176  The food morality movement: The race to the moral high
ground. K. Murphy*, Food-Chain Communications LLC, Lees
Summit, MO.

Many critics of modern, intensive farming and food production have
shifted their criticism to one based upon questions of religion, ethics
and morality. We term this “the food morality movement” (FMM). The
FMM often employs the language of science, food-safety, environmental
impact and socio-economics to entice the general public into debate
regarding ethical questions involving social justice, environmental
justice, economic equality, animal rights, and others. Animal scientists
and others who must respond to FMM-based criticism must adapt their
response to incorporate several elements of a morality-focused defense,
including reclaiming the farmer’s moral heritage, relearning communica-
tion strategies based on morality, avoiding internecine strife caused by
misunderstanding of FMM motives, and shedding lingering guilt based
on moral uncertainty. The modern food system needs an agricultural
apologia to answer the FMM in the race to the moral high ground.
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177  Consumer perception of production process attributes
for pork and lunchmeat products. M. G. S. McKendree*, N. J. O.
Widmar, and C. C. Crony, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Livestock producers are facing a changing marketplace. Consumers are
increasingly focused on the practices used to produce their food and
are especially interested in the treatment of livestock. An online survey
of 798 US consumers was conducted in June 2012. One objective of
this study was to determine consumer purchasing patterns of meat and
dairy products, and perceptions of hog rearing and livestock product
attributes. Fourteen percent of respondents reported reduced overall
pork consumption due to animal welfare/handling concerns in the
past 3 years. Of those included in the survey, concern for pig rearing
practices was highest for intensive housing practices; fewest respondents
were concerned about castration and ear notching. Although concern
for livestock animals is often discussed, consumers’ actual shopping
decisions focus on individual products. Lunchmeat purchasing and
preferences for lunchmeat attributes were assessed. Inconsistencies
were found between which lunchmeat attributes consumers associated
with high quality and which attributes they actually considered during
purchase. Over 73% of respondents agreed that “produced on farms
with animal welfare and handling standards in place” and “produced
by farmers certified in animal welfare techniques” were associated
with higher quality lunchmeats. Of those purchasing lunchmeat, only
47% and 45% of respondents, respectively, reported considering these
attributes during purchase. When asked about concern for animal welfare
and food safety, the majority of products studied elicited concern from
more respondents for food safety. Staple products (milk, eggs and ground
beef) generated concern for the largest number of respondents. Numbers
of respondents indicating concern varied across products, even when
they were produced by the same animal species (i.e., steak versus roast
beef lunchmeat). This work suggests that consumers’ values and beliefs
influence their perceptions of important product attributes (such as food
safety and animal welfare/handling) and potentially their purchasing
behavior. However, high variation exists in concerns as a function of
the product type and attribute.
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178  An analysis of perceived obligations by consumers across
animal species: Livestock, pet, or neither? M. G. S. McKendree*,
C. C. Crony, and N. J. O. Widmar, Purdue University, West Lafayette,
IN.

Do perceived concerns about and obligations to animals vary based on
their classification as a pet, livestock animal, or neither? An online survey
(n = 798) was conducted with an objective of determining consumers’
classification of animal species, the relationship between classification
and opposition to eating those species, and the relationship between
pet ownership/erating and their perceived obligations to animals. The
survey collected information on household demographics, pet
ownership and perceptions of pets, and perceptions of traditional and
non-traditional livestock animals. One interesting species classification
was the horse, with 55% selecting pet, 27% livestock and 18% neither.
Respondent opposition to eating animals varied by animal species; 81
respondents opposed eating a beef cow while 151 opposed eating a dairy
cow. Respondents opposed to eating certain animal species were less
opposed to others eating them. Tying classification with opposition to
eating animals, those classifying a beef cow as non-livestock more often
reported opposition to eating animals than those classifying a beef cow
as livestock. Sixty-six percent of respondents reported having at least
one household pet. At the 95% confidence level, respondents with cats
and/or dogs more frequently reported concern about livestock animal
welfare than those without cats and dogs. Of those with cats and/or dogs,
20% reported using cages/crates. However, no statistical differences
were found between those who used crates/cages and those who did not
regarding their level of concern for pig housing and management prac-
tices (including gestation crates, farrowing crates, group housing, and
indoor confinement). Dog and/or cat owners more frequently reported
having a source for animal welfare information (51% of dog and cat
owners vs. 32% without a cat/dog). Understanding consumers’ views of
different livestock species, their perceived obligations to animals
and sources of relevant information is an important step in facilitating
constructive discussions of agricultural animal care, welfare and ethics
that incorporates layperson’s beliefs and values.

Key Words: animal welfare, pet, livestock

179  Industry stakeholder views on dairy cattle welfare. B. A.
Program, Faculty of Land and Food Systems, University of British
Columbia, Vancouver, BC Canada.

Increasing stakeholder engagement is important as the dairy industry
seeks to address societal concerns about the welfare of farm animals.
The aim of the current study was to facilitate engagement among
stakeholders and to describe their perspectives on key issues affecting
the welfare of dairy cattle. Five heterogeneous focus groups were
conducted during a dairy cattle industry meeting in Guelph, Canada
in October 2012. Each group contained between 7 and 10 participants
and consisted of a mix of dairy producers, veterinarians, researchers,
students, and industry specialists. The 1 h facilitator-led discussion
focused on participants’ perceptions of the key welfare issues and the
role of different groups in addressing these concerns. Discussions were
audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, and the resulting transcripts coded and the themes identified. Lameness was uniformly recognized as the most important welfare issue facing dairy cattle; cow comfort, painful procedures (such as dehorning) and other production diseases (such as mastitis) were also commonly discussed. Participants had mixed views on the roles of different stakeholders in formulating solutions; many felt that producers and others working within the dairy industry should be primarily responsible, but some believed that members of the general public also had an important role. Participants agreed that improved knowledge translation from researchers to producers and from dairy industry groups to the public was required to develop solutions to these concerns. These results illustrate the value of stakeholder engagement in developing solutions to dairy cattle welfare concerns.
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