



TeachKind 
SCIENCE

CUTTING OUT DISSECTION

Benefits of **Non-Animal** Teaching Methods



Contents

Introduction	1
Educational Efficacy of Non-Animal Teaching Methods in Science Education	1
Economic Benefits and Efficiency of Non-Animal Teaching Methods	3
Ethical Considerations and Student Perspective	4
Endorsement of Non-Animal Methods by Scientists, Educators, and Legislators	4
Conclusion	6



INTRODUCTION

Every year in the United States, an estimated 20 million animals are used for educational purposes.¹ These animals are obtained from a variety of sources and suffer immensely as a result of being trapped, transported, confined, experimented on, and killed for classroom science exercises.

Millions of frogs, for example, are captured in their natural habitats every year and killed for dissection or used while still alive in classroom biology experiments. The U.S. Department of the Interior has even stated that declines in amphibian populations can be attributed in part to the use of amphibians in dissection.² Biological supply companies obtain fetal pigs used for dissection from slaughterhouses; the fetuses are cut out of the bodies of pregnant sows who are slaughtered for meat. These companies also purchase stray, lost, and abandoned cats from animal shelters or “bunchers”—dealers who illicitly obtain animals from backyards and the streets of the U.S. and Mexico. Millions of other “animals, such as mice, rats, and rabbits, are” bred at facilities that cater to businesses and schools that use animals in classroom experiments and laboratories.

The U.S. Department of the Interior has even stated that declines in amphibian populations can be attributed in part to the use of amphibians in dissection.²

Fortunately, educators can help prevent this suffering *and* enhance students’ learning experience by using the modern, life-affirming, educationally effective non-animal teaching methods that are discussed in this informational brief.

EDUCATIONAL EFFICACY OF NON-ANIMAL TEACHING METHODS IN SCIENCE EDUCATION

Non-animal teaching methods—such as interactive computer programs, high-quality videos, and lifelike models—have inherent educational advantages over the use of animal laboratories for science education, translating into superior student outcomes.

Unlike dissection or live-animal laboratories in which students have just one opportunity to perform a procedure and learn the requisite content, non-animal methods allow students to repeat the material until they are proficient and confident, without having to cut into the corpses of animals. Furthermore, many software programs include modules that demonstrate how



the living body works, side-by-side comparative anatomy modules, and content about ecology and behavior, none of which can be taught by dissecting an animal cadaver.

Because of these and other advantages, nearly every peer-reviewed comparative study published has concluded that the educational outcomes of students who are taught basic or advanced biomedical concepts and skills using non-animal methods are equivalent or superior to those of their peers who use animal-based laboratories.³ One systematic review concluded that students taught using non-animal methods demonstrated “superior understanding of complex biological processes, increased learning efficiency, and increased examination results.”⁴ It also reported that students’ confidence and satisfaction increased, as did their preparedness for laboratories and their information-retrieval and communication skills. Three recent studies at universities across the U.S. found that students who modeled body systems out of clay were significantly better at identifying the constituent parts of human anatomy than their classmates who performed animal dissection.^{5,6,7} Another study found that students preferred using clay modeling over animal dissection and performed just as well as their counterparts who dissected animals.⁸



In 2022, authors of a systematic review comparing student learning outcomes showed that in 95% of studies, students at all educational levels performed as well as or better than those who dissected animals.⁹

The use of non-animal teaching methods also improves the preparedness of students who are pursuing careers in the medical professions by better reflecting the teaching methods that they can expect to encounter in graduate school. All U.S. and Canadian medical schools—including such prestigious institutions as Harvard, Stanford, and Yale universities—have discontinued the use of animals to teach medical students, and no U.S. medical schools expect or require students to have participated in animal dissection.¹⁰ Furthermore, the American Medical Student Association (AMSA), the oldest and largest independent association of physicians-in-training in the U.S., states that it “strongly encourages the replacement of animal laboratories with non-animal alternatives in undergraduate medical education.”^{11,12} Today, one can become a board-certified surgeon without ever having cut into an animal—alive or dead.

In 2022, authors of a systematic review comparing student learning outcomes showed that in 95% of studies, students at all educational levels performed as well as or better than those who dissected animals.⁹

ECONOMIC BENEFITS AND EFFICIENCY OF NON-ANIMAL TEACHING METHODS

Non-animal teaching methods benefit educators by increasing teaching efficiency and lowering costs while affording enhanced potential for the customization and repeatability of teaching exercises.

Studies have shown that computer-based teaching methods “saved academic and nonacademic staff time ... were considered to be less expensive and an effective and enjoyable mode of student learning [and] ... contributed to a significant reduction in animal use”^{13,14,15} because there are no obligatory safety lessons, no set-up or clean-up time, and no monitoring of misbehavior with animal cadavers, scissors, and scalpels. With software and other non-animal methods, there is also no expensive disposal of equipment or hazardous-material removal. Some programs also allow educators to customize lessons and include built-in test and quiz modules that can track student performance.

Furthermore, animals (whether dead or alive) can be used only once, whereas non-animal resources can be used for many years—an added benefit that could result in significant cost savings for teachers, school districts, and state educational systems. For example, a site license for the popular eMind Cat software, which includes assessments and lab practicals, costs \$209 per year, while the cost of setting up cat dissection for 300 students over a period of five years can add up to \$8,277. PETA’s cost comparison shows similar savings for other species as well.¹⁶ PETA has worked with eMind and other companies to make discounts on their educational products available.



A comprehensive list of recommended animal-free dissection programs is available at PETA.org/Dissection.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVE

Concern for animal welfare is at the root of most students' objections to animal dissection. Research has shown that many students at all stages of their educational careers are uncomfortable with the use of animals in education and experimentation. Furthermore, exposing young people to animal dissection can foster a callousness toward animals and nature and can even dissuade some from pursuing careers in science.^{17,18,19} According to Gallup polls, between 2001 and 2013, the number of young people opposed to animal testing rose from 31% to 54%.²⁰ Studies have shown that many students are reluctant to express their objections to participation in animal dissection, perhaps out of fear of real or perceived punishment or ostracism by their teachers and peers, and many do not speak up.^{21,22} For this reason, educators must clearly convey the message that students need not compromise their personal beliefs in order to learn science.²³ Replacing dissection opens the door to a new generation of students who can approach science from a humane perspective.²⁴

Many teachers are also opposed to animal dissection in the classroom, citing health and safety concerns, classroom management, learning and retention issues, cost, and the inability to justify killing animals for it.²⁵

ENDORSEMENT OF NON-ANIMAL METHODS BY SCIENTISTS, EDUCATORS, AND LEGISLATORS

To reflect technological advances, robust findings about the educational efficacy of non-animal teaching methods, and growing ethical concerns, the official animal use policy of the National Science Education Leadership Association discourages animal dissection as an instructional strategy in STEM classes.²⁶

In the U.S., 17 states and the District of Columbia have enacted dissection-choice laws or policies that allow students in grades K–12 to opt out of dissection and require teachers to provide non-animal assignments. California,²⁷ Connecticut,²⁸ D.C.,²⁹ Florida,³⁰ Illinois,³¹ Louisiana,³² Maine,³³ Massachusetts,³⁴ Michigan,³⁵ New Hampshire,³⁶ New Jersey,³⁷ New Mexico,³⁸ New York,³⁹ Oregon,⁴⁰ Pennsylvania,⁴¹ Rhode Island,⁴² Vermont,⁴³ and Virginia⁴⁴

The National Science Education Leadership Association discourages animal dissection as an instructional strategy in STEM classes.²⁶




all have statewide laws or department of education policies that allow students to opt out of animal dissection in favor of a non-animal method. In addition, other states—including Arizona,⁴⁵ Hawaii,⁴⁶ Minnesota,⁴⁷ Texas,⁴⁸ and Utah⁴⁹—have more general policies on allowing students to opt out of material that they find objectionable on ethical or religious grounds. Many school districts, universities, and secondary schools have policies in place. As of 2016, 63% of U.S. students in public schools could opt out of dissection.⁵⁰

In a 2022 teacher survey, authors found that most educators believe that alternatives can be used to meet the biology-related learning objectives that have been traditionally associated with animal dissection. The perceived benefits of the hands-on experience that comes with animal dissection do not outweigh the harm to animals used in these exercises.⁵¹ For teachers who place value on providing their students with hands-on dissection experiences, dissectible synthetic models offer a realistic dissection experience with none of the negative effects associated with dissecting once-living animals.

A majority of Canadian provinces—including Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, the Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Québec, Saskatchewan, and Yukon—have similar policies and practices, and their curricula support the use of non-animal methods. See this interactive map for a list of U.S. and Canadian policies on dissection:

[PETA.org/TeachKind/OptOut](https://peta.org/TeachKind/OptOut).



Conclusion

Replacing the use of animals in education with one or more of the many non-animal teaching methods available today offers numerous benefits, including reducing the number of animals who are captured in the wild or bred to be killed for dissection, providing students with a more effective and inclusive learning experience, encouraging students to show respect for animals and nature, and conserving the valuable resources of schools and their educators.

We encourage you to visit [PETA.org/Dissection](https://peta.org/dissection) for video demonstrations of virtual-dissection software, resource lists, and information about PETA's pilot program that provides teachers and schools with non-animal dissection materials. PETA also offers online training sessions in non-animal dissection for science education majors and teachers. Please pass along this information to your colleagues, and contact PETA if you have any questions or comments.

Inquiries can be directed to Science@teachkind.org.



- ¹Hart, L. A., Wood, M. W., & Hart, B. L. (2008). Why dissection?: Animal use in education. ABC-CLIO.
- ²Baker, B. (1999). New federal task force tackles amphibian troubles. *BioScience*, 49(5), 366.
- ³Patronek, G. J., & Rauch, A. (2007). Systematic review of comparative studies examining alternatives to the harmful use of animals in biomedical education. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 230(1), 37-43.
- ⁴Knight, A. (2007). The effectiveness of humane teaching methods in veterinary education. *ALTEX*, 24(2/07), 91.
- ⁵Waters, J. R., Van Meter, P., Perrotti, W., Drogo, S., & Cyr, R. J. (2005). Cat dissection vs. sculpting human structures in clay: An analysis of two approaches to undergraduate human anatomy laboratory education. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 29(1), 27-34.
- ⁶Motoike, H. K., O'Kane, R. L., Lenchner, E., & Haspel, C. (2009). Clay modeling as a method to learn human muscles: A community college study. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 2(1), 19-23.
- ⁷Waters, J. R., Van Meter, P., Perrotti, W., Drogo, S., & Cyr, R. J. (2011). Human clay models versus cat dissection: How the similarity between the classroom and the exam affects student performance. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 35(2), 227-236.
- ⁸DeHoff, M. E., Clark, K. L., & Meganathan, K. (2011). Learning outcomes and student-perceived value of clay modeling and cat dissection in undergraduate human anatomy and physiology. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 35(1), 68-75.
- ⁹Ormandy, E. (2022). Animal dissection vs. non-animal teaching methods: a systematic review of pedagogical value. *American Biology Teacher*, 84(7).
- ¹⁰Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. Last Remaining Medical School to Use Live Animals for Training Makes Switch to Human-Relevant Methods (2016). Retrieved February 8, 2023, from <https://www.pcrm.org/news/news-releases/last-remaining-medical-school-use-live-animals-training-makes-switch-human#>
- ¹¹The AMSA is made up of more than 68,000 medical students, pre-medical students, interns, residents, and practicing physicians from across the U.S.
- ¹²American Medical Student Association. (2013). House of Delegates 2013 Resolution. Retrieved December 13, 2022 from <http://www.amsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/C13.pdf>.
- ¹³Dewhurst, D., & Jenkinson, L. (1995). The impact of computer-based alternatives on the use of animals in undergraduate teaching: A pilot study. *ATLA: Alternatives to Laboratory Animals*, 23(4), 521-530.
- ¹⁴Predevec, M. (2001). Evaluation of E-Rat, a computer-based rat dissection, in terms of student learning outcomes. *Journal of Biological Education*, 35(2), 75-80.
- ¹⁵Youngblut, C. (2001). Use of multimedia technology to provide solutions to existing curriculum problems: Virtual frog dissection (Doctoral dissertation).
- ¹⁶PETA. (2024). Cost comparison between animal dissection and interactive anatomy software. Retrieved August 23, 2024 from <https://www.peta.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/CostComparisonSheet.pdf>.
- ¹⁷Arluke, A., & Hafferty, F. (1996). From apprehension to fascination with "dog lab": the use of absolutions by medical students. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 25(2), 201-225.
- ¹⁸Solot, D., & Arluke, A. (1997). Learning the scientist's role: Animal dissection in middle school. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 26(1), 28-54.
- ¹⁹Stanisstreet, M., Spofforth, N., & Williams, T. (1993). Attitudes of undergraduate students to the uses of animals. *Studies in Higher Education*, 18(2), 177-196.
- ²⁰Goodman, J.R. & Borch, C.A. (2014, February). Trends in Americans' attitudes toward animal testing: 2001-2013. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Chicago, Ill.
- ²¹Oakley, J. (2012). Dissection and choice in the science classroom: student experiences, teacher responses, and a critical analysis of the right to refuse. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2).
- ²²Oakley, J. (2013). "I didn't feel right about animal dissection": Dissection objectors share their science class experiences. *Society & Animals*, 21(1).
- ²³Lopresti-Goodman, S. M. (2012). Towards plasticity in brain science pedagogy. *Psychology and Education*, 49(3), 25.
- ²⁴Kramer, M. G. (2006). Humane education, dissection, and the law. *Animal Law*, 13, 281.
- ²⁵Oakley, J. (2012). Science teachers and the dissection debate: Perspectives on animal dissection and alternatives. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 7(2), 253-267.
- ²⁶National Science Education Leadership Association (2022). NSELA Position Statement, Safety Code of Practice on the Use of Animals in Science Education. Retrieved July 23, 2024, from <https://www.nsela.org/resources/Documents/NSELA%20Position%20Statement%20Safety-Code%20of%20Practice%20on%20the%20Use%20of%20Animals%20in%20Science%20Education.pdf>.
- ²⁷California Education Code §32255-32255.6 (1988).
- ²⁸Connecticut Public Act No.13-273 (2013).
- ²⁹The District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education. (2012). Non-regulatory guidance for local education agencies: Animal dissection opt-out choice for district students.
- ³⁰Florida Statutes (Education) §1002.20 (1985, rev'd. 2004).
- ³¹105 Illinois Compiled Statutes 112/15 et seq. (2000).
- ³²1992 Animal Dissection Resolution (Louisiana House Concurrent Resolution 153).
- ³³1989 Maine State Department of Education Policy.
- ³⁴2005 Massachusetts Board of Education Policy.
- ³⁵2014 Michigan Board of Education Policy.
- ³⁶2014 New Hampshire Board of Education Policy.
- ³⁷New Jersey Statutes §18A:35-4.25.
- ³⁸2005 New Mexico Board of Education Policy.
- ³⁹New York Education Law §809(4) (1994).
- ⁴⁰Oregon Revised Statutes §337.300.
- ⁴¹24 Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes §15-1522 (1992).
- ⁴²Rhode Island Statutes §16-22-20 (1997).
- ⁴³16 Vermont Statutes Annotated §912.
- ⁴⁴Virginia Code Annotated §22.1-200.01 (2004).
- ⁴⁵Arizona Revised Statutes 15-102. This statute states, in part, that "[p]rocedures by which parents who object to any learning material or activity on the basis that it is harmful may withdraw their children from the activity or from the class or program."
- ⁴⁶Hawaii Department of Education Regulation 2210.1. This controversial issues regulation states, in part, that schools shall "[p]rovide a means through which and deadline by which parents and legal guardians may contact instructional staff or school administrators to exclude their child from the specific lesson or activity."
- ⁴⁷Minnesota Statutes §120B.20 (2012).
- ⁴⁸Texas Education Code 26.010. This code reads, in part, that parents may remove students "temporarily from a class or other school activity that conflicts with the parent's religious or moral beliefs if the parent presents or delivers to the teacher of the parent's child a written statement authorizing the removal of the child from the class or other school activity."
- ⁴⁹Utah Administrative Code R277-105-5. This administrative code states, in part, that "[a] parent, a legal guardian of a student, or a secondary student may request a waiver of participation in any portion of the curriculum or school activity which the requesting party believes to be an infringement upon a right of conscience or the exercise of religious freedom."
- ⁵⁰Suiter, S. (2016). Prevalence of student dissection-choice policies in U.S. schools. *American Biology Teacher*, 78(7).
- ⁵¹Osenkowski, P. (2022). Educators' views on the use of dissection and dissection alternatives in American biology classrooms. *ALTA: Alternatives to Laboratory Animals*, 50(3) 235-243.





 @teachkindteachers •  @teachkindteachers
 Science@teachkind.org •  TeachKind.org