

Animal Tracker – Wave 1

An HRC-Managed Research Study, June 2008



Report in Brief

This report summarizes results from Wave 1 of the *Animal Tracker* annual survey of U.S. adults regarding their attitudes and behavior toward animals. This inaugural survey of 16 core questions shows strong support for the protection of all animals. The strength of that support varies by situation and species, however, and actual behavior does not always reflect the favorable attitudes identified.

Notice of Confidentiality

This document is provided exclusively to HumaneSpot.org users for informational purposes. This *Animal Tracker* report and the included data remain the sole property of the Humane Research Council (HRC). Anyone accessing this information must be a current HumaneSpot.org user in good standing.

No authorization is granted to share or reproduce any of the content herein or to use any of the survey results with the media, the public, or any third party, unless such use is entirely non-commercial in nature. Anyone using the data agrees not to misuse, misstate, or otherwise skew any of the *Animal Tracker* results when sharing them with a third party for non-commercial purposes. All uses of the information with a third party must clearly cite HRC as the source.

By reading or utilizing this content, you are also agreeing to HumaneSpot.org's terms and conditions (see <http://www.humanespot.org/legal>). If you have any questions about this policy, please contact HRC at (206) 905-9887 or info@humanereseach.org.

HRC Information

The Humane Research Council is a nonprofit organization dedicated to maximizing the effectiveness of animal advocates by applying professional, cost-efficient, and informative consumer and market research methods.

To learn more about HRC, please contact us:

By phone: (206) 905-9887

By e-mail: info@humanereseach.org

Online: <http://www.humanereseach.org>

By post: Post Office Box 6476

Olympia, WA 98507-6476



Overview and Discussion

ANIMAL TRACKER RESULTS IN BRIEF

- ❖ 72% of U.S. adults have a “favorable” opinion of the animal protection (AP) movement.
- ❖ 32% give AP groups “significant” credibility regarding information about animal welfare.
- ❖ Many people “strongly support” using anti-cruelty investigations (47%), the media (37%), and speaking in schools (33%) to advocate for animals.
- ❖ 44% think the AP movement has had a “moderate” or “significant” impact.
- ❖ 43% have talked or heard about AP “frequently” or “occasionally” in the past three months.
- ❖ A majority say they are “not very” or “not at all” knowledgeable about each of the animal issues listed except companion animals.
- ❖ 78% or more believe the welfare and protection of animals is “very” or “somewhat” important for all of the animal situations listed.
- ❖ 38% say it is “very” important that students of all ages are taught humane education.
- ❖ 73% have watched wildlife, 25% have donated to an AP group, 19% have adopted an animal, and 5% have volunteered for an animal group in the past year.
- ❖ Concern for animals has caused 58% of people to spay/neuter their pets, 31% to sign an animal-related petition, and 20% to vote for an animal-friendly candidate.
- ❖ 40% would “strongly support” a law requiring that farmed animals are given enough space to behave naturally.
- ❖ 35% “strongly support” the specific goal to “minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering.”

COMPARISONS WITH HISTORICAL DATA

Following are a handful of comparisons between *Animal Tracker* data and surveys conducted previously by other organizations. Please note that question wording and sampling differences exist between surveys and in most cases these are not direct comparisons. However, there is some slight indication that opinions of animals advocates are improving. Questions from the National Council for Animal Protection (NCAP) survey conducted in 2005 are proprietary and available only to NCAP members; the complete references to all other studies can be found on HumaneSpot.org.

Awareness of Animal Issues

- 2005: NCAP asked, “In the past year, how often have you talked about or heard someone talking about animal protection as an issue, including animal rights and/or animal welfare?” 41% said “occasionally,” 37% said “rarely,” 15% said “frequently,” and 7% said “never.”
- 2008: The *Animal Tracker Wave 1* asked a very similar question and received fairly comparable results, but with the timeframe limited to the past three months. 35% of respondents said “rarely,” 33% said “occasionally,” 10% said “frequently,” and 22% said “not at all.”

Opinions of Advocates

- 1994: The Times Mirror Company asked about people's "overall opinion of the animal rights movement," 65% said "favorable," 30% said "unfavorable," and 5% had no opinion.
- 1998: Americans for Medical Progress (a pro-vivisection group) asked about favorability toward "animal welfare groups." Overall, 48% said "favorable," 21% "unfavorable," and 32% had no opinion.
- 2005: NCAP asked about opinions of several causes, with "animal protection" listed. 76% said "favorable," 8% said "unfavorable," and 16% had no opinion. The same question was asked about "animal rights" and "animal welfare," with similar results.
- 2008: In the *Animal Tracker* Wave 1, when respondents were asked for their opinion about the "animal protection movement," in series with other movements, 72% had a favorable opinion, 7% said unfavorable, and 21% had no opinion.

Credibility of Advocates

- 2002: The National Pork Board asked how much confidence people have in various sources of information when it comes to animal welfare. For "animal rights groups," 13% said "great deal" and 38% "moderate amount" of confidence (the remaining answers are unpublished). The question was asked in a series with other sources of information.
- 2008: *Animal Tracker* Wave 1 respondents answered a similar question about "credibility of sources when it comes to information about animal welfare." For animal protection groups, 32% said "significant" credibility, 38% said "moderate," 17% said "very little," 6% said "none," and 7% had no opinion.

Impact of Animal Advocates

- 2000: Gallup asked how much impact people thought the "animal rights movement" has had on U.S. policies? 15% said a "great deal," 35% "moderate amount," 35% "slight amount," 13% "none at all," and 2% had no opinion.
- 2005: NCAP asked how much impact people think "animal protection" has on U.S. policies (the question was asked in series with other causes). 12% said a "great deal," 30% said "moderate amount," 42% a "slight amount," 14% "none at all," and 1% had no opinion.
- 2008: The *Animal Tracker* Wave 1 asked how much of an impact the "animal protection movement" has had on our nation's policies, including laws and corporate policies. 10% said "significant" impact," 34% said "moderate" impact, 40% said "very little" impact, 4% said "no impact," and 12% said "do not know."

Support for Advocacy Goals

- 2005: NCAP asked survey respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement (as part of a series of statements): "I support the goals of the animal protection movement." Just over half (56%) said "agree," 16% disagreed, and 28% said they have no opinion.
- 2008: The *Animal Tracker* Wave 1 asked a somewhat more specific question: "Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?" 70% said they support such a goal, 14% oppose it, and 16% said "do not know."

Actions Taken for Animals

- 2005: NCAP asked, “Has your concern for animals ever caused you to do any of the following?” 53% said yes to “spay or neuter a companion animal,” 34% said yes to “adopt an animal from a shelter,” and 25% said yes to “purchase cruelty-free products.”
- 2008: *Animal Tracker* Wave 1 asked the same question, although with different options listed. 58% said yes to “spay or neuter your pet,” 35% said yes to “adopt an animal from a shelter,” and 40% said yes to “buy products labeled as ‘not tested on animals.’”

KEY IMPLICATIONS FOR ANIMAL ADVOCATES

The *Animal Tracker* is designed to be a longitudinal study, for which the results will be most meaningful after we have collected several waves of survey data. When we have two or three data points for any given survey question, then we will be able to begin making time-series comparisons and understanding how public opinion is changing over time. The implications from this inaugural survey are therefore somewhat limited because they represent only a snapshot in time. With that said, the following are important considerations for animal advocates:

- ❖ As these Wave 1 results show, awareness and knowledge of animal issues are somewhat low. This is no surprise to animal advocates, but it underscores the need to generate awareness and increase knowledge while maintaining credibility, which is relatively high.
- ❖ There is clearly a strong disconnect between thought and action, with very positive attitudes toward animals coupled with moderate animal-friendly behavior. Because of this cognitive dissonance, advocates should focus on changing behavior, not attitudes.
- ❖ Effective ways to change people’s behavior are “incremental advocacy” and system-wide change. The former recognizes that people change slowly (i.e., incrementally) and that our messages should provide incremental steps. The latter takes persuasion out of the picture with changes in laws or policies that “force” different behavior on the masses.
- ❖ Specifically, according to these results, the most supported advocacy tactics include anti-cruelty investigations, using the media, and speaking in schools. Particularly given the success of recent farm animal investigations by groups like Mercy for Animals and The Humane Society of the United States, advocates should consider employing these tactics more often to raise awareness of animal cruelty among their target audiences.
- ❖ These *Animal Tracker* results provide responses for the overall U.S. adult population. In reality, however, people are not homogeneous and advocates are advised to target audiences that are smaller and more reachable than the “general public.” Animal advocates must recognize that one message or approach will not work for all audiences (for access to detailed results for key demographic segments, please consider becoming a sponsor).

Summary Results by Topic

OPINIONS OF ADVOCATES AND THE ANIMAL PROTECTION CAUSE

- **Favorability [Q1]** – Animal protection (AP) ranks within the top three causes in terms of favorability, among the 8 listed. 72% of respondents have a favorable opinion of AP, compared with 76% for workers' rights and 74% for tax reform/relief. AP also ranks ahead of environmentalism (67%). All causes receive a majority "favorable" response except two: gay/lesbian rights (30%); pro life (anti-abortion) (40%).
- **Credibility [Q2]** – AP groups rank second to veterinarians when it comes to credibility regarding animal welfare information (tied with farmers/ranchers). 87% of respondents say veterinarians have "significant" or "moderate" credibility, compared with 71% for farmers/ranchers, 70% for AP groups, and 69% for scientists/researchers. Conversely, 46% of respondents give "very little" or no credibility to governments and 61% say the same about businesses (apparently with the exception of farmers/ranchers).
- **Advocacy Tactics [Q11]** – More than half of respondents strongly or somewhat support all of the tactics listed except "demonstrating or protesting." Among the most supported tactics, 80% support anti-cruelty investigations, 76% support using the media, and 71% support speaking in schools. However, only 52% support product boycotts and 48% support demonstrating and protesting (and 29% *oppose* it). Additionally, 26% oppose boycotts and 22% oppose lobbying. This question had high "don't know" and "no opinion" rates (14-25%).
- **Impact [Q12]** – People believe the impact of AP groups on government and corporate policies has been minimal. A plurality (40%) say AP groups have had "very little" impact (a plurality is when the response for a given answer is the largest proportion of respondents, but less than a 50% majority). A third (34%) says "moderate" impact; 4% say "no impact" and 12% don't know. One in ten respondents (10%) say AP groups have had "significant" impact on these policies.

AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE OF ANIMAL ISSUES

- **Awareness [Q7]** – Awareness and discussion of animal issues over the past three months seems moderate (and may have been inflated somewhat by the Hallmark/Westland cruelty case in late January 2008). The majority of respondents is split between "rarely" (35%) and "occasionally" (33%) having discussed or heard about AP issues in the past three months. About a fifth (22%) says "not at all," more than twice those who say "frequently" (10%).
- **Knowledge [Q8]** – Self-reported knowledge of animal issues varies significantly by circumstance. People are most knowledgeable about companion animals (72% very/somewhat knowledgeable). Knowledge drops off considerably for other issues, however, with less than half of respondents saying they are very/somewhat knowledgeable about all other issues. There is more knowledge about farm animals, wildlife and endangered species, and animals in zoos/aquariums. There is relatively less knowledge of horses/dogs used in racing, laboratory animals, and animals in circuses/rodeos.
- **Current Laws [Q13]** – Regarding the perceived "adequacy" of legal protections, only companion animals received a majority response saying that current laws are adequate (58%). A plurality of respondents feel laws are adequate for animals in zoos/aquariums (49%), wildlife (44%), and endangered species (41%). However, a plurality believes laws are *inadequate* for animals in laboratories and animals raised for food. This question also yielded very high "don't know" rates (20-39%), representing a plurality of respondents for animals in circuses/rodeos and horses/dogs used in racing.

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF ANIMAL PROTECTION

- **Animal Welfare Importance by Choice [Q5]** – Perceived importance of animal welfare differs by personal choice (this question is significantly affected by how likely people are to engage in the activity; less frequent behavior results in less perceived importance). Over half of respondents (59%) say animal welfare is very/somewhat important when “buying food (i.e., meat, dairy, eggs),” essentially the same as when “getting a new pet” (56%). About half say it is very or somewhat important when buying consumer products, voting for a political candidate, and buying clothes. Animal welfare is less important when it comes to dog/horse races, going hunting or fishing, and attending circuses/rodeos.
- **Animal Welfare Importance by Situation [Q9]** – Asked generally, rather than relative to personal decisions, the perceived importance of animal welfare is very high. For all of the eight situations listed, more than three-fourths of respondents said the “welfare and protection of animals” is very/somewhat important. Relatively more importance is placed on companion animals and endangered species, and relatively low importance on welfare for farm animals, animals in labs, and horses/dogs used in racing.
- **Humane Education [Q10]** – Regarding humane education, respondents are very supportive of incorporating animal topics into educational curricula at K-12 and college levels. A majority of respondents is split between thinking this is “very important” (40%) and “somewhat important” (38%). About one in ten (11%) says incorporating humane education is “not very important;” 5% say “not at all important” and 5% do not know.

ENGAGEMENT IN KEY BEHAVIORS

- **Personal Behavior (yes/no) [Q3]** – Respondents were asked which of a list of nine animal-related activities they have done in the past year, if any. A majority of respondents have watched wildlife (73%) or consumed a meat/dairy substitute (58%), representing the most frequent behaviors. These were followed at some distance by visiting a zoo/aquarium (44%). The lowest-incidence behaviors were “going to a circus with animals” (9% did so within the past year) and volunteering for an animal group (5%). Slightly more people have adopted an animal (19%) vs. bought an animal (14%) in the past year.
- **Personal Behavior (frequency) [Q4]** – As a follow-up to question 3, respondents were asked the frequency for each activity they had engaged in (resulting in sub-samples). Given the diverse nature of the activities described, they should not be compared, but they do provide interesting benchmarks for each behavior. In summary, very large majorities of respondents who have done so at least once in the past year say they often/sometimes consume meat or dairy substitutes (85%) and watch wildlife (84%). Small minorities of people who have done so at least once in the past year say they often/sometimes go to circuses (9%) or adopt an animal (13%). The other activities fall in between these extremes.
- **Actions Taken for Animals [Q6]** – When asked if their concern for animals had specifically prompted certain actions, only “spay or neuter your pet” received a majority “yes” response (58%). The least likely behavior was “boycott a store or a product” (17%); resistance to boycotts is a common theme in other studies conducted by HRC. Other noteworthy behaviors included “adopt an animal from a shelter” (35%), sign a petition for animals (31%), vote for an animal-friendly law (30%), and vote for an animal-friendly candidate (20%). Note that this question also yielded fairly large “don’t know” responses (6-20%).

OTHER ISSUES AND SPECIAL TOPICS

- **Farm Animal Confinement Law [Q14]** – There is strong support for “a law requiring that farm animals including pigs, cows, and chickens are provided with enough space to behave naturally.” About three-fourths (72%) of U.S. adults support this statement, including 40% who say “strongly.” Only 14% oppose such a law (6% “strongly oppose” it), about the same proportion as those who say they don’t know.
- **Attitudinal Statements [Q15]** – Agreement and disagreement with various animal-related statements shows some interesting differences. Strong majorities of respondents agree with these statements: “some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions” (71% agreement) and “protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority” (70%). However, 70% also agree that “using animals for food is necessary for human survival.” Additionally, a majority of people (55%) agree that “research on animals is necessary for medical advancement,” and a solid plurality agree that “dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy” (49%).
- **Advocates’ Goals [Q16]** – Consistent with most of the other survey responses, there is also strong support for the description of the AP movement’s goal to “minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering.” Seven in ten people support this statement, including 35% who “strongly support” it. About 14% of respondents oppose it (5% “strongly oppose” it). One in six (16%) says they don’t know.

Background and Methodology

STUDY BACKGROUND

The *Animal Tracker* is a collaborative research project that provides advocates with an accurate and consistent understanding of the opinions and behavior of U.S. adults over time. The initial *Animal Tracker* survey (“Wave 1”) includes results combined from two surveys conducted in late February and early March and then late May and early June of 2008. Both surveys were fielded using the Knowledge Networks panel, which combines offline random digit dialing techniques with online panel research capabilities. This results in a true probability sample and survey data that are much more accurate than most other online surveys. The combined Wave 1 response rate was 62%.

The total Wave 1 sample size is 1,544 respondents, although this number is slightly lower for most questions due to missing data (the result of refusals, which were less than 1% in almost all cases). This sample size yields a maximum margin of error of +/- 2.5% for the entire sample, at a 95% confidence level. The error margin is larger for subgroups, as is the case with respondents to Q4, which was conditional based on answers to Q3. Note that the possible answers were randomized for all survey questions except 6, 9, 11, 13, and 15. Additionally, the results have been weighted to account for differences between survey respondents and the population being studied, in this case all non-institutionalized adults (18+) currently living in the United States.

WAVE 1 VITAL SIGNS

- Field period: 2/27 - 3/4 and 5/21 - 6/4, 2008
- Total number of surveys fielded: 2,499
- Total number of surveys completed: 1,544
- Survey response rate: 62.2%
- Median completion time: 12 minutes
- Questions included: All questions (1-16)

SURVEY LIMITATIONS

It should be noted that using online research methods can be subject to limitations given that some groups are not fully represented online; this typically results in under-representation of non-white, lower-income, and elderly individuals. Weighting the survey results reduces this bias considerably, but does not eliminate it entirely. Another caveat to these results is the reliance on self-reported data. Respondents' answers may differ from their actual opinions or behavior for a variety of reasons, particularly for questions involving predictions of the respondents' own changes in the future. This may also occur when asking research participants to describe their own motivations and barriers to change, including cases in which participants may not be aware of their own motivations.

Sponsorship Information

The *Animal Tracker* (Wave 1) was sponsored by a consortium of animal advocacy organizations including American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Animal Welfare Trust, Humane Society of the United States, American Humane Association, Animal Legal Defense Fund, Farm Sanctuary, and World Society for the Protection of Animals (USA). The Humane Research Council initiated the collaborative study and provided discounted consulting services related to project planning, survey design, research, and analysis.

Wave 2 of the *Animal Tracker* will be fielded in the first quarter of 2009 and will include a subset of the survey's questions. The exact cost of sponsorship for Wave 2 is still being determined, but is likely to be in the range of \$500 to \$1,000 per sponsor. The benefits of sponsorship are significant, including access to more detailed survey results (including "cross-tab" data for key demographic segments) and full permission to use the results publicly with the media, in reports, etc. New sponsors for Wave 2 will be considered through December 15, 2008.

Please contact the Humane Research Council at (206) 905-9887 or info@humanereseach.org if your organization is interested in sponsoring the *Animal Tracker*.

Wave 1 Complete Data (Frequency Counts)

NOTES ABOUT THE WAVE 1 SURVEY

- For multi-part questions, the “N” shown is the *minimum* sample size for any element in the question; the actual sample size may vary slightly by question element.
- “Don’t know” (DK) and “no opinion” (NO) responses have been combined.
- Missing data (blanks) have been omitted from the analysis; however, blanks represent at most 1.5% of the response for any individual question.
- Responses are ranked by the first column of data. For some questions, however, it makes more sense to sum columns for a more accurate impression of public opinion.

1. What is your opinion of each of the following social causes or political movements?

<i>N=1,542</i>	<i>Favorable</i>	<i>Unfavorable</i>	<i>NO/DK</i>
Workers’ rights	76%	4%	20%
Tax reform and relief	74	6	20
Animal protection	72	7	21
Environmentalism	67	9	24
Immigration reform	58	17	25
Homeless advocacy	57	9	34
Pro life (anti-abortion)	40	32	28
Gay/lesbian rights	30	35	34

2. How much credibility do you give to each of the following sources when it comes to information about animal welfare?

<i>N=1,533</i>	<i>Significant</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Very Little</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>DK</i>
Veterinarians	58%	30%	5%	2%	6%
Animal protection groups	32	38	17	6	7
Farmers and ranchers	29	42	17	4	8
Scientists and researchers	26	43	17	6	8
Academics and scholars	17	40	25	6	12
Local or national news media	11	41	31	9	8
Government (federal or state)	9	35	38	9	9
Businesses and corporations	5	24	44	17	10

3. In the past year, have you personally done any of the following?

<i>N=1,551</i>	Yes	No
Watched wildlife	73%	27%
Consumed a meat or dairy substitute	58	42
Visited a zoo or aquarium	44	56
Donated to an animal group	25	75
Gone hunting or fishing	24	76
Adopted an animal	19	81
Bought an animal	14	86
Gone to a circus with animals	9	91
Volunteered for an animal group	5	95

4. In the past year, roughly how often have you personally done each of the following? *

<i>N=per item (see below)</i>	Often	Some-times	Rarely	Never	DK
Consumed a meat or dairy substitute (N=903)	63%	22%	13%	1%	0%
Watched wildlife (N=1,133)	46	38	15	0	0
Volunteered for an animal group (N=81)	23	27	43	7	0
Gone hunting or fishing (N=367)	17	43	39	1	1
Bought an animal (N=221)	7	12	71	6	3
Donated to an animal group (N=378)	6	33	58	2	0
Adopted an animal (N=289)	5	7	79	6	2
Visited a zoo or aquarium (N=679)	3	19	76	1	0
Gone to a circus with animals (N=147)	5	4	78	12	0

* *The full scale provided to respondents included the following detail: Often (i.e., daily or weekly); Sometimes (i.e., monthly or every few months); Rarely (i.e., once or twice during the year); Never; and Do not know.*

5. How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making the following personal choices? If you never make these choices, mark “not applicable.”

<i>N=1,551</i>	<i>Very Imp.</i>	<i>Some-what Imp.</i>	<i>Not Very Imp.</i>	<i>Not at All Imp.</i>	<i>DK</i>	<i>N/a</i>
Getting a new pet	37%	18%	9%	9%	4%	23%
Buying food (i.e., meat, eggs, dairy)	28	31	17	12	4	8
Voting for a political candidate	22	25	19	13	6	14
Buying consumer products	17	34	20	11	7	11
Buying clothing	17	29	21	13	6	13
Attending circuses or rodeos	14	19	12	14	5	35
Going hunting or fishing	14	17	11	13	4	41
Going to dog or horse races	10	11	10	13	4	51

6. Has your concern for animals ever caused you to do any of the following? Please mark “yes” only if your motive was animal welfare or protection.

<i>N=1,540</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>DK</i>
Spay or neuter your pet	58%	35%	7%
Buy products labeled as “not tested on animals”	40	47	13
Adopt an animal from a shelter	35	59	6
Sign a petition for an animal cause	31	60	9
Vote for an animal-friendly law or initiative	30	55	15
Buy meat or dairy products labeled “humane”	21	59	20
Vote for an animal-friendly candidate	20	62	18
Boycott a store or a product	17	75	9

7. In the past three months, how often have you talked about or heard someone talking about animal protection, including animal rights and/or animal welfare? Please include any personal discussions, items heard on the news, issues read about in magazines, etc.

<i>N=1,554</i>	
Rarely (i.e., once or twice)	35%
Occasionally (i.e., weekly or monthly)	33
Not at all	22
Frequently (i.e., daily or almost daily)	10

8. How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals in the following circumstances?

<i>N=1,546</i>	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not Very</i>	<i>Not at All</i>	<i>DK</i>
Animals kept as companions or pets	28%	44%	14%	8%	5%
Animals raised for food	8	34	35	17	5
Wildlife on public lands	8	34	36	17	6
Endangered species	8	40	32	16	6
Animals in zoos and aquariums	6	36	37	16	6
Horses and dogs used in racing	5	21	41	27	6
Animals in laboratories	5	21	42	25	7
Animals in circuses and rodeos	4	23	45	23	6

9. How important to you is the welfare and protection of animals in each of the following situations?

<i>N=1,551</i>	<i>Very Imp.</i>	<i>Somewhat Imp.</i>	<i>Not Very Imp.</i>	<i>Not at All Imp.</i>	<i>DK</i>
Animals kept as companions or pets	62%	27%	5%	2%	4%
Endangered species	60	27	5	2	6
Wildlife on public lands	50	34	7	3	6
Animals in zoos and aquariums	49	36	7	3	5
Animals raised for food	44	35	12	3	6
Animals in laboratories	42	34	12	4	7
Animals in circuses and rodeos	42	39	9	3	7
Horses and dogs used in racing	41	37	11	4	7

10. How important is it that schools and teachers (Kindergarten-12 and college level) incorporate humane education, including animal welfare topics, into their lessons?

<i>N=1,554</i>	
Somewhat important	40%
Very important	38
Not very important	11
Not at all important	5
Do not know	5

11. Social and political movements use a variety of tactics to create change for their issues. In general, how much do you support or oppose each of the following tactics?

<i>N=1,538</i>	<i>Strongly Support</i>	<i>Somewhat Support</i>	<i>Somewhat Oppose</i>	<i>Strongly Oppose</i>	<i>NO/DK</i>
Anti-cruelty investigations	47%	32%	4%	2%	15%
Using media to reach the public	37	39	6	3	14
Speaking in schools	33	38	9	4	16
Filing lawsuits to protect animals	24	35	14	9	19
State ballot initiatives	21	39	11	5	25
Lobbying government officials	19	36	13	9	23
Calling for product boycotts	18	33	19	7	22
Demonstrating or protesting	14	34	20	10	23

12. Regardless of your personal opinion about the animal protection movement, how much of an impact do you think it has had on our nation's policies? Please include any impact on federal and state laws and regulations, as well as corporate policies.

<i>N=1,550</i>	
Very little impact	40%
Moderate impact	34
Significant impact	10
No impact	4
Do not know	12

13. Do you think that laws protecting animals from inhumane treatment are adequate or inadequate for each of the following kinds of animals?

<i>N=1,536</i>	<i>Not Adequate</i>	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>DK</i>
Animals in laboratories	40%	25	35
Animals raised for food	39	31	30
Animals in circuses and rodeos	36	26	38
Horses and dogs used in racing	36	25	39
Endangered species	34	41	25
Wildlife on public lands	27	44	29
Animals kept as companions or pets	22	58	20
Animals in zoos and aquariums	20	49	31

14. Would you support or oppose a law requiring that farm animals including pigs, cows, and chickens are provided with enough space to behave naturally?

<i>N=1,550</i>	
Strongly support	40%
Somewhat support	33
Somewhat oppose	8
Strongly oppose	6
Do not know	14

15. Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<i>N=1,541</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>NO/DK</i>
Some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions	71%	9%	20%
Protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority	70	11	19
Using animals for food is necessary for human survival	70	14	16
Farm animals deserve the same consideration as pets and other animals	56	24	20
People have an obligation to avoid harming all animals	55	23	22
Research on animals is necessary for medical advancement	55	18	27
Dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy	49	23	28
Buying clothes made of real animal fur is ethically acceptable	27	42	32

16. Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?

<i>N=1,552</i>	
Strongly support	35%
Somewhat support	35
Somewhat oppose	9
Strongly oppose	5
Do not know	16