



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Honors Theses

Lee Honors College

4-20-2017

Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge

Megan Ekkert

Western Michigan University, mrekkert@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses



Part of the Criminology Commons, Politics and Social Change Commons, and the Social Psychology and Interaction Commons

Recommended Citation

Ekkert, Megan, "Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge" (2017). *Honors Theses*. 2838.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses/2838

This Honors Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Honors College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge

By: Megan Ekkert

Thesis Chair: Dr. Zoann Snyder, Department of Sociology

Committee Members: Dr. Angela Moe, Department of Sociology
And Cindy Daines, Adopt a Friend for Life Volunteer and Feline Intake
Coordinator

Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge

By: Megan Ekkert

Abstract

Animal abuse is never an easy topic for people to discuss. Until recently, animal abuse was only considered a misdemeanor charge under the law, but now it can be considered a felony charge. While that should be good news for animals, there are still a lot of questions when it comes to animal abuse. Breed discrimination is a topic of animal abuse that is largely ignored in criminology. This topic brings about several questions. Should breed discrimination be a topic studied more in criminology and why? What is the current view of breed discrimination by the community? Are certain behaviors, such as antisocial behaviors, present more in people that own certain breeds of dogs? All of these questions need to be answered in order to fully grasp what is needed to make the world safer for all animals and to give them a chance at a good life.

This research addresses these questions and focuses on what the community knows about breed discrimination. Several theories inform the research. The main theory is green criminology which is shaped by social theory, utilitarian theory, rights theory, and feminist theory. A mixed methods approach is used for this study. The qualitative analysis addresses what the public knows or thinks about breed discrimination. The quantitative analysis examines personality types of the owners with the type of dog owned. I believe the research shows that not many people are aware of what breed discrimination is. Of those that are aware, I believe the community's opinion is largely against breed discrimination and they believe it should be studied more in criminology. The data will show if a correlation exists between people with antisocial behavior owning large breeds of dogs. If a correlation exists, criminologist can study who owns the

discriminated breeds. This information can then help show that the focus needs to be turned onto the owners of dogs, not the breed of the dog.

Introduction

Animal cruelty is not a topic many people want to think about, let alone talk about. It brings about sad images of animals, injured or abandoned. There are dogs blamed for doing something wrong, when in reality it was the owners that raised the dog in a negative way. If humans do not take on the responsibility to train and socialize their dogs, humans should be blamed for bad behavior, not the dogs. There are also dogs that are discriminated against because of their breed, not because of what they did. Some people may have to give up their dog or move somewhere else because breed specific legislation in their area does not allow certain breeds of dogs to live in specific apartments, homes, or towns. This is a problem that needs to be addressed. Since very little research has been done on this topic, many have no idea it is even an issue.

Animals are considered property under U.S. law, so it can be hard to create laws to prosecute owners for abuse or neglect. Until recently, a conviction for animal abuse was only a misdemeanor charge, but now it can be a felony offense. Animals only come to the attention of criminology when they have done something that is wrong or undesirable, and it negatively affects human relationships (Beirne, 1995). There is not much focus on the animals themselves; it is mostly on how they affect humans. Very little research or attention has been paid to the issue of breed discrimination; however, a few studies have been done to determine whether or not a dog's breed is the sole reason for aggressive behavior. Breed discrimination for the purpose of this study is defined as any dog that is euthanized or forced to be given up due largely to the breed or the owner's lack of responsibility in proper training and socialization. The studies that

have been done have shown that the owners of aggressive dogs are more likely to have antisocial or even criminal behavior (Ragatz et al., 2009). This would help support the theory that a dog's behavior is largely based on the way it is raised, not by its breed.

Due to the lack of research on breed discrimination, there are a lot of deficiencies in the literature. While there are many people, including myself, that have an opinion on the matter, there is not much research to back it up. Previous studies consist of small samples so they may not be representative of the entire US population. Earlier inquiries may also generalize to only a small population, such as college students, rather than the larger population. The research is just beginning to expand so every study plays an important role in how the world deals with the issue of breed discrimination.

It is hoped that this study will help expand on what has been found already. The goal of this project is to answer the following questions: Should breed discrimination be a topic studied more in criminology and why? What is the current view of breed discrimination by the community? Are certain behaviors, such as antisocial behaviors, present more in people that own certain breeds of dogs? There are several theories used for this study. Green criminology is the overall theory used to help guide the research. Green criminology is a mixture of social theory, utilitarian theory, rights theory, and feminist theory.

The method used for this research consists of a mixed methods approach. A survey was distributed to students at Western Michigan University as well as the outside community. Both close-ended and open-ended questions are used. The instrument includes general demographic questions, as well as, questions asking about experience and opinions on certain dog breeds. There are also questions on the participant's personality. This survey helps current research on the topic of how breeds are perceived and what kind of people get certain breeds of dogs.

By expanding on the literature, I demonstrate why breed discrimination in dogs is a problem and needs further research. I compare the findings of this research with research that looks into the behavior of breeds of dogs that are discriminated against to see if there are similarities. Further research may compare the breeds of dogs that are discriminated against, the public's opinion to these breeds, and the reality of the laws that discriminate against them. With new research being done on this topic, the closer it will get to being a major topic studied in criminology.

Literature Review

The literature review is organized by the research questions listed in the introduction for my research study. This review discusses what is already known about these questions, as well as, some background on breed discrimination as a whole. The review of previous literature has shown that there are still several gaps in the topic of breed discrimination in criminology. There is not a lot of research done solely on breed discrimination. Most research focuses on animal abuse, with breed discrimination as a small topic compared to physical animal abuse and neglect.

The first topic for discussion is the definition of breed discrimination. From here on out, breed discrimination is defined as any dog that is euthanized or forced to be given up due largely to its breed or the owner's lack of responsibility in proper training and socialization. There are many situations where someone can be denied housing due to owning a specific breed of dog. Pit Bull Terriers, Dobermans, Chows, Akitas, and Rottweilers are the common breeds that are generally seen as "vicious" and discriminated against because of their breed (Ragatz, 2009). The Pit Bull Terrier, or breeds that looks similar to one, are the breeds most commonly discriminated against. Pit Bulls are a stocky breed of dog with very powerful jaws (Hallsworth, 2011). However, Hallsworth (2011) also states that Pit Bulls are devoted pets that have a natural

reaction to connect and please people. Every dog is different, but many people only look at the breed to determine if a dog is good or not.

People tend to judge a dog by its breed before getting to know its personality. The bigger the size and build of a dog, the more people will judge it as “aggressive” and discriminate against the dog without even knowing the dog. When people see a small dog, first reactions tend to be loving and adoring. Many people think bigger dogs are more aggressive and bite more often than small dogs. Bate et al found the opposite to be true. Bate et al (2001) found that more bites actually came from smaller dogs, but were less reported and did not seek medical attention as it was thought to be less severe. Another study found that aggression and disobedience was seen more in smaller dogs than larger dogs and was tolerated by the owners (Arhant et al, 2010). It is not the big breeds that are the only ones biting, small dogs are biting more often but no one is paying attention to those. One study compared a control group of golden retrievers to dogs generally discriminated against and found that no matter what breed the dog was, the same simulations or events can trigger aggressive behavior (Hackbarth et al, 2008). This kind of research is why breed discrimination needs to be studied more in criminology.

Animal abuse, specifically breed discrimination, is a topic that is not often seen in criminology. Although this topic is slowly growing in criminology, Beirne discusses how there are four areas that bring about the topic of animal abuse as a whole. They are as follows: animals as criminals (and vice versa), animals and humans as partners in crime, analogies between animals and humans, and animals as objects (1995). In a different article, Bierne discusses why theory and research on animal abuse should be a larger topic in criminology (1999). One reason Bierne states that animal abuse should be studied more is because animal abuse is a violation of

their rights (1999). Forms of human discrimination are a violation of human rights. Why should it be different for different types of animals? The answer is, it should not be any different.

There may be several different reasons as to why animal abuse is not studied more in criminology. Bierne explains two theories that may explain why. He says that it may be due to lack of government and private research funding. He also states that a better explanation may be that criminologists prefer to study harms that are committed by humans that hurt humans (1999). Humans, as a species, place so much emphasis on our own species that it may be reasonable to infer that animals are not as important. By bringing them into our lives as companions, humans created the responsibility to care for them properly. Sollund explains that humans brought animals into our lives as companions because humans can form a connection or relationship with them that closely resembles the way humans bond with other humans (2011). If this bond with animals is so close in relation to how humans bond with other humans, then the issue of animal abuse should be almost as important, or as important, as the issues of criminal acts against other humans.

If the bond between animals and humans is similar to that of humans with other humans, there is also another correlation. The way adults were raised as children can play a crucial role in what they become as adults. The same is true with animals, if you raise an animal with proper training and socialization, it will grow into a well behaved animal. Bennett and Rohlf (2006) completed a study that showed training and shared activities between owner and dog helped decrease problem behaviors in the dog. Kubinyi (2009) stated that owners who spend more time with their dogs reported having calmer, more trainable, more sociable and less bold dogs. There is also a significant association between history or aggressive behavior and the following: not being socialized with other dogs, not responding to "sit" command, not being socialized with

children, fearful reactions to specific stimuli, being punished verbally/physically by owner, and being fed directly from the family table (Hanlon et al, 2009). If you raise a dog with proper training and socialization, aggressive behaviors are less likely to occur. Since training and shared activities between dog and owner decrease the problem behaviors, then it cannot be just the breed that plays a role in how a dog will behave.

The community's current view on animal abuse, and breed discrimination, is different depending on what community you ask. Henry (2004) studied college students' attitudes regarding the treatment of animals. The survey used for Henry's study will be helpful in creating a survey for my study. Henry's survey was very limited in who it reached, only a single class of 169 psychology students. This may not be a representative sample as psychology students may think differently than college students in another major. I include different majors at Western Michigan University, as well as members of the outside community, to broaden the sample size. Henry's (2004) survey also looked not only at people's experience with animals and their attitudes toward the treatment of animals, but also at if anyone participated in delinquency acts. The self-report on delinquency may or may not be a helpful part in the survey because some people may not want to report that they have committed a delinquent behavior, such as theft, arson, fraud, or assault, even if the survey is anonymous. In order to get a larger amount of responses that may be more honest, my survey focuses more on antisocial behaviors, such as shyness.

Allen (2005) focused on the community's opinion on animal abuse focused more on what the community, specifically interest groups, did to help increase the penalty for animal abuse. Allen (2005) did a study that looked at interest groups and how they affect a state's adoption of animal cruelty felony laws. While the main purpose of the study does not directly relate to the

community's opinion on animal abuse, Allen's research, and some of the findings, showed the increase in opinion that better laws are needed. Allen stated that interest groups for different topics have grown since the 1960s. Allen (2005) further goes on to say that interest groups for animal rights, such as the Humane Society of the United States, have been increasing in number since the 1990s. This information shows us that people are beginning to see that animals should have more rights and be better protected under law. The results from Allen's research showed that the interest groups had a significant influence on state law adoptions (2005). This can also infer that the number of people interested in animal rights, and to fight animal abuse has grown significantly; otherwise there probably would not have been enough people to make such a difference in these laws.

The research into animal abuse is finally growing, although for different reasons than previously stated. The few studies that have been completed on animal abuse have found a trend between animal abuse and other criminal behaviors, such as domestic violence (Henry, 2004). Through Henry's study, some correlations were found between committing animal abuse and having antisocial characteristics or delinquent behaviors (2004). Ascione (2009) expands on this research by explaining that animals in the home of domestic violence against women can create more serious abuse, whether against the women or the animals. This can occur if the animals in the home are owned by the women. They may not leave the abusive partner because not many shelters for domestic violence victims allow animals.

Some research has begun to see if there is a relationship between a person's personality type and the type of the dog they have. Researchers are trying to figure out if certain personality types are in people that own the dogs that are discriminated against. Kubinyi et al (2012) examined the association between an owner's personality type and the perceived personality of

their dog. The study used the 44-item Big Five Inventory questionnaire which examines the same five personality types as the Five Factor Model Form used for this current research. The results of Kubinyi et al (2012) found there was a significant positive relationship between owners and dogs in all five dimensions. Research can show there is a relationship between an aggressive dog and its owner. If the dog is aggressive, then there could be some link back to the personality type of the owner. If the owner is examined and found to have personality types similar to antisocial or criminal behavior, than the owner should be blamed not the dog.

This literature review has shown that there is not a lot of research being done on the topic of animal abuse, especially breed discrimination, in criminology. The research that has been done, demonstrates why animal abuse should be focused on more in criminology. My statements on why it is important to study animal abuse have been supported by the research. There have been more reasons found through previous research to support research of animal abuse in criminology as well. Several researchers also found that the community's view or opinion on the topic of animal abuse is growing. There has even been supporting research showing that antisocial or criminal behavior can be associated with animal abuse.

Due to there being so little research on animal abuse in crime, there is a lot of information that could be missing. Larger samples in research are missing as well as more in-depth research on the topic as whole. My study can contribute to previous research to expand the knowledge on the topic. The survey can reach a larger community and focus on what knowledge the community already has. There needs to be more research done on animal abuse, especially the victimization of animals when it comes to breed discrimination. My research is a stepping stone to growing the knowledge and awareness.

Theory/Methods

There are several theories that helped in guiding this research topic. The main theories used revolved around green criminology. Though there is not a unique theory for green criminology, defined as the study of the environment, Beirne (2007) describes several theories that shape the idea of green criminology. The theories are social theory, utilitarian theory, rights theory, and feminist theory (Beirne, 2007). While all different theories, they come together to discuss the important topic of human-animal relationships, which in turn makes it an important topic that should be studied more in criminology.

Social theory focuses on social interactions. These interactions can be human to human or human to animal. The human-animal interaction aspect helps guide the idea that human-animal interactions can have both positive and negative outcomes for both parties just as the same can be true about human to human interactions. The utilitarian theory focus is that everyone, including animals, has the right to the freedom from pain and suffering. The idea that animals can suffer helps support the idea that animal abuse, which includes breed discrimination, is a serious problem that needs to be studied by criminologists to help decrease the suffering of animals. Rights theory states that animals are moral agents and therefore have the same rights as humans. Feminist theory says that no one will be free until all life is free from harm, including animals. All of these theories explain that animals deserve more rights and should be protected (Beirne, 2007).

The methods used for this study include a phone interview with a local animal law enforcement officer and an online survey. The interview helps guide the questions for the overall survey that is used largely for my research. It can also be used for some general insights to my discussion. The answers are analyzed to determine the similarities and differences in answers and

feelings towards the topic of breed discrimination. These similarities and differences helped guide the questions used in the main method of research, an online survey.

The phone interview with a Kalamazoo Animal Law Enforcement Officer was used to get the opinions of someone in the field of animal law enforcement and to help guide the questions asked in the survey. The officer has been in the field for about ten years and was very passionate about the problems of breed discrimination. He made several points that had not been discussed in previous research that could help guide further research on the topic. The officer's definition of breed discrimination was very detailed and could be a stronger definition for future research. He stated that breed discrimination is "profiling certain types of dogs as a bad dog, having a bad attitude towards certain dogs, or putting a label on dogs, just like racial discrimination." This definition, compared to the one used for my research study, is more precise and helps compare breed discrimination to racial discrimination, a topic studied more often in criminology.

A portion of this research project focused on what kinds of personalities exist in people who own certain breeds of dog. Another comment made by the interviewed officer was how people can use dogs as a "status symbol." This is how the personality questions in the survey were formed. The five factor model rating form helped to answer the following research question: Are certain behaviors, such as antisocial behavior, present in people that own certain breeds of dogs? The personality questions in the survey are analyzed as five separate personality categories: neuroticism vs emotional stability, extraversion vs introversion, openness vs closedness, agreeable vs antagonism, and conscientiousness vs undependability. Henry (2004) found correlations between antisocial and criminal behaviors and animal abuse. Using the

officer's idea of dogs being a "status symbol," my research focused more on antisocial behavior than criminal to see if people viewed their dogs as a portrayal of themselves.

An online survey was created to ask people their opinions on the topic of breed discrimination. It consisted of 50 questions, separated onto different pages with a specific focus. The survey asks general demographic questions such as age, gender, and if they own a dog(s). The survey also asks questions that relate to their personality traits. These are 30 questions that come from Widiger's "Five Factor Model Rating Form" (2004). Every six questions relate to a different personality trait cluster. The five categories are as follows: neuroticism vs emotional stability, extraversion vs introversion, openness vs closedness, agreeableness vs antagonism, and conscientiousness vs undependability. Participants describe themselves on a 1 to 5 scale for each of the questions. The next part of the survey asks questions about the living arrangements and rules for pet ownership on the property. Then, the survey asks for the person's opinion on breed discrimination. A definition of breed discrimination is not given at this point, in order to get an understanding of how well-known the topic is to the public. The definition is given on the next part of the survey that also includes questions on if they feel the topic is of importance and should be studied.

The questions used for the interview and surveys consist of a mixture of closed-ended and open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions allow me to group people by age or gender. It also allows me to look more at those that stated they own a dog. The open-ended questions help focus on the opinions on breed discrimination. These help to see if the public knows what breed discrimination is. Since the topic is not covered a lot in criminology, the idea is that the public will not have a large understanding of the topic either. These open-ended

questions also help in determining if the majority of the public's opinions point to the idea that breed discrimination should be a larger focus in criminology.

The online survey was distributed to people as an online link through Facebook social media. The survey was also shared through Western Michigan University groups and other community groups. There is a consent form at the start of the survey and a note stating to only fill out once, in hopes of eliminating duplicate entries. These different groups allow me to get a variety of responses from college students to families in the community. With a larger variety of responses, the results from this research can have the potential to be generalized to a larger population than just college students.

The results from the survey are organized into an excel document as they come in. This format allows the option to sort by different questions. For example, I can sort by gender, age, or if they owned a dog. Then the answers to open ended questions are compared for similarities and differences to get an overall idea on the public's view on breed discrimination. The analysis of the questions shows whether or not a majority of the public thinks breed discrimination is an important topic that should be studied.

Findings/Conclusion

In this study, a survey was issued to answer three questions. Should breed discrimination be studied in criminology and why? What is the current view of breed discrimination by the community? Are certain behaviors, such as antisocial behavior, present in people that own certain breeds of dogs? Overall the survey resulted in 110 responses, with the majority being about 85.5% female, 48.2% between 18 and 25 years old, and 76.4% owners of dogs. This section analyzes the results and relates them to the previous research.

The current view of breed discrimination by the community is part of this research. The survey found that 91.8% of people had heard of breed discrimination before. This percentage alone is a surprising result as most research has shown that the community was not very aware of breed discrimination. By comparing my results to Allen's (2005) research on the influence of interest groups on animal abuse in general, it shows that the knowledge of animal issues is still growing. However, there still remains an issue when it comes to the actual definition of breed discrimination. There were several different definitions given by respondents. Definitions varied from "bans on specific breeds of dogs in certain areas" to "biased judgments based on breed" to simply "not getting a dog because of its breed." These very different responses show that there needs to be a clearer definition for the term breed discrimination. The lack of a distinct definition can be a reason why many people do not really understand what breed discrimination is because there is not a clear answer to begin with.

Even without a clear definition, the results showed there is a small problem with breed discrimination in our community. The results showed 30.9% of respondents said they lived in an apartment, 62.7% lived in a house and 6.4% said other. Of those percentages, 54.5% of respondents stated their apartments or landlords allowed pets on the property. Out of those that allowed pets only 44.5% allowed small animals, 50% allowed dogs with 5.5% of that allowing small dogs only. Based on these percentages alone, this community is largely discriminating against all breeds of dogs, instead of only a few specific breeds. However, there are still some places that do not allow some large breeds on their property for liability reasons. Some of the breeds listed are as follows: Pit Bulls, German Shepherds, Rottweilers, Doberman Pinschers, Akitas, and mastiff breeds. When asked if landlords should not be allowed to deny housing to owners of certain breeds of dogs, 72.7% of respondents said yes, they should not be allowed to

deny housing based on the breed of the dog. On the other hand, some argued that landlords should be allowed to deny housing, but to all large breeds instead of specific ones in order to keep a quieter community and have less damage from large breeds due to small spaces. They also felt there should be more checks, such as amount of training, done on the owners of the dogs to see if they would fit well in that community with a large dog, versus looking at the breed and denying housing.

In comparison to previous research, this study did not show a large sample of breed discrimination. With only 5.5% of apartments or landlords only allowing small dogs on their property, this shows that specific breed discrimination is not a large problem for the communities surveyed. While this is a good sign, it does not mean that breed discrimination is disappearing. There are many places in the south and southwest regions that have breed discrimination laws and even ban certain breeds from the entire city. My research did not support previous research showing the larger areas that discriminated against specific breeds of dogs.

Holland (2013) states “pit bulls are the dog of choice for irresponsible breeders, dog-fighters, people who want a tough-looking dog to tie up in their yard and those who refuse to have their male dogs fixed because they think it makes them look tough by proxy.” It can be inferred from this statement that people choose larger breeds of dogs to be viewed as tough people to their peers. A Chi-Square Test was used for further analysis on the relationship between dog owner personalities and the size of dog they own. This test was performed by sorting the data into a table for each of the five personality categories (See Appendix) that separated the different personality types and the size of dog they owned. Dogs were organized into two size categories: small dogs below 50 lbs and large dogs about 50 lbs. For the respondents that owned several dogs, it was only recorded as one dog. If they owned a large dog,

the count went under the large dog column. If they only had small dogs, the count went under the small dog column. The program called Minitab 17 was used to complete the Chi-Square test.

The data showed that only two of the five personality categories had a relationship with the size of the dog. For the category of agreeableness vs antagonism, the data was invalid due to a count in the calculations being less than 1. The calculations for neuroticism vs emotional stability gave a Chi-Square of 5.076 with a degrees of freedom of 2 and a P-Value of 0.079. Using 0.05 as the level of significance, the results showed that there is not a relationship between dog owner personalities of this category and the types of dogs they own. The category of extraversion vs introversion gave a Chi-Square of 13.673 with a degrees of freedom of 2 and a P-Value of 0.001. Using 0.05 as the level of significance, the results showed that there is a relationship between dog owner personalities of this category and the types of dogs they own. The calculations for openness vs closedness resulted in a Chi-Square of 7.545 with a degrees of freedom of 2 and a P-Value of 0.023. Using 0.05 as the level of significance, the results showed that there is a relationship between dog owner personalities of this category and the types of dogs they own. The final category of conscientiousness and undependability resulted in a Chi-Square of 2.824 with a degrees of freedom of 2 and a P-Value of 0.244. Using 0.05 as the level of significance, the results showed that there is not a relationship between dog owner personalities of this category and the types of dogs they own. There still needs to be more research, with larger samples, done to see if there is actually a relationship between antisocial behavior and large breeds of dogs that are generally discriminated against.

The community that contributed to this research did provide positive feedback that this topic is important. Many commented on how this is an interesting topic, and several were glad to see research growing on the topic. For many people, criminology is seen as the study of crime

against people, when in reality it is about the study of crime in general. Breed discrimination is not considered a crime by law. This current study shows that it is a problem, with over 50% of respondents stating it should be studied. The reasoning behind these responses was because it is similar to racial discrimination and profiling, and it can relate to crimes against humans. 86.4% of this community believes that breed discrimination is wrong. If it is said to be wrong by more than 50% of people, it should be against the law. The majority does not think breed discrimination is ok and that it should be studied more.

This research did have limitations. One limitation was the lack of difference in the community the survey reached. A sample larger than 110 people should happen in the future, along with more than only 84 owning dogs. Not only should the number of responses be larger, but the age differences should be larger as well. Almost 50% of the people that filled out the survey were in the age group of 18 to 25 years old which is generally college students. Henry's research was on only college students. The goal of my research was to reach a broader audience, but that did not happen. In the future, there should be more variety in the age groups in order to get more than just the college student's opinions. This could be achieved by reaching people in cities or more populated areas than the suburbs.

Another limitation was some of the survey questions themselves. The personality questions in particular were not marked as required questions. This resulted in only 76 of the 84 dog owners being included in the personality analysis. Those that did not answer all of the personality questions were excluded from the analysis. Not only was this a time consuming problem to look one by one through every participant's responses to look for missed questions, but it also made the sample size even smaller. In the future, the personality questions would need to be required questions in order to avoid missed responses.

Overall, the research study went rather well. The phone interview with the animal law enforcement officer was extremely helpful with ideas for questions and points to make in this research topic. There were more responses to the survey than anticipated in less than a week. Also, the open-ended responses had great feedback for the topic and analysis. There are still areas to improve for this research. A larger community needs to be reached, and the survey format would need to be rearranged. But overall, this was a great start to expanding the knowledge and research on the issue of breed discrimination.

Bibliography

- Allen, Mahalley. (2005). "Laying Down the Law? Interest Group Influence on State Adoption of Animal Cruelty Felony Laws." *The Policy Studies Journal*. 33(3):443-457.
- Arhant, C., Bartels, A., Bubna-Littitz, H., Futschik, A., & Troxler, J. (2010). "Behaviour of smaller and larger dogs: Effects of training methods, inconsistency of owner behaviour and level of engagement in activities with the dog." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 123:131-142.
- Ascione, Frank. (2009). "People and Animals, Kindness and Cruelty: Research Directions and Policy Implications." *Journal of Social Issues*. 65(3):569-587.
- Bate, L., Dohoo, I., Dohoo, S., Guy, N., Luescher, U., Miller, J., & Spangler, E. (2001). "A case series of biting dogs: characteristics of the dogs, their behaviour, and their victims." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 74:43-57.
- Beirne, Piers. (1995). "The Use and Abuse of Animals In Criminology: A Brief History And Current Review." *Social Injustice*. 22(1):5-31.
- Beirne, Piers. (1999). "For a Nonspeciesist Criminology: Animal Abuse as an Object of Study." *Criminology*. 37(1):117-147.
- Beirne, Piers. (2007). "Animal abuse, animal rights, and green criminology." *Issues in Green Criminology*. (pp. 55-82). New York, NY: Willan Publishing.
- Bennett, Pauleen & Rohlf, Vanessa. (2006). "Owner-companion dog interactions: Relationships between demographic variables, potentially problematic behaviours, training engagement and shared activities." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 102:67-84.
- Hackbarth, H., Ott, S., Schalke, E., & Von Gaertner, A. (2008). "Is there a difference?"

- Comparison of golden retrievers and dogs affected by breed-specific legislation regarding aggressive behavior.” *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 3:134-140.
- Hallsworth, Simon. (2011). “Then they came for the dogs!” *Crime Law Soc Change*. 55:391-403.
- Hanlon, A., Jones, B., O'Sullivan, E., & O'Sullivan, K. (2008). “The management and behavioural history of 100 dogs reported for biting a person.” *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 114:149-158.
- Henry, Bill. (2004). “The Relationship between Animal Cruelty, Delinquency, and Attitudes toward the Treatment of Animals.” *Society & Animals*. 12(3):185-207.
- Holland, Joshua. (2013). “Pitbulls Used to be Considered the Perfect ‘Nanny Dogs’ for Children-Until the Media Turned Them Into Monsters.” *Alternet*. Retrieved from <http://www.alternet.org/civil-liberties/pitbulls-used-be-considered-perfect-nanny-dogs-children-until-media-turned-them>.
- Kubinyi, E., Miklosi, A., Range, F., Turcsan, B., & Viranyi, Z. (2012). “Birds of a feather flock together? Perceived personality matching in owner-dog dyads.” *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. 140:154-160.
- Kubinyi, E., Miklosi, A., & Turcsan, B. (2009). “Dog and owner demographic characteristics and dog personality trait association.” *Behavioral Processes*. 81:392-401.
- Ragatz, L., Fremouw, W., Thomas, T., & McCoy, K. (May, 2009). “Vicious Dogs: The Antisocial Behaviors and Psychological Characteristics of Owners.” *J. Forensic Sci*. 54(3):699-703.
- Sollund, Ragnhild. (2011). “Expressions of speciesism: the effects of keeping companion animals on animal abuse, animal trafficking and species decline.” *Crime Law Soc Change*. 55:437-451

Widiger, Thomas. (2004). "Five Factor Model Rating Form." *University of Kentucky*. Retrieved from www.uky.edu/~widiger/ffmrf.doc.

Interview with a Kalamazoo Animal Law Enforcement Officer on 11/13/15

Question: How long have you worked with animals?

Answer: I have lived with them all my life; I have been an officer for 10 years.

Question: How would you define breed discrimination?

Answer: Breed discrimination is profiling certain types of animals as a bad dog, having a bad attitude towards certain dogs, or putting a label on dogs (just like racial discrimination). People are making assumptions without facts. For example, golden retriever is the number one dog that bites, but no one thinks or knows about it because it is such a loved breed. All people know about pit bulls is they have a strong muscle structure, but they cannot actually lock their jaw like everyone believes, no dog can.

Question: What is your view on breed discrimination?

Answer: It can be good and bad, people use dogs as a status symbol. It used to be that everyone had to have a Rottweiler, but now they do not. If you search on petfinder for different breeds, the numbers are shocking. (I did a search and found these numbers: over 20,000 for pit bulls, around 2,000 Rottweilers, around 5,000 for German Shepherds, 16,000 Chihuahua, 1,500 for golden retrievers in MI) The media is guilty of spreading breed discrimination. The media hides a lot of information as well. Small dogs and even golden retrievers have some of the highest numbers of dog bites recorded, higher than pit bulls. I know many veterinarians that will bring a muzzle in for any small dog vet visit but will not for any large dog unless asked for nail trimmings.

Question: What breeds do you generally see discriminated against?

Answer: Pit Bulls are the most common. Rottweilers are another breed.

Question: Do you think it is more nature or nurture when it comes to a dog's behavior?

Answer: Nurture. It is how they are raised and what they are raised for. It may be lack of training, lack of exercise or socialization. Dogs are used as a status symbol. For example: "I have a strong dog so I'm strong," they want to be feared.

Survey Consent Information

**Western Michigan University,
Department of Sociology**

Principal Investigator: Zoann Snyder
Student Investigator: Megan Ekkert
Title of Study: Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge

Please read this consent information before you begin the survey.

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “Dog Breed Discrimination in Criminology and Public Knowledge,” designed to determine what the public knows about breed discrimination and if it is a valid concept. There is not a lot of research on this specific topic, so this project is to expand on previous research. This study is being conducted by student Megan Ekkert, under faculty advisor Zoann Snyder from Western Michigan University, Department of Sociology. This research is being conducted as part of the honors thesis requirements for Megan Ekkert.

This survey consists of 41 multiple choice questions, and 10 free-response questions and will take approximately 10-20 minutes to complete. There are no known risks to participating in this study. The potential benefits would be gaining knowledge on dog breed discrimination and learning more about the laws in your area.

Your replies will be completely anonymous, so please do not include your name anywhere in the survey. When you begin the survey, you are consenting to participate in the study. If you do not agree to participate in this research projects simply exit now or select “I do not wish to participate.” If, after beginning the survey, you decide that you do not wish to continue, you may stop at any time. If you have questions prior to or during the survey, you may contact Megan Ekkert at megan.r.ekkert@wmich.edu, faculty advisor Zoann Snyder at zoann.snyder@wmich.edu, Western Michigan University Department of Sociology, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293) or the vice president of research (269-387-8298).

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on 3/1/17. Please do not participate in this study after April of 2017.

Participating in this survey online indicates your consent for us of the answers you supply.

- I agree to participate.
- I do not agree to participate.

Survey Questions

Demographics

1. Gender
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
 - c. Transgender
 - d. Other
 - e. I prefer not to answer
2. Age
 - a. 18-25
 - b. 26-35
 - c. 36-45
 - d. 45-55
 - e. 55 and up
3. Do you own a dog(s)?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. If you own a dog, please list the breed(s) of dog(s) you own.
5. Do you work or volunteer with dogs on a regular basis? (Regular basis defined as working or volunteering with dogs weekly or monthly for more than a month.)
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
6. If you own a dog, how do you view them in relation to your household? (Example: Family, pet, living creature, best friend, etc.)

Personality Types

Please describe yourself on a 1 to 5 scale on each of the following 30 personality traits, where 1 is extremely low (i.e., extremely lower than the average person), 2 is low, 3 is neither high nor low (i.e., does not differ from the average person), 4 is high and 5 is extremely high. Use any number from 1 to 5. Please provide a rating for all 30 traits (Widiger, 2004).

	5= Extremely high	4= High	3= Neither high nor low	2= Low	1=Extremely Low	
1. Anxiousness (fearful, apprehensive)	5	4	3	2	1	(relaxed, unconcerned, cool)
2. Angry Hostility (angry, bitter)	5	4	3	2	1	(even-tempered)
3. Depressiveness (pessimistic, glum)	5	4	3	2	1	(optimistic)
4. Self-consciousness (timid, embarrassed)	5	4	3	2	1	(self-assured, glib, shameless)
5. Impulsivity (tempted, urgency)	5	4	3	2	1	(controlled, restrained)
6. Vulnerability (helpless, fragile)	5	4	3	2	1	(clear-thinking, fearless, unflappable)
7. Warmth (cordial, affectionate, attached)	5	4	3	2	1	(cold, aloof, indifferent)
8. Gregariousness (sociable, outgoing)	5	4	3	2	1	(withdrawn, isolated)

9. Assertiveness (dominant, forceful)	5	4	3	2	1	(unassuming, quiet, resigned)
10. Activity (vigorous, energetic, active)	5	4	3	2	1	(passive, lethargic)
11. Excitement-Seeking (reckless, daring)	5	4	3	2	1	(cautious, monotonous, dull)
12. Positive Emotions (high-spirited)	5	4	3	2	1	(placid, anhedonic)
13. Fantasy (dreamer, unrealistic, imaginative)	5	4	3	2	1	(practical, concrete)
14. Aesthetics (aberrant interests, aesthetic)	5	4	3	2	1	(uninvolved, no aesthetic interests)
15. Feelings (self-aware)	5	4	3	2	1	(constricted, unaware, alexythymic)
16. Actions (unconventional, eccentric) stubborn)	5	4	3	2	1	(routine, predictable, habitual,
17. Ideas (strange, odd, peculiar, creative)	5	4	3	2	1	(pragmatic, rigid)
18. Values (permissive, broad-minded)	5	4	3	2	1	(traditional, inflexible, dogmatic)
19. Trust (gullible, naïve, trusting) paranoid)	5	4	3	2	1	(skeptical, cynical, suspicious,
20. Straightforwardness (confiding, honest)	5	4	3	2	1	(cunning, manipulative, deceptive)
21. Altruism (sacrificial, giving)	5	4	3	2	1	(stingy, selfish, greedy, exploitative)
22. Compliance (docile, cooperative)	5	4	3	2	1	(oppositional, combative, aggressive)
23. Modesty (meek, self-effacing, humble)	5	4	3	2	1	(confident, boastful, arrogant)
24. Tender-Mindedness (soft, empathetic)	5	4	3	2	1	(tough, callous, ruthless)
25. Competence (perfectionistic, efficient)	5	4	3	2	1	(lax, negligent)
26. Order (ordered, methodical, organized)	5	4	3	2	1	(haphazard, disorganized, sloppy)
27. Dutifulness (rigid, reliable, dependable)	5	4	3	2	1	(casual, undependable, unethical)
28. Achievement (workaholic, ambitious)	5	4	3	2	1	(aimless, desultory)
29. Self-Discipline (dogged, devoted)	5	4	3	2	1	(hedonistic, negligent)
30. Deliberation (cautious, ruminative, reflective)	5	4	3	2	1	(hasty, careless, rash)

Breed Discrimination Laws

1. Do you live in an apartment or house?
 - a. Apartment
 - b. House
 - c. Other
2. Does your apartment or landlord allow pets on the property?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I don't know.
 - d. N/A
3. What kind(s) of pets are allowed?
 - a. Small animals (fish, lizards, snakes, etc.)
 - b. Cats only
 - c. Dogs only
 - d. Dogs and/or cats
 - e. I don't know
 - f. N/A
4. What size dog(s) are allowed?

- a. Small dogs only
 - b. Any size
 - c. I don't know
 - d. N/A
5. Are certain breeds not allowed?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I don't know
 - d. N/A
 6. If you answered yes to the previous question, please list which breeds are not allowed.

Breed Discrimination Opinions

1. Have you heard about breed discrimination before?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
2. What do you think breed discrimination is? (A definition will be given later. This question is to see what the community defines breed discrimination as.)
3. Do you think it is okay for apartments or landlords to deny housing to owners of certain breeds of dogs, such as Pit Bulls, Rottweilers, and Chows?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I have no opinion

Breed discrimination is defined as any dog that is euthanized or forced to be given up due to its breed or the owner's lack of responsibility in training.

4. What words come to mind when you think of Pit Bull Terriers?
5. What words come to mind when you think of German Shepherds?
6. What words come to mind when you think of Labrador Retrievers?
7. Should breed discrimination laws be allowed? Why or why not?
8. Do you think breed discrimination should be a topic in criminology? Why or why not?

Final Thoughts


If there's anything else you would like to share with me on the topic of breed discrimination in criminology, please share that here.

- 1.




Appendix

Pie Charts of Responses


Gender (110 responses)




Age (110 responses)




Do you own a dog(s)? (110 responses)




Do you work or volunteer with dogs on a regular basis? (110 responses)




Do you live in an apartment or house? (110 responses)




Does your apartment or landlord allow pets on the property? (110 responses)




What kind(s) of pets are allowed? (110 responses)




What size dog(s) are allowed? (110 responses)




Are certain breeds not allowed? (110 responses)



Have you heard about breed discrimination before? (110 responses)



Do you think it is okay for apartments or landlords to deny housing to owners of certain large breeds of dogs, such as Pit Bulls, Rottweilers, or Chows? (110 responses)



Chi Square Tables and Calculations

Neuroticism VS Emotional Stability			
Dog Owner Personalities	Size of Dog		Totals for Dog Owners
	Small Dog (Below 50 lbs)	Large Dog (above 50 lbs)	
Neuroticism	11	12	23
Emotional Stability	14	34	48
Both Neuroticism and Emotional Stability	0	5	5
Total	25	51	76

Hypotheses

H₀: Personality type and size of dog are independent.

H_a: Personality type and size of dog are not independent.

Analysis of Sample Data

For this analysis, the significance level is 0.05.

Chi-Square Test for Association: Dog Owner Personalities, Dog Type

Rows: Dog Owner Personalities Columns: Dog Type

	Small Dog	Large Dog	All
Neuroticism	11	12	23
	7.566	15.434	
Emotional Stability	14	34	48
	15.789	32.211	
Both Neuroticism and Emotional Stability	0	5	5
	1.645	3.355	
All	25	51	76

Pearson Chi-Square = 5.076, DF = 2, P-Value = 0.079

Decision

P-Value=0.079

0.079>0.05

There is not a relationship between the personality type of dog owners and the size of their dogs.

Extraversion VS Introversion			
Dog Owner Personalities	Size of Dog		Totals for Dog Owners
	Small Dog (Below 50 lbs)	Large Dog (above 50 lbs)	
Extraversion	12	41	53
Introversion	6	9	15
Both Extraversion and Introversion	7	1	8
Total	25	51	76

Hypotheses

H₀: Personality type and size of dog are independent.

H_a: Personality type and size of dog are not independent.

Analysis of Sample Data

For this analysis, the significance level is 0.05.

Chi-Square Test for Association: Dog Owner Personalities, Dog Type

Rows: Dog Owner Personalities Columns: Dog Type

	Small Dog	Large Dog	All
Extraversion	12	41	53
	17.434	35.566	
Introversion	6	9	15
	4.934	10.066	
Both Extraversion and Introversion	7	1	8
	2.632	5.368	
All	25	51	76

Pearson Chi-Square = 13.673, DF = 2, P-Value = 0.001

Decision

P-Value=0.001

0.001<0.05

There is a relationship between the personality type of dog owners and the size of their dogs.

Openness VS Closedness			
Dog Owner Personalities	Size of Dog		Totals for Dog Owners
	Small Dog (Below 50 lbs)	Large Dog (above 50 lbs)	
Openness	11	37	48
Closedness	11	8	19
Both Openness and Closedness	3	6	9
Total	25	51	76

Hypotheses

H₀: Personality type and size of dog are independent.

H_a: Personality type and size of dog are not independent.

Analysis of Sample Data

For this analysis, the significance level is 0.05.

Chi-Square Test for Association: Dog Owner Personalities, Dog Type

Rows: Dog Owner Personalities Columns: Dog Type

	Small Dog	Large Dog	All
Openness	11	37	48
	15.789	32.211	
Closedness	11	8	19
	6.250	12.750	
Both Openness and Closedness	3	6	9
	2.961	6.039	
All	25	51	76

Pearson Chi-Square = 7.545, DF = 2, P-Value = 0.023

Decision

P-Value=0.023

0.023<0.05

There is a relationship between the personality type of dog owners and the size of their dogs.

Agreeableness VS Antagonism			
Dog Owner Personalities	Size of Dog		Totals for Dog Owners
	Small Dog (Below 50 lbs)	Large Dog (above 50 lbs)	
Agreeableness	23	45	68
Antagonism	1	4	5
Both Agreeableness and Antagonism	1	2	3
Total	25	51	76

Hypotheses

H₀: Personality type and size of dog are independent.

H_a: Personality type and size of dog are not independent.

Analysis of Sample Data

For this analysis, the significance level is 0.05.

Chi-Square Test for Association: Dog Owner Personalities, Dog Type

Rows: Dog Owner Personalities Columns: Dog Type

	Small Dog	Large Dog	All
Agreeableness	23	45	68
	22.368	45.632	
Antagonism	1	4	5
	1.645	3.355	
Both Agreeableness and Antagonism	1	2	3
	0.987	2.013	
All	25	51	76

Pearson Chi-Square = 0.403, DF = 2

* WARNING * 1 cells with expected counts less than 1

* WARNING * Chi-Square approximation probably invalid

Conscientiousness VS Undependability			
Dog Owner Personalities	Size of Dog		Totals for Dog Owners
	Small Dog (Below 50 lbs)	Large Dog (above 50 lbs)	
Conscientiousness	24	43	67
Undependability	0	5	5
Both Conscientiousness and Undependability	1	3	4
Total	25	51	76

Hypotheses

H_0 : Personality type and size of dog are independent.

H_a : Personality type and size of dog are not independent.

Analysis of Sample Data

For this analysis, the significance level is 0.05.

Chi-Square Test for Association: Dog Owner Personalities, Dog Type

Rows: Dog Owner Personalities Columns: Dog Type

	Small Dog	Large Dog	All
Conscientiousness	24	43	67
	22.039	44.961	
Undependability	0	5	5
	1.645	3.355	
Both Conscientiousness and Undependability	1	3	4
	1.316	2.684	
All	25	51	76

Pearson Chi-Square = 2.824, DF = 2, P-Value = 0.244

Decision

P-Value=0.244

$0.44 > 0.05$

There is not a relationship between the personality type of dog owners and the size of their dogs.