

DOCUMENT TYPE	Annotated Bibliography
SUBJECT	Attitudes Toward Animal Research and Experimentation
DATE(S)	1981-1990
CREATED BY	Erich Yahner
AFFILIATION	The Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy

Bowd, A. D., & Boylan, C. R. (1986). High school biology and attitudes toward treatment of animals. *Psychological reports*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1986.58.3.890>

Examined attitudes toward the treatment of animals in 47 undergraduates who studied laboratory-based biology in high school and 31 undergraduates who did not study biology in high school. Data indicate positive attitudes toward animals for both groups, but those who had not studied biology had more favorable attitudes.

Braithwaite, J. & Braithwaite, V. (1982). Attitudes toward animal suffering: An exploratory study. *International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems*, 3, 42-49. [PDF](#)

A total of 302 undergraduates in the social sciences and the humanities, at two Australian universities, were given a questionnaire designed to explore public attitudes toward animal suffering. The results, though preliminary, strongly suggest that attitudes may be in great part supportive of animal welfare and animal rights. However, as reflected in the answers to the questionnaire, actual behavior does not always follow suit. The recommendation is made that the animal welfare/animal rights movement should perhaps place more emphasis on raising people's awareness of the inconsistencies between their attitudes toward animals and their behavior concerning them.

Caplan, A. L. (1983). Beastly conduct: ethical issues in animal experimentation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 406(1), 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1983.tb53500.x>

No abstract available.

Dresser, R. (1987). Assessing harm and justification in animal research: federal policy opens the laboratory door. *Rutgers L Rev.*, 40, 723.

No abstract available.

Fox, M. A. (1987). Animal experimentation: A philosopher's changing views. *Between the Species*, 3(2), 3. [PDF](#)

No abstract available.

Furnham, A., & Pinder, A. (1990). Young people's attitudes to experimentation on animals. *Psychologist*, 10, 444-448. [PDF](#)

This study reports on the results of a 63 item questionnaire examining attitudes to experimentation on animals. Over 250 young Britons (average age 20 years) completed the questionnaire and gave various personal details (apart from their name). Subjects seemed strongly against animals being used in product testing and in favour of stricter controls on laboratories using animals. The standard deviation in responses to each item was fairly high (nearly always over 1.5 on a 7 point scale) indicating a reasonable spread of responses. Despite various factor analytic rotations, the results seemed to suggest that attitudes to animal experimentation are uni-dimensional (simple pro - anti) as against multi-dimensional. These attitudes did correlate predictably with a number of demographic variables particularly sex, political orientation and whether people were vegetarians or not. Females more than males, left-wing more than right-wing, and vegetarians more than non-vegetarians were more strongly against animal experimentation. Alpha co-efficients suggested that the scale would be useful in further research. Results are discussed in terms of the debate on animal experimentation that continues to rage particularly among psychologists.

Gallop, G. G., & Beckstead, J. W. (1988). Attitudes toward animal research. *American Psychologist*, 43(6), 474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.43.6.474>

263 university students completed a questionnaire about animal research, to assess the impression created by animal rights activists that there is a growing opposition in this country to the use of animals for research. Data show that most Ss were concerned about pain and suffering in animals but the majority appreciated and supported the need for using animals in research.

Goeke, J. E. (1987). The history of the use of animals in research and the development of the animal welfare concept. *Journal of the American College of Toxicology*, 6(2), 187-194. [PDF](#)

The ideological underpinning of the animal welfare/animal rights movement is not a recent development, but rather the result of a revolutionary change in Western man's perception of the natural world between 1500 and 1800. In 1500, these basic perceptions were

as follows: (1) the world was created for man's sake and all other species were subordinate to his wishes, (2) man's stance toward other species was essentially that of subjugation or conquest, (3) humans were absolutely unique and separate from the rest of creation. By 1800, these basic perceptions had been fundamentally altered to reflect the following: (1) the world did not exist for nor was it created for man alone, (2) man's stance toward the natural world and especially toward other animals was that of stewardship, and animals were within the sphere of moral concern, (3) man was a superior animal, although the basis for this superiority was not entirely clear, and was related to all other animals through physiologic similarities and the powers of feeling and sensation.

Hampson, J. (1989). Legislation and the changing consensus. In *Animal Experimentation* (pp. 219-251). Palgrave, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-20376-5_10

Laws designed to control the practice of experimentation on living animals have a central purpose: 'to reconcile the needs of science with the just claims of humanity'. This purpose was outlined by the UK Royal Commission on the Practice of Subjecting Live Animals to Experiments, the first enquiry of its kind, which led to the earliest law in the world controlling the practice, the Cruelty to Animals Act 1876. Since that time, legislation to control animal experiments has been enacted in many countries throughout the Western world. But a century of heated debate on this thorny topic has resulted only in changes to the details of such laws and to their administration, not to their fundamental purpose and scope. This remains everywhere the same as that of the UK 1876 Act—to restrict experimentation within what society deems to be acceptable limits while causing least harm to free scientific enquiry.

Keehn, J. D. (1982). To do or not to do: Dimensions of value and morality in experiments with animal and human subjects. In *The Ethics of Psychological Research* (pp. 81-84). Pergamon. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-028116-2.50014-2>

A questionnaire about ethical considerations in experiments involving animals or human subject populations consisting of students, mental patients or prison inmates was administered, to 73 undergraduate students enrolled in several psychology classes. For the most part the questionnaire was completed without difficulty, and the results were that most subjects did not differentiate among the human populations, and that human and animal experiments were judged by different ethical standards. For humans, the principal considerations were for the protection and safety of the subjects while for animals they pertained to the design and conduct of the experiment.

Kellert, S. R. (1985). American attitudes toward and knowledge of animals: An update. In *Advances in Animal Welfare Science 1984* (pp. 177-213). Springer, Dordrecht. [PDF](#)

The distribution of a typology of basic attitudes toward animals in the American population is explored through the personal interviews with the 3,107 randomly selected persons in the 48 contiguous states and Alaska. Data is presented on the prevalence of these attitudes in the overall American population and among major social demographic and animal activity groups. In addition, results are presented on American's knowledge of animals as well as their species preferences. Finally, information is presented on perceptions of critical wildlife issues including endangered species, predator control, hunting, trapping, marine mammals and wildlife habitat protection.

King, F. A. (1986). Philosophical and practical issues in animal research involving pain and stress. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 467(1), 405-409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1986.tb14644.x>

No abstract available.

Langley, G. (1989). Animal experimentation: The consensus changes. ISBN: 9781349203765

This book addresses practical and philosophical issues regarding the use of animals in biomedical research, testing and teaching. It does so with the aim of presenting facts and arguments to encourage scientists to reconsider their views about animal experiments.

Loeb, J. M., Hendee, W. R., Smith, S. J., & Schwarz, M. R. (1989). Human vs animal rights: In defense of animal research. *JAMA*, 262(19), 2716-2720. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1989.03430190100039>

For centuries, opposition has been directed against the use of animals for the benefit of humans. For more than four centuries in Europe, and for more than a century in the United States, this opposition has targeted scientific research that involves animals. More recent movements in support of animal rights have arisen in an attempt to impede, if not prohibit, the use of animals in scientific experimentation. These movements employ various means that range from information and media campaigns to destruction of property and threats against investigators. The latter efforts have resulted in the identification of more militant animal rights bands as terrorist groups. The American Medical Association has long been a defender of humane research that employs animals, and it is very concerned about the efforts of animal rights and welfare groups to interfere with research. Recently, the Association prepared a detailed analysis of the controversy over the use of animals in research, and the consequences for research and clinical medicine if the philosophy of animal rights activists were to prevail in society. This article is a condensation of the Association's analysis.

Marwick, C. (1990). Additional voices heard in support of humane animal use in research. *JAMA*, 263(21), 2863-2863. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1990.03440210013003>

Stung by the spreading incidence of vandalism of biomedical research laboratories in the name of more humane treatment of experimental animals, government leaders and scientists have joined the American Medical Association and others in the battle and are beginning to strike back. At the annual meeting of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, Louis W. Sullivan,

MD, secretary of the US Department of Health and Human Services, called for legal action against those animal rights advocates who, by threats of intimidation and bombings, have "created a veritable siege mentality among research scientists."

Monamy, V. (2017). *Animal experimentation: A guide to the issues*. Cambridge University Press. [HTML](#)

An essential book for all those who conduct animal-based research or are involved in education and training, as well as regulators, supporters, and opponents alike. This fully updated third edition includes discussion of genetically altered animals and associated welfare and ethical issues that surround the breeding programmes in animal based research. The book discusses the origins of vivisection, the advances in human and non-human welfare made possible by animal experimentation, moral objections, and alternatives to the use of animals in research. It also examines the regulatory umbrella under which experiments are conducted in Europe, USA and Australasia. The author highlights the future responsibilities of researchers who will be working with animals, and offers practical advice on experimental design, literature search, consultation with colleagues, and the importance of the ongoing search for alternatives.

Moss, T. H. (1984). The modern politics of laboratory animal use. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 9(2), 51-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224398400900206>

No abstract available.

Richmond, G., & Engelmann, M. (1990). The animal research controversy: exploring student attitudes. *The American biology teacher*, 52(8), 467-471. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i408275>

No abstract available.

Rollin, B. E. (1989). *The unheeded cry: Animal consciousness, animal pain and science*. Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780826221261

Bernard Rollin explains why and how scientists have been so cavalier about animal use, animal pain, and the moral questions they raise. He explores the damage caused by this position, both morally and scientifically; for it is not only the animals used in research which have suffered, but science itself, given that failure to take animal feelings into account has been shown to distort experimental results. In this book Bernard Rollin traced the development of changing attitudes towards animals and shows how growing social concern about the way in which we treat them is forcing science to turn back to the common-sense view.

Rowan, A. N. (1984). *Of mice, models, and men: A critical evaluation of animal research*. SUNY Press. [eBook](#)

No abstract available.

Rowan, A. N., & Rollin, B. E. (1983). Animal research—for and against: a philosophical, social, and historical perspective. *Perspectives in biology and medicine*, 27(1), 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pbm.1983.0001>

The last 3 decades have witnessed major challenges, both theoretical and practical, to the traditional dogma that science is value neutral. On the theoretical side, these challenges have issued from a variety of sources, most notably the work of Kuhn [1] and Feyerabend [2] in the philosophy of science, but also from reasoned critiques of individual sciences by such thinkers as Szasz [3] and Chomsky [4]. The practical sources of skepticism about value-free science are well-known—research into nuclear energy, recombinant DNA studies, research on human subjects and on the nature of intelligence, and space exploration have all been severely criticized as fundamentally fraught with questionable value assumptions. Perhaps the most far-reaching of these concerns in terms of its potential effect on science as it is now conducted is the question of the morality of using animals in scientific research. The issue is as old as biological research itself and has surfaced many times in the history of science. Most often, it has appeared as an emotionally based antivivisectionism, typically espoused by people unsophisticated in the sciences and often given to lurid exaggeration and distortion. Recently, however, the question has been raised on a much more rational basis and increasingly by people who are not only scientifically knowledgeable but are often themselves scientists who offer constructive.

Sapontzis, S. F. (1988). On justifying the exploitation of animals in research. *The Journal of medicine and philosophy*, 13(2), 177-196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmp/13.2.177>

In research employing animals we commonly do things to them which would be grossly immoral to do to humans. This paper discusses three possible justifications for so treating animals: (a) it is violating the autonomy of rational beings which makes actions immoral, and animals are not autonomous; (b) due to our participation in the human community, we have special obligations to humans that we do not have to animals; and (c) human life is morally more worthy than animal life. The conclusion of this discussion is that none of these three propositions justifies the routine sacrifice of animal interests for human benefit. Particular attention is paid to the idea that human life is morally more worthy than animal life, because I believe that to be the most common justification for our sacrifice of animal interests in research. The claim of greater worth is considered and criticized from both utilitarian and Kantian perspectives, and the inference from superior worth to being entitled to exploit one's inferiors is also criticized. The paper concludes by recommending a governing principle for research with animals which would bring that research into line with the rejection of hierarchical worldviews, social orders, and value systems which characterizes modern moral progress.

Scharmann, W. (1986). Ethical aspects of animal experimentation. In *Advances in Animal Welfare Science 1985*(pp. 87-90). Springer, Dordrecht. [PDF](#)

No abstract available.

Sechzer, J. A. (1983). The ethical dilemma of some classical animal experiments. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 406(1), 5-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1983.tb53480.x>

No abstract available.

Sechzer, J. A. (1982). Historical issues concerning animal experimentation in the United States. In *The Ethics of Psychological Research* (pp. 13-17). Pergamon. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-028116-2.50005-1>

The use of animals for research and teaching has now become an issue of great concern in the United States. In contrast to the legislative systems in Britain, Scandinavia and many European countries, American scientists can pursue research projects with relative freedom. Recent activities in the United States may effect this practice and future animal experimentation may be subjected to restriction and control by legislation. Events leading to this possibility are similar in many ways to those in 19th century Britain prior to the passage of the Cruelty to Animals Act in 1876 (which licenses scientists, regulates experimentation and carries out inspections). Historically, it seemed that the immediate effect of the 1876 act was to decrease the number of scientists who could conduct experiments on live vertebrate animals in Great Britain and hence the number of experiments and animals. Yet, antivivisection activity in Britain did not decrease but continued toward its goal of abolishing all research with animals. By 1882, the medical scientific community established the Association for the Advancement of Medicine by Research which began to advise the Home Secretary on licensing scientists. This was a turning point for British science since large numbers of qualified investigators were licensed, the number of animal experiments increased, and experimental medicine and science in the United Kingdom soon became dominant. Thus, although the antivivisection movement in Britain did not ultimately halt animal research, it did raise the consciousness of scientists, the government, and the general public about the need for humane treatment of research animals and the limits to which those animals should be used.

Sieber, J. E. (1986). Students' and scientists' attitudes on animal research. *American Biology Teacher*, 48, 85-91.

No abstract available.

Swindle, M. M. (1988). The use of animals in surgical research. *Journal of Investigative Surgery*, 1(1), 3-4. <https://doi.org/10.3109/08941938809141069>

No abstract available.

Takooshian, H. (1988). Opinions on animal research: Scientists vs. the public? *PSYeta Bulletin*, 7(2), 5-9.

No abstract available.

Tannenbaum, J., & Rowan, A. N. (1985). Rethinking the morality of animal research. *Hastings Center Report*, 15(5), 32-43. [PDF](#)

The debate on animal research has entered a new phase, involving a reevaluation of the moral status of animals, a detailed examination of the biological and philosophical meaning of animal pain and suffering, and a closer examination of the benefits of different types of knowledge. We need a clearer understanding of the ethical issues in animal research to provide the groundwork for public policy.

Weber, H. (1986). Democratic expression of public opinion on animal experimentation. *Journal of medical primatology*, 15(6), 379-389.

In December 1985, a very clear majority of 70% of the Swiss population rejected the proposal of adding an article to the constitution which would have brought animal experimentation to a complete halt in the country. Evidently, the extreme views of antivivisectionist groups are only shared by a minority of the population. It was possible to achieve this very clear result although a strong aversion to animal experiments and a critical attitude toward biological research exist in Switzerland, as well as in other European countries. The favorable outcome of the vote is due to a broad campaign of frank and comprehensible information provided by the research community, and to the willingness of the scientists to accept ethical restrictions to their work. It has been deemed important in Switzerland to continue with the basic information on biological research and its implications, since an informed public is obviously less prone to the influence of extreme groups.

Zola, J. C., Sechzer, J. A., Sieber, J. E., & Griffin, A. (1984). Animal experimentation: Issues for the 1980s. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 9(2), 40-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224398400900205>

No abstract available.