller than the actual enrollment numbers in the courses, chiefly due to difficulty matching pre-course and post-course questionnaires. This was more of an issue with the pre-calculus class where N=11, but the actual enrollment was 35 students. The class size was 40 for the animal abuse course, but N=31.

The main reason questionnaires could not be matched for comparison was that the students did not fill out the number in the second questionnaire prior to sealing the envelope containing that questionnaire. Instructions might not have been as clear to students in the pre-calculus course. Other factors preventing inclusion were incomplete questionnaires and late enrollment, in which case there were not any corresponding pre-course questionnaires.

### *Background information*

In the Sample 68% of the respondents were female and 74% were criminology majors, the remainder majoring in other social sciences, except for one biology student. Of the respondents in the Control group 42.8% were female and only 36% were social science or humanities students. Most of the Control group was majoring in the natural sciences, computer science or engineering. The overwhelming majority of the Sample (97%) enrolled in the course out of interest in the subject matter. Five students, however, reported enrolling in the course also for credit; only one said the sole reason for enrollment was to obtain academic credit.

### *Attitudinal and Behavioral Changes*

While there was virtually no difference in the pre- and post-course attitudes of the Control group, students in the Sample registered statistically significant pro-animal attitudinal changes along several dimensions. These included, especially, students' attitudes towards the wearing of animals as fur; breeding pure-bred dogs as pets; using animals in scientific or medical research, in cosmetic testing and for dissection; and using them as edible objects for human consumption.

The Table below summarizes the statistically significant changes in the Sample:

## **TABLE 1**

***STUDENTS' ATTITUDINAL CHANGES TOWARDS ANIMALS***

Question	Pre-Course Mean	Post-Course Mean	t-statistic	p-value
#2-I do not think that there is anything wrong with using animals in medical research	3.226	3.903	-3.021	.005
#6-I think people who object to raising animals for meat are too sentimental	3.484	3.839	-2.160	.039
#7-Much of the scientific research done with animals is unnecessary and cruel	2.516	1.774	3.674	.0009
#8-I think it is perfectly acceptable for cattle and pigs to be raised for human consumption	2.323	2.935	-3.236	.0029
#14-Breeding animals for their skins is a legitimate use of animals	4.194	4.645	-3.276	.0026
#15-Some aspects of biology can only be learned through dissecting preserved animals such as cats	2.678	3.129	-2.618	.0137
#16-Continued research with animals will be necessary if we are to ever conquer diseases such as cancer, heart disease, and AIDS	2.645	3.709	-5.578	.0000046
#17-It is unethical to breed purebred dogs for pets when millions of dogs are killed in animal shelters yearly	2.677	2.226	2.373	.024
#18-The production of inexpensive meat, eggs, and dairy products justifies maintaining animals under crowded conditions	3.903	4.258	-2.356	.025
#19- The use of animals such as rabbits for testing the safety of cosmetics and household products is unnecessary and should be stopped	1.806	1.290	5.042	.0000207

Moreover, the Control group registered only one statistically significant pro-animal

attitudinal change and that was for Question 23: "In general animals should have the same basic rights as humans." The pre-course mean was 3.5 (between undecided and disagree) and the post-course mean was 3.09, which was closer to undecided ( $t$ -statistic=2.887,  $p$ -value= .016).

The dramatic difference in the respective results of the Control group and the Sample is strong evidence for the conclusion that instruction in the sociology of animal abuse - and, more generally, in humane education - can help students develop more favorable attitudes towards animals. Having a point of comparison with the Control group, which registered only one change, suggests that the attitudes were most likely affected by the animal abuse course and not from exposure to other sources.

Comparison of other data also provides evidence supporting the conclusion that the animal abuse course also succeeded in changing students' behavior towards animals. A very noticeable difference between the Sample and Control group pertains to dietary habits. For example, the pre-course questionnaires reveal that a very similar and overwhelming majority of students in both the Control group (88.5%) and the Sample (91.9%) consumed red meat, poultry, fish and seafood. Yet, although none of the students in the Control group had changed their dietary habits by the end of their course, 26% of the Sample (20% of the men and 29% of the women) reported having eliminated red meat, poultry, fish and/or seafood by the end of the animal abuse course. One of these students - who reported that she had become a vegetarian at the end of the course - wrote that whenever she is tempted to eat meat again, she thinks about what she has learned in the course.

Still more notably, in the final question of the post-course questionnaires, clearly no students in the Control group felt the pre-calculus course changed their attitudes toward animals, but the Sample listed numerous ways they felt they were affected by their course. Again, food consumption was a major issue. Interestingly, even though only 26% of the Sample said they actually changed their dietary habits by consuming less meat or seafood by the end of the course, the written answers to the open-ended question indicated that 58% of the Sample (20% of the males and 48% of the females) felt the course heightened their sensitivities to meat consumption. Those that mentioned this increased awareness, but who nonetheless did not eliminate any foods from their diets, reported that they now consumed less meat or seafood, were actively seeking alternatives, felt guilty when they consumed meat, or tried to dissociate themselves from what they were doing when they ate meat.

The responses to the open-ended question at the end of the post-course questionnaire distributed to the Sample spoke eloquently about how students' attitudes and behavior had changed by the end of the course. Besides altering their diets, students reported other behavioral changes, such as becoming more supportive of animal causes. These new practices included:

- volunteering time and donating money;
- checking products prior to purchase to ensure they were not tested on animals;
- pursuing jobs at animal welfare organizations;
- arguing with people wearing fur coats;
- not having turkey at Thanksgiving anymore, even if regular dietary habits had not changed;
- teaching others about issues pertaining to animal abuse; and
- feeling more connected to animals generally in a way that extended beyond affection for household pets.

Some students also indicated that the course had caused them to:

- expand their definition of animal abuse to include hunting;
- change their attitudes to fly fishing;
- oppose animal research and testing;
- become disturbed about the use of animals in entertainment;
- be more skeptical of news in the mass media; and
- support harsh punishments for animal abusers.

One student said that even though she does not support animal rights, she thinks animals should not suffer. There were also some rather dramatic comments about the influence of the course, including “traumatic awakening,” “sharply changed opinions,” “opened eyes,” and “a greater appreciation for animals.”

In terms of support of animal organizations, 6 students in the Sample (19%) reported supporting an animal organization pre-course, but half of them withdrew such support by the end of the course for no obvious reason. All these students were female and had written short answers indicating that they were deeply affected by the course: one was left with a “heavy heart,” another was pursuing a job at the SPCA and eating less meat, and the third was checking products for animal testing. Perhaps the withdrawal of support for animal organizations was a result of the limited time and resources they were experiencing as students. Two students (one female, one male) did not support animal groups prior to the course, but did so after the course. Generally, there did not appear to be discernible patterns in responses based on gender.

In the Control group, one student who did not support an animal organization prior to the course did so afterwards, but also mentioned that the course had no influence on him. Also, only one student in the Control group supported an animal organization prior to the course and maintained such support after the course, resulting in 18% of the Control group supporting an animal organization. Thus, on this particular question there does not appear to be any notable difference between the Control group and Sample.

### **Conclusion: Moving Humane Education Forward**

This study has found that, while there was virtually no difference in the attitudes of the control group, students in the animal abuse class registered ten statistically significant pro-animal attitudinal changes. These changes occurred in several important dimensions and included, especially, students' attitudes towards the wearing of animals as fur; breeding pure-bred dogs as pets; using animals in scientific or medical research, in cosmetic testing and for dissection; and using them as edible objects for human consumption. A pedagogy of difference does indeed seem to make a difference!

The findings of our study should be placed in three contexts: the specific content of one particular course on the sociology of animal abuse; students' intellectual and emotional reactions to a variety of pedagogic aids, including animal rights, feminist and other texts about animal abuse and depictions of animal abuse in films and in other course-related material; and the recent growth in humane education and in “Animals and Society” college courses.

On this last context let us note that the expansion of humane education has been hindered both by the common perception that it is only relevant to children and also by the varied definitions of its subject matter. For example, the education laws of states like New York and Pennsylvania reflect a narrow view of the salience of humane education by mandating it only in public elementary schools. In addition, statutes contain significantly different definitions of the subject. For example, s.809 of New York's *Education Law* specifically requires instruction in the humane treatment of animals and on the importance of spaying or neutering. Yet, s.14.16 of Wisconsin's *Code* requires the designation of an "Arbor and Bird Day" to encourage the protection of trees and birds. Similar definitional ambivalence exists in mandatory humane education laws in seven other states, which include Florida, Tennessee, California, Illinois, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Furthermore, Maine, Louisiana, New Jersey and Oregon - the four states with non-mandatory humane education statutes that specify only legislative intent - also advance conflicting definitions of humane education. For example, Maine's law refers to the "teaching of virtue and morality" to impress upon youth "the principles of humanity and a universal benevolence", including the importance of "kindness to birds and animals and regard for all factors which contribute to the well-being of man." (20 *Me. Rev. Stat. Ann.* 1221 [2002])

Many colleges and universities perhaps do not see themselves as providing humane education since they, too, might associate the subject with elementary schools. However, if the aim of humane education is to develop empathy and critical thinking so that students can act in ethically-informed and compassionate ways, then humane education should obviously be integrated into curricula at all educational levels (to that end we note in Appendix 2 the existence of several institutions of higher learning that offer guidance on the craft of humane education).

## References

- Adams, C.J. and J. Donovan 1999 (eds.). *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Agnew, R. 1998. The Causes of Animal Abuse: a Social-Psychological Analysis. *Theoretical Criminology*, 2(2):177-210.
- Alagappan, M. 2003. Expanding Humane Education: the Development of 'Animals and Society' Courses in Liberal Arts Colleges. unpublished M.S. Thesis, Center for Animals and Public Policy, Tufts University School of Veterinary Medicine.
- Ascione, F.R. 1997. Humane Education Research: Evaluating Efforts to Encourage Children's Kindness and Caring Towards Animals. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 123(1), 59-77.
- Balcombe, J. 1999. Animals & Society Courses: A Growing Trend in Post-Secondary Education. *Society & Animals*, 7(3):229-240.

- Blackshaw, J.K. and A.W. Blackshaw. 1993. Student Perceptions of Attitudes to the Human-Animal Bond. *Anthrozöos*, 6(3), 190-198.
- Flynn, C.P. 2003. A Course Is a Course, Of Course, Of Course (Unless It's an Animals and Society Course): Challenging Boundaries in Academia. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 23(3):94-108.
- Herzog, H., A.N. Rowan and D.Kossow. 2001. Social Attitudes and Animals. pp.55-69 in D.J. Salem and A.N.Rowan (eds.), *The State of the Animals 2001*. Washington, D.C.: HSUS.
- Herzog, H.A., N.S. Betchart and R.B. Pittman. 1991. Gender, Sex Role Orientation and Attitudes towards Animals. *Anthrozöos*, 4:184-191.
- Higgins, A. and J. Choe, J. 2006. *Report of the First Evaluation of the Humane Education Project in New York City*. Unpublished assessment report for Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers (HEART).
- Nussbaum, M. 1997. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Roper Center for Public Opinion. 1995. Question US-AP.945K,Q2. *Associated Press*, November 10.
- Singer, P. 1990). *Animal Liberation*. Avon Books.
- Thomas, S. and P. Beirne. 2002. Humane Education and Humanistic Philosophy: Toward A New Curriculum. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 41(2):190-199.
- Thompson, K.L. and E. Gullone. 2003. The Children's Treatment of Animals Questionnaire (CTAQ): A Psychometric Investigation. *Society & Animals*, 11(1):1-15.
- Wise, Steven M. 2000. *Rattling the Cage: Towards legal Rights For Animals*. Cambridge, Ma.: Perseus.

## Appendix 1

**ANIMAL ABUSE**  
(Criminology 327, Fall, 2003)

**Post-Course Animal Attitude Scale**

Please answer the following questions as accurately as possible. Your responses are anonymous and completely confidential. Your responses will be used solely to examine if student attitudes to animals differ pre- and post-course. Participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate and find a particular question sensitive in nature, please answer according to your comfort level. Thank you for your time!

\*\*\*\*\*

Please check or fill in the appropriate responses for questions 1-3 below.

1. Gender:     \_\_\_ Male  
              \_\_\_ Female
  
2. What is your major? \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. Which ONE of the choices below most closely resembles your dietary habits?  
      \_\_\_ I eat red meat, poultry, fish and seafood  
      \_\_\_ I eat poultry, but no red meat  
      \_\_\_ I eat fish and seafood, but no red meat/poultry  
      \_\_\_ I am a vegetarian  
      \_\_\_ I am a vegan

Listed below are statements regarding animals. Circle the response that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement, where Strongly Agree = SA, Agree = A, Undecided = U, Disagree = D, and SD = Strongly Disagree

- |  | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
|--|----------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|
|  | Strongly | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly |
|  | Agree    |       |           | Disagree | Disagree |
| 1. It is morally wrong to hunt wild animals just for sport.  | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 2. I do not think that there is anything wrong with using animals in medical research.                               | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 3. There should be extremely stiff penalties, including jail sentences, for people who participate in cock-fighting. | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 4. Wild animals, such as mink and raccoons, should not be trapped and their skins made into fur coats.               | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 5. There is nothing morally wrong with hunting wild animals for food.  | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 6. I think people who object to raising animals for meat are too sentimental.  | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 7. Much of the scientific research done with animals is unnecessary and cruel.                                       | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 8. I think it is perfectly acceptable for cattle and pigs to be raised for human consumption.                        | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |
| 9. Basically, humans have the  | SA       | A     | U         | D        | SD       |

right to use animals as we see fit.

10. Fishing for whales and dolphins should be stopped immediately even if it means some people will be put out of work. SA A U D SD
11. I sometimes get upset when I see wild animals in cages at zoos. SA A U D SD
12. In general, I think that human economic gain is more important than setting aside more land for wildlife. SA A U D SD
13. Too much fuss is made over the welfare of animals these days when there are many human problems that need to be solved. SA A U D SD
14. Breeding animals for their skins is a legitimate use of animals. SA A U D SD
15. Some aspects of biology can only be learned through dissecting preserved animals such as cats. SA A U D SD
16. Continued research with animals will be necessary if we are to ever conquer diseases such as cancer, heart disease, and AIDS. SA A U D SD
17. It is unethical to breed purebred dogs for pets when millions of dogs are killed in animal shelters yearly. SA A U D SD
18. The production of inexpensive meat, eggs, and dairy products justifies maintaining animals SA A U D SD

under crowded conditions.

19. The use of animals such as rabbits for testing the safety of cosmetics and household products is unnecessary and should be stopped. SA A U D SD
20. The use of animals in rodeos and circuses is cruel. SA A U D SD
21. Horse- and oxen-pulling at Maine fairs is a harmless tradition that should be allowed to continue. SA A U D SD
22. Sex between humans and animals is morally acceptable. SA A U D SD
23. In general, animals should have the same basic rights as humans. SA A U D SD
24. An animal's right to live free of suffering should be just as important as a human's right to live free of suffering. SA A U D SD
25. Those who abuse animals should be punished severely, including by incarceration. SA A U D SD
26. Do you currently support (e.g., with money or time) an animal welfare or animal rights organization? (please circle)
- Yes            No
27. Please describe how this course has altered your attitudes to nonhuman animals and your actual interaction with them. Be as lengthy or as brief in your answer as you like.

## Appendix 2

### HUMANE EDUCATION

\* *The Institute for Humane Education*. This is a non-profit organization based in Maine. It has a unique certification program for humane educators and has developed a Master of Education program at Cambridge College with a focus on humane education. The training includes courses on presentation and communication, animal protection issues, environmental ethics, culture, and human rights. This holistic approach to humane education further supports its infusion into the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum.

[www.humaneeducation.org](http://www.humaneeducation.org)

\* *Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers (HEART)*. This is a non-profit organization based in New York. It is dedicated to fostering compassion and respect for all living beings and for the environment by educating both youth and teachers in humane education. Its goal is the infusion of humane education into all educational settings. HEART accomplishes its mission through teacher training workshops, in-class presentations, consulting services and advocacy to increase compliance with New York State's humane education law.

[www.teachhumane.org](http://www.teachhumane.org)

\* *The United Federation of Teachers*. UFT's Humane Education Committee helps educators of grades pre-kindergarten to twelve, bring humane, environmental and animal-rights philosophies and materials into their classrooms as a source of information for discussion and debate.

UFT/HEC offers teacher training workshops, newsletters, and resource materials. Humane education materials are readily blended with reading, writing, science, music and art programs.

[www.uft.org](http://www.uft.org)

\* *Webster University* has developed a humane education program designed for teachers. The program comprises coursework in the history, philosophy, and practice of humane education, character development, and environmental education.

[www.webster.edu/gradcatalog/ed\\_multidis.html](http://www.webster.edu/gradcatalog/ed_multidis.html)

\* *Miami-Dade College's Animal Ethics Study Center* provides training and educational events for faculty, students and the local community in Miami. The center offers humane education training programs for faculty, encouraging teachers to consider and incorporate ideas of compassion and community in the college curriculum.

[www.crle.org/prog\\_courses\\_humane](http://www.crle.org/prog_courses_humane)

\* *Humane Society University and Humane Society Youth* (an affiliate of the Humane Society of the United States) offer a certificate program for humane education specialists, an online professional development workshop consisting of four to six courses for animal care and control practitioners and volunteers committed to humane education.

[www.humanesocietyu.org](http://www.humanesocietyu.org)