



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

A STUDY OF SCIENTIFIC PERCEPTION ON THE UTILIZATION OF ANIMALS IN LABORATORIES AND RESEARCH

DHUHA JAWAD MAHDI



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION (BIOLOGY)
(MASTER BY MIX MODE)

FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS
SULTAN IDRIS EDUCATION UNIVERSITY

2017



05-4506832



pustaka.upsi.edu.my



Perpustakaan Tuanku Bainun
Kampus Sultan Abdul Jalil Shah



PustakaTBainun



ptbupsi



ABSTRACT

This research was carried out to identify the factors that may influence humans' choice on whether to bolster or revoke the utilization of animals in laboratories and research. This study was focused to determine the views of people with science background. A total of 351 respondents from 1236 research population with different academic levels consisting of students who are pursuing their studies in one of the programmes offered at the Faculty of Science and Mathematics, lecturers and laboratory assistant. Two instruments used for this study in order to answer the research questions were the survey questionnaire and the interview protocols. Data were statistically analysed using ANOVA and t-test. Results showed various factors; such as gender, age, academic level and position, influence the utilization of animals in laboratories and research. Female gender was found more concern about animal testing compared with male, whilst higher academic level shows better knowledge in the alternative methods for animal testing. The outcomes propose that animal applications in laboratories and research are adequate, given that animal welfare are thought about and under adequate control. More prominent exertion may likewise be required to educate students and people in general about logical practice using animals in laboratories and research, as well as to allow criticism by means of open engagement, to lessen the holes between basic logical practices and moral qualities.





SATU KAJIAN MENGENAI PERSEPSI SAINTIFIK TERHADAP PENGUNAAN HAIWAN DALAM MAKMAL DAN PENYELIDIKAN

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini dijalankan untuk mengenal pasti faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pilihan manusia sama ada untuk meningkatkan atau mengelakkan penggunaan haiwan dalam makmal dan penyelidikan. Kajian ini memberi fokus kepada pandangan responden yang mempunyai latar sains. Sejumlah 351 responden daripada 1236 populasi kajian dengan tahap akademik yang berbeza, terdiri daripada pelajar yang mengikuti pengajian di salah satu program yang ditawarkan di Fakulti Sains dan Matematik, pensyarah dan pembantu makmal. Dua instrumen yang digunakan ialah soal selidik dan protokol temubual. Data dianalisis secara statistik menggunakan ujian-t dan ANOVA. Keputusan menunjukkan jantina, umur, tahap akademik dan jawatan mempengaruhi penggunaan haiwan dalam makmal dan penyelidikan. Wanita didapati lebih prihatin terhadap ujian menggunakan haiwan berbanding lelaki, sementara tahap akademik yang lebih tinggi menunjukkan pengetahuan yang lebih baik dalam kaedah alternatif untuk ujian menggunakan haiwan. Kesimpulannya penggunaan haiwan dalam makmal dan penyelidikan adalah memuaskan dengan mengambilkira kebajikan haiwan tersebut dan berada di bawah kawalan yang rapi. Implikasinya, usaha yang lebih giat diperlukan untuk mendidik pelajar dan orang ramai secara amnya tentang amalan baik dalam penggunaan haiwan dalam makmal dan kajian, serta membenarkan kritikan melalui perbincangan terbuka untuk mengurangkan jurang antara amalan yang sering dilakukan dan kualiti moral.



**TABLE OF CONTENT**

	Page
DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ABSTRAK	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvi
APPENDIX LIST	xix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background of research	2
1.2.1 Attitudes toward the utilization of animal testing	2
1.2.2 The continuing needs to use animals in research	4
1.3 Problem statement	5
1.4 Theoretical framework	7



1.4.1	Human behaviour	8
1.4.2	Moral reasoning for animal testing	10
1.4.3	People's concern on animal experimentation	13
1.5	Conceptual framework of the study	15
1.6	Research objectives	16
1.7	Research questions	17
1.8	Hypotheses	17
1.9	Significance of research	19
1.10	Limitation of Research	20
1.11	Operational Definitions	20
1.11.1	Utilization of animal	20
1.11.2	Laboratories	21
1.11.3	Animal treatment and management	21
1.11.4	Alternative methods	22
1.11.5	Scientific perception	23
1.12	Conclusions	23
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW		
2.1	Introduction	25
2.2	Personal and Cultural Characteristics on the decision of the utilization of animals in research	27
2.2.1	Age	27
2.2.2	Gender	28
2.2.3	Academic level	28
2.2.4	Position	29
2.3	Animal Cruelty	30



2.3.1	Awareness towards animal utilization	30
2.3.2	Animal brutality laws	32
2.4	Unnecessary suffering	34
2.4.1	Torment administration	34
2.4.2	Concern on the methodology of animal care standard	35
2.5	Animal welfare and rights, and the utilization of animals in Malaysia laboratories	37
2.5.1	Animal welfare and rights in Malaysia	37
2.5.2	The 3Rs	37
2.5.3	Scope of the code	40
2.5.4	General principles for the care and utilize of animals for scientific purposes	40
2.5.5	Provisions	44
2.5.6	Organizations	45
2.5.7	How to ensure ethical animal testing	45
2.5.8	How animals are researched in Malaysia	46
2.5.9	Animal experimentation – pros and cons	47
2.5.10	Pros of Animal Testing	48
2.5.11	Cons of Animal Testing	52
2.6	Animal testing alternatives	56
2.6.1	Computer models	56
2.6.2	Cells and tissue societies	58
2.6.3	Benefits of non-animal testing	60
2.6.4	The use of human tissue in toxicity testing is more accurate than the animal models	60



2.6.5	Non-animal tests are more cost-effective, practical, and expedient	61
2.6.6	Cruelty-free products are more environmentally friendly	61
2.6.7	Action against animal abuse in Malaysia	62
2.7	Conclusion	64

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	66
3.2	Research design	66
3.3	Research population	67
3.3.1	Survey respondents	68
3.3.2	Interview respondents	69
3.4	Research instruments	71
i.	Questionnaires for survey (Appendix A)	71
ii.	Interview protocol (Appendix B)	71
3.4.1	Survey questionnaires	71
3.4.2	Pilot study	76
3.4.3	Interview protocols	80
3.5	Statistical analysis	81
3.6	Limitations of the Methodology	83

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1	Introduction	85
4.2	Demographic data	86
4.2.1	Gender	86
4.2.2	Age	87
4.2.3	Academic Level	87
4.2.4	Position	88

4.3 The factors that influence the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	89
4.3.1 The reasons for using animals in laboratories and research	91
4.3.2 The influence of demographic data in the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	94
4.3.3 The practices for using animals in laboratories and research	103
4.3.4 The alternative methods for using animals in laboratories and research	106
4.4 Interview results	109
4.4.1 Respondents' experience in the utilization of animals in research/teaching and learning	110
4.4.2 Issues in the utilization of animals in research/teaching and learning	112
4.4.3 Respondents' view on the practice of animal treatment and management in laboratories	113
4.4.4 Respondents' attitudes towards methods in reducing animal use	115
4.5 Conclusion	116

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Overall discussion	118
5.2 The factors that influence the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	119
5.2.1 Influence of gender in the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	120
5.2.2 Influence of age in the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	122
5.2.3 Influence of academic level and position in the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	123
5.3 Current practices of animal treatment and management in laboratories and research	125
5.4 The involvement of alternative methods for animal testing	127



5.5 Ethical issues in animal testing in laboratories and research	128
5.6 Conclusion	130
5.7 Suggestion for further research	130
REFERENCES	134
APPENDIXES	148





LIST OF THE TABLES

Table No.		Page
3.1	Total Number of Students undertake Biology programmes at the Faculty of Science and Mathematics, UPSI	69
3.2	The selection of interviewees	70
3.3	Likert scale of score mean	73
3.4	Items and sub-constructs for reasons influencing the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	74
3.5	The practice of animal treatment and management in laboratories and research	75
3.6	The alternative methods for animal testing in laboratories and research	76
3.7	Rules of Thumb Cronbach's alpha	78
3.8	Percentage of agreement on the survey instrument by the experts	80
3.9	Summary of data analysis will be used to answer all research questions	83
4.1	Gender of Respondents	86
4.2	Age groups of Respondents	87
4.3	Academic level groups of Respondents	88
4.4	Position of Respondents	88
4.5	Descriptive statistics of biology students' perception on the factors influencing the utilization of animal in laboratories and research	91
4.6	Descriptive statistics of sub-constructs of reason factors	91
4.7	The overall reasons for using animals in laboratories and research	92
4.8	Items and sub-constructs for reasons influencing the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	93





4.9	Mean value of gender effect on the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	95
4.10	Gender effect on the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	95
4.11	Mean value of age in influencing the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	96
4.12	T-test Analysis of Age group effect on the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	97
4.13	Mean value of respondents' academic level effect on the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	98
4.14	ANOVA analysis on differences of the academic level perceptions towards the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	99
4.15	Tukey HSD Post Hoc Test of Differences between Factors and Academic level	100
4.16	Mean value of position groups effect on the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	102
4.17	ANOVA Analysis of differences the position perceptions towards the utilization of animals in laboratories and research	102
4.18	Descriptive Statistics of sub-constructs of practice factors	104
4.19	The overall practices for using animals in laboratories and research	104
4.20	The practice of animal treatment and management in laboratories and research for each item	105
4.21	Descriptive Statistics of sub-constructs of alternative methods factors	107
4.22	The overall alternative methods for using animals in laboratories and research	107
4.23	The alternative methods for animal testing in laboratories and research	109
4.24	The selection of interviewees	110
4.25	Experience in the utilization of animals in research/teaching and learning of some respondents	111
4.26	Issues in the utilization of animals in research/teaching and learning of some respondents	113





4.27	View on the practice of animal treatment and management in laboratories of some respondents	114
4.28	Attitudes towards reducing animal use of some respondents	116





LIST OF FIGURES

No. Figures	Page
1.1 The stages of behaviour change	9
1.2 Moral actions to use animals	12
1.3 Dual-concern theory	14
1.4 Conceptual framework of the study	15
3.1 Cronbach's Alpha Formula	78
3.2 Percentage of agreement	79





LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3RS	Reduction, Refinement, and Replacement
A	Agree
A1	Age group 1
A2	Age group 2
AA	Animals Act
AAALAC	Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International
AALAS	American Association for Laboratory Animal Science
AEC	Animal Ethics Committee
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
AVMA	American Veterinary Medical Association
AWA	Animal Welfare Act
CADD	Computer Aided Drug Design
CBRA	California Biomedical Research Association
CT	Computed Tomography
D	Disagree
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
EUPASP	EU Directive on the Protection of Animals used for Scientific Purposes
H	Hypothesis
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HSUS	Humane Society of the United States





IACUC	Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
IACUCs	Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees
ILAR-NRC	Institute for Laboratory Animal Research
IMR	Institute for Medical Research
KL	Kuala Lumpur
LASAM	Laboratory Animal Science Association of Malaysia
LD50	Lethal Dose 50
MNAWF	Malaysian National Animal Welfare Foundation
MRIs	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
N	Neutral
NEAVS	New England Anti-Vivisection Society
NIH	National Institutes of Health
NRC	National Research Council
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PC	Personal Computer
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PHS	Public Health Service
PNAS	Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
QSAR	Quantitative Structure Activity Relationship
R1	Lecturer Respondent
R10	Diploma Student Respondent
R2, R3	Lab Assistance Respondent
R4, R5	PhD Student Respondent
R6, R7	Master Student Respondent
R8, R9	Degree Student Respondent



RM	Ringgit Malaysia
RQ	Research Question
SA	Strongly Agree
SARs	Structure Activity Relationship
SD	Strongly Disagree
SPCA	Selangor Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SSPCA	Sarawak Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Tukey HSD	Tukey Honestly Significant Difference
UAR	Understanding Animal Research
UFAW	Universities Federation for animal well-charges
UK	United Kingdom
UPM	Universiti Putra Malaysia
UPSI	Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris
US	United State
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFDA	US Food and Drug Administration
USNIH	US National Institutes of Health



APPENDIX LIST

- A Survey questionnaire on the utilization of animals for scientific purposes
- B Interview Questions Regarding Animal Testing
- C Reliability statistics
- D Validation of instrument
- E Sample of consent form





CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION



1.1 Introduction

The utilization of animals in scientific research remains an imperative device in enhancing our comprehension of how organic materials function in both wellbeing and illnesses. Such utilize is significant for the advancement of new medications and front line medicinal advances for both people and animals, and for the assurance of our surroundings. Subsequently, empowering appropriately controlled utilization of animals is basic to enhancing the wellbeing and lives of people and animals and to the security and the ability to maintain our surroundings. For instance, the advancement of monoclonal immune response treatments in the course of the most recent 20 years has totally changed our capacity to treat ailments including breast and other cancers, rheumatoid joint inflammation and numerous sclerosis (Lehmann et al., 2009).



1.2 Background of Research

The scientific basic for developing new methods to deal with innovative work is extremely solid. Numerous potential medications bomb because of the absence of adequacy in people or worries about their security. Also, there are worries about the utilization of animal studies for testing natural chemicals. Current animal right movements have revealed a higher measurement in excessive amount of animal usage in research and laboratories. This issue has become an endless argument between the scientists and the involved parties.

1.2.1 Attitudes Toward The Utilization of Animal Testing

There are a few calculates past literary works that show to impact individuals' dispositions towards animals, and animal based research particularly. These incorporate the individual and social attributes, animal qualities, and research qualities (Knight and Barnett, 2008). By investigating these persuasive figures's detail, the accompanying audit gives a report on the overview based open disposition writing that was looked into 10 years back by Hagelin et al. (2003).

The case is often made that the public do not have enough background knowledge to be involved in discussions or engagement exercises about animal research, the so-called deficit or 'Enlightenment' model (Elam & Bertilsson, 2003). Whilst having some support in studies that show a relationship between familiarity with science and support for animal research (Broida et al., 1993; Pifer et al., 1994; Pifer,



1996; Schuppli & Weary, 2010; Crettaz, 2013), the deficit model has nevertheless been widely criticized. Indeed, one study has shown that as knowledge increases members of the public may become less supportive, particularly if the topic under discussion is considered morally contentious (Evans & Durant, 1995). Other studies have echoed this and found that in some cases familiarity with animal research was associated with lower levels of support (Broida et al., 1993; Pifer et al., 1994; Knight et al., 2003; Ormandy et al., 2013).

Furthermore, some authors proposed that science and society cannot feasibly be separated, and have called for the democratization of scientific practice (Irwin, 2001; Elam & Bertilsson, 2003; Jasanoff, 2006). Since there are shifts toward the democratization of science (Schiele, 2008) it becomes increasingly important to understand public attitudes toward scientific practices that invoke polarized opinion or might be considered morally contentious, such as animal research, and to develop novel mechanisms for public engagement on such issues.

The term ‘attitude’ has been used to refer to “the evaluation of an object, concept, or behavior along a dimension of favour or disfavour, good or bad, like or dislike” (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2000). Attitudes are distinct from, but related to, people’s beliefs and values. It is postulated in the expectancy-value model (Fishbein, 1963; Fishbein, 1967) that attitudes are formed through a person’s accessible beliefs about an object, where a belief is defined as “the subjective probability that the object has a certain attribute” (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2000). Ajzen & Fishbein (2000) (p. 4) give an illustrative example: “a person may believe that exercise (the attitude object) reduces the risk of heart disease (the attribute).” An imperative ramifications of the anticipation





esteem model is that states of mind towards a protest are framed naturally and unavoidably as we get new (and relevant) data around a question's traits, and as the subjective estimations of these credits get to be distinctly connected to the question.

In this manner, surveying individuals' states of mind towards animal research can educate us all the more concerning whether diverse sorts of animal research are normatively viewed as "great" or "terrible" at both an individual and societal level. Thus, this study focused on understanding the factors, practices and also the contribution of alternative methods that influence the people who directly involved in the utilization of animals in laboratories and research.



1.2.2 The Continuing Needs to Use Animals in Research



It is clear that there is a continuing need for properly regulated and ethically conducted research-using animals where the harm caused to the animals is justified by the potential benefits, and where no practicable alternative exists. Despite the fact that it isn't right to superfluously mishandle animals, animal experimentation must proceed with on account of the tremendous logical asset that animal models give (Liou, 2010).

Animals are proper research subjects since they are like individuals from numerous points of view. Chimpanzees impart 99% of their DNA to people, and mice are 98% hereditarily like people (CBRA, 2013). All warm blooded animals, including people, are plunged from basic predecessors, and all have a similar arrangement of organs (heart, kidneys, lungs, and so forth.) that capacity in basically a similar route





with the assistance of a circulation system and focal sensory system (UAR, 2014). Because animals and people are so naturally comparable, they are helpless to a hefty portion of similar conditions and ailments, including coronary illness, growth, and diabetes (David et al., 2012).

Animal research is astoundingly overseen, with laws set up to shield animals from mishandle. Despite neighborhood and state laws and guidelines, animal ask about has been controlled by the administration Animal Welfare Act (AWA) since 1966. And additionally stipulating least lodging models for research animals (fenced in area measure, temperature, access to clean nourishment and water, and others), the AWA likewise requires general reviews by veterinarians (AWA, 2008). All recommendations to utilize animals for research must be affirmed by an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) set up by every exploration office. Compassionate treatment is authorized by every office's IACUC, and most significant research establishments' projects are willfully audited for sympathetic practices by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International (AAALAC) (AMP, 2016). All foundations getting subsidizing from the US Public Health Service (PHS) must agree to the PHS Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (Society of Toxicology, 2006; AWA, 2008; USDA, 2010).

1.3 Problem Statement

The utilization of animals in research raises various opinions and attitudes. Some people articulate the desire for complete abolition of animal research practices, while





others express strong support it (Hagelin et al., 2003). In any case, as Knight et al. (2009) call attention to, the crucial contentions used to contradict or bolster animal look into have moved minimal after some time: regularly, the individuals who restrict animal investigate tend to concentrate on animal welfare and the misery of the animals included, though the individuals who are included in research (e.g., researchers, analysts) tend to construct their contentions in light of the advantages of their work and the absence of contrasting options to animal models (Baldwin, 1993; Paul, 1995). They also agree that it is wrong to use animals if alternative-testing methods would produce equally valid results.

Many teaching and research laboratories make use of non-human animals as test subjects. Animals may be subjected to experimentation or modified into conditions useful for gaining knowledge about human disease or for testing potential human treatments. Even though animals such as mice and rats are distant from humans, they share many physiological and genetic similarities with humans. Thus, animal experimentation can be tremendously helpful as at pre-university biology laboratories as well as for furthering medical sciences or any related biomedical fields.

There is often no discrepancy made between the diversity of animal use in laboratories and research in the previous years. There appears to be an underlying assumption that people's attitudes are uni-dimensional (Knight & Barnett, 2008). Typically, studies of public attitude involve the use of survey style methods; however, a few reviews don't unveil all the methodological subtle elements of the study (Herzog et al., 2001), and now and again the inquiries that make up these studies are worded in one-sided ways, hence trading off the estimation of the outcomes. Thus, it is high time





to view the insight of people who directly involved in the utilization of animals in the laboratories and research, to seek the current practices carried out and to identify any alternative methods to animal testing. The administration of animals before, during and after experimentation should be looked into in order to monitor the fate of tested animals.

1.4 Theoretical Framework

At the heart of the debate about the ethics of animal experimentation lies the question of the moral relationship between humans and non-humans. Western philosophers over the centuries have regarded humans in a different light to the rest of the animal kingdom. For example, Aristotle believed that there was a hierarchy of animals, with humans at the top, as humans could reason and had “rational souls” (Foëx, 2007).

Indeed, even inside people there was a chain of command: men were more discerning than ladies. This made it flawlessly satisfactory to oppress "savages". Descartes considered that non - humans were insentient "machines". All things considered, they could feel no agony, thus could be abused savagely. Then again, acknowledged that animals could endure, in any case, by lacking good self-sufficiency, they likewise needed good status (Foëx, 2007).

Three main elements with regard the human attitude towards animal testing or experimentation include the behavior change model (Prochaska et al., 1992), the moral status (theory) and moral actions to use animals are discussed below.

