

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The scope of humane education literature and research dedicated to the educator and educator practice is limited. This chapter includes an overview of humane education, including the history of humane education, a review of humane education laws, humane education research, information about connecting humane education with broader educational movements, and the status of humane education professional development offerings. Bodies of literature specifically related to research involving educators have also been included.

History of Humane Education

Humane education, defined as the teaching of kindness and compassion to people, animals, and the environment, began as a formal movement in 19th century England after the inception of organized animal welfare establishments (HSUS, 2012). Nonetheless, the importance of correcting cruelty in children and providing humane modeling and instruction has been noted since the time of John Locke. In 1693, Locke dedicated a section of his book to the concern about animal cruelty in children.

One thing I have frequently observed in Children, that when they have got possession of any poor Creature, they are apt to use it ill: They often torment, and treat very roughly young Birds, Butterflies, and such other poor Animals, which fall into their Hands, and that with a seeming kind of Pleasure. This I think should be watched in them, and if they incline to any such *Cruelty*; they should be taught the contrary Usage. For the custom of tormenting and killing of Beasts will, by degrees, harden their Minds even towards Men; and they who delight in the suffering and destruction of inferiour Creatures, will not be apt to be very compassionate or benigne to those of their own kind. (Locke, 1693, p. 130)

Benjamin Franklin also voiced support for humane instruction, providing backing for the Quaker education model. Quaker education and laws, based upon the ideals of the

Quaker religion, supported humane virtues and protected both people and animals through early common laws in the United States (Larabee & Bell, 1967). He said,

I think also, that general virtue is more probably to be . . . obtained from the education of youth, than from the exhortations of adult persons; bad habits and vices of the mind, being, like diseases of the body, more easily prevented than cured. (p. 232)

Colonial America did not specifically set out to teach humane education, as formal and compulsory education was not yet in vogue. During this period, humane education was part of the “cultural value of the society” (Whitlock & Westerlund, 1975, p. 40). In many ways, humane values and concepts were part of a religious expectation and principle in which individuals tried to live in a way that outwardly showed what they believed. Colonial America also began to entertain the idea that children needed moral guidance—guidance that was to be nurtured by the family (Middleton & Lombard, 2011).

Two main aspects of humane education include the “sociological and psychological dimensions of animal abuse. The second is the need for a cultivation of empathy for nonhuman animals” (Thomas & Beirne, 2002, p. 190). The importance of humane education does not impact animals alone, as the existence of animal abuse coincides with a high risk of other forms of violence (Arkow, 1996). Empathy for animals is not only beneficial to the animals, but because positive interactions and the practice of affirmative agency with animals can aid healthy character development in children, humane education extends beyond the nonhuman animal into the realm of the human animal (Ascione, 2005). “Both animal abuse and interpersonal violence . . . share common characteristics: both types of victims are living creatures, have a capacity for experiencing pain and distress, [and] can display audible or visible physical signs of their pain and distress” (Ascione, 2005, p. 91). This shared

characteristic gives educators and researchers a reason to examine the relationship between histories of animal abuse in children and violent offenses in adulthood.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, organized in 1824 after the first animal protection law was passed in 1822 and sanctioned by the Royal Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) by Queen Victoria in 1840, inspired action by the man who would become known as the “father” of humane education (Whitlock & Westerlund, 1975, p. 45). George Thorndike Angell, upon visiting England and becoming familiar with the RSPCA and their youth education arm, the Bands of Mercy, founded the American Bands of Mercy and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (MSPCA). The Bands of Mercy, founded in 1881, was designed to create humane education clubs for boys and girls, allowing students to compete in contests and to earn badges for kind behavior. It also provided lesson plan ideas and resources for educators. By 1883, the Bands of Mercy had over one-quarter million participants. Eight years later, in 1889, Angell incorporated the American Humane Education Society (MSPCA, 2009).

Another banner year for humane education occurred in 1915 when the American Humane Association (AHA) initiated “Be Kind to Animals Week” under the direction of Dr. William O’Stillman. The objective of “Be Kind to Animals Week” was initially focused more on developing relationships with schools and providing visits by AHA staff than on providing curriculum to educators (Unti & DeRosa, 2003).

The Decline of Nature-Study and Humane Education in the Curriculum

Nature-study, or the “study and appreciation of the natural world,” encourages children to learn science less through book work and instead to interact with the environment and observe animals in their natural habitat (Tolley, 2003, p. 128). During the Progressive

Era (1890-1920), nature-study and humane education movements flourished. Both areas of study supported the building of morals, and both suffered a similar outcome at the end of the era. The proponents of humane education and nature-study advocated interaction with animals and nature through observation as opposed to the killing of animals through trapping or hunting. Nature-study came into vogue due to the concern that urbanization would have a negative impact on those living in the cities (Shepherd, 1909). During this time period, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts were founded (Ewing, 1913, pp. 298-299; Unti, n.d.). The developers of both nature-study and humane education had difficulty infusing their subject matter into the content areas of schools and educator training programs, with nature-study having the advantage of support by agricultural supporters who wished to reduce the number of farmers who were migrating to urban areas (Davenport, 1909).

With the beginning of World War I, when time and money in the United States were dedicated to the war effort, some people were concerned that humane education would make the boys soft or less effective soldiers (Unti, n.d.). Many leaders in humane education shifted their work toward support of the troops and wartime animals—specifically horses. The war did, however, inspire some humane education advocates to call for more humane education so that children would learn about the ills of bias and prejudice, thus reducing the likelihood of future war (Unti, n.d.). Additionally, the increase in a unified science curriculum shifted away from natural studies, and pedagogical practices in science education began to promote vivisection, which is the cutting of or operation on a living animal, and dissection, or the cutting and analyzing of dead animals (Hodge, 1902). Humane education did not vanish; however, its inclusion in schools and curricula began to decrease. Even the time and budget dedicated to humane education on the part of humane groups decreased (Unti, n.d.).

Another reason that humane education had difficulty becoming part of traditional university training for pre-service teachers was the misuse of a \$100,000 grant on the part of Columbia University in 1907. The grant money, donated by wealthy General Horace W. Carpentier of California, was meant to be the establishing fund for the Henry Burgh Foundation. General Carpentier envisioned the foundation supporting humane education endeavors and honoring Henry Burgh, who in 1866 founded the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The money ultimately supported the salary of Samuel McCune Lindsay, the Professor of Social Legislation, with a resulting outcome being nine lectures along with a handful of reports, and a bibliography of humane work (Ewing, 1913, pp. 300-311; McCrea, 1910; Unti & DeRosa, 2003). General Carpentier was not content with the outcome. In 1921, Dr. Nicolas Butler, President of Columbia University, responded to an inquiry from Dr. William Stillman, President of the American Humane Association, regarding the use of the Henry Bergh Foundation funds. He was assured that the money was being used to offset the “cost of instruction in ethics” (*National Humane Review*, 1921, p. 35). Those who opposed the use of the funds argued that the money should have gone to the Columbia Teachers’ College where researchers could have “conducted studies in humane instruction” (*National Humane Review*, 1921, p. 35; Unti, n.d.).

The Development of Educational Resources

A variety of humane organizations have created educational resources for use by classroom teachers in the hope of inspiring kindness. Beginning with the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Bands of Mercy, organizations and departments came into existence. The combined work of George T. Angell and his supporters allowed for the creation of the American Humane Education Society (AHES) in

1889. Of the many educator resources created by AHES to promote the humane ethic, the most widely distributed is *Black Beauty*. This book, along with other tales told from the perspective of animals, as well as resources such as awards and badges, was provided to educators and distributed in “schools in recognition of good behavior, recitations, essays, acts of kindness” and other humane behaviors (Unti, 2003, p. 29). In 1902, a committee formed by the American Humane Association endorsed the inclusion of humane education in school textbooks. By 1930, an assortment of titles was in print, including a 1929 AHES publication, *Humane Education* (Reynolds, n.d.; Unti & DeRosa, 2003).

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) began a formal humane education program in 1916. The program goals were designed to “stimulate the work of the schools themselves” (Shultz, 1924, p. 139). By 1921, the ASPCA humane education department was working with schools to promote essay contests, and by 1922, the group estimated that it had reached approximately 300 New York schools. The early humane education programs of the ASPCA were focused on teaching children about stray animals (Unti & DeRosa, 2003).

Continuing the theme of humane narrative as a teaching tool, The Latham Foundation, founded in 1918 by Edith and Milton Latham, produced resources for schools in the Oakland, California area. By 1927, The Latham Foundation provided a school newsletter entitled the *Kindness Messenger* and a radio program in which stories of kindness were shared. The foundation also provided The Kind Deeds Club, which sent resources and activity ideas to educators for use in schools (Evans, 1980).

Providing a national scope, The Humane Society of the United States, established in 1954 with education as a founding principle, developed partnerships to support humane

education research and resource development. Under the direction of the National Humane Education Center at Waterford, Virginia, a feasibility study on humane education in school-based programs was completed in partnership with George Washington University (Westerlund, 1965). The Humane Society of the United States remained a leader in humane education by announcing the development of the KIND program and a 1972 Humane Education Development and Evaluation Project to be completed with the University of Tulsa (Hoyt, 1972; Morse, 1969).

Recognizing the continued interest in humane education, The Humane Society of the United States founded the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) in 1973 (Unti & DeRosa, 2003). NAAHE became a clearinghouse for publications, including *Kind News* and education resources. NAAHE has since undergone a variety of name changes, including the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education (NAHEE) and Humane Society Youth. As of 2011, many of the programs continue and have been absorbed into The Humane Society of the United States and Humane Society University.¹

During the growth of the environmental movement in the 1970s, other programs, including the Association of Professional Humane Educators (formerly Western Humane and Environmental Education Association) and the National Association for the Advancement of Environmental Education, were formed and continue to offer resources for both formal and informal educators. More recent school and literature-based programs such as the RedRover Readers and Operation Outreach provide book lists and lesson plans for credentialed

¹ I was part of the National Association for Humane and Environmental Education when the affiliate became a department of The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) in 2008 and when *Kind News* was absorbed into The HSUS publications department in 2009. Additionally, I was part of the organization when professional development and educator resources became part of Humane Society University in 2011.

educators and humane educators working in informal education programs such as those at humane societies.

Humane Education Laws

With little institutional support from university education programs, it is logical that few standard laws relating to humane education developed. Educators who become leaders will have little to no experience with humane and prosocial education without training and will not support mandated programs. Laws and mandates supporting humane education in public school do exist but vary greatly throughout the United States.

Early curricula for all states required the inclusion of “reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, geography, and history of the United States” (Monroe, 1911, pp. 221-222). Studies that included “morals, manners, physiology and hygiene, civics . . . and music, drawing, elementary bookkeeping, humane education, domestic science” were optional in most states, with a handful having requirements prescribed in their mandates or laws (Monroe, 1911, p. 222-224). Where laws did exist, few curricular requirements were provided, and states and schools were left to introduce the material that they felt best suited their students (Monroe, 1911).

At the 1921 American Humane Association conference, a committee was created to draft proposed legislation requiring humane education in schools. Proposed language suggested that each elementary school should “prescribe courses of instruction . . . in humane treatment and protection of animals and birds and the importance of the part they play in the economy of nature” (National Humane Review, 1921, para. 1). By 1926, 23 states had endorsed some form of regulation related to the inclusion of humane education in the public schools (Whitlock, 1973, p. 77).

New York State passed the first humane education law in the United States in 1947. The New York State Education Law, Section 809 (1947), mandated the instruction . . . in every elementary school . . . in the humane treatment and protection of animals . . . Such weekly instruction may be divided into two or more periods. A school district shall not be entitled to participate in the public school money . . . if the instruction required . . . is not given. (Leavitt, 1978, p. 153)

This law remains active, yet is not enforced. Many certificated educators and administrators do not know the law exists. Other laws exist in states such as Pennsylvania, Oregon, and Florida, but with similar standing and lack of enforcement as the New York law (Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers, n.d.). The law relating to humane education that is most often enforced is that of allowing students to opt out of dissection. As of 2012, 13 states had either a law, mandate, or resolution related to dissection alternatives in K-12 classrooms (Animal Learn, n.d.).

Humane Education Research

Much of the empirical research surrounding humane education was completed between 1980 and 1990 and was focused on student learning and outcomes. During this time period, when humane education topics such as environmental awareness and character education appeared to be gaining in popularity, many of the humane education programs took place at or were run by animal shelters rather than schools and were focused primarily on companion animals (Olin, 2000).

In a 1978 study completed by the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), researchers asked member organizations from 14 states to rank the most pressing needs in humane education. The responses indicated the following:

1. Inclusion of humane education in the school curriculum
2. Creation of more substantial secondary-level materials

3. Establishment of research related to and supporting humane education. (NAAHE, 1978, p. 24)

According to the report, humane organizations do not have the resources in either staff or funding to create materials or facilitate research. Much of the existing research has been based around youth and measuring their attitude, as opposed to research about educators and implications for inclusion of humane-themed topics in the classroom (Ascione, 1992).

Daly and Suggs (2010), in their Canadian study of elementary educators, did not specifically study the training of the classroom teacher, but sought to understand teachers' attitudes toward and incorporation of companion animals in the classroom and why companion animals are or are not part of the classroom. A 31-item qualitative and quantitative survey was administered to elementary-level teachers via Survey Monkey, an internet survey development application. Of the 75 teacher respondents, 85% ($n = 63$) were from urban areas, with 15% ($n = 12$) from rural school districts. The number of educators who kept animals in the classroom was only 17.3% ($n = 14$), with 75.3% ($n = 61$) not having pets in the classroom. Forty-seven percent of the teachers ($n = 35$) worked with others to have animals visit their classroom. When educators were asked in a quantitative question why they incorporated animals into their class, the most common responses revolved around the care of the animal and the habitat. Teachers related this care to the district science requirements and state standards to which they are held (Daly & Suggs, 2010).

Additional support for the presence of humane education in classroom work included students' high interest in animal topics, the belief that their presence initiated conversation and writing for language arts classes, and student growth in empathy (Daly & Suggs, 2010). One of the teachers in the study commented,

The students love to name the pets and write stories about them. They also bring in their siblings and parents to see them. When the class heard that Rocky had died over the summer, one girl brought me in a sympathy card and a stuffed hedgehog. (Daly & Suggs, 2010, p. 6)

Instructor skill and training make a difference in both student academic success and moral growth. By building ethical and humane components into curriculum, moral education becomes not a stand-alone addition to teacher requirements, but positions it at the “very center of teaching and learning” (Lickona, 1991, p. 184). Fifty-four high school students, taught by either a teacher or teaching assistant from a university, took part in an 18-week course studying critical thinking and moral development through three pedagogical methodologies (DeHaan, Hanford, Kinlaw, Philler, & Snarey, 1997). Interventions included,

Introductory ethics—High school students ($n = 13$; 24%) received an introductory course in ethics and ethical reasoning as well as social and psychological perspectives. Class included lecture, topical discussions, and dilemma discussions.

Economics-ethics—High school students ($n = 15$; 28%) received an economics course which was infused with portions of the ethics curriculum. Class included lecture, topical discussions, and dilemma discussions. All students took and passed a system-wide economics examination at the end of the course.

Role-model ethics—High school students ($n = 11$; 20%) received a role-model ethics class in which six teaching assistants from a local university took turns teaching units of the course. Class included the same curriculum as the Introductory and Economics ethics courses.

Control—High school students ($n = 15$; 28%) participated in a computer science class and received no instruction in ethics. (DeHaan et al., pp. 8-10)

Student social and emotional growth were most noticeable, and the curriculum was most effective when taught by the classroom teacher versus the teaching assistants from a local university (DeHaan et al., 1997). Scores in moral reasoning change and moral behavior change were significant for both the economics-ethics ($p \leq 0.05$) and introductory ethics classes ($p \leq 0.05$). The role-model ethics class taught by graduate students had no significant

gains ($p = NS$); (DeHaan et al., 1997). The course taught by the students' regular teacher versus the course taught by the teaching assistants, had "positive effects on the moral maturity of the students" (p. 14). The course taught by the graduate students increased the students' reasoning skill; however, it actually had a negative effect on student empathy (DeHaan et al., 1997). Data suggested that

It is preferable for all teachers to think of themselves as practical ethicists, regardless of their primary field of formal training, and to integrate ethics instruction into their regular courses. Current curriculum designers also seem to favour an integrated or comprehensive approach. (DeHaan et al., 1997, p. 16)

Educators can make a difference in students' growth of humane behaviors such as empathy, increase student connection to the school and learning community, and help students to have more academic success (Blum & Libby, 2004). In a 2006 study of students in grades 6 through 12 ($n = 148,189$), only 29% to 45% reported having skills such as empathy and conflict resolution (Benson, 2006). Programs and curriculum created for educators and designed to model and build these skills enhance humane attitudes and social and emotional learning, as well as increase academic performance and create classrooms with lower emotional distress and conduct concerns (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Shellinger, 2011).

In a 2011 meta-analysis conducted by Durlak et al., of 213 social and emotional learning programs, the researchers used three intervention groups:

Class by Teacher—programs were presented by the regular school staff

Class by Non-School Personnel—programs were presented by non-school personnel

Multicomponent—programs were presented in a combined effort by the regular school staff and non-school personnel. (p. 407)

Humane pedagogy, including pro-social behavior and the modeling of positive social behaviors and attitudes, when initiated by the classroom teacher, were found to be the most effective (Durlak et al., 2011). When all six categories were reviewed, Class by Teacher programs produced the most robust results: Social and Emotional Learning skills ($ES = .62$), Attitudes ($ES = .23$), Positive social behavior ($ES = .26$), Conduct problems ($ES = .20$), Emotional distress ($ES = .25$), and Academic performance ($ES = .34$); (Durlak et al., 2011).

Classroom by Teacher programs were effective in all six outcome categories, and Multicomponent programs (also conducted by school staff) were effective in four outcome categories. In contrast, classroom programs delivered by non-school personnel produced only three significant outcomes. Student academic performance significantly improved only when school personnel conducted the programs. (Durlak et al., 2011, p. 413)

The above research supports observations of Vockell and Hodal (1980), who suggested that shorter, hour-long, one-time visits that are often supported by humane and environmental groups may be ineffective. They suggested instead that a humane-infused curriculum may be more effective in creating long-term change. Vockell and Hodal (1980) conducted a study in India using the Fireman Tests as pre- and post-test instruments and trained humane educators. In the Fireman Test, educators ask students to read the story of either character Johnny or Billy. In each, the family is safe, but the house is on fire, and Johnny or Billy have a chance to retrieve three items before everything is destroyed. Students are asked to suggest three items and give the reason they chose these items. Students are given the choice of 10 items, including inanimate objects such as a television and bike, and three animals. Students receive a score based upon the number of animals they choose. The instrument is considered valid for students in grades 3-6; thus, Vockell and Hodal administered the pre- and post-test in these grades, even though grades 1-8 took part in the humane education lessons at each participating school. Eighteen Comprehensive

Employment Training Act (CETA) personnel received nine months of training, specifically on the animal welfare component of humane education, before working with the schools in India. The study included three types of groups:

Intensive—a 60-minute presentation with audio-visual enrichment taught by trained humane educators; print and poster materials from The HSUS and Pet Food Institute.

Light—print and poster materials from The HSUS and Pet Food Institute presented with no direction, no discussion or follow-up; no speaker.

Control—no materials or programs until after pretest and posttest data collection. (Vockell & Hodal, p. 20)

Vockell and Hodal (1980) hypothesized that the intensive groups, those with a trained educator, would have the most impact in each grade level. Results reported in the pre-tests showed approximately the same score in the Intensive and Light treatment groups and lower scores in the Control group. After the treatment, the scores of each group went up, with the Light and Control group surpassing the Intensive group in total score. The write-up by Vockall and Hodal did not include the number of participants or the standard deviations, however. Without these data, it is difficult to confirm the validity of the reported results. The one reason given by the researchers concerning the lack of significant change in the Intensive group was that the visiting educator came into the classroom for only one hour-long presentation. They suggested that these types of programs may be “wasting time and money” (p. 21). They proposed that curriculum-infused materials, year-long school-wide programming, and professional development opportunities for school personnel and teachers may have greater impact.

Other studies indicated that the involvement of the classroom teacher is key in modeling. Malcarne’s Stanford Study (1981) was focused on pedagogy and teaching technique in order to identify the practice that was most effective in changing or influencing

attitudes or behavior of children toward “animals as well as humans” (Malcarne, pp. 18-19). Malcarne found that role-play was an effective means of allowing student empathy to proliferate. Through role-play, students could see the similarities between themselves and animals and participate in activities that would assist animals.

In Malcarne’s larger (1983) study, which he did in conjunction with the Animal Rescue League of Boston, he reviewed four types of humane education interventions and again used the Fireman Test as a pre- and post- assessment. Additionally, treatments in the Malcarne study emphasized the importance of prolonged involvement and inclusion of trained educators.

The study involved four groupings of educational programming offered to Boston Public School District 6 students ($n = 236$) in grades four and five:

Repeated Treatment: 8 days of activities coordinated by a humane society educator and classroom teachers

Intensive Treatment: a single one-hour program by a humane society educator using audiovisual resources and classroom discussion

Light Treatment: reading material on pet care only

Control: neither instruction nor reading; only pre and post-testing using the two Fireman tests. (Malcarne, 1983, p. 12)

Upon final analysis of the data, the Repeated Treatment and Intensive Treatment showed an increase in empathy or humane understanding. “The Repeated Treatment was found to be superior to the Light Treatment ($p = .03$)” (Malcarne, 1983, p. 13). Malcarne concluded that

Repeated lessons with well-designed and presented materials, and involving . . . a teacher in the classroom, can produce benefits greater than those that can be achieved through simple distribution . . . A similarly well-planned and focused one-time presentation . . . can produce . . . less pronounced results. Simply providing students

with literature was not found to be sufficient to affect their attitudes; accompanying instruction of some sort was needed. (p. 13)

Few studies have been done on the importance of humane pedagogy and the participation of the classroom teacher. Those that do exist were often focused on the student, and any discussion of teacher involvement was secondary. Even though the involvement of the teacher was considered ancillary to student-focused studies, the most effective manner by which to increase empathy, understanding of humane concepts, and moral maturity in students is to have the concepts incorporated into the school culture or curriculum (Daly & Suggs, 2010; Malcarne, 1983; Vockell & Hodal, 1980). The lessons taught by the regular classroom educator were most effective.

Even though the limited research supports the inclusion of humane work in the traditional classroom, a study of in-service educators completed by the Humane Literacy Coalition showed a lack of teacher understanding of the definition of humane education and little teacher understanding of related state laws and mandates (Itle-Clark & Forsyth, 2012). In phase one of a two-part study, educators, administrators, and policymakers ($n = 909$) were asked to complete a three-question survey in order to identify educator understanding of humane education and state requirements.

When asked to rank their familiarity with humane education, primary educators ($n = 149$; 57.9%), secondary educators ($n = 247$; 66.2%), and administrators and policymakers ($n = 39$; 85%) were only somewhat or very familiar with humane education (Itle-Clark & Forsyth, 2012). Additionally, a majority of respondents ($n = 167$; 57.2%) who lived in a state with a humane education requirement reported being unaware of any requirement.

In the second phase of the study, educators ($n = 179$) were asked to rate the importance of incorporating humane education into their work (Itle-Clark & Forsyth, 2012).

Of these respondents, 97% of primary school teachers ($n = 109$) felt that incorporating humane education into their work was very important or somewhat important, with 70.27% ($n = 78$) saying it was very important. Secondary educators, while smaller in number, reported that humane education combined with their work was very important or somewhat important ($n = 47$; 100%). Humane education guidelines were reported by 70.88% to be either very important ($n = 99$) or somewhat important ($n = 64$).

This 2012 study showed that educators had a high level of interest in humane education, indicating that execution of school- and curriculum-based humane education is possible. If humane education organizations can understand the needs of the credentialed educator, resources and professional development can be created and will more likely be embraced by the formal educator (Westerlund, 1965). Without training or professional development, educators are not fully able to provide the necessary support to assist students in developing humane behaviors or attitudes. Professional development would provide educators with knowledge of how to incorporate humane concepts into standards-based requirements.

Status of Humane Education Professional Development Offerings

Currently, few standards-based humane education professional development offerings are designed for and available to formal educators nationwide. Programs such as Humane Education Advocates Reaching Teachers (HEART) and the Humane Education Committee of the New York United Federation of Teachers (UFT) are both New York-based groups whose leaders advocate for inclusion of humane education in all K-12 grade levels. (It should be noted that HEART initiated additional programs in Illinois in 2009, Indiana in 2011, and Oregon in 2012.) HEART and UFT direct their work toward educating

credentialed teachers in the area of humane education and providing resources that help meet humane education goals, as well as the required curriculum and state mandates.

RedRover, a California-based non-profit, offers the RedRover Readers program to train volunteers to visit classrooms and read humane-themed literacy while utilizing inquiry-based questioning techniques (Stokes, 2009). The RedRover program, while maintaining a strong connection to literacy standards and acting as a robust complement to Common Core Standards, does not require volunteers to be formal educators, nor that the program be fully incorporated into the curriculum. Formal educators can be trained in the program, and they can utilize the techniques in the classroom.

Groups that work on a more national level to provide professional development and support to educators include the Association of Professional Humane Educators (APHE) and Humane Society University (HSU), which offers the Certified Humane Education Specialist (CHES) program, as well as a new Graduate Certificate in Humane Education. APHE is a national organization incorporated in California. At the present time, membership consists predominantly of individuals who are associated with animal shelters and environmental awareness groups (Association of Professional Humane Educators, 2012). The focus of the Association, based upon the membership materials that are available, is to assist those in the informal education fields to reach schools and youth groups with the message of humane education. Similarly, the CHES program was founded in 2004 after the success of the National Association of Humane and Environmental Education *Teach Kids to Care* workshops, which were held predominantly for shelter-based humane educators. The CHES program began a process of revisions in 2007, opening the scope of the content so it would be relevant to both the informal educator and credentialed teacher. As of 2012, the

enrollment of individuals in the program of study includes an equal percentage of credentialed and non-credentialed educators (Humane Society University, 2012). In response to the success of opening up the CHES program to formal educators, HSU launched the Graduate Certificate in Humane Education in the fall of 2012. The graduate certificate provides a program of study in humane education

as it relates to academic curriculum and educational culture. Educators will learn to strengthen humane pedagogy and integrate concepts of compassion into their instruction by utilizing innovative research and best practices while actively addressing barriers to student achievement and confidence. (HSU, n.d., para.1)

Three other programs provide university-level humane education. Duquesne University offers a Humane Leadership program designed for those who wish to work in animal protection. One course in the 36-credit core requirement is called *Studies in Humane Education* (Duquesne University, 2012). The Duquesne program is designed for those who wish to work in the managerial and leadership roles for humane organizations. The introduction to humane education allows potential leaders to learn about programs so they can be developed and lead in their future roles.

The second university program including humane education is Canisius College. Their Masters' of Anthrozoology requires 36-credit hours, with a course titled *Animals in Humane Education and Development* offered as an elective (Canisius, 2012). The Canisius program is intended to introduce the concept of "Anthrozoology by evaluating the history of human/nonhuman interactions, the categories into which humans have sorted animals, and a variety of science-based and value-based approaches to humans' inevitable intersection with other living beings" (Canisius College, 2012, p. 1).

Additionally, a Masters' of Education focused on humane education is available from Valparaiso University in conjunction with the Institute for Humane Education

(Valparaiso, 2012). According to the description of the program of study, it supports the professional development of educators in understanding humane concepts. Little standards-based work is required in the core or elective courses, however.

Of all the programs mentioned above, only the RedRover Readers program has been studied empirically. In the 2009 strength and weakness analysis, Stokes (2009) found that the strengths of the visiting reader program were that it aligned with literacy goals and assisted credentialed educators in adding high-interest topics to their lessons. It also provided a way for teachers to include humanistic and social and moral development modeling in the curriculum.

Connecting Humane Education with Broad Educational Movements

Humane pedagogy and humane education are not new or stand-alone programs. They are similar to a variety of current program offerings, including environmental studies, character education and proactive anti-bullying work, and social and emotional learning.

Similar to ecopedagogy, the teaching practice that supports social justice and environmental education in the foundation of biophilia, which is a connection to the natural world, humane education can inspire curricular models (Freire, 2004; Kahn & Kellert, 2002). Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), or the combination of academic education and awareness of nature and the environment, contains three components (United Nations, 2005). Each piece builds upon the knowledge gained by the learner in the previous piece. The first component, learning about the environment, suggests that in phase one of education for sustainable development, a student needs a basic understanding of humane issues. In order to develop appreciation of the environment, learners build their understanding of

ecological concepts and theory with phase one praxis, and “through learning they can make and remake themselves” (Freire, 2004, p. 15).

Phase two of Education for Sustainable Development, education and learning in the environment, is the supporting component for the many experiential programs in existence (United Nations, 2005). Experiential education, such as Project Adventure, Youth Service America, Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound, and Boys and Girls Clubs of America allow students to use their personal voice to purposefully engage in first-hand knowledge and experience, allowing them to take action and reflect on what they did in order to contribute to their communities. Experiential components of humane and sustainable education also allow students to learn and practice leadership. The Association for Experiential Education reported that 26% of programs are interwoven into leadership programs, 23% into K-12 programming, and 12% into environmental education (Association for Experiential Education, 2011). Building the number of leadership opportunities allows students to continue the praxis from phase one.

Phase three, education and learning for the environment, is the sustainability component of the learning program in which students learn how to create change (Donaldson & Donaldson 1958; United Nations, 2005). This same breakdown of components supports all areas of humane education and service-learning. In many ways, ecopedagogy mirrors the obstacles faced by humane education. The definition remains ambiguous, programs are often perceived as political, and programs support the change of the hidden curriculum in learning and education (Freire, 2004; Illich, 1988; Kahn, 2010).

Teacher modeling of prosocial behavior can be built into a curriculum. Character education, anti-bullying, and social and emotional learning all fit under the umbrella of

prosocial behavior. Teacher modeling influences the behavior of students (Crick, 1996). Modeled behavior in the classroom fosters intrinsic motivation in students, making replication of the prosocial behavior likely. The best motivators do not include extrinsic influences (Benabau & Tirole, 2005).

Professional Development and Educator Change

“Teacher development is the professional growth a teacher achieves as a result of gaining increased experience and examining his or her teaching systematically” (Glatthorn, 1995, p. 41). Participant-driven professional development programs that engage teachers in inquiry and reflective practices to improve their learning has been emphasized by many researchers as a means to create change in educators skills and behaviors (Loucks-Horsley, Love, Stiles, Mundry, & Hewson, 2003; Zeichner, 2006). Professional development allows teachers to “contribute to their growth, and enhance their effectiveness with students (Guskey, 2002, p.382). Sherer, Shea, and Kristensen (2003) recognized that educators often facilitate “their own growth and development” through professional development activities such as “conferences, workshops, and informal conversations” (p.187).

Birman, Desimone, Garet, and Porter’s (2000) study of over 1,000 teachers who took part in the federally funded Eisenhower Professional Development program identified *form*, *duration*, and *participation* as “three structural features that set the context for professional development” (p. 29). Activities with extended duration and which allowed participants from a similar “department, subject, or grade” to discuss “concepts and problems” were those most desired by educators (Birman et al., 2000, p. 30). Additionally, the same study identified *content focus*, *active learning*, and *coherence* as “three core features that characterize the processes that occur during professional development” (Birman et al., 2000,

p. 29). Successful professional development plans proven to improve pedagogical practice include

- Experiential, engaging teachers in concrete tasks of teaching, assessment, and observation that illuminate the processes of learning and development;
- Grounded in participants' questions, inquiry, and experimentation as well as profession-wide research;
- Collaborative, involving a sharing of knowledge among educators;
- Connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students, as well as to examinations of subject matter and teaching methods;
- Sustained and intensive, supported by modeling, coaching, and problem solving around specific problems of practice; and
- Connected to other aspects of school change. (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995, p. 600)

Educator preference of professional development indicates that they prefer trainings that will provide new instructional methods based on practical and tangible concepts that can be utilized in the classroom immediately and that positively impact students (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Much like educational opportunities designed utilizing Freire's concept of consciousness-raising in which a learner wants to know new content, motivation plays a part in the success of any training provided to educators (Freire, 1970). Along with the desire for continuing education that is reflective of educational reforms, classroom and student need, educators want training that allows them to feel connected to and supported by grade or content-area peers (Parke & Coble, 1997). Teachers learn best when actively engaged and reflecting with other teachers (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995).

Professional development programs that offer ongoing relationships and reflection and in which teachers receive feedback on classroom practice and strategies for change foster personal professional growth (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001; Huffman, 2006; Loucks-Horsley, et al., 2003). Research indicates that “activities of longer duration have more subject-area content focus, more opportunities for active learning, and more coherence with teachers’ other experiences than do shorter activities” (Birman et al., 2000, p. 30).

Summary

While many studies have been done on the topic of children and humane education, little research has been done in the field of humane education focusing on the teacher and the incorporation of strategies in the classroom. Vockell and Hodel (1980) and Malcarne (1983) indicated that when humane education is infused into the curriculum and school culture, student attitudes and prosocial actions are more positively impacted.

If the inference is to be made that the most effective way to incorporate humane education into the standard practice of teachers is to provide professional development, then support must be given to educators. Professional development designed to meet the needs of credentialed educators improves not only their attitudes about the value of the topic, but provides strategies for them to use and increases their efficacy in using recommended practices (Aspy, 1975). As schools and educators work toward developing humane curriculum, programs will include both academic and experiential components. Experiences that assist students in developing positive feelings toward self, others, and the environment will be necessary (Little, 1974). A common structure in humane professional development is needed so that educators can learn how to implement their new learning about humane pedagogy (Gusky, 1988). Desimone (2009) studied professional development and found that

five items should be present in order for the new information to be relevant and utilized in the classroom. Developmental activities and information should be focused on content, involve active learning, be coherent with educator “knowledge and beliefs” (p. 188), provide learning spread over a semester (ideally a minimum of 20 hours), and include collective participation, allowing content area educators or grade levels to work together.

Although professional development programs seem to be an optimal way to provide credentialed educators with the information needed to allow them to integrate humane pedagogy into the standards-based classroom, no empirical support yet exists for this position. Teacher workshops and trainings on humane topics in both pre-service and in-service development are meager, yet the modeling of humane skills (i.e., empathy, kindness, honesty, and responsibility) requires a constant and trusted presence, which is a role played by the classroom teacher. Through professional development training, educators can develop the skills to build a positive culture in the classroom, to expand critical thinking activities, and to provide instruction that helps students to evaluate information presented to them.

The study supports teacher training and the development of standards-based humane education pedagogy. Through an online learning community, participants discussed humane education and the ways in which it could be infused into the curriculum.