

## Follow-Up Questions for Faunalytics (2017)

**1. Is Faunalytics working on an evaluation of an animal advocacy documentary? If so, what are the details and status of that project?**

We are not. We previously conducted a [limited evaluation](#) of *The Ghosts In Our Machine*.

**2. Just to clarify, are any of Faunalytics' staff members also on the board?**

Yes, one. Che Green (founder) is on the board and also serves as our Executive Director. We have a conflict of interest clause in the organization's bylaws and the board asks Green to be excused from the call if there is any issue where he might be perceived as having a conflict, such as his own compensation.

**3. Do you have a formal statement of your organization's mission you can share with us?**

Yes: "To empower animal advocates with access to the research, analysis, strategies, and messages that maximize their effectiveness to reduce animal suffering." Our long-term goals are to 1) Provide animal advocates with relevant, useful, and affordable research; 2) Centralize, organize, and analyze essential research data for animal protection; 3) Identify and promote the use of effective advocacy strategies and tactics; and 4) Increase animal advocates' awareness and utilization of our resources.

**4. Have you instituted public pre-registration and open commentary for all major studies, as you mentioned considering in 2015? Also, could you clarify what is meant by "open commentary" in [this case](#)?**

Yes. However, there have only been a few "major" studies since 2015. We are working with Animal Equality on an RCT of their 360-degree video and have pre-registered with OSF as well as sought feedback from fellow EAAs, including directly and via Facebook. We are currently finalizing the design of our clean meat study (funded through the AARF) and will pre-register it with OSF on or about November 30th. We are also finalizing the design of our BRIC study and will pre-register that with OSF around the same timeframe. We had similar open comment processes for these studies as well and are committed to pre-registration for all major independent studies going forward.

*Addendum:* To clarify, Faunalytics has always sought feedback from fellow animal advocates, but previously it was usually just at the design phase and not prior to publishing. Now we have baked that commentary into several steps throughout the research process. Basically, we've gone from loose, informal commentary to a more robust process and now we're also incorporating pre-registration and OSF for major studies.

“Open Commentary” refers to requesting feedback on research designs before finalizing them, as outlined above.

**5. Some argue that the expected effect size of individual diet change interventions such as leaflets, PPV and VR is so small and the variability in diet is so large that these interventions cannot be subject to an adequately powered experimental evaluation with the sample sizes Faunalytics has historically employed. What is Faunalytics' view on this?**

This is largely true, but is not unique to Faunalytics. In fact, Faunalytics has done much of the work to advance the movement's understanding of the variability of diet self-reporting and the need for larger samples. Most of our independent studies to date have been descriptive, not experimental, and have been powered accordingly. Additionally, we have conducted studies with large sample sizes, including our study of semi-vegetarians and meat reducers in 2005 (sample size of more than 3,000) and our study of lapsed and current vegetarians/vegans in 2014 (initial sample size of more than 11,000). For many of our studies, a main limitation has been the budgets of our clients, which often do not allow for sufficient sample sizes to detect small effect sizes. However, we understand the importance of sample size for experimental studies, in particular, and have conducted power analyses for both the Animal Equality study and our new clean meat study and we will continue to look at power vs. sample for all future experimental studies. In general, enabling more meaningful research results via increased sample size requires a greater priority in the field for funding this type of research.

**6. Some would argue that the development of new cultured and plant-based food technology will be the key turning point for ending animal farming, and that a shift in public attitudes will naturally follow. What role does Faunalytics play in facilitating the development and acceptance of technologies?**

We agree that behavior change might precede attitude change in this way and have been making this point for more than a decade ([one example](#)). In addition to being a vocal proponent of both plant-based and clean alternatives, we are currently conducting an experimental study to

help overcome the naturalness barrier for clean meat. We have also taken on the task of organizing research and researchers who are working on these topics. For a summary of our work in this area, [please see this post](#). Additionally, we currently have volunteers working on sizing the overall market for plant-based and clean alternatives and we are actively involved with the GFI community.

**7. Are you aware of any concrete examples of groups updating their practices in light of Faunalytics' research? Please feel free to list any that come to mind.**

Yes, but most of our studies have been on behalf of clients and the results and actions they've taken are proprietary. That said, here are a few examples of groups updating their practices:

- Based on our research in the early 2000s, most major organizations in the movement began using the term "animal protection" instead "animal welfare" or "animal rights" and using "advocate" instead of "activist."
- One client that runs a farmed animal sanctuary evaluated three different programs and found that tours were most effective. As a result, they put more resources toward tours and fewer resources toward the other two programs.
- Alley Cat Allies used the results of custom Animal Tracker questions to understand public support for different services for community cats and prioritize their advocacy accordingly.
- We conducted two years of evaluations of the Veganuary campaign, finding that the program had a substantial positive impact but also identifying several areas of improvement that Veganuary team has begun implementing.
- We analyzed the reasons for participation in The "Save" Movement (e.g., Toronto Pig Save), which gave their leaders insight regarding how to find, motivate, and sustain people who are bearing witness to farmed animal suffering.
- We have helped a number of organizations by conducting small studies to assist them in choosing from among different options, including a new logo for one group, a leaflet title for another, etc.
- NEAVS used our research on chimpanzee captivity to reframe the debate and focus on "retirement" of chimpanzees used in animal experiments, a notion that garners widespread approval from the public.
- Shelters that participated in a pilot study we supported for the Jackson Galaxy Foundation began using clicker training to increase the perceived adoptability of the cats in the shelter.

- Many organizations have updated their veg\*n outreach practices in light of our study of lapsed veg\*ns. These include mostly anecdotal comments about advocates focusing more on strategies like incremental change, mentoring new veg\*ns.

### **8. Why doesn't Faunalytics publish more of their research in peer reviewed journals?**

Faunalytics is a small organization with a staff of 2.5 full-time equivalent people and limited financial resources. As such, we've made the strategic decision to focus our time on making sure our research reaches animal advocates as a first priority. Reaching an academic audience is also important for us, but is not a focus given our current funding. The long cycles and extra time required for formal peer review are not feasible given our current staff size and other commitments. That said, we engage in informal peer review processes for all of our major independent studies, such as our study of lapsed and current vegetarians/vegans.

### **9. There are some who think that the scope of suffering in the wild is much greater than the scope of farmed animal suffering. Does Faunalytics do any research on ways to help wild animals?**

We have conducted research on anthropogenic wild animal suffering for a variety of purposes. This includes our Animal Tracker study, which examines a range of attitudes and behavior that impact wild animals. We have also conducted a number of one-off studies for clients related to protecting wolves, elephants, tigers, primates, and other wild species. In our library, we make a point of covering wild animal issues, including insects. We are also aware of the growing EAA interest in reducing naturogenic wild animal suffering, but have not yet researched the topic in any meaningful way.