Document 1

Electric Shock Collars: Countries Supporting a Ban

Electric training collars are banned in Denmark, Australia, Germany, Switzerland and Slovenia, and in Austria a ban is under way. The FCI[1] also prohibits any use of shock collars.

Austria: In June 2004 Austria introduced new animal protection legislation, which "put the country high on the list of European nations regulating the fate of their animals"[2]… The legislation is being phased in over several years and is expected to be in full effect by 2009. "The law foresees a ban on the sale of puppies or cats in shops and the training of dogs with electric shock collars"[3]…Animal rights' activists say that while marking a step in the right direction, the new law in some respects still is not as far advanced as legislation in countries such as **Sweden, Norway and Switzerland[4]".**

Australia: Electric shock collars are banned in most states in Australia under the Cruelty to Animals Act – they are a restricted import in Australia, though there are exemptions for when veterinarians prescribe their use[5]. In New South Wales, Parramatta Local Court fined pet supplies company Kra-mar Pet Supplies $2,500 and ordered them to pay total costs of $6,691 after the company pleaded guilty to selling an electrical device manufactured for the purpose of administering an electric shock to an animal as the sale, possession and use of electrical collars is illegal under the New South Wales Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1997[6].

Germany: The German Animal Welfare Act enforces the utilitarian principle that there must be good reason for one to cause an animal harm and identifies that it is the responsibility of human beings to protect the lives and well being of their fellow creatures. Article 3, paragraph 11 states that: "It shall be prohibited to use a device which by applying direct electrocution considerably restricts the species-specific behaviour of an animal, in particular its movement, or forces it to move thereby causing the animal considerable pain, suffering or harm, unless federal or Land provisions authorize such practices"[7].

Switzerland: The Swiss Animal Protection Ordinance 1981, Article 34, states that: "Training instruments may not be applied in a manner to cause injury or major pain to the animal, provoke it, or cause it great fear"[8] and that "Training instruments delivering electric shocks, making acoustic signals, or using chemicals are prohibited, with the exception of whistling during training or the professional application of bordering systems"[9]. Swiss law also states that the cantonal authorities may grant persons with the necessary specialist knowledge permission to use such training instruments only for exceptional therapeutic purposes[10]. Permission is granted only when person handling the dog has passed a theoretical exam consisting of four parts (principles of animal learning, ethics, techniques and legislation) and a practical exam to demonstrate they can operate and understand the functioning of instruments emitting electric shocks, including instruments unknown to them. Since 2001 only about 30 people in Switzerland have passed the exam. The Swiss animal welfare legislation is also undergoing a revision, which will also forbid the use, advertising and the sale of training devices emitting electric shocks

---

[1] The Fédération Cynologique Internationale represents canine organisations around the world. It includes 80 members and contract partners.
[2] Water and Woods.net: 'New Law for Austrian Animals', June 1 2004, http://www.waterandwoods.net/forum_viewtopic.php?8.662
Supported by:
Kole, William J: 'Austria Enacts one of Europe's Toughest Animal Rights Laws', FactoryFarming.com, May 28 2004, www.factoryfarming.com/issues_austria.htm
[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid
[5] The Australian Customs Service: 'Prohibited and Restricted Imports', www.customs.gov.au/site/page.cfm?u=4369
[6] RSPCA: 'Pet Supplies Company Fined Over Sale of Electronic Collar', February 6 2004, http://www.rspcansw.org.au/rspca-electr_collar_2-04.pdf
[7] Michigan State University, College of Law, Animal Legal and Historical Center, http://www.animallaw.info/nonus/statutes/stdeawa1998.htm
[8] Michigan State University, College of Law, Animal Legal and Historical Center, Michigan http://www.animallaw.info/nonus/statutes/stchapo1981.htm
[9] Ibid
[10] Ibid

Slovenia: Slovenian Law for the Protection of Animals prohibits the use of certain methods and objects used to train dogs, including electric shock collars.

Document 2

Current Research on Electric Shock Collars

During meetings between the Kennel Club and Defra it became clear that Defra were not prepared to ban electric shock collars as part of the Animal Welfare Bill. This was because it had concerns regarding the validity of existing scientific research. Although Defra were not able to explain these concerns to the Kennel Club, they did recommend that the Kennel Club contact Dr Stephen Wickens PhD, Development Officer, Universities Federation for Animal Welfare. Dr Wickens cited several concerns with one study in particular which concluded: "Shocks received during training are not only unpleasant but also painful and frightening." This study was undertaken by Matthijs Schilder and Joanne A M van der Borg and entitled 'Training dogs with help of the shock collar: short and long term behavioural effects.' The concerns with the research have since been addressed by the main author of the study, Matthijs Schilder.

Concern 1: Study Design

Wickens stated: "For this comparison to be valid and robust it depends on the two groups of dogs differing significantly from one another only with respect to the fact that one group had received electric shocks and the other control group had not…There are other differences between the two groups that may also account for some of the differences in behaviour that this study measured…there was a difference in 1) the training background of the two groups, 2) the sex ratio (6% female in the shocked group, 20% female in the control group) and 3) the breed make-up".

Schilder responded: "For the comparison study we only used watchdog trained dogs for both the control and the shocked groups. I must admit that this may not be quite clear from the description in the article on p321. In one case, one owner owned two dogs, one was trained using the shock collar and the other was not…Since only German Shepherd dogs were used in the comparison part of the study, Wickens' mention of a breed-related problem here is not realistic…Different breeds other than German Shepherds were only used to access acute effects of shocks. This leaves only the difference in sex-ratio as a possible confounding factor. (However) the sex ratio was 2/16 = 12.5% in the shocked group versus 3/15 = 20% in the control group. Wickens' mention of only 6% females in the shocked group must be an error. Since the sex ratio was biased towards females and female dogs are slightly more susceptible to stress the data point in the opposite direction as expected and therefore, this difference in sex ratio cannot explain the data. Moreover the difference is smaller than Wickens states. So we are quite confident, that the experimental set up is ok and that confounding factors have not contributed to the differences found".

Wickens clarified: "It appeared that he had tested 31 dogs that had been shocked (IPO and VH3 dogs) against 15 that had not (VH3) - that it was only 16 German Shepherd dogs that received shocks and that these were compared against 15 German Shepherd's that did not, resolves the concern I had relating to difference in training regime, breed and sex ratio. With respect

to the other two concerns I raised and which he comments on, these are much more minor points".

Concern 2: Dog handlers

Wickens stated: "Some trainers handled dogs in both the shocked and control groups. This introduces the issue that the behaviour shown by dogs in each group is not independent but rather might be related to the identity of the handler."

Schilder responded: "Some other control dogs were trained on the same training grounds as some shocked dogs but by different handlers. There may be some dependency here, as Wickens points out correctly. However such a dependency would lead in the direction of the nul-hypothesis (no difference between groups). Therefore this cannot explain differences between both groups as found. As far as training regime is concerned, both these dog groups were completely comparable."

Concern 3: One tailed tests:

Wickens stated: "The use of such tests is not a conservative thing to do and is more likely to produce significant findings when none exist or which would not had been found if two tailed tests had been used…The authors need to be more explicit in this paper and give greater justification as to why they used a one-tailed test rather than two-tailed."

Schilder responded: "I agree that it is more conservative to use two tailed tests. One-tailed tests are however admitted if there is a-priori hypothesis, where one states predictions as to the direction of differences. In our case, we stated such expectations in the introduction and in the last section of the Materials and Methods section regarding directions of expected differences…On other occasions, we tested two sided, as stated on p 324. Moreover, the use of statistics has been checked by the world's prime experts in the area of behavioural statistics, Dr Han de Vries".

Conclusion:

Wickens concluded: "In light of the fact that this paper does not give us sufficient evidence that such differences between the two groups did not exist or influence the study or that the authors have considered these potential variables and allowed for them, the findings of this study and their conclusions should be treated with caution."

Schilder concluded: "I find the statement that the results of our study should be treated with caution because of a failure to consider or allow for confounding variables a gross overstatement…I do not blame him (Wickens) for this, since in the description of the study we do not seem to have been clear enough at some points".

Wickens clarified: "I am much happier about the validity of the study and its findings than I was previously".

Document 3

Electric Shock Collars - Answers to FAQs:

Experts in the field of animal behaviour have produced this paper:
1) [redacted]
2) [redacted]

a) Why is research relating to different species is still valid?

There has been a great deal of research on laboratory species evaluating the effects of aversive stimuli, including shocks. In fact, it is this type of research that has provided us with the information on how animals learn that we use all the time in dog training and behaviour. Rodents are often used as a 'model' species for other 'higher' species – for example in the testing of drugs that are used to deduce anxiety in humans. This is because the rodent brain has the same basic structures involved in the generation of emotional responses as do 'higher' species such as dogs or even humans. Hence studies on the response of rodents to shocks should be considered a reliable model for the response of dogs. As an example, there are classic experiments on rodents which show that unpredictable application of shocks cause stress in subjects that can lead to a range of consequences, such as the development of stomach ulcers.

b) How do you train a dog that you have re-homed who is only used to aversive training?

Having experienced 'harsh' training methods is if anything more likely to make the dog resistant to electronic stimulation! This is because dogs, as any species, will gradually become 'habituated' to, or more tolerant of, aversive events, so they gradually take less notice of them. This is particularly the case where the level of stimulus is increased gradually over time, as is often the case when people are trying to train their dogs using these methods (See 'e') below)

A dog trained in such a way would be no less likely to respond to reward based training as this approach depends upon determining what motivates the dog (i.e. why it is showing the problem behaviour) and teaching the dog that it is more motivating to perform an alternative behaviour (one that is acceptable to the owner).

c) Do dogs always want to be dominant?

There is a general misunderstanding about dog behaviour that tends to lead people to the conclusion that somehow all dogs 'want to take control' and in order to prevent this they have to be 'dominated' (i.e. punished in some way). This misconception arises from the fact that the dog is domesticated from the wolf, a species that has a relatively stable hierarchical structure in order to optimise reproductive function. However, not only is social structure in wolves

not maintained through overt aggression, but it is clear that dogs have a very different social structure anyway. In brief, this is because they have been domesticated over a long period of time, and selected for compliance and being easy to live with. Groups of free ranging feral dogs, therefore, do not appear to display fixed hierarchies, nor any restricted breeding, as would a group of wolves. In essence, therefore, dogs have no 'drive' to try and control people or be 'high ranking'. Behaviours that they display towards people arise through individual learning experiences. Aggression, for example, generally starts as a defensive response when an animal feels that either itself, or a resource that it highly values, is under threat. If this aggressive response is 'successful' for the animal in keeping the threat away, the animal will become more confident in showing aggression the next time it is in the same context. Hence it is often the misconception that dogs need to be punished or 'kept down' that leads to problem behaviours rather then resolving them.

d) Do collars only emit a mild tingling to change dogs' behaviour.

Electric shock collars work by creating an association between what the dog is doing at the time at which the current is applied, and an aversive event (the current). If the dog makes this association, it will be less likely to repeat the action again. This means that if the collar is going to be effective, it needs to be used at a level that the animal will find aversive. This level will vary between different dogs, but also between different situations with one dog. Pain thresholds and levels of resistance in the neck will influence the amount of current the animal experiences. However, its perception will also be affected by whatever else is going on at the time – if it is highly aroused chasing sheep, for example, then a high level of stimulus will be needed for the animal to be aware of it. The level needed for each dog is impossible to 'know' prior to use, and this creates two problems. One is that the device is set too low initially and the dog gradually habituates to the pain as the device is turned up. In this way the device can end up delivering a dangerously high level of current without the animal 'responding'. The other danger is that the device is initially set too high, and the dog finds the experience so aversive that it becomes frightened of the context / handler / environment. The other main risk, whatever level is chosen, is that the animal does not associate the current with its own behaviour, but with something else that is happening in the environment at the time, such as another dog approaching. This would result in the dog becoming fearful, or fearfully aggressive of other dogs.

e) How do you deal with a dog that is a 'strong character' with a strong chase instinct? Is it not quicker and easier to use a shock collar?

If a dog has a strong drive to perform a behaviour, to the extent that it is difficult to find anything more motivating (rewarding) to the dog (even basic survival needs such as food?), then the level of pain required to permanently stop the behaviour would be such that the chance of causing the dog to become fearful of incidental stimuli (such as the owner) is greatly increased, as explained above.

Whilst electronic collars have been found to be effective at stopping chasing behaviour in some cases, there is no evidence for the long-term efficacy of this method and therefore the risk of regression exits.

In such cases where positive reinforcement has been attempted unsuccessfully, then there always remains the option of restraining the dog when in the presence of livestock – a guaranteed method of preventing chase behaviour!

f) Is it ok if you only use the collar at a low setting?

Using the collar at a low setting inevitably means that the level may be insufficient to prevent the target behaviour. If the initial level is ineffective the stimulation is then increased by the trainer. When electronic stimulation is applied in this manner the dog can become accustomed to the gradually increasing discomfort through the process of habituation (something that we commonly encounter in practice). In order to use punishment effectively the initial level needs to be sufficient to immediately stop the behaviour. As all dogs (even within a single litter) have varying perceptions of pain/the stimulation, this is impossible to judge (even by an experienced trainer!) prior to the collar's use; therefore use of collars at low settings is unlikely to be an effective training strategy.

g) Is it ok if a professional trainer or experienced dog handler uses a collar?

Even an experienced trainer cannot know the appropriate level of stimulation required for an individual dog in an individual situation (see above). In addition, there is no way that even an experienced trainer can control for every possible inadvertent association that may be made when these devices are used in real-life situations.

h) What if a dog's behavioural problems were so severe that it would have to be put down - would it be ok to use a collar then?

Every animal shows behavioural problems for a reason. In resolving these problems, it is important to find out why the behaviour is occurring and change this reason. In almost all cases this can be achieved very successfully by changing the environment, consequences of the behaviour, or pattern of interaction with people. However, in some cases, the behavioural development of an animal has been so abnormal (e.g. abusive), that the best option for its welfare, or for human safety, is to euthanize the animal. Using an electronic device will not be effective in these cases, and in general is completely contra-indicated, as it will tend to make an animal more anxious, defensive and dangerous.

i) What if you can't afford professional 'positive' training sessions?

The cost of seeking professional reward based training advice does not exceed that of seeking punishment based advice!

J) Do positive training methods work every time?

The effectiveness of any method depends on how well it is used. There is extensive scientific evidence backing up the theories of learning that are used in both reward based and punishment based training methods. There is also good evidence that neither will work as effectively in changing behaviour if the timing of the reward or punisher is not associated with the target behaviour, or is not applied consistently. The main difference between reward and punishment based training, however, is the consequent effects on the animal where the techniques are not applied well. Because punishers work by associating an action with a fear response, there is a danger that mistiming or misuse can lead to this fear response becoming associated with other events, actions or stimuli. With a severe punisher, such as electronic training devices, the level of fear created can lead to prolonged or permanent avoidance or aggression responses to these stimuli. On the other hand mistiming a reward will mean that the wrong behaviour is associated with a positive emotional response – which although can be a nuisance is more easily remedied, and is obviously less likely to create long term welfare or safety issues.

Document 4

Consultation on the use, sale, distribution and possession of electronic training aids
Kennel Club Response

NB: Throughout this document 'electronic' training aids are referred to as 'electric' training aids. This is because such devices work by emitting electric shocks. In addition all scientific research papers referred to have gone through the peer review process.

Questions 1: Should sonic or spray collars be treated differently to devices which transmit an electric shock or static pulse? Please state your reasons.

Sonic and spray collars are aversive training devices because if they work, they change a dog's behaviour through punishment, either in the form of a high pitched sound or a splash of liquid, rather than reinforcing good behaviour with reward. Like electric shock collars, they are not designed to tackle the root cause of unwanted behaviour.

However, unlike electric shock collars, sonic and spray collars do not work through emitting an electric shock, but through emitting sound and water respectively, and the Kennel Club believes that, for this reason, they should be treated differently. In a comparative study of the use of an electric anti bark collar with a citronella collar, the citronella collar was found to be more effective[1].

Even though sonic and spray collars are aversive, electric shock collars are more so given both the mental and physical harm that they can cause – this is explained in more detail in the later answers.

Questions 2: Do you agree with what we intend to cover? If not, what should be covered (and what should not be covered) and why?

The Kennel Club agrees with what the Scottish Government intends to cover if legislation to prohibit or control the sale or use of certain electric training aids is to be introduced. Such legislation is already in place in other countries (see enclosed briefing). Further, the Kennel Club welcomes the Scottish Government's distinction between the electric collars, mats and leads and the boundary fences used to contain livestock and horses. Although the boundary fences are also aversive devices the principles on which they work are different to the electric shock collars, mats and leads in so much as an animal can step away from the fence and therefore be in control of the shock; in addition the fence is used outdoors where an animal has an area of land to move freely in. Such fences are therefore less aversive than the other electric devices.

[1] Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996) Comparison of two anti-barking collars for treatment of nuisance barking. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **32**, 231-235

However the Kennel Club believes indoor boundary fences being used by dog owners who want to keep their dogs from going into certain rooms of the house should be covered by the Scottish Government's definition as they could fall under the term 'other device'. In comparison with electric boundary fences that are used to contain livestock and horses outdoors, we consider these types of boundary fences to be unacceptable and highly aversive because they are designed for use within the home, meaning that a dog will not have a large area to move freely in and may not be in a position to access food, water or outside space easily.

Question 3: Do you believe that the provision prohibiting "unnecessary suffering" in section 19 and the need to protect an animal from suffering and injury in section 24 of the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 are sufficient to protect animals who wear electric shock or static pulse collars or come into contact with "scat mats"? If not, why not?

The Kennel Cub does not believe that the provisions in section 19 and 24 protect animals that wear electric shock collars or come into contact with scat mats for several reasons.

Firstly dog owners, who would not otherwise breach their duty of care or inflict unnecessary suffering, are using electric shock collars and other similar devices since they are marketed in a manner that leads people to believe they are a harmless, fast and easy way to train dogs. Retailers' websites state:

- With reference to scat mats: "It quickly conditions pets to avoid prohibited areas with harmless, low-power electronic pulses similar to static electricity"[2]. "ScatMat emits a mild, harmless, static pulse when your pet touches it…the vet approved ScatMat works when all else fails".[3]
- With reference to stay mats: "Stay! Mats provide an effective, safe and comfortable environment… "Safe and effective way to train your dog to stay in one place"[4]
- With reference to anti bark collars, wireless pet containment and electric fences: "They are extremely effective, humane, and affordable products for your dog"[5].
- With reference to remote control electric shock collars: "training collars are built to provide quick and efficient corrections and they strive to get the most out of your dog"[6]. "It is mild but motivating!"[7]

Evidence that dog owners who would not otherwise breach their duty of care or inflict unnecessary suffering are using electric training devices is outlined through the anecdotal evidence provided in the answer to the next question.

[2] http://dogtrainingstore.com/scat_mats.htm
[3] http://www.petcaredirect.co.uk/Scatmat.htm
[4] http://www.petsafe.net/training/staymat.php
[5] http://www.e-collars.com/
[6] http://www.pet-super-store.com/html/Subcategory-22-0.html
[7] Dogtra owners manual for 'remote controlled dog training collars', p 3.

Further, given that such devices are being sold via mainstream outlets such as Amazon[8], E-bay[9] and the Ideal Home Show, this sends out a further message to dog owners that they are widely used and therefore harmless and ethical. Conversely, making the sale and use of such devices illegal, would indicate the opposite to somebody who was considering purchasing one. The Kennel Club has had correspondence with the more mainstream retailers of electric training devices as we have explained our position on the devices and asked that they be removed from websites. However until this is a legal requirement, the retailers cannot do this easily. Amazon's UK PR Manager has written to us: "We appreciate the points that are raised and will continue to monitor the situation with regard to the products mentioned. However, at this time, the product offering from www.paccollars.co.uk is fully compliant with the UK law and as such we don't believe there are grounds for removal"[10].

There are great ethical concerns regarding the use of electric training aids. The Kennel Club learned this when the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs issued the first open tender call for research on 'electronic training aids' and no academic institution or individual responded to it. When we contacted those institutions and individuals we found out that they considered sufficient scientific research existed to justify a ban on electric shock training devices and therefore further research was deemed unethical.

Dr Dennis Turner[11] stated: "Both at the university and at my private research institute, I would have great difficulties conducting such research for ethical reasons and the Ethical Commissions would almost certainly not approve of such tests, since such devices are principally forbidden in Switzerland".

Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell[12] of University of Bristol stated: "Given the wealth of peer reviewed research currently available on the physiological and behavioural effects of aversive stimuli, such as electrical shocks, on a range of different species, as well as the peer reviewed work done in dogs by Schilder[13] et al, Beerda et al etc we feel that there is a sufficiently robust scientific argument for the banning of the use of electronic shock collars in dog training. We are unable to conduct a direct experimental study on the effects of shock collars on dogs, as such a study would not be viewed positively by the University ethics committee".

[8] http://www.answers.com/topic/shock-collar
[9] http://stores.ebay.co.uk/Inner-Wolf_Remote-Trainers_W0QQfsubZ2
[10] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and Ben Howes, Amazon UK PR Manager, 8th August 2007
[11] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and PD Dr. sc. Dennis C Turner, I.E.T. / I.E.A.P., P.O. Box 32, CH-8816 Hirzel, Switzerland, www.turner-iet.ch. (7 August 2006)
[12] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and Rachel Casey BVMS Dip(AS)CABC Dip ECVBM-CA ILTM MRCVS & Emily Blackwell BSc (Hons), Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol. (15 May 2006)
[13] Please see enclosure for further evidence that the Schilder study is scientifically valid.

Question 4: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 be banned? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support a ban? If you believe that any of the devices should not be banned, why have you reached that decision and what evidence do you have to show that these devices do not adversely affect the welfare of the animals.

The Kennel Club believes that all of the devices listed should be banned but considers a ban on electric boundary fences to be less of a priority. The Kennel Club believes electric training devices a) cause dogs stress, b) fail to address underlying behavioural problems, c) cause further behavioural problems, d) can malfunction or be used to inflict deliberate cruelty, e) that the availability of positive training devices outweigh the need for such aversive devices, f) there is no need to use electric shock training devices to prevent dogs chasing sheep and g) electric shock training devices should be banned rather than be used as a 'last resort' to dog training. The reason for our having reached this position is based on the scientific and anecdotal evidence outlined below. We have also attempted to dispel arguments used by proponents of electric shock collars by focusing on scientific learning theory.

a) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they cause stress/pain

Stress is defined as physiological conditioning in response to environmental or psychological pressures. The Kennel Club is of the view that in order to change behaviour electric shock training devices have to hurt. We accord with the view "electric shock training devices hurt. They have to. If they didn't they wouldn't work"[14]

Scientific evidence

Polsky[15] stated in his paper about shock collars that they: "Have only one function: namely to deliver a painful stimulus to a dog. A dog absolutely has to perceive the shock as painful in order for the collar to effectively serve as a training tool".

During a study undertaken by Tservkov, Carlezon, Benes, Kandel and Bolshakov[16] researchers introduced rats to a sound that was accompanied by an electric shock to the foot. The shock, while of a low intensity, did cause the rats to be visibly startled. The day after the rats were trained this way, they were exposed to the sound but were not shocked. However, the sound still

[14] Carolyn Menteith, professional dog trainer, Association of Pet Dog Trainers.
[15] Polsky, R.H (1994). Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468
[16] Tsevtkov, E, Carlezon, W, Benes, F, Kandel, E, Bolshakov, V. (2002). Fear conditioning occludes LTP-induced presynaptic enhancement of synaptic transmission in the cortical pathway to the lateral amygdala. *Neuron,* **34***(2),* 289-300.

frightened them, even more so than during the initial training, and their fear increased as time passed. The researchers also concluded that the physiological changes occurring during emotional learning contribute to intense anxiety disorders, including posttraumatic stress disorder.

According to Dr Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell of the University of Bristol, rodents are often used as a 'model' species for other 'higher' species – for example in the testing of drugs that are used to reduce anxiety in humans. This is because the rodent brain has the same basic structures involved in the generation of emotional responses as 'higher' species do such as dogs and humans. Hence studies on the response of rodents to shocks should be considered a reliable model for the response of dogs.

Lindsay[17] states that electric shock at high levels can cause distress and emotional harm to dogs. He explains that contact with electricity causes the body to respond as if injured as the brain perceives a threat to survival that causes neurological, psychological (fear of pain), and physiological responses e.g. an increase in heart rate and cortisol levels. According to Lindsay, electricity activates muscular and skin-burning sensations even if there is no physically burned flesh and no physical damage has actually occurred. The study specifically stated that the sensation of burning was perceived even when there was no actual physical injury.

Based on research undertaken by Shalke[18], electrical stimulation causes a physiological stress response in dogs, especially when the dog cannot associate the shock with its behaviour. Tortora[19] also states that high intensity shocks cause behavioural responses associated with fear and distress such as yelping, struggling, biting, freezing, withdrawal, hiding, running to the owner, cowering, trembling, defecation and urination and that such responses can be detrimental where the dog cannot predict or control the shock. Solomon and Wynne[20] also found that electric shocks caused dogs to urinate, defecate, emit high pitch screeches, salivate profusely and roll their eyes rapidly with dilated pupils.

The Kennel Club notes that the dog is in control of shocks emitted from containment systems including the indoor and outdoor fences and the scat mats, but also that although a dog may be able to adapt its behaviour accordingly, it can only do so by initially showing signs of stress. Also, it is harder for dogs to control the shocks in more unpredictable circumstances, for example when wearing an electric shock collar, which is either owner

[17] Lindsay, S. (2005) Biobehavioral monitoring and electronic control of behavior. Handbook of Applied Dog Behavior and Training Procedures and Protocols, *Iowa: Blackwell Publishing,* **3**, 557-665.

[18] Schalke, E, Stichnoth, J, Jones-Baade, R (2005) Stress symptoms caused by the use of electric training collar on dogs (Canis Familiaris) in everyday life situations. Current Issues and Research in Veterinary Behavioural Medicine: Papers presented at the 5th International Veterinary Behaviour meeting, *Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana.*

[19] Tortora, D.F (1982) Understanding Electronic Dog Training Part 1. *Canine Practice,* **9** (2), 17-22

[20] Soloman, R.L, Wynne, L.C (1953) Traumatic avoidance learning: acquisition in normal dogs. *Psychol. Monogr: Gen. Appl,* ***67*** (4), 1-19

controlled completely or activates when a dog barks. Since, according to Soraya et al[21] barking is part of a dog's natural behaviour, a dog will not normally be able to associate the barking with receiving an electric shock, meaning that the dog will not be in control of the shock. All behaviour such as chasing and barking are examples of dogs engaging in pleasurable and most importantly, natural behaviour.

Dr Dunbar[22] has stated: "Of all the misuses of punishment, I think that the use of a shock collar to stop the dog from barking is the most barbaric…I find that anyone who would want to electrically shock a dog offensive and unnecessarily cruel".

Anecdotal evidence

Shalise Keating[23] from Rochester, Minnesota reported the following in 1999: "Our neighbour has an Irish Setter who wore a shock collar for about 5 years to prevent barking. She learned that if she kept barking that the collar would stop shocking her. So once she started barking she just wouldn't stop. She also had big open sores on her neck all the time from the collar shocking her…She frequently comes over to my house to play with my dogs. The consequence for barking in my yard and not stopping when asked is that she has to go home. She can be here 6-8 hours before barking. For about a year her collar has been broken. If I'm outside with my dogs and she is in her yard, all I have to do is ask her to be quiet and she will be…My point is that the shock collar did nothing except give her sores on her neck, it didn't ever get her to stop barking and just spending time with her and helping her to understand what was wanted of her worked".

Mr John D Tucker[24], reported the following to the Kennel Club:
"I was walking with my Labrador, Snowball, when he was attacked without any provocation or warning by a Doberman, Eli, who was wearing an electric shock collar. During the attack, the owner triggered the collar which simply further enraged the dog. When the owner finally got Eli under control, she took him about 15 yards away, made him sit, and proceeded to give him a prolonged shocking which caused him to howl, whine, yelp and writhe in pain, the whole time telling the dog "It's your own fault Eli, you shouldn't attack other dogs!"

b) Electric training devices should be banned because they fail to address underlying behavioural problems

The Kennel Club is of the view that electric shock training devices train a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment, i.e. stress and pain (as explained above), having received an 'electric shock' when it does not perform what is asked of it, rather than from a natural willingness to obey. Therefore we

[21] Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996) Comparison of two anti-barking collars for treatment of nuisance barking. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **32**, 231-235
[22] Dunbar, I. (1986-7) Barking. *Berkeley: Center for Applied Animal Behavior*.
[23] Shalise Keating is contactable via e-mail on shalise@rconnect.com
[24] John Tucker is contactable via e-mail on PATalban@aol.com

believe they fail to address underlying behavioural problems and leave the root cause of behavioural problems, such as barking or aggression suppressed.

Scientific evidence

Seligman and Johnston[25] have shown that while aversive conditioning can influence the suppression of unwanted behaviour, this is restricted to the presence of the conditioned stimulus after full conditioning has taken place. They found that while aversion conditioning may eliminate an unwanted behaviour, it does not serve to establish an acceptable alternative.

Schilder[26] compared the behaviour of dogs trained using remote control shock collars with a control group of dogs, during both free walking in a park and training sessions. In both situations the dogs previously trained using shock collars showed more behaviours associated with stress than dogs trained in a similar way, but without shock collars such as lowering of body posture, high-pitched yelps, barks and squeals, avoidance, redirected aggression, and tongue flicking, even during play and relaxed walking. The author concluded that shock-collar training is stressful; receiving shocks is a painful experience to dogs; and the shock group of dogs evidently learned that the presence of their owner (or his commands) announced the reception of shocks, even outside of the normal training context.

Another study undertaken by Polsky[27] also supports Schilder's experiment as he highlighted that a reason electric shock training devices fail to achieve the desired results is that dogs could learn that the shock is only applied when the collar is worn, meaning the unwanted behaviour returns when the collar is removed.

Overall's[28] theory too is that if shock collars do change behaviour, they do so not by addressing the underlying behavioural problem, but by causing the dog 'learned helplessness' or 'immobility'. She claims that proponents of electric shock training devices confuse this immobility with improved behaviour: "No one who is recommending shock for treatment of behavioural problems has evaluated the extent to which they may be inducing learned helplessness".
She recognises that not every dog subjected to electric shock training methods experienced learned helplessness as this only occurs when electric shock devices alter behaviour. She points to other cases where they do not alter behaviour at all because for example, "if (dogs) are fully engaged in attack behaviours, these dogs are likely to be further stimulated by pain, if they don't already override such outside sensations".

[25] Seligman, M.E.P, Maier, S.F, Geer, J.H. (1968) Alleviation of learned helplessness in the dog. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, **73**, 256-272.
[26] Schilder, M. B. H, van der Borg, J. A. M. (2004) Training dogs with the help of the shock collar: short and long term behavioural effects. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **85**, (3-4), 319-334
[27] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30**, (5), 463-468
[28] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behaviour modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4

In Seksel's[29] discussion of anti bark electric shock collars she concludes that that: "Several are available but none of these address the underlying causes of barking, just try to decrease the signs."

Studies undertaken by Bodariou[30],Walker[31] et al, Mendl[32] demonstrate that given that there is some indication that high levels of stress may influence a dog's ability to learn and that any punishment that is too severe may result in a stress response that impedes learning.

Expert evidence

Pat Miller[33], a certified pet dog trainer in Tennessee and President of the Board of Directors of the Association of Pet Dog Trainers has stated: "Shelter workers from across the country tell of the number of stray dogs who are brought in wearing them (electric shock collars linked to a fence). When their owners retrieve them…some will admit that their dogs will run through the fence to chase a squirrel or follow another dog". She goes on to highlight another problem: " Marauding canines, dog thieves, neighbourhood bullies – all have easy access to a dog who lives inside a fenceless fence".

c) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they cause further behavioural problems

The Kennel Club believes that not only do shock collars cause pain and fail to address underlying behavioural problems, but they also cause further behavioural problems e.g. aggression, as a consequence of the dog not associating the shock with behaviour that it perceives as natural. To illustrate, as a dog will have no idea what caused the pain, it is far more likely to associate it with something in its immediate environment than with its behaviour at that time. This is why cases of dogs attacking other dogs, their owner or another animal close by at the time of the shock are quite common, as is the dog developing 'superstitious' fears to things in the environment (such as birds, wind, grass and even other dogs and children) that were heard or seen at the time of the shock.

[29] Seksel, K (2003) Why do dogs bark and what can help to resolve the problem? *28th World Congress of the World Small Animal Veterinary Association,* Bangkok, Thailand, http://www.vin.com/proceedings/Proceedings.plx?CID=WSAVA2003&PID=6603&O=Generic
[30] Bodnariu, A. (2005) The effects of stress on cognitive abilities in kennelled dogs. *MSc Thesis: The University of Edinburgh, Royal School of Veterinary Studies, Division of Animal Health & Welfare, Easter Bush Veterinary Centre, Easter Bush, Roslin, EH25 9RG*
[31] Walker, R, Fisher, J, Veville, P. (1997) The treatment of phobias in the dog. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **52**, 275-289
[32] Mendl, M, (1999) Performing under pressure: stress and cognitive function. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **65**, 221-244
[33] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*

Scientific evidence

Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw[34] also concluded: "Punishment-based training seems to be linked with the increased occurrence of potential problems". In their experiment they found a link between the use of punishment and increased incidence of separation related problems, which were also exacerbated through the use of further punishment.

In a study undertaken by Reisner[35] the author stated that aversive tools such as electric shock stimulation could increase anxiety and therefore increase the risk of biting; in addition, he claimed that they were likely to lead to treatment failure. He advised that in order to reduce aggression, all circumstances, provocations, and aversive interactions associated with the dog's aggression need to be avoided, as many aggressive dogs are anxious or fearful, meaning punishment of any kind should be avoided.

Similarly Polsky's[36] study stated: "Any stimuli present when the aversive stimulus (shock) is presented may serve as a discriminative stimulus for punishment". In addition he states: "If the dog is subject to poorly timed shocks or shocks that last too long, then the dog is likely to become confused and possibly traumatized and probably afraid of the environment in which it was experienced. Effects like this can be long lasting and devastating, particularly in dogs with fearful temperaments." According to an impartial literature review undertaken by University of Bristol[37]: "This means there is a real danger of an unwanted association being made between the shock and some coincidental stimuli (e.g.: the presence of the trainer, or context in which the shock occurs), other than the performance of the targeted unwanted behaviour, even when the two are temporally contiguous. In addition inappropriate levels of shock may result in an intense fear and avoidance of the location e.g.: of the owner's back garden".

The University of Bristol[38] literature review clarifies that several studies undertaken by Heacock[39], Hutchinson[40], Polsky[41] and Tortora[42] support the

[34] Hiby, E.F, Rooney, N.J, Bradshaw, J.W.S. (2004) Dog training methods: their use, effectiveness and interaction with behaviour and welfare. *Animal Welfare,* **13** (1), 63-69
[35] Reisner, I.R. (2003) Differential diagnosis and management of human-directed aggression in dogs. *The Veterinary Clinic Small Animal Practice,* **33**, 303-320.
[36] Polsky, R. H (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468
[37] Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006) The Use of Electric Shock Collars and their Impact on the Welfare of Dogs, *Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol,* 1-8
[38] Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006) The Use of Electric Shock Collars and their Impact on the Welfare of Dogs, *Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol,* 1-8
[39] Heacock, D, Thurber, S, Vale, D. (1975) Shock-elicited aggression by human subjects. *Journal of Social Psychology,* **95**, 55-59
[40] Hutchinson, R. (1973) The environmental causes of aggression. *In J.K. Cole & D.D. Jensen (Eds) Newraska Symposium on Motivation: University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln,* **20**, 155-181.
[41] Polsky, R. H. (1983) Factors influencing aggressive behaviour in dogs. *California Veterinarian,* **10**.
[42] Tortora, D.F. (1982) Understanding Electric Dog Training Part 3. *Canine Practice,* **9**, (4), 8-17

argument that the use of electric training devices can cause behavioural problems: “Given that pain caused by an electric shock is a well documented stimulus for aggression in a wide variety of species (Heacock, Hutchinson) it is clear that the potential exists for a dog to respond aggressively to a nearby person (Polsky)”. For example Tortora, found that when electrical stimulation had been used to teach a dog not to chase snakes, some dogs attacked the snake. The literature review went on to say that “In cases of interdog aggression, shock collars will potentiate aggression if used when the dogs are fighting (Tortora) and case histories suggest that aggression is enhanced if used on dogs showing signs of fear or defensive aggression at the sight of other dogs” Ulrich[43] agrees that the perception of pain is a stimulus for aggression.

Expert evidence

The Association of Pet Dog Trainers[44] supports the Kennel Club’s view. They claim, that because dogs have a natural inbuilt flight or fight response when put in a situation that causes pain and fear, meaning the dog either does anything it can to get away from the source of pain (flight), or becomes aggressive in response (fight)[45], shock collars can cause further behavioural problems in addition to the one(s) being ‘treated’. Pat Miller[46] has explained that any visitor who crosses an invisible fence could be a victim of a dog’s pent up frustration and that if a dog’s arousal is high enough to run through an electric fence the immediacy of that shock is likely to add to the intensity of the dog’s aggressive behaviour.

Anecdotal evidence

Ms Val Palmer[47], a Bearded Collie owner has reported the following:
“I know of two Bearded Collies (brothers) that lived happily together for more than three years. The owner had a problem with one who was a ‘barker’ and was advised to buy an electric shock (anti bark) collar. However when the dog received a shock, it turned on its mate, as it did not know where the shock had come from. On the third day his mate turned on him and a fight took place. The owner took the collar off but every time the dog which had worn the collar barked, his mate turned on him and fights continued to occur”.

The following text is an extract from an article published in the Brighton Evening Argus[48]:
“A woman who used (remote control) electric collars in a bid to tame her dogs today called for them to be banned after her pets killed another dog. She sought the help of a behaviourist when (the dogs) started to run away…but

[43] Ulrich, R. (1996) Pain as a cause of aggression. *American Zoologist*, **6**, 643-62
[44] Carolyn Menteith, Association of Pet Dog Trainers, http://www.apdt.co.uk/press.htm
[45] Beera, B et al. (1997) Manifestations of chronic and acute stress in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* **52** 307-319
[46] Miller, P. (2003) ‘Simply Shocking’. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[47] Ms Val Palmer is contactable via e-mail on Karakarakk@aol.com
[48] Buckle, C (Thursday 25 October 2001) Turned Dogs into Killers. *Brighton Evening Argus*

the first time the dogs got a shock was by mistake, after a small dog they were walking past made Miss Langridge jump. From then on her pets associated the shocks with small dogs and became afraid of them". Miss Langridge described the incident: "I saw an old lady walking towards me with her little Shih Tzu…As she passed my dogs went for her dog…It was taken to the vet but they had to put it down…(my dogs) had never harmed anything before. They grew up around animals…I realised they connected the pain of the electric shock with little dogs because of the first time I used the collar".

Pat Miller[49] reported about a trainer:
"The 'trainer' put a shock collar around Andy's neck and one around his groin. He led Andy to the fence and shocked him repeatedly. According to his owner Andy screamed and bit at his flanks and the sight was so gruesome the owners couldn't watch. When the trainer was done he came in and told her Andy had bitten him in the leg…. two weeks later Andy charged through the fence again, knocked a girl into a ditch and inflicted level 4 bites. Andy was ultimately euthanased."

d) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they are high risk i.e. they can malfunction or fall into irresponsible hands

As the Kennel Club is of the view that electric shock training devices have to hurt a dog in order to work i.e. change behaviour, if a dog does not respond, then the punishment has to escalate, thereby creating further potential for abuse and cruelty. Also an angry or inferior trainer or even novice owner could misuse a collar to abuse and punish, especially given that the products are readily available by mail order, via retail outlets and on the internet and are therefore available to anyone who, with no training or supervision whatsoever, can place them on a dog and administer 'correctional' treatment.

Scientific evidence

Wells[50] 2001 claims bark activated collars have been affected by ambient noise. Polsky[51] also supports this claim and has stated: "Frequently the cause of random discharge is an extraneous radio signal from a source other than the hand held transmitter. The anti bark automatic collars are also prone to misfire". He also notes that most anti bark collars do not discriminate against different kinds of barking i.e barking that occurs during play, barking at a prowler or barking out of excitement and that if any electric collar is too tight on the dog or on the dog for too long then the dog may develop lesions as a result of the electrodes rubbing on the skin. He goes on to note that shock training devices are subject to mechanical failure.

[49] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[50] Wells, D.L. (2001) The effectiveness of a citronella spray collar in reducing certain forms of barking in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **73**, 299-309
[51] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468

Overall[52] points to the fact that manufacturers claims that shock collars do not hurt and that shock collars emit a 'static shock' cannot be proven: "There are no data to support someone's assertion that a model that 'taps' as fast as 1/1000 of a second is over as quick as a static shock you get from a doorknob". Overall goes on to question the assertion that if shocks emitted from training devices were subtle, and only used to get a dog's attention, why clickers were not simply used instead.

Anecdotal evidence

Pat Miller[53] has reported the following case:
"Rufus was a typical adolescent Labrador Retriever: Rufus's energy was a bit much for the younger children…A pet supply store (sold) a product that promised to solve problems with the push of a button. One rainy afternoon, a neighbour, sent his son out to the pen to take Rufus for a walk. Rufus wouldn't let the boy get near him. He said: "Rufus had this green colour round his neck under the training collar. I carefully removed the collar to find a huge gaping hole in Rufus' neck, under one of the prongs". Dr Susan Benson of the Animal Medical Centre in Preston, Idaho who treated Rufus' injuries claimed: "This was one of the worst electrical burns I have seen other than dogs who have had contact with high power lines."

Lesley Gray[54] wrote to the UK Leonberger Association to report a case of a shock collar causing long-term damage:
"At a recent event one of the participants put an electric shock collar (anti-bark collar) on a dog to stop it barking. The dog screamed in agony and panic. As the collar was noise activated, the more she screamed, the more the collar administered shocks. Within a few days the dog had lost all the fur from her neck".

Leslie McDevitt, a professional dog trainer reported the following on the 'say no to shock collars' website[55]:
"A local trainer was doing shock collar demos where my club was doing clicker and agility demos. She was using her 5-month-old Jack Russell Terrier as the demo dog. The puppy got out of her crate when this trainer left her booth, and ran loose around the expo... My friend noticed that the trainer was trying to find her puppy by shocking it as a cue to recall".

"The next year, at the same pet expo, we had another shock training demo. After the demo, the trainer was taking his two GSDs (German Shepherd Dogs) outside and the collar broke on one of them. The collar was burning the dog and would not turn off. The dog was screaming at the top of its lungs and bolted for the open exit door. The trainer was shouting at him to "SIT SIT"

[52] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behaviour modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4
[53] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[54] Leonberger Association Newsletter, (Aug/Sept 2006), **21**
[55] http://www.hollysden.com/say-no-to-shock-collars.htm#Shock_Collar_Abuse_and_Accident_-Trainers_Eye_Witness_Account

while he was trying to turn off the collar with his remote, and he couldn't turn it off. Finally the trainer caught up to the screaming dog and grabbed the collar and literally ripped it off the dog's neck while continuing to yell SIT!"

e) Electric shock training devices should be banned because reward based training methods are more effective.

The Kennel Club believes that the primary purpose of any training programme should be to improve the relationship and communication between a dog and its owner through compassionate reward based training. Positive training tools and methods produce dogs that are trained just as (if not more) quickly and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. With these alternatives available, the Kennel Club believes there is no need for electric shock training devices.

Scientific evidence

Scientific learning theory dictates that all animals learn through experience and if an action brings about a positive outcome, that action will be repeated, as it is beneficial. Similarly if the action does not bring about a positive outcome, it will be forgotten, as it is not beneficial. These reactions to external stimuli have ensured the survival of domestic dogs, and it is because dogs are so highly reactive to these learning experiences, and have a strong bond with humans, that people can utilise their natural instincts to train them easily.

This view is supported by the results of the questionnaire survey conducted by Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw[56] where owners' ratings of their dogs obedience during eight specified tasks was positively correlated to the number of tasks that were trained using rewards, but not using punishment. The study also found that the use of punishment techniques in the training of dogs was associated with an increase in the incidence of problem behaviours including aggression toward people and other dogs, fear, repetitive behaviours, overexcitement, anxiety, and separation issues.

Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw believed that using rewards exclusively in training may produce a more balanced and obedient dog, thereby reducing the number of owner-relinquished dogs in shelters: "Examination of the individual tasks provides no support for the value of punishment…Furthermore dogs trained exclusively using reward-based methods were reported to be significantly more obedient than those trained using either punishment or a combination of reward and punishment…Obedience is an important aspect of the dog-owner relationship…Because satisfied owners are less likely to relinquish or abandon their dogs, training methods that produce an obedient dog may exert a secondary welfare benefit…Because reward-based methods are associated with higher levels of obedience and fewer problematic behaviours, we suggest

[56] Hiby, E.F, Rooney, N.J, Bradshaw, J.W.S. (2004) Dog training methods: their use, effectiveness and interaction with behaviour and welfare. *Animal Welfare,* **13** (1), 63-69

that their use is a more effective and welfare-compatible alternative to punishment for the average dog owners".

Expert evidence

Approximately 1000 Kennel Club associated training clubs, the Association of Pet Dog Trainers, University of Bristol Department of Clinical Veterinary Science and some of the biggest dog training clubs in the country including Essex Dog Training Club and the German Shepard Dog Club of Great Britain do not use aversive training devices including electric shock devices to train their dogs. In line with this, neither the Police nor the armed forces use electric shock training devices to train their dogs and assistance dogs are also trained using only positive training methods. Given that police, armed forces and assistance dogs are amongst the best-trained dogs in the world, this proves that electric shock collars are not necessary.

Even in difficult cases where for example somebody had re-homed a dog that had only been trained using aversive methods, Casey and Blackwell[57] have confirmed to the Kennel Club: "Having experienced 'harsh' training methods is if anything more likely to make the dog resistant to electronic stimulation because dogs, as any species, will gradually become 'habituated' to, or more tolerant of, aversive events, so they gradually take less notice of them. A dog trained in such a way would be no less likely to respond to reward based training as this approach depends upon determining what motivates the dog and teaching the dog that it is more motivating to perform an alternative behaviour"

f) Electric training devices should be banned because there is no need to use them to prevent a dog from chasing sheep

If a dog is housed and exercised near livestock, proponents of shock collars argue that training may be more difficult due to some dog's chase instinct. The Kennel Club believes that dogs that are not trained in recall should be placed on a lead or extending lead. Not only is this the safest way of preventing dogs running into roads, but an offence is committed if a dog owner allows a dog to be at large (not on a lead or otherwise under close control) in a field of sheep; Under the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953 a person in control of a dog worrying livestock on agricultural land will be guilty of an offence. The Kennel Club's view that those dogs that cannot be trained not to chase sheep should be placed on a lead is supported by Compassion in World Farming.

Scientific evidence

Polsky's[58] study supports this theory: "If the dog's motivation to engage in the problem behaviour is high, then repeated applications of strong intensity

[57] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)
[58] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468

shock may be required. It is here where one has to be very concerned about the ethics involved…if too weak intensity shock is applied, it's likely that the punishment will be ineffective to stop a misbehaviour. Repeated applications of too weak a shock in the beginning phases of training may allow the dog to habituate to the shock. If this happens then it is likely the dog will tolerate and be unaffected by even higher levels of intensity that could subsequently be needed. The initial calibration of the proper shock intensity is not a straightforward task".

Expert evidence

Professional dog trainers including Carolyn Menteith[59] and professional behaviourists including Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell[60] claim that the success of using an electric shock training device to stop a dog chasing sheep would be based on luck rather than judgement, as it is "impossible to know" at which level the collar should be set when the dog is near the sheep as pain thresholds and levels of resistance in the neck varies between dogs. In order for the dog to think the sheep 'shocked' it, the trainer would have to wait until the dog was very near the sheep or else the dog would think the shock came from something in its immediate environment, which Casey and Blackwell have explained, creates two problems. One is that if the device is set too low initially, the dog gradually habituates to the pain as the device is turned up. This means the device can end up delivering a dangerously high level of current without the animal 'responding'. The other danger is that if the device is initially set too high, the dog will find the experience so aversive that it becomes frightened of the context/handler/environment. The other main risk, whatever level is chosen, is that the animal does not associate the shock with its own behaviour, but with something else that is happening in the environment at the time, such as another dog approaching. This would result in the dog becoming fearful, or fearfully aggressive of other dogs (as explained above).

This means if the trainer did wait until the dog was very near the sheep and the setting of the collar was low, there is a high chance that the shock would not prevent the dog from worrying the sheep. Similarly, the collar could be set at the highest setting but have no effect on the dog's behaviour because the dog would be so aroused by chasing the sheep. However, at a high setting the collar may physically harm the dog.

Casey and Blackwell have gone on to explain that whilst electronic collars have been found to be effective at stopping chasing behaviour in some cases, there is no evidence for the long-term efficacy of this method and therefore the risk of regression exists. In such cases where positive reinforcement has been attempted unsuccessfully, then there always remains the option of restraining the dog when in the presence of livestock – a guaranteed method of preventing chase behaviour.

[59] Association of Pet Dog Trainers
[60] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

Anecdotal evidence

Please note, that this anecdotal evidence proves that it is very possible for dogs to ignore electric shocks as a result of the intensity being incorrect:
On 26th August 2006, the Los Angeles Times newspaper[61] reported that a police dog, in the course of searching a garage for a burglar, repeatedly bit his handler, ignoring shocks from the collar he was wearing (NB. In the UK the use of electric shock training devices has been banned for Police and Armed forces dogs).

g) Electric shock training devices should be banned rather than be used as a 'last resort' to dog training

Proponents of electric shock training devices have argued that they can be used as a last resort method to train dogs with serious behavioural problems. However dealing with a dog's aggression is the most serious problem a dog owner could encounter and this would not be resolved through using a remote control electric shock collar. Other devices such as the two types of mat and the anti bark collar are not designed to address serious behavioural problems, they were designed to address house training and barking respectively.

Scientific evidence

Overall[62] has stated: "The use of shock is not treatment for pets with behavioural concerns; the use of shock is not a way forward; the use of shock does not bring dogs back from the brink of euthanasia; instead it might send them there". She goes on to state: "Claims citing efficacy of shock are not based in science or scientific method". In an open letter from Dr Karen Overall dated 6th December 2005[63], she further claimed "Dogs who have been treated with shock have a much higher risk of euthanasia than dogs not subjected to shock and I never recommend euthanasia".

Expert evidence

Casey and Blackwell[64] have explained: "Every animal shows behavioural problems for a reason. In resolving these problems, it is important to find out why the behaviour is occurring and change this reason. In almost all cases this can be achieved very successfully by changing the environment, consequences of the behaviour, or pattern of interaction with people. However, in some cases, the behavioural development of an animal has been so abnormal (e.g. abusive), that the best option for its welfare, or for human safety, is to euthanase the animal. Using an electronic device will not be

[61] Lin, S (2006) Santa Ana officer files suit over police dog bite *Los Angeles Times*, latimes.com
[62] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behavior modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4
[63] www.joelwalton.com/shockcollars.html
[64] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

effective in these cases, and in general is completely contra-indicated, as it will tend to make an animal more anxious, defensive and dangerous".

Question 5: If there was to be a ban, what are your views on whether the ban should be limited to a prohibition on the use of the devices or whether the ban should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices?

The Kennel Club believes that in order for a ban to be fully effective it should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices. This is because it may send out a confused message to somebody who was thinking about using an electric training device, if they were able to purchase the device legally but they were prohibited from using it. If they had not realised until after the device was purchased, this may cause frustration. If the use of a device is to be banned, it follows naturally that the sale and distribution should also be prohibited because there would be no use (from a consumer point of view) in being able to purchase something legally, which is then prohibited from being used. From an enforcement perspective, it would not be easy to find out whether electric shock training devices were being used behind closed doors, but it would be possible to keep track of sales of such devices.

The Kennel Club understands that it would be difficult to regulate a prohibition on the complete sale and distribution of the devices because it is possible to order them over the internet from overseas countries, however for the sake of consistency, there should be a prohibition on the sale and distribution of the devices within Scottish borders.

Question 6: Do you believe that a ban should extend to the possession of these devices?

Ideally, the Kennel Club believes the ban should extend to the possession of these devices. This is because it may not be possible to enforce a ban, if only the use of such devices were prohibited. Even if the sale and distribution of the devices were prohibited, people could still purchase the devices from other countries where they are legal over the internet. It would be beneficial from an enforcement point of view to extend the ban to possession because if somebody using the devices did not come to the attention of the authorities for otherwise breaching the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act, it may not be possible for an authorised officer to prove they were actually using them, even if the devices were seen in their possession.

Question 7: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 require a licence either by the operator or the seller? If so which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support that such a restriction is required?

Question 8: What criteria or conditions should be placed on the issue of a licence? Explain why you think this is necessary.

The answers to these two questions are combined:

The Kennel Club does not believe anybody would be able to be licensed for operating or selling electric training devices, since the main condition of any licence requirements should be that the operator uses the electric training device safely to ensure the welfare of the animal is not compromised. For the reasons explained above this is not possible as by their very nature, whether used by somebody experienced in dog training or not, electric training aids have to hurt the animal[65] and also risk creating further behavioural problems[66].

In addition in order to apply for the licence, the operator should need to state a legitimate reason for using electric shock training devices in order that he could prove the potential gain from using such devices outweighs the risks of using them. However this is also not possible.

In the case of using either type of electric shock mat, an indoor containment system or an anti-bark electric shock collar, such potentially damaging effects of the devices could not be outweighed through their gain since their purpose is to restrict a dog's movement within the home, and stop a dog barking respectively. However, most dogs live in the home and barking is part of a dog's natural behaviour. Seksel[67] agrees "dogs bark as a form of communication, as a greeting, as a warning, when they are fearful, in pain, anxious and when they are not sufficiently stimulated either mentally or physically…in many cases it is not abnormal".

In the case of remote control electric shock collars, the potential gains of using this device that are cited by manufacturers have been that they save sheep's lives and dogs' lives by allowing dogs to be exercised near livestock without chasing and attacking them, and therefore not being put at risk of being shot by the farmer. While the Kennel Club understands the theory behind this training method, as explained above, in practice it is virtually impossible for any dog trainer, experienced or not, to predict how aroused a dog is by chasing sheep and therefore at which level to administer the shock.[68]

Casey and Blackwell[69] have told the Kennel Club "Even an experienced trainer cannot know the appropriate level of stimulation required for an

[65] Polsky, R.H (1994); Tsevtkov, E, Carlezon, W, Benes, F, Kandel, E, Bolshakov, V. (2002); Lindsay, S (2005); Schalke, E, Stichnoth, J, Jones-Baade, R (2005); Tortora, D.F (1982); Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996); Dunbar, I (1986-7).

[66] Schilder, M. B. H, van der Borg, J. A. M. (2004). Polsky, R. H. (1994). Bodnariu, A. (2005). Walker, R, Fisher, J, Veville, P. (1997); Mendl, M, (1999); Reisner, I.R. (2003); Hutchinson, R. (1973); Tortora, D.F. (1982); Ulrich, R. (1996); Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006); Heacock, D, Thurber, S, Vale, D. (1975).

[67] Seksel, K (2003) Why do dogs bark and what can help to resolve the problem? *28th World Congress of the World Small Animal Veterinary Association,* Bangkok, Thailand, http://www.vin.com/proceedings/Proceedings.plx?CID=WSAVA2003&PID=6603&O=Generic

[68] Association of Pet Dog Trainers; University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science; Polsky, R.H (1994).

[69] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

individual dog in an individual situation (see above). In addition, there is no way that even an experienced trainer could control every possible inadvertent association that may be made when these devices are used in real-life situations".

Carolyn Menteith[70] claims that: "An e-collar is certainly a powerful tool for altering a dog's behaviour for better or, more likely for worse. For someone to be able to use it effectively in a way that would actually produce the behaviour they wanted, would require them to have a deep understanding of canine behaviour, a thorough knowledge of learning theory and behaviour modification, and an exquisite sense of timing. A trainer with all of those rare skills would, of course, have no need of a shock collar."

In the case of electric fences, the potential gains are that the fence prevents a dog escaping and either running away or in the worst cases, running into roads. The Kennel Club notes that most fences do emit a warning signal when the dog approaches the fence and that the dog has the ability to step back from the fence and still exercise in an area of land. However, it is important to note that this gain has to be balanced against the risk of a dog passing through the fence and not returning or developing superstitious fears and becoming aggressive as a result of associating the shock from the fence with another factor. An alternative to using an electric fence, is erecting a visible fence.

Question 9: Do you have any views on which body would be best placed to issue licences?

The Kennel Club does not believe that licences should be issued for the reasons detailed above.

Question 10: What effect would a ban on the use and sale of electric shock or static pulse collars in Scotland have on your business or organisation? Please detail the effect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 16?

A ban on the use and sale of electric shock collars would have no effect on our organisation in terms of financial gain. However a ban is consistent with the Kennel Club's objective to promote the general improvement of all dogs and encourage responsible dog ownership.

It is important that the Scottish Government's decision on whether or not to ban electric shock training devices is not based on how much financial impact this could have on retailers/distributors of such devices. The issue should be considered from an animal welfare, rather than a financial perspective.

[70] Carolyn Menteith, professional dog trainer, Association of Pet Dog Trainers.

Question 11: What effect would restricting the sale of electric shock or static pulse collars to licence holders have on your business or organisation? Please detail the effect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 16?

Again, from a financial point of view restricting the sale of electric shock collars to licence holders would not affect the Kennel Club's business.

However our main objective is to promote the general improvement of all dogs and encourage responsible dog ownership. This is more difficult if electric shock training devices remain legal as they do not improve dogs and are not consistent with responsible dog ownership.

Document 5

CONSULTATION ON THE USE, SALE, DISTRIBUTION AND POSSESSION OF ELECTRONIC TRAINING AIDS

DOGS TRUST COMMENT

Dogs Trust is the UK's largest welfare organization dealing with dogs. Fourteen thousand dogs passed through our network of seventeen Re-homing Centres in 2006. There are two Centres in Scotland at West Calder and Glasgow. In addition we provide subsidized neutering and microchipping in the areas where the most stray dogs are found and provide support for the dogs of people in housing crisis, women fleeing domestic violence, and people on earnings related benefits whose dog requires unexpected emergency treatment. As Dogs Trust deals only with dogs our comments will be restricted to matters that pertain to dogs.

Question 1: Should sonic or spray collars be treated differently to devices which transmit an electric shock or static pulse? In principle Dogs Trust is against any form of training that causes pain as we consider it causes suffering and is less effective than training by reward which makes the use of pain unnecessary. There is ample evidence[1] that shock collars induce pain in dogs. There may also be long term effects on the behaviour of the dog[2] that indicate compromise of their welfare such as chronic stress and learned helplessness simply in the presence of the owner. We therefore have no doubt that devices that emit a shock are undesirable. The use of other devices that are aversive without causing pain is more controversial. Furthermore, devices that emit only a sound as a marker and are therefore not even aversive are even more controversial.

If any of the non-shock type devices is used as a part of a structured training programme in the right hands to address underlying behavioural issues such as separation related anxiety, Dogs Trust considers that their use is acceptable. However we realise that any legislation that might embody such a requirement would be entirely unenforceable and therefore impractical. Furthermore, a device used to restrict a dog to a relatively small area in a house could be unacceptable as it could contravene Section 24 of the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 by inhibiting the animal from expressing normal behaviour patterns.

Devices that emit a non-aversive marker sound, such as available in some boundary fences, are unlikely to cause distress to a dog. Although we accept that training the dog may be more difficult we have no objection to such devices.

On balance therefore, Dogs Trust considers that any device that transmits an electric shock or pulse should be treated differently to all other devices as they deliberately cause pain during their use.

---

[1] Behavioural, saliva cortisol and heart rate responses to different stimuli in dogs, Beerda et al, Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 1998

[2] Training dogs with the help of the shock collar: short and long term behavioural effects, Schilder et al, Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 2003

Dogs Trust
17 Wakley Street
London EC1V 7RQ
T 020 7837 0006
F 020 7833 2701
www.dogstrust.org.uk

Question 2: Do you agree with what we intend to cover? If not, what should be covered (and what should not be covered) and why? Dogs Trust is content with the principles expressed in the consultation document. However we consider it would be more clear if the first sentence was to read "Any collar, mat, lead, fence or other device used or designed or intended to be used to train or control an animal by means of transmission of an electric current or other electric impulse across electrodes or by other means which may cause shock, pain or other stimulus to an animal wearing or in contact with the device."

Question 3: Do you believe that the provision prohibiting "unnecessary suffering" in section 19 and the need to protect an animal from suffering and injury in section 24 of the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 are sufficient to protect animals who wear electric shock or static pulse collars or come into contact with "scat mats"? If not, why not? Dogs Trust does not consider the provisions of the Act, excellent as they are, to be effective in controlling the use of these devices. We consider it would be difficult to prosecute a user of such a device as evidence of their use would be difficult to acquire and proof beyond reasonable doubt that their use caused unnecessary suffering or pain on a specific occasion would inevitably result in opposing expert witness arguing every case. Furthermore, most of these devices are used away from the public gaze and we consider that significant use would remain undetected and therefore unpunished.

Question 4: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 be banned? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support a ban? If you believe that any of the devices should not be banned, why have you reached that decision and what evidence do you have to show that these devices do not adversely affect the welfare of the animals? For all these devices Dogs Trust cannot accept the use of pain in training for the reasons stated in question 1. We therefore start from the premise that any device causing pain should be banned. We will deal with each device individually.

Anti-bark collar: The underlying issue is why the dog is barking. Dogs Trust considers that in the great majority of cases the dog is likely to be suffering from separation related anxiety. Suppressing the dog's barking is therefore not the primary issue and simply doing so by whatever means leaves the dog to continue to suffer. We therefore consider that the use of any such device must be accompanied by behavioural advice to address the primary separation issue. We consider the use of a painful stimulus in such circumstances to be entirely unacceptable and almost certainly counterproductive.

If the primary separation issue is properly addressed there should be no need for an anti-bark collar. However we can envisage circumstances where official complaints have been made to the local authority about noise nuisance and rapid remedies to reduce the noise are required to prevent the dog being re-homed or euthanased while further behavioural treatment is being provided. In such circumstances we reluctantly accept that the use of a spray or sound collar is acceptable.

Dogs Trust considers any anti-bark device that delivers a shock should be banned.

Remote control collar: Dogs Trust does not consider such devices to be acceptable in any circumstance. In particular the timing of the shock is critical, as it is extremely difficult to be sure that the dog will connect the pain of the shock with the unwanted behaviour. We are aware of instances of dogs relating the shock with objects such as visitors or children and consequently showing aggression towards them rather than aversion to the intended behaviour. Our judgement is that similar behaviour could be induced even with sound and spray versions of the collar

although we are not aware of them being in common use and we have no direct evidence. Dogs Trust considers they should be banned.

Electric shock training leads: The use of these devices is entirely unnecessary as there are very effective alternative means of training a dog to walk on a lead. Dogs Trust considers they should be banned.

Electric "stay" mats (wireless crates): These devices restrict a dog from expressing normal behaviour patterns and therefore contravene section 24 (c) of the Act as well as causing pain during training, to which Dogs Trust objects on principle. They should be banned.

Electric "scat" mats: These devices are also an unnecessary restriction on a dog's normal behaviour as well as causing pain during training, to which Dogs Trust objects on principle. They should be banned.

Electric boundary or "freedom" fence: Dogs Trust understands the motivation for a secure boundary for dogs. Indeed we insist that persons re-homing a dog from us have one where they have their own garden in which the dog could be free running. However our basic tenet that pain should not be used in training leads us to reject any form of boundary fence that leads to the dog being given an electric shock as we consider there to be preferable alternatives. However we are aware that some more modern versions of the collar allow the shock to be switched off so that it simply emits a marker sound. It is possible to train a dog to remain within a boundary by using the marker sound alone although it is likely to be more difficult to do so. We have no objection to such a process. However Dogs Trust considers that any boundary fence that causes the dog to receive a shock should be banned.

Question 5: If there was to be a ban, what are your views on whether the ban should be limited to a prohibition on the use of such devices or whether the ban should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices? Dogs Trust considers that any ban solely on the use of these devices would be impossible to enforce and would inevitably lead to the continuing sale and covert use of them. We can see no other reason for the sale and distribution of the devices other than their use. We therefore consider that the legislation should ban sale, distribution and use of shock collars.

Question 6: Do you believe that a ban should extend to the possession of these devices? If so, for what reasons? The arguments about the difficulty of enforcement mentioned above apply to the possession of shock collars as well. In addition, there has been a significant internet based import market for shock collars from countries where their use is legal, such as the US, that would not be covered by a ban on sale or distribution. Dogs Trust therefore considers that the possession of shock collars should be banned.

Question 7: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 require a licence either by the operator or the seller? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support that such a restriction is required? Dogs Trust considers that any of the devices that deliver a shock should be banned and licensing is not therefore an issue for them. We can see advantages in the alternative collars that use aversive stimuli requiring a licence to be sold or used. However we are aware of the difficulties in establishing such a licensing system and conscious of the proportional effort required. On balance we do not consider that the potential for harming a dog is great enough to justify the imposition of a licence requirement for any of the devices that do not deliver a shock.

Question 8: What criteria or conditions should be placed on the issue of a licence? Explain why you think that is necessary. If a licensing system were to be implemented, Dogs Trust considers that licences should be restricted to persons who have some formal training and qualification in animal behaviour. There are a large number of organisations providing behaviour training and it is of variable quality. Dogs Trust therefore considers that some system of accreditation would be required for any training or qualification to qualify for a licence.

This would undoubtedly raise the issue of those existing behaviourists who have no formal qualifications, some of whom are undoubtedly very competent. We suggest that there would need to be some form of 'grandfather rights' for those who could show that they have suitable experience, perhaps by proving to the licensing authority that they have successfully provided behaviour advice for a significant number of animals over a defined period of time.

Question 9: Do you have any views on which body would be best placed to issue licences? Dogs Trust is aware that there are a number of accreditation schemes for behaviourists and that they are set at different levels of technical knowledge and practical experience. We do not consider any of them to be more appropriate than others. We recommend that an independent body, such as a university veterinary school, should be consulted on a required standard and note that the Royal (Dick) Veterinary School has a centre of excellence in this field.

Question 10: What effect would a ban on the use and sale of electric shock or static pulse collars in Scotland have on your business or organisation? None.

Question 11: What affect would restricting the sale of electric shock or static pulse collars to licence holders have on your business or organisation? None.

Dogs Trust would be pleased to provide further information on this subject if it would be helpful.

Chris Laurence MBE QVRM TD BVSc MRCVS
Veterinary Director

Dogs Trust
17 Wakley Street
London EC1V 7RQ
T 020 7837 0006
F 020 7833 2701
www.dogstrust.org.uk

The Scottish Kennel Club: Eskmills Park, Station Road, Musselburgh EH21 7PQ
Tel: 0131 665 3920

Document 6

Consultation on the use, sale, distribution and possession of electronic training aids
Scottish Kennel Club Response

NB: Throughout this document 'electronic' training aids are referred to as 'electric' training aids. This is because such devices work by emitting electric shocks. In addition all scientific research papers referred to have gone through the peer review process.

Questions 1: Should sonic or spray collars be treated differently to devices which transmit an electric shock or static pulse? Please state your reasons.

Sonic and spray collars are aversive training devices because if they work, they change a dog's behaviour through punishment, either in the form of a high pitched sound or a splash of liquid, rather than reinforcing good behaviour with reward. Like electric shock collars, they are not designed to tackle the root cause of unwanted behaviour.

However, unlike electric shock collars, sonic and spray collars do not work through emitting an electric shock, but through emitting sound and water respectively, and the Scottish Kennel Club believes that, for this reason, they should be treated differently. In a comparative study of the use of an electric anti bark collar with a citronella collar, the citronella collar was found to be more effective[1].

Even though sonic and spray collars are aversive, electric shock collars are more so given both the mental and physical harm that they can cause – this is explained in more detail in the later answers.

Questions 2: Do you agree with what we intend to cover? If not, what should be covered (and what should not be covered) and why?

The Scottish Kennel Club agrees with what the Scottish Government intends to cover if legislation to prohibit or control the sale or use of certain electric training aids is to be introduced. Such legislation is already in place in other countries (see enclosed briefing). Further, the Scottish Kennel Club welcomes the Scottish Government's distinction between the electric collars, mats and leads and the boundary fences used to contain livestock and horses. Although the boundary fences are also aversive devices the principles on which they work are different to the electric shock collars, mats and leads in so much as an animal can step away from the fence and therefore be in control of the shock; in addition the fence is used outdoors where an animal has an area of land to move freely in. Such fences are therefore less aversive than the other electric devices.

[1] Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996) Comparison of two anti-barking collars for treatment of nuisance barking. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **32**, 231-235

However, the Scottish Kennel Club believes indoor boundary fences being used by dog owners who want to keep their dogs from going into certain rooms of the house should be covered by the Scottish Government's definition as they could fall under the term 'other device'. In comparison with electric boundary fences that are used to contain livestock and horses outdoors, we consider these types of boundary fences to be unacceptable and highly aversive because they are designed for use within the home, meaning that a dog will not have a large area to move freely in and may not be in a position to access food, water or outside space easily.

Question 3: Do you believe that the provision prohibiting "unnecessary suffering" in section 19 and the need to protect an animal from suffering and injury in section 24 of the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 are sufficient to protect animals who wear electric shock or static pulse collars or come into contact with "scat mats"? If not, why not?

The Scottish Kennel Cub does not believe that the provisions in section 19 and 24 protect animals that wear electric shock collars or come into contact with scat mats for several reasons.

Firstly dog owners, who would not otherwise breach their duty of care or inflict unnecessary suffering, are using electric shock collars and other similar devices since they are marketed in a manner that leads people to believe they are a harmless, fast and easy way to train dogs. Retailers' websites state:

- With reference to scat mats: "It quickly conditions pets to avoid prohibited areas with harmless, low-power electronic pulses similar to static electricity"[2]. "ScatMat emits a mild, harmless, static pulse when your pet touches it…the vet approved ScatMat works when all else fails".[3]
- With reference to stay mats: "Stay! Mats provide an effective, safe and comfortable environment… "Safe and effective way to train your dog to stay in one place"[4]
- With reference to anti bark collars, wireless pet containment and electric fences: "They are extremely effective, humane, and affordable products for your dog"[5].
- With reference to remote control electric shock collars: "training collars are built to provide quick and efficient corrections and they strive to get the most out of your dog"[6].

Evidence that dog owners who would not otherwise breach their duty of care or inflict unnecessary suffering are using electric training devices is outlined through the anecdotal evidence provided in the answer to the next question.

Further, given that such devices are being sold via mainstream outlets such as Amazon[7], E-bay[8] and the Ideal Home Show, this sends out a further

[2] http://dogtrainingstore.com/scat_mats.htm
[3] http://www.petcaredirect.co.uk/Scatmat.htm
[4] http://www.petsafe.net/training/staymat.php
[5] http://www.e-collars.com/
[6] http://www.pet-super-store.com/html/Subcategory-22-0.html

message to dog owners that they are widely used and therefore harmless and ethical. Conversely, making the sale and use of such devices illegal, would indicate the opposite to somebody who was considering purchasing one. The Scottish Kennel Club has had correspondence with the more mainstream retailers of electric training devices as we have explained our position on the devices and asked that they be removed from websites. However, until this is a legal requirement, the retailers cannot do this easily. Amazon's UK PR Manager has written to the Kennel Club: "We appreciate the points that are raised and will continue to monitor the situation with regard to the products mentioned. However, at this time, the product offering from www.paccollars.co.uk is fully compliant with the UK law and as such we don't believe there are grounds for removal"[9].

There are great ethical concerns regarding the use of electric training aids. The Scottish Kennel Club learned this when the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs issued the first open tender call for research on 'electronic training aids' and no academic institution or individual responded to it. When those institutions and individuals were contacted it was discovered that they considered sufficient scientific research existed to justify a ban on electric shock training devices and therefore further research was deemed unethical.

Dr Dennis Turner[10] stated: "Both at the university and at my private research institute, I would have great difficulties conducting such research for ethical reasons and the Ethical Commissions would almost certainly not approve of such tests, since such devices are principally forbidden in Switzerland".

Dr Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell[11] of University of Bristol stated: "Given the wealth of peer reviewed research currently available on the physiological and behavioural effects of aversive stimuli, such as electrical shocks, on a range of different species, as well as the peer reviewed work done in dogs by Schilder[12] et al, Beerda et al etc we feel that there is a sufficiently robust scientific argument for the banning of the use of electronic shock collars in dog training. We are unable to conduct a direct experimental study on the effects of shock collars on dogs, as such a study would not be viewed positively by the University ethics committee".

Question 4: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 be banned? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to

---

[7] http://www.answers.com/topic/shock-collar
[8] http://stores.ebay.co.uk/Inner-Wolf_Remote-Trainers_W0QQfsubZ2
[9] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and Ben Howes, Amazon UK PR Manager, 8th August 2007
[10] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and PD Dr. sc. Dennis C Turner, I.E.T. / I.E.A.P., P.O. Box 32, CH-8816 Hirzel, Switzerland, www.turner-iet.ch. (7 August 2006)
[11] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and Rachel Casey BVMS Dip(AS)CABC Dip ECVBM-CA ILTM MRCVS & Emily Blackwell BSc (Hons), Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol. (15 May 2006)
[12] Please see enclosure for further evidence that the Schilder study is scientifically valid.

support a ban? If you believe that any of the devices should not be banned, why have you reached that decision and what evidence do you have to show that these devices do not adversely affect the welfare of the animals.

The Scottish Kennel Club believes that all of the devices listed should be banned but considers a ban on electric boundary fences to be less of a priority. The Scottish Kennel Club believes electric training devices a) cause dogs stress, b) fail to address underlying behavioural problems, c) cause further behavioural problems, d) can malfunction or be used to inflict deliberate cruelty, e) that the availability of positive training devices outweigh the need for such aversive devices, f) there is no need to use electric shock training devices to prevent dogs chasing sheep and g) electric shock training devices should be banned rather than be used as a 'last resort' to dog training. The reason for our having reached this position is based on the scientific and anecdotal evidence outlined below. We have also attempted to dispel arguments used by proponents of electric shock collars by focusing on scientific learning theory.

a) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they cause stress/pain

Stress is defined as physiological conditioning in response to environmental or psychological pressures. The Scottish Kennel Club is of the view that in order to change behaviour electric shock training devices have to hurt. We accord with the view "electric shock training devices hurt. They have to. If they didn't they wouldn't work"[13]

Scientific evidence

Polsky[14] stated in his paper about shock collars that they: "Have only one function: namely to deliver a painful stimulus to a dog. A dog absolutely has to perceive the shock as painful in order for the collar to effectively serve as a training tool".

During a study undertaken by Tservkov, Carlezon, Benes, Kandel and Bolshakov[15] researchers introduced rats to a sound that was accompanied by an electric shock to the foot. The shock, while of a low intensity, did cause the rats to be visibly startled. The day after the rats were trained this way, they were exposed to the sound but were not shocked. However, the sound still frightened them, even more so than during the initial training, and their fear increased as time passed. The researchers also concluded that the physiological changes occurring during emotional learning contribute to intense anxiety disorders, including posttraumatic stress disorder.

[13] Carolyn Menteith, professional dog trainer, Association of Pet Dog Trainers.
[14] Polsky, R.H (1994). Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468
[15] Tsevtkov, E, Carlezon, W, Benes, F, Kandel, E, Bolshakov, V. (2002). Fear conditioning occludes LTP-induced presynaptic enhancement of synaptic transmission in the cortical pathway to the lateral amygdala. *Neuron,* **34***(2),* 289-300.

According to Dr Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell of the University of Bristol, rodents are often used as a 'model' species for other 'higher' species – for example in the testing of drugs that are used to reduce anxiety in humans. This is because the rodent brain has the same basic structures involved in the generation of emotional responses as 'higher' species do such as dogs and humans. Hence studies on the response of rodents to shocks should be considered a reliable model for the response of dogs.

Lindsay[16] states that electric shock at high levels can cause distress and emotional harm to dogs. He explains that contact with electricity causes the body to respond as if injured as the brain perceives a threat to survival that causes neurological, psychological (fear of pain), and physiological responses e.g. an increase in heart rate and cortisol levels. According to Lindsay, electricity activates muscular and skin-burning sensations even if there is no physically burned flesh and no physical damage has actually occurred. The study specifically stated that the sensation of burning was perceived even when there was no actual physical injury.

Based on research undertaken by Shalke[17], electrical stimulation causes a physiological stress response in dogs, especially when the dog cannot associate the shock with its behaviour. Tortora[18] also states that high intensity shocks cause behavioural responses associated with fear and distress such as yelping, struggling, biting, freezing, withdrawal, hiding, running to the owner, cowering, trembling, defecation and urination and that such responses can be detrimental where the dog cannot predict or control the shock. Solomon and Wynne[19] also found that electric shocks caused dogs to urinate, defecate, emit high pitch screeches, salivate profusely and roll their eyes rapidly with dilated pupils.

The Scottish Kennel Club notes that the dog is in control of shocks emitted from containment systems including the indoor and outdoor fences and the scat mats, but also that although a dog may be able to adapt its behaviour accordingly, it can only do so by initially showing signs of stress. Also, it is harder for dogs to control the shocks in more unpredictable circumstances, for example when wearing an electric shock collar, which is either owner controlled completely or activates when a dog barks. Since, according to Soraya et al[20] barking is part of a dog's natural behaviour, a dog will not

[16] Lindsay, S. (2005) Biobehavioral monitoring and electronic control of behavior. Handbook of Applied Dog Behavior and Training Procedures and Protocols, *Iowa: Blackwell Publishing,* **3**, 557-665.
[17] Schalke, E, Stichnoth, J, Jones-Baade, R (2005) Stress symptoms caused by the use of electric training collar on dogs (Canis Familiaris) in everyday life situations. Current Issues and Research in Veterinary Behavioural Medicine: Papers presented at the 5th International Veterinary Behaviour meeting, *Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana.*
[18] Tortora, D.F (1982) Understanding Electronic Dog Training Part 1. *Canine Practice,* **9** (2), 17-22
[19] Soloman, R.L, Wynne, L.C (1953) Traumatic avoidance learning: acquisition in normal dogs. *Psychol. Monogr: Gen. Appl,* ***67*** (4), 1-19
[20] Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996) Comparison of two anti-barking collars for treatment of nuisance barking. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **32**, 231-235

normally be able to associate the barking with receiving an electric shock, meaning that the dog will not be in control of the shock. All behaviour such as chasing and barking are examples of dogs engaging in pleasurable and most importantly, natural behaviour.

Dr Dunbar[21] has stated: "Of all the misuses of punishment, I think that the use of a shock collar to stop the dog from barking is the most barbaric…I find that anyone who would want to electrically shock a dog offensive and unnecessarily cruel".

Anecdotal evidence

Shalise Keating[22] from Rochester, Minnesota reported the following in 1999: "Our neighbour has an Irish Setter who wore a shock collar for about 5 years to prevent barking. She learned that if she kept barking that the collar would stop shocking her. So once she started barking she just wouldn't stop. She also had big open sores on her neck all the time from the collar shocking her…She frequently comes over to my house to play with my dogs. The consequence for barking in my yard and not stopping when asked is that she has to go home. She can be here 6-8 hours before barking. For about a year her collar has been broken. If I'm outside with my dogs and she is in her yard, all I have to do is ask her to be quiet and she will be…My point is that the shock collar did nothing except give her sores on her neck, it didn't ever get her to stop barking and just spending time with her and helping her to understand what was wanted of her worked".

Mr John D Tucker[23], reported the following to the Kennel Club:
"I was walking with my Labrador, Snowball, when he was attacked without any provocation or warning by a Doberman, Eli, who was wearing an electric shock collar. During the attack, the owner triggered the collar which simply further enraged the dog. When the owner finally got Eli under control, she took him about 15 yards away, made him sit, and proceeded to give him a prolonged shocking which caused him to howl, whine, yelp and writhe in pain, the whole time telling the dog "It's your own fault Eli, you shouldn't attack other dogs!"

b) Electric training devices should be banned because they fail to address underlying behavioural problems

The Scottish Kennel Club is of the view that electric shock training devices train a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment, i.e. stress and pain (as explained above), having received an 'electric shock' when it does not perform what is asked of it, rather than from a natural willingness to obey. Therefore we believe they fail to address underlying behavioural problems and leave the root cause of behavioural problems, such as barking or aggression suppressed.

[21] Dunbar, I. (1986-7) Barking. *Berkeley: Center for Applied Animal Behavior*.
[22] Shalise Keating is contactable via e-mail on shalise@rconnect.com
[23] John Tucker is contactable via e-mail on PATalban@aol.com

Scientific evidence

Seligman and Johnston[24] have shown that while aversive conditioning can influence the suppression of unwanted behaviour, this is restricted to the presence of the conditioned stimulus after full conditioning has taken place. They found that while aversion conditioning may eliminate an unwanted behaviour, it does not serve to establish an acceptable alternative.

Schilder[25] compared the behaviour of dogs trained using remote control shock collars with a control group of dogs, during both free walking in a park and training sessions. In both situations the dogs previously trained using shock collars showed more behaviours associated with stress than dogs trained in a similar way, but without shock collars such as lowering of body posture, high-pitched yelps, barks and squeals, avoidance, redirected aggression, and tongue flicking, even during play and relaxed walking. The author concluded that shock-collar training is stressful; receiving shocks is a painful experience to dogs; and the shock group of dogs evidently learned that the presence of their owner (or his commands) announced the reception of shocks, even outside of the normal training context.

Another study undertaken by Polsky[26] also supports Schilder's experiment as he highlighted that a reason electric shock training devices fail to achieve the desired results is that dogs could learn that the shock is only applied when the collar is worn, meaning the unwanted behaviour returns when the collar is removed.

Overall's[27] theory too is that if shock collars do change behaviour, they do so not by addressing the underlying behavioural problem, but by causing the dog 'learned helplessness' or 'immobility'. She claims that proponents of electric shock training devices confuse this immobility with improved behaviour: "No one who is recommending shock for treatment of behavioural problems has evaluated the extent to which they may be inducing learned helplessness".
She recognises that not every dog subjected to electric shock training methods experienced learned helplessness as this only occurs when electric shock devices alter behaviour. She points to other cases where they do not alter behaviour at all because for example, "if (dogs) are fully engaged in attack behaviours, these dogs are likely to be further stimulated by pain, if they don't already override such outside sensations".

[24] Seligman, M.E.P, Maier, S.F, Geer, J.H. (1968) Alleviation of learned helplessness in the dog. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, **73**, 256-272.
[25] Schilder, M. B. H, van der Borg, J. A. M. (2004) Training dogs with the help of the shock collar: short and long term behavioural effects. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **85**, (3-4), 319-334
[26] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30**, (5), 463-468
[27] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behaviour modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4

In Seksel's[28] discussion of anti bark electric shock collars she concludes that that: "Several are available but none of these address the underlying causes of barking, just try to decrease the signs."

Studies undertaken by Bodariou[29],Walker[30] et al, Mendl[31] demonstrate that given that there is some indication that high levels of stress may influence a dog's ability to learn and that any punishment that is too severe may result in a stress response that impedes learning.

Expert evidence

Pat Miller[32], a certified pet dog trainer in Tennessee and President of the Board of Directors of the Association of Pet Dog Trainers has stated: "Shelter workers from across the country tell of the number of stray dogs who are brought in wearing them (electric shock collars linked to a fence). When their owners retrieve them…some will admit that their dogs will run through the fence to chase a squirrel or follow another dog". She goes on to highlight another problem: " Marauding canines, dog thieves, neighbourhood bullies – all have easy access to a dog who lives inside a fenceless fence".

c) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they cause further behavioural problems

The Scottish Kennel Club believes that not only do shock collars cause pain and fail to address underlying behavioural problems, but they also cause further behavioural problems e.g. aggression, as a consequence of the dog not associating the shock with behaviour that it perceives as natural. To illustrate, as a dog will have no idea what caused the pain, it is far more likely to associate it with something in its immediate environment than with its behaviour at that time. This is why cases of dogs attacking other dogs, their owner or another animal close by at the time of the shock are quite common, as is the dog developing 'superstitious' fears to things in the environment (such as birds, wind, grass and even other dogs and children) that were heard or seen at the time of the shock.

Scientific evidence

[28] Seksel, K (2003) Why do dogs bark and what can help to resolve the problem? *28th World Congress of the World Small Animal Veterinary Association,* Bangkok, Thailand, http://www.vin.com/proceedings/Proceedings.plx?CID=WSAVA2003&PID=6603&O=Generic
[29] Bodnariu, A. (2005) The effects of stress on cognitive abilities in kennelled dogs. *MSc Thesis: The University of Edinburgh, Royal School of Veterinary Studies, Division of Animal Health & Welfare, Easter Bush Veterinary Centre, Easter Bush, Roslin, EH25 9RG*
[30] Walker, R, Fisher, J, Veville, P. (1997) The treatment of phobias in the dog. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **52**, 275-289
[31] Mendl, M, (1999) Performing under pressure: stress and cognitive function. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **65**, 221-244
[32] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*

Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw[33] also concluded: "Punishment-based training seems to be linked with the increased occurrence of potential problems". In their experiment they found a link between the use of punishment and increased incidence of separation related problems, which were also exacerbated through the use of further punishment.

In a study undertaken by Reisner[34] the author stated that aversive tools such as electric shock stimulation could increase anxiety and therefore increase the risk of biting; in addition, he claimed that they were likely to lead to treatment failure. He advised that in order to reduce aggression, all circumstances, provocations, and aversive interactions associated with the dog's aggression need to be avoided, as many aggressive dogs are anxious or fearful, meaning punishment of any kind should be avoided.

Similarly Polsky's[35] study stated: "Any stimuli present when the aversive stimulus (shock) is presented may serve as a discriminative stimulus for punishment". In addition he states: "If the dog is subject to poorly timed shocks or shocks that last too long, then the dog is likely to become confused and possibly traumatized and probably afraid of the environment in which it was experienced. Effects like this can be long lasting and devastating, particularly in dogs with fearful temperaments." According to an impartial literature review undertaken by University of Bristol[36]: "This means there is a real danger of an unwanted association being made between the shock and some coincidental stimuli (e.g.: the presence of the trainer, or context in which the shock occurs), other than the performance of the targeted unwanted behaviour, even when the two are temporally contiguous. In addition inappropriate levels of shock may result in an intense fear and avoidance of the location e.g.: of the owner's back garden".

The University of Bristol[37] literature review clarifies that several studies undertaken by Heacock[38], Hutchinson[39], Polsky[40] and Tortora[41] support the argument that the use of electric training devices can cause behavioural problems: "Given that pain caused by an electric shock is a well documented

[33] Hiby, E.F, Rooney, N.J, Bradshaw, J.W.S. (2004) Dog training methods: their use, effectiveness and interaction with behaviour and welfare. *Animal Welfare,* **13** (1), 63-69
[34] Reisner, I.R. (2003) Differential diagnosis and management of human-directed aggression in dogs. *The Veterinary Clinic Small Animal Practice,* **33**, 303-320.
[35] Polsky, R. H (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468
[36] Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006) The Use of Electric Shock Collars and their Impact on the Welfare of Dogs, *Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol,* 1-8
[37] Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006) The Use of Electric Shock Collars and their Impact on the Welfare of Dogs, *Department of Clinical Veterinary Science, University of Bristol,* 1-8
[38] Heacock, D, Thurber, S, Vale, D. (1975) Shock-elicited aggression by human subjects. *Journal of Social Psychology,* **95**, 55-59
[39] Hutchinson, R. (1973) The environmental causes of aggression. *In J.K. Cole & D.D. Jensen (Eds) Newraska Symposium on Motivation: University of Nebraska Press: Lincoln,* **20**, 155-181.
[40] Polsky, R. H. (1983) Factors influencing aggressive behaviour in dogs. *California Veterinarian,* **10**.
[41] Tortora, D.F. (1982) Understanding Electric Dog Training Part 3. *Canine Practice,* **9**, (4), 8-17

stimulus for aggression in a wide variety of species (Heacock, Hutchinson) it is clear that the potential exists for a dog to respond aggressively to a nearby person (Polsky)". For example Tortora, found that when electrical stimulation had been used to teach a dog not to chase snakes, some dogs attacked the snake. The literature review went on to say that "In cases of interdog aggression, shock collars will potentiate aggression if used when the dogs are fighting (Tortora) and case histories suggest that aggression is enhanced if used on dogs showing signs of fear or defensive aggression at the sight of other dogs" Ulrich[42] agrees that the perception of pain is a stimulus for aggression.

Expert evidence

The Association of Pet Dog Trainers[43] supports the Scottish Kennel Club's view. They claim that, because dogs have a natural inbuilt flight or fight response when put in a situation that causes pain and fear, meaning the dog either does anything it can to get away from the source of pain (flight), or becomes aggressive in response (fight)[44], shock collars can cause further behavioural problems in addition to the one(s) being 'treated'. Pat Miller[45] has explained that any visitor who crosses an invisible fence could be a victim of a dog's pent up frustration and that if a dog's arousal is high enough to run through an electric fence the immediacy of that shock is likely to add to the intensity of the dog's aggressive behaviour.

Anecdotal evidence

Ms Val Palmer[46], a Bearded Collie owner has reported the following:
"I know of two Bearded Collies (brothers) that lived happily together for more than three years. The owner had a problem with one who was a 'barker' and was advised to buy an electric shock (anti bark) collar. However when the dog received a shock, it turned on its mate, as it did not know where the shock had come from. On the third day his mate turned on him and a fight took place. The owner took the collar off but every time the dog which had worn the collar barked, his mate turned on him and fights continued to occur".

The following text is an extract from an article published in the Brighton Evening Argus[47]:
"A woman who used (remote control) electric collars in a bid to tame her dogs today called for them to be banned after her pets killed another dog. She sought the help of a behaviourist when (the dogs) started to run away…but the first time the dogs got a shock was by mistake, after a small dog they were walking past made Miss Langridge jump. From then on her pets

[42] Ulrich, R. (1996) Pain as a cause of aggression. *American Zoologist*, **6**, 643-62
[43] Carolyn Menteith, Association of Pet Dog Trainers, http://www.apdt.co.uk/press.htm
[44] Beera, B et al. (1997) Manifestations of chronic and acute stress in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* **52** 307-319
[45] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[46] Ms Val Palmer is contactable via e-mail on Karakarakk@aol.com
[47] Buckle, C (Thursday 25 October 2001) Turned Dogs into Killers. *Brighton Evening Argus*

associated the shocks with small dogs and became afraid of them". Miss Langridge described the incident: "I saw an old lady walking towards me with her little Shih Tzu…As she passed my dogs went for her dog…It was taken to the vet but they had to put it down…(my dogs) had never harmed anything before. They grew up around animals…I realised they connected the pain of the electric shock with little dogs because of the first time I used the collar".

Pat Miller[48] reported about a trainer:
"The 'trainer' put a shock collar around Andy's neck and one around his groin. He led Andy to the fence and shocked him repeatedly. According to his owner Andy screamed and bit at his flanks and the sight was so gruesome the owners couldn't watch. When the trainer was done he came in and told her Andy had bitten him in the leg…. two weeks later Andy charged through the fence again, knocked a girl into a ditch and inflicted level 4 bites. Andy was ultimately euthanased."

d) Electric shock training devices should be banned because they are high risk i.e. they can malfunction or fall into irresponsible hands

As the Scottish Kennel Club is of the view that electric shock training devices have to hurt a dog in order to work i.e. change behaviour, if a dog does not respond, then the punishment has to escalate, thereby creating further potential for abuse and cruelty. Also an angry or inferior trainer or even novice owner could misuse a collar to abuse and punish, especially given that the products are readily available by mail order, via retail outlets and on the internet and are therefore available to anyone who, with no training or supervision whatsoever, can place them on a dog and administer 'correctional' treatment.

Scientific evidence

Wells[49] 2001 claims bark activated collars have been affected by ambient noise. Polsky[50] also supports this claim and has stated: "Frequently the cause of random discharge is an extraneous radio signal from a source other than the hand held transmitter. The anti bark automatic collars are also prone to misfire". He also notes that most anti bark collars do not discriminate against different kinds of barking i.e barking that occurs during play, barking at a prowler or barking out of excitement and that if any electric collar is too tight on the dog or on the dog for too long then the dog may develop lesions as a result of the electrodes rubbing on the skin. He goes on to note that shock training devices are subject to mechanical failure.

[48] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[49] Wells, D.L. (2001) The effectiveness of a citronella spray collar in reducing certain forms of barking in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science,* **73**, 299-309
[50] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468

Overall[51] points to the fact that manufacturers claims that shock collars do not hurt and that shock collars emit a 'static shock' cannot be proven: "There is no data to support someone's assertion that a model that 'taps' as fast as 1/1000 of a second is over as quick as a static shock you get from a doorknob". Overall goes on to question the assertion that if shocks emitted from training devices were subtle, and only used to get a dog's attention, why clickers were not simply used instead.

Anecdotal evidence

Pat Miller[52] has reported the following case:
"Rufus was a typical adolescent Labrador Retriever: Rufus's energy was a bit much for the younger children…A pet supply store (sold) a product that promised to solve problems with the push of a button. One rainy afternoon, a neighbour, sent his son out to the pen to take Rufus for a walk. Rufus wouldn't let the boy get near him. He said: "Rufus had this green colour round his neck under the training collar. I carefully removed the collar to find a huge gaping hole in Rufus' neck, under one of the prongs". Dr Susan Benson of the Animal Medical Centre in Preston, Idaho who treated Rufus' injuries claimed: "This was one of the worst electrical burns I have seen other than dogs who have had contact with high power lines."

Lesley Gray[53] wrote to the UK Leonberger Association to report a case of a shock collar causing long-term damage:
"At a recent event one of the participants put an electric shock collar (anti-bark collar) on a dog to stop it barking. The dog screamed in agony and panic. As the collar was noise activated, the more she screamed, the more the collar administered shocks. Within a few days the dog had lost all the fur from her neck".

Leslie McDevitt, a professional dog trainer reported the following on the 'say no to shock collars' website[54]:
"A local trainer was doing shock collar demos where my club was doing clicker and agility demos. She was using her 5-month-old Jack Russell Terrier as the demo dog. The puppy got out of her crate when this trainer left her booth, and ran loose around the expo. A friend of mine caught the puppy and was carrying it around looking for the trainer. My friend noticed that the puppy shook hard in her arms intermittently. My friend then noticed that when the puppy shook, the red light on her collar was on. The trainer was trying to find her puppy by shocking it as a cue to recall".

"The next year, at the same pet expo, we had another shock training demo. After the demo, the trainer was taking his two GSDs (German Shepherd

[51] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behaviour modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4
[52] Miller, P. (2003) 'Simply Shocking'. *The Whole-Dog-Journal.com - A Monthly Guide to Natural Dog Care & Training.*
[53] Leonberger Association Newsletter, (Aug/Sept 2006), **21**
[54] http://www.hollysden.com/say-no-to-shock-collars.htm#Shock_Collar_Abuse_and_Accident_-Trainers_Eye_Witness_Account

Dogs) outside and the collar broke on one of them. The collar was burning the dog and would not turn off. The dog was screaming at the top of its lungs and bolted for the open exit door. The trainer was shouting at him to "SIT SIT" while he was trying to turn off the collar with his remote, and he couldn't turn it off. Finally the trainer caught up to the screaming dog and grabbed the collar and literally ripped it off the dog's neck while continuing to yell SIT!"

e) Electric shock training devices should be banned because reward based training methods are more effective.

The Scottish Kennel Club believes that the primary purpose of any training programme should be to improve the relationship and communication between a dog and its owner through compassionate reward based training. Positive training tools and methods produce dogs that are trained just as (if not more) quickly and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. With these alternatives available, the Scottish Kennel Club believes there is no need for electric shock training devices.

Scientific evidence

Scientific learning theory dictates that all animals learn through experience and if an action brings about a positive outcome, that action will be repeated, as it is beneficial. Similarly if the action does not bring about a positive outcome, it will be forgotten, as it is not beneficial. These reactions to external stimuli have ensured the survival of domestic dogs, and it is because dogs are so highly reactive to these learning experiences, and have a strong bond with humans, that people can utilise their natural instincts to train them easily.

This view is supported by the results of the questionnaire survey conducted by Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw[55] where owners' ratings of their dogs obedience during eight specified tasks was positively correlated to the number of tasks that were trained using rewards, but not using punishment. The study also found that the use of punishment techniques in the training of dogs was associated with an increase in the incidence of problem behaviours including aggression toward people and other dogs, fear, repetitive behaviours, overexcitement, anxiety, and separation issues.

Hiby, Rooney and Bradshaw believed that using rewards exclusively in training may produce a more balanced and obedient dog, thereby reducing the number of owner-relinquished dogs in shelters: "Examination of the individual tasks provides no support for the value of punishment…Furthermore dogs trained exclusively using reward-based methods were reported to be significantly more obedient than those trained using either punishment or a combination of reward and punishment…Obedience is an important aspect of the dog-owner relationship…Because satisfied owners are less likely to relinquish or

[55] Hiby, E.F, Rooney, N.J, Bradshaw, J.W.S. (2004) Dog training methods: their use, effectiveness and interaction with behaviour and welfare. *Animal Welfare,* **13** (1), 63-69

abandon their dogs, training methods that produce an obedient dog may exert a secondary welfare benefit…Because reward-based methods are associated with higher levels of obedience and fewer problematic behaviours, we suggest that their use is a more effective and welfare-compatible alternative to punishment for the average dog owners".

Expert evidence

Approximately 1000 Kennel Club associated training clubs, the Association of Pet Dog Trainers, University of Bristol Department of Clinical Veterinary Science and some of the biggest dog training clubs in the country including Essex Dog Training Club and the German Shepard Dog Club of Great Britain do not use aversive training devices including electric shock devices to train their dogs. In line with this, neither the Police nor the armed forces use electric shock training devices to train their dogs and assistance dogs are also trained using only positive training methods. Given that police, armed forces and assistance dogs are amongst the best-trained dogs in the world, this proves that electric shock collars are not necessary.

Even in difficult cases where, for example, someone had re-homed a dog that had only been trained using aversive methods, Casey and Blackwell[56] have confirmed to the Kennel Club: "Having experienced 'harsh' training methods is, if anything, more likely to make the dog resistant to electronic stimulation because dogs, as any species, will gradually become 'habituated' to, or more tolerant of, aversive events, so they gradually take less notice of them. A dog trained in such a way would be no less likely to respond to reward based training as this approach depends upon determining what motivates the dog and teaching the dog that it is more motivating to perform an alternative behaviour"

f) Electric training devices should be banned because there is no need to use them to prevent a dog from chasing sheep

If a dog is housed and exercised near livestock, proponents of shock collars argue that training may be more difficult due to some dogs' chase instinct. The Scottish Kennel Club believes that dogs that are not trained in recall should be placed on a lead or extending lead. Not only is this the safest way of preventing dogs running into roads, but an offence is committed if a dog owner allows a dog to be at large (not on a lead or otherwise under close control) in a field of sheep; Under the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953, a person in control of a dog worrying livestock on agricultural land will be guilty of an offence. The Scottish Kennel Club's view that those dogs that cannot be trained not to chase sheep should be placed on a lead is supported by Compassion in World Farming.

Scientific evidence

[56] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

Polsky's[57] study supports this theory: "If the dog's motivation to engage in the problem behaviour is high, then repeated applications of strong intensity shock may be required. It is here where one has to be very concerned about the ethics involved…if too weak intensity shock is applied, it's likely that the punishment will be ineffective to stop a misbehaviour. Repeated applications of too weak a shock in the beginning phases of training may allow the dog to habituate to the shock. If this happens then it is likely the dog will tolerate and be unaffected by even higher levels of intensity that could subsequently be needed. The initial calibration of the proper shock intensity is not a straightforward task".

Expert evidence

Professional dog trainers including Carolyn Menteith[58] and professional behaviourists including Rachel Casey and Emily Blackwell[59] claim that the success of using an electric shock training device to stop a dog chasing sheep would be based on luck rather than judgement, as it is "impossible to know" at which level the collar should be set when the dog is near the sheep as pain thresholds and levels of resistance in the neck varies between dogs. In order for the dog to think the sheep 'shocked' it, the trainer would have to wait until the dog was very near the sheep or else the dog would think the shock came from something in its immediate environment, which Casey and Blackwell have explained, creates two problems. One is that if the device is set too low initially, the dog gradually habituates to the pain as the device is turned up. This means the device can end up delivering a dangerously high level of current without the animal 'responding'. The other danger is that if the device is initially set too high, the dog will find the experience so aversive that it becomes frightened of the context/handler/environment. The other main risk, whatever level is chosen, is that the animal does not associate the shock with its own behaviour, but with something else that is happening in the environment at the time, such as another dog approaching. This would result in the dog becoming fearful, or fearfully aggressive of other dogs (as explained above).

This means if the trainer did wait until the dog was very near the sheep and the setting of the collar was low, there is a high chance that the shock would not prevent the dog from worrying the sheep. Similarly, the collar could be set at the highest setting but have no effect on the dog's behaviour because the dog would be so aroused by chasing the sheep. However, at a high setting, the collar may physically harm the dog.

Casey and Blackwell have gone on to explain that whilst electronic collars have been found to be effective at stopping chasing behaviour in some cases, there is no evidence for the long-term efficacy of this method and therefore the risk of regression exists. In such cases where positive reinforcement has

[57] Polsky, R. H. (1994) Electric shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association,* **30** (5), 463-468
[58] Association of Pet Dog Trainers
[59] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

been attempted unsuccessfully, then there always remains the option of restraining the dog when in the presence of livestock – a guaranteed method of preventing chase behaviour.

Anecdotal evidence

Please note, that this anecdotal evidence proves that it is very possible for dogs to ignore electric shocks as a result of the intensity being incorrect:
On 26th August 2006, the Los Angeles Times newspaper[60] reported that a police dog, in the course of searching a garage for a burglar, repeatedly bit his handler, ignoring shocks from the collar he was wearing (NB. In the UK the use of electric shock training devices has been banned for Police and Armed forces dogs).

g) Electric shock training devices should be banned rather than be used as a 'last resort' to dog training

Proponents of electric shock training devices have argued that they can be used as a last resort method to train dogs with serious behavioural problems. However dealing with a dog's aggression is the most serious problem a dog owner could encounter and this would not be resolved through using a remote control electric shock collar. Other devices such as the two types of mat and the anti bark collar are not designed to address serious behavioural problems, they were designed to address house training and barking respectively.

Scientific evidence

Overall[61] has stated: "The use of shock is not treatment for pets with behavioural concerns; the use of shock is not a way forward; the use of shock does not bring dogs back from the brink of euthanasia; instead it might send them there". She goes on to state: "Claims citing efficacy of shock are not based in science or scientific method". In an open letter from Dr Karen Overall dated 6th December 2005[62], she further claimed "Dogs who have been treated with shock have a much higher risk of euthanasia than dogs not subjected to shock and I never recommend euthanasia".

Expert evidence

Casey and Blackwell[63] have explained: "Every animal shows behavioural problems for a reason. In resolving these problems, it is important to find out why the behaviour is occurring and change this reason. In almost all cases this can be achieved very successfully by changing the environment,

[60] Lin, S (2006) Santa Ana officer files suit over police dog bite *Los Angeles Times*, latimes.com
[61] Overall, K (2007) Why electric shock is not behavior modification. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*, **2**, 1-4
[62] www.joelwalton.com/shockcollars.html
[63] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)

consequences of the behaviour, or pattern of interaction with people. However, in some cases, the behavioural development of an animal has been so abnormal (e.g. abusive), that the best option for its welfare, or for human safety, is to euthanase the animal. Using an electronic device will not be effective in these cases, and in general is completely contra-indicated, as it will tend to make an animal more anxious, defensive and dangerous".

Question 5: If there was to be a ban, what are your views on whether the ban should be limited to a prohibition on the use of the devices or whether the ban should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices?

The Scottish Kennel Club believes that in order for a ban to be fully effective it should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices. This is because it may send out a confused message to somebody who was thinking about using an electric training device, if they were able to purchase the device legally but they were prohibited from using it. If they had not realised until after the device was purchased, this may cause frustration. If the use of a device is to be banned, it follows naturally that the sale and distribution should also be prohibited because there would be no use (from a consumer point of view) in being able to purchase something legally, which is then prohibited from being used. From an enforcement perspective, it would not be easy to find out whether electric shock training devices were being used behind closed doors, but it would be possible to keep track of sales of such devices.

The Scottish Kennel Club understands that it would be difficult to regulate a prohibition on the complete sale and distribution of the devices because it is possible to order them over the internet from overseas countries, however for the sake of consistency, there should be a prohibition on the sale and distribution of the devices within Scottish borders.

Question 6: Do you believe that a ban should extend to the possession of these devices?

Ideally, the Scottish Kennel Club believes the ban should extend to the possession of these devices. This is because it may not be possible to enforce a ban, if only the use of such devices were prohibited. Even if the sale and distribution of the devices were prohibited, people could still purchase the devices from other countries where they are legal over the internet. It would be beneficial from an enforcement point of view to extend the ban to possession because, if somebody using the devices did not come to the attention of the authorities for otherwise breaching the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act, it may not be possible for an authorised officer to prove they were actually using them, even if the devices were seen in their possession.

Question 7: Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 16 require a licence either by the operator or the seller? If so which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support that such a restriction is required?

Question 8: What criteria or conditions should be placed on the issue of a licence? Explain why you think this is necessary.

The answers to these two questions are combined:

The Scottish Kennel Club does not believe anybody would be able to be licensed for operating or selling electric training devices, since the main condition of any licence requirements should be that the operator uses the electric training device safely to ensure that the welfare of the animal is not compromised. For the reasons explained above this is not possible as by their very nature, whether used by somebody experienced in dog training or not, electric training aids have to hurt the animal[64] and also risk creating further behavioural problems[65].

In addition in order to apply for the licence, the operator should need to state a legitimate reason for using electric shock training devices in order that he could prove the potential gain from using such devices outweighs the risks of using them. However this is also not possible.

In the case of using either type of electric shock mat, an indoor containment system or an anti-bark electric shock collar, such potentially damaging effects of the devices could not be outweighed through their gain since their purpose is to restrict a dog's movement within the home, and stop a dog barking respectively. However, most dogs live in the home and barking is part of a dog's natural behaviour. Seksel[66] agrees "dogs bark as a form of communication, as a greeting, as a warning, when they are fearful, in pain, anxious and when they are not sufficiently stimulated either mentally or physically…in many cases it is not abnormal".

In the case of remote control electric shock collars, the potential gains of using this device that are cited by manufacturers have been that they save sheep's lives and dogs' lives by allowing dogs to be exercised near livestock without chasing and attacking them, and therefore not being put at risk of being shot by the farmer. While the Scottish Kennel Club understands the theory behind this training method, as explained above, in practice it is virtually impossible for any dog trainer, experienced or not, to predict how

[64] Polsky, R.H (1994); Tsevtkov, E, Carlezon, W, Benes, F, Kandel, E, Bolshakov, V. (2002); Lindsay, S (2005); Schalke, E, Stichnoth, J, Jones-Baade, R (2005); Tortora, D.F (1982); Juarbe Diaz, S.V, Houpt, K.A (1996); Dunbar, I (1986-7).

[65] Schilder, M. B. H, van der Borg, J. A. M. (2004). Polsky, R. H. (1994). Bodnariu, A. (2005). Walker, R, Fisher, J, Veville, P. (1997); Mendl, M, (1999); Reisner, I.R. (2003); Hutchinson, R. (1973); Tortora, D.F. (1982); Ulrich, R. (1996); Blackwell, E, Casey, R (2006); Heacock, D, Thurber, S, Vale, D. (1975).

[66] Seksel, K (2003) Why do dogs bark and what can help to resolve the problem? *28th World Congress of the World Small Animal Veterinary Association,* Bangkok, Thailand, http://www.vin.com/proceedings/Proceedings.plx?CID=WSAVA2003&PID=6603&O=Generic

aroused a dog is by chasing sheep and therefore at which level to administer the shock.[67]

Casey and Blackwell[68] have told the Kennel Club "Even an experienced trainer cannot know the appropriate level of stimulation required for an individual dog in an individual situation (see above). In addition, there is no way that even an experienced trainer could control every possible inadvertent association that may be made when these devices are used in real-life situations".

Carolyn Menteith[69] claims that: "An e-collar is certainly a powerful tool for altering a dog's behaviour for better or, more likely for worse. For someone to be able to use it effectively in a way that would actually produce the behaviour they wanted, would require them to have a deep understanding of canine behaviour, a thorough knowledge of learning theory and behaviour modification, and an exquisite sense of timing. A trainer with all of those rare skills would, of course, have no need of a shock collar."

In the case of electric fences, the potential gains are that the fence prevents a dog escaping and either running away or in the worst cases, running into roads. The Scottish Kennel Club notes that most fences do emit a warning signal when the dog approaches the fence and that the dog has the ability to step back from the fence and still exercise in an area of land. However, it is important to note that this gain has to be balanced against the risk of a dog passing through the fence and not returning or developing superstitious fears and becoming aggressive as a result of associating the shock from the fence with another factor. An alternative to using an electric fence, is erecting a visible fence.

Question 9: Do you have any views on which body would be best placed to issue licences?

The Scottish Kennel Club does not believe that licences should be issued for the reasons detailed above.

Question 10: What effect would a ban on the use and sale of electric shock or static pulse collars in Scotland have on your business or organisation? Please detail the effect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 16?

A ban on the use and sale of electric shock collars would have no effect on our organisation in terms of financial gain. However a ban is consistent with the Scottish Kennel Club's objective to promote the general improvement of all dogs and encourage responsible dog ownership.

[67] Association of Pet Dog Trainers; University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science; Polsky, R.H (1994).
[68] E-mail correspondence between Holly Lee, Kennel Club Public Affairs Manager and University of Bristol, Department of Clinical Veterinary Science. (June 2006)
[69] Carolyn Menteith, professional dog trainer, Association of Pet Dog Trainers.

It is important that the Scottish Government's decision on whether or not to ban electric shock training devices is not based on how much financial impact this could have on retailers/distributors of such devices. The issue should be considered from an animal welfare, rather than a financial perspective.

Question 11: What effect would restricting the sale of electric shock or static pulse collars to licence holders have on your business or organisation? Please detail the effect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 16?

Again, from a financial point of view restricting the sale of electric shock collars to licence holders would not affect the Scottish Kennel Club's business.

However our main objective is to promote the general improvement of all dogs and encourage responsible dog ownership. This is more difficult if electric shock training devices remain legal as they do not improve dogs and are not consistent with responsible dog ownership.

Document 07

THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

Richard Lochhead MSP
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

19 November 2010

Dear Richard,

Re: Electric shock training devices

As you may be aware, Wales set a precedent for the rest of the UK this week after the ruling by the Royal Courts of Justice quashed the Electric Collar Manufacturers Association's request to overturn Animal Welfare (Electronic Collars) (Wales) Regulations 2010 introduced in March of this year in a judicial review. The Kennel Club was instrumental in securing a ban in Wales which we would also like to achieve in the rest of the UK. I am therefore writing to kindly ask that you join us in putting pressure on Seerad to move forward with a ban to prohibit the use of electric shock training devices.

The Welsh Assembly has led the way in animal welfare and the ban was the first of its kind in the UK. The Court ruling now paves the way for all UK governments to move for a ban after they proved that legislating against these devices was legitimate.

Electric shock collars are worn around a dog's neck and work either via a remote control with various settings which, when activated, deliver an electric shock to the neck of a dog, or deliver an electric shock to a dog automatically as a result of a trigger such as barking. A YouGov survey regarding electric shock collars found that 70% disapproved of their use, with only 9% of people giving their approval. Other, positive, training tools and methods can produce dogs that are trained just as (if not more) quickly and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. With these alternatives available, there is no need for electric shock training devices.

After many delays by Seerad we now feel it is time to act in Scotland and would ask that you put pressure on the Environment and Rural Affairs Department to move forward with a ban in the best interests of animal welfare.

If you would like to discuss this further please contact [redacted], Senior Public Affairs Officer on 020 7518 1020 or [redacted] to arrange a meeting.

Kind regards

[redacted]

[redacted]
Kennel Club Secretary

1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London W1J 8AB
Telephone 0844 4633 980 Facsimile 020 7518 1058
email info@thekennelclub.org.uk www.thekennelclub.org.uk

MCM Ho 17/10.

Document 8

THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

Secretary
[redacted]

Mr Alex Salmond
Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

RECEIVED
[illegible] OFFICE

18 OCT 2007

21 September 2007

Dear Mr Salmond MSP

As you may already be aware, the Kennel Club has long been campaigning for the use of electric shock collars to be completely banned across the UK.

Electric shock collars train a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment, having received a 'static shock' when it does not perform what is asked of it, rather than from a natural willingness to obey. In order for the collar to serve effectively as a training tool, the dog has to perceive the shock as painful - moreover if the dog does not respond the punishment has to escalate, creating further potential for abuse.

The Kennel Club is delighted that the Scottish Government has issued a consultation seeking views regarding the use, sale, distribution and possession of electric shock collars in Scotland. I am writing to you to ask you to consider signing **Motion S3M-428: Electric Training Devices** tabled by Kenneth Gibson MSP and to write to the Minister for Environment and Rural Affairs, Richard Lochhead, to show your support for the consultation. I have attached a briefing for your information but should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact [redacted] on [redacted] or email [redacted]@thekennelclub.org.uk

Thank you for your support on this issue.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]
Kennel Club Secretary

1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London W1J 8AB
Telephone 020 7518 1056 Facsimile 020 7518 1028
www.thekennelclub.org.uk

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, W1J 8AB. T: 0207 518 1020

Briefing Note: Electric Shock Collars and Other Training Devices

1. What Electric Shock Collars and Other Devices are:

- **Electric shock collars** - worn around a dog's neck these work either via a remote control with various settings which, when pressed, deliver an electric shock to the neck of a dog or; deliver an electric shock to a dog automatically when a dog barks.
- **Electric shock mats** - there are two types of electric mats: one is known as a 'wireless crate' and emits electric shocks to the dog when it steps off the mat and the other is called a 'scat mat' and emits an electric shock to the dog when it steps on it.
- **Electric shock leads** - these emit electric shocks to a dog if it exerts more pressure on the lead than is considered 'normal' for its size.

2. Why Electric Training Devices are not Effective:

- **Scientific learning theory** - this dictates that if a dog has a strong desire to indulge in pleasurable natural behaviour, any negative training method employed to prevent this has to be far more unpleasant for them than their natural behaviour is pleasant (i.e. be extremely aversive). Therefore if an action brings about a positive outcome, that action will be repeated, as it is beneficial
- **Failure to address underlying behavioural problems** – electric training devices alter behaviour due to fear of further punishment rather than a natural willingness to obey. Any change in behaviour would result from the dog perceiving the shock as painful. "An electric shock collar hurts. It has to. If it didn't, it wouldn't work" (Carolyn Menteith, Dog Trainer, Association of Pet Dog Trainers)
- **Cause of further behavioural problems** - dogs have a natural inbuilt flight or fight response when put in a situation that causes pain and fear, meaning the dog either does anything it can to get away from the source of pain (flight), or becomes aggressive in response (fight). This means shock collars can cause further behavioural problems in addition to the one(s) being 'treated'. As a dog will have no idea what caused the pain, it is far more likely to associate it with something in its immediate environment than with its behaviour at that time. This is why cases of dogs attacking other dogs, their owner or another animal close by at the time of the shock are quite common, as is the dog developing 'superstitious' fears to things in the environment that were heard or seen at the time of the shock.

3. Why Electric Shock Collars are used:

The most common defence for using electric shock collars (which does not apply to the other devices, for which, the Kennel Club has not heard a defence) is that they train dogs to stop chasing sheep. However it is important to note that:

It is virtually impossible to use an electric shock collar to train a dog to not chase sheep – the theory behind the training method is that the dog will believe the sheep gave it an electric shock and not chase sheep again.

- Professional dog trainers claim that the success of this would be based on luck rather than judgement, as it is impossible to know at which level the collar should be set when the dog is near the sheep. In order for the dog to think the sheep 'shocked' it, the trainer would have to wait until the dog was very near the sheep or else, the dog would think the shock came from something in its immediate environment (see above).
- If the trainer did wait until the dog was very near the sheep and the setting of the collar was low, there is a high chance that the shock would not prevent the dog from worrying the sheep. Similarly, the collar could be set at the highest setting but have no effect on the dog's behaviour because the dog would be so aroused

by chasing the sheep. However, at a high setting the collar may physically harm the dog.

- Under the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953 a person in control of a dog worrying livestock on agricultural land will be guilty of an offence. Under this Act dogs must be kept on leads or under close control.
- Dogs exercised near livestock should be kept on leads - it's that simple!

4. Positive Alternative Training Methods and Devices:

There are other, positive, training tools and methods that can produce dogs that are trained just as (if not more) quickly and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. Police dogs, armed forces dogs and assistance dogs may not be trained using electric shock training devices. Similarly the two largest German Shepherd Dog clubs in the country have banned the use of electric shock collars from their training grounds. With these alternatives available, there is no need for electric shock training devices:

- **Clicker Training** – Method of reward based training whereby the dog is taught to associate a particular sound (a click) with a successful action and a resultant reward. It is a proven method of communicating effectively with a dog using positive reinforcement, giving owners the ability to train their dog to a high level without any need for force or punishment.
- **Recall** - Used to teach a dog to return to its owner on command, recall is usually the basis of any puppy-training programme and results in an owner being able to control their dog easily. A reliable recall is best achieved through rewarding successful returns to the owner (i.e. with treats) rather than by punishing mistakes. This way, a dog returns to its owner because of the bond between them.
- **Retractable lead** – A lead that extends so the dog can walk further from its owner, giving the dog freedom, whilst keeping it under control. It is especially useful for untrained dogs, dogs with a strong chase instinct, or exercising dogs near livestock (see section 3.1).

5. Research on Electric Shock Training Devices:

The Kennel Club has obtained peer reviewed scientific evidence which proves that the use of electronic training products is 'not only unpleasant but also painful and frightening' and 'may influence the dog's well being in the long term in a negative way'. Since then:

- DEFRA issued an open tender call for scientific research but received only one response which could not be followed up because it was a proposal for a non-invasive study (i.e. a study that would not have involved actually testing shock collars on dogs).
- The Kennel Club contacted Universities and academics to find out why they had not responded to the open call and were informed that Defra's proposal would not get past their universities' respective ethics committees given that enough research already existed to prove electric shock training devices were cruel.
- This left a 'catch 22' situation whereby Defra wanted further research on electric training devices and the Universities they wanted to carry this out would not do so because they believed the research already existed.
- Defra has since issued a second, limited tender call for research and appointed the Companion Animal Welfare Council (CAWC) to undertake an inquiry into 'electronic training devices' but it is unknown how long this will take to complete. In the meantime based on scientific evidence and ethical objections, the then Welsh Minister responsible for animal welfare, Carwyn Jones stated his intentions to bring forward a ban on electric shock collars. Both his predecessors Jane Davidson AM and Elin Jones AM have said they will carry forward this commitment.

The Kennel Club: 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, W1J 8AB. T:020 7518 1020

Information Guide 1:
Kennel Club Position Statement on Electric Shock Collars

The Kennel Club has produced this information guide as an introduction to the Kennel Club's views on electric shock collars.

Since the Animals (Electric Shock) Collars Bill ran out of Parliamentary time in 2003, the Kennel Club has campaigned to see the product banned for the following reasons

- Electric shock collars train a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment, having received a 'static shock' when it does not perform what is asked of it, rather than from a natural willingness to obey.
- In order for the collar to serve effectively as a training tool, the dog has to perceive the shock as painful – moreover if a dog does not respond, then the punishment has to escalate, creating further potential for abuse and cruelty.
- An angry or inferior trainer or even novice owner could misuse a collar to abuse and punish.
- The products are readily available by mail order, via retail outlets and on the Internet, and therefore available to anyone who, with no training or supervision whatsoever, can place them on a dog and administer 'correctional' treatment.
- Ultimately such training devices do not address underlying behavioural problems, leaving the cause of the barking or aggression suppressed, and may cause further behavioural problems in the future.

The primary purpose of any training programme should be to improve the relationship and communication between a dog and its owner through compassionate reward based training. There are other, positive, training tools and methods that can produce dogs that are trained just as (if not more) quickly and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. With these alternatives available, there is no need for electric shock collars.

The Kennel Club is calling on the Government to introduce a complete ban on the sale and use of training devices that emit electric shocks to dogs via collars, as part of the forthcoming Animal Welfare Act.

The Kennel Club: 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, W1J 8AB. T: 020 7518 1020

Information Guide 2:
Electric Shock Dog Training: Devices and Retailers

The Kennel Club has produced this paper to raise awareness of the growing range of electric dog training devices entering the market, and out of concern that their use is increasingly considered the 'normal' way to train dogs.

Electric Shock Training Devices

Device	Description	Battery Voltage	Cost
Anti-bark shock collars	Used to train a dog not to bark, these collars emit an electric shock to the dog every time it barks while wearing the collar. Attached to the collar is a box with two metal prongs that sit against the dog's neck. Settings on the collar can range from 1-100 and most do not emit a beeping sound to warn the dog of the shock.	6* – 9 volts depending on size	Around £70
Remote control shock collars	Used to correct any unwanted behaviour, these collars deliver a shock via an owner-operated remote control, also with settings ranging between 1-100 depending on the model. The collar looks the same as an anti-bark collar but the remote control has 2 buttons: one delivers a short sharp shock and the other, a constant 12-second shock.	3 – 9 volts depending on size	Up to £270
Electric shock training lead	Used to prevent a dog from pulling on the lead when walking, these leads operate via a sensor that detects the pressure being exerted against it and emits an electric shock when the dog exerts more pressure than is considered normal for its size. The level of electric shock increases in line with the amount of pressure the dog puts on the lead.	6* volts	Around £50
Electric shock mats (wireless crates)	Designed to keep a dog in one place at home, wireless crates detect a dog's weight and emit electric shocks via a collar to the dog when it is within a 6ft radius of the 'crate', until it returns. Although the collar emits a beeping sound before a shock, this would be unlikely to deter a dog from needing to go to the toilet or needing to get water.	Unknown	Up to £80
Electric mats (scat mats)	Designed for use within the home, to train a dog to avoid certain areas where the mat is placed, scat mats emit an electric shock when the dog makes contact with a mat in any two places at one time i.e. when it has at least 2 paws on the mat.	9 volts	Up to £45
Electric Fence	Designed to keep a dog within certain boundaries, indoor and outdoor fences emit an electric shock to a dog that steps outside this, sometimes following a warning sound.	3-9 volts	Around £150 (+ fitting

***NB for comparison: A Black and Decker Drill/Driver also requires a 6-volt battery**

Retailers of Electric Training Devices:

Electric shock training devices are readily available by mail order and via the Internet and are easily accessible to people with limited experience to administer 'correctional treatment' or by an inferior trainer to abuse and punish. Instruction manuals may be sold with products, but usually for an additional charge.

The various types of shock collars are sold at outlets in the UK as well as over the internet. Other types of electric training devices can easily be imported into the UK via numerous dog training websites as well as mainstream ones, including Amazon and e-bay.

In addition to this, while Crufts and other Kennel Club licensed events ban the sale and use of electric shock training products, they are sold at exhibitions including the Ideal Home Show and can even be hired from tool shops.

Conclusion:

The growing range of electric training devices as well as the escalating number of retailers that sell them indicates that their use is increasingly considered the 'normal' way to train dogs. Although marketed as a non-harmful quick fix solution for altering behaviour, electric training devices (if they work), alter behaviour through pain, fear and suffering. There are other, positive, training tools and methods that can produce dogs that are trained quickly, easily and reliably, with absolutely no fear, pain, or potential damage to the relationship between dog and handler. With these alternatives available, there is no justification for electric shock training devices.

The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges Street, London W1J 8AB. T:020 7518 1020

Information Guide 3:
Dog Training Learning Theory – supported by leading academics and behaviourists

The Kennel Club has produced this information guide to explain why electric shock collars are ineffective training tools. Renowned behaviourists at Bristol University and the Association of Pet Dog Trainers have approved this paper.

Introduction – why dogs can be trained

Scientific learning theory dictates that if a dog has a strong desire to indulge in pleasurable natural behaviour, any negative training method employed to prevent this has to be far more unpleasant for them than their natural behaviour is pleasant - in other words, be extremely aversive. All behaviour such as chasing, barking, and biting are examples of dogs engaging in pleasurable and natural behaviour.

However, all animals learn through experience and if an action brings about a positive outcome, that action will be repeated, as it is beneficial. Similarly if the action does not bring about a positive outcome, it will be forgotten, as it is not beneficial. These reactions to external stimuli have ensured the survival of domestic dogs, and it is because dogs are so highly reactive to these learning experiences, and have a strong bond with humans, people can utilise their natural instincts to train them easily.

The importance of the animal/human bond to aid training

Recall[1] (training a dog to return to its owner on command) is usually the basis of any puppy-training programme and results in an owner being able to control their dog easily, by ensuring it will return to them. A dog returns to its owner because of the bond that develops between them as a result of positive training. To illustrate, a dog that is rewarded every time it comes to its owner will continue to do so just as a dog that is trained through pain and fear may not because such training will likely have weakened its bond with the owner.

The effects of negative training

As shock collars train a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment, rather than a natural willingness to obey, they do not address underlying behavioural problems, leaving the cause of the barking or aggression suppressed.

In addition to this because dogs have a natural inbuilt flight or fight response when put in a situation that causes pain and fear, meaning the dog either does anything it can to get away from the source of pain (flight), or becomes aggressive in response (fight), shock collars can cause further behavioural problems in addition to the one(s) being 'treated'. To illustrate, as a dog will have no idea what caused the pain, it is far more likely to associate it with

[1] Recall is explained further in Information Guide 2

something in its immediate environment than with its behaviour at that time. This is why cases of dogs attacking other dogs, their owner or another animal close by at the time of the shock are quite common, as is the dog developing 'superstitious' fears to things in the environment (such as birds, wind and grass) that were heard or seen at the time of the shock.

Difficulties in dog training

If a dog is housed and exercised near livestock, recall training may be more difficult due to some dogs' chase instinct. While in these circumstances shock collars are often employed to instil an aversive reaction to the livestock and prevent chasing, dogs that are not trained in recall should be placed on a lead or flexi-lead. Not only is this the safest way of preventing dogs running into roads, but a civil offence is committed if a dog owner allows a dog to be at large (not on a lead or otherwise under close control) in a field of sheep; Under the Dogs (Protection of Livestock) Act 1953 a person in control of a dog worrying livestock on agricultural land will be guilty of an offence.

Conclusion

"An electric shock collar hurts. It has to. If it didn't, it wouldn't work" (Carolyn Mentelth, Dog Trainer affiliated to the Association of Pet Dog Trainers) In instances where dogs do not become aggressive or do not develop serious psychological problems as a result of shock collar use, they can indeed alter behaviour. The reason they do is because they cause enough pain that a dog is forced to submit. **With the advent of the Animal Welfare Bill, the Kennel Club feels it is time the government recognised that pain and fear are not humane methods to educate or train any creature.**

Information Guide 4:
Alternatives to Electric Training Devices

The Kennel Club has produced this information guide to raise awareness of alternative training devices to electric shock collars.

Alternative Training Devices, Methods and Accessories

Device/Method	Description	Type	Cost
Training discs	Discs are used to stop unwanted behaviours such as barking, over aggression and over enthusiasm as well as to train a dog in recall, stop a dog pulling on the lead and to teach a dog to stay. They work by making a unique sound as the dog takes part in unwanted behaviour, which teaches the dog quickly that its own action creates an unusual reaction. The dog subsequently learns to avoid that action.	Multi purpose training devices (alternative to electric shock anti bark collars, remote control collars and mats).	Around £6.50
Clickers	Used to train a dog in recall, to sit and to lie down, clicker training works by teaching a dog to associate a particular sound (a click) with a successful action and a resultant reward. It is a proven method of communicating effectively with a dog, giving owners the ability to train their dog to a high level.	Multi purpose training devices (alternative to electric shock anti bark collars, remote control collars and mats).	Between £2 - £9
House lines	Used to interrupt a dog's undesirable behaviours, including jumping up, stealing, chewing, digging and chasing, house lines are lightweight leads designed for use within the home.	Multi purpose training devices (alternative to electric shock anti bark collars, remote control collars and mats).	Around £2
Training leads	This multi functional lead was designed to simplify the training of a dog. The short length can be used for heelwork training, medium length for obedience training and the long length for recall and distance work.	Multi purpose training devices (alternative to electric shock anti bark collars, remote control collars and mats).	Around £6
Kongs	Extremely hardwearing, this strong rubber toy can be used to train even police and military dogs to stop chewing, becoming aggressive and to stay in one place. It has a hollow centre so that treats and snacks can be inserted. It can be also be used to prevent boredom.	Multi purpose training devices (alternative to electric shock anti bark collars, remote control collars and mats).	Between £6.50 - £12
Recall	Used to teach a dog to return to its owner on command, recall is	Dog walking method	Free

	usually the basis of any puppy-training programme and results in an owner being able to control their dog easily. A reliable recall is best achieved through rewarding successful returns to the owner (i.e. with treats) rather than by punishing mistakes. This way, a dog returns to its owner because of the bond between them.	(alternative to electric shock collars and leads).	
Halti Collars	This device stops a dog from pulling uncontrollably and can be used to control boisterous behaviour whilst allowing enough freedom to pant and yawn. The collar works on the same principle as a horse's head-collar - guide the head and the body will follow.	Dog walking devices (alternative to electric shock collars and leads).	Around £8
Retractable lead	Used on dogs with a strong chase instinct, or for exercising dogs near livestock, this lead extends so the dog can walk further from its owner, giving the dog freedom, whilst keeping it under control.	Dog walking devices (alternative to electric shock collars and leads).	Between £12 - £25
Muzzle	A muzzle can be placed over the mouth of a dog, which may be unreliable in a public place to ensure that the dog cannot bite.	Dog walking devices (alternative to electric shock collars and leads).	Around £10
Gates	Gates are used to deny a dog freedom of movement around a house, to keep a dog away from certain areas or to teach a dog that it is subordinate to its master, who controls the gate.	Confinement devices (alternative to electric shock mats).	Around £30
Crates	A crate should act as a home for the dog and offer security. If toys and/or treats are kept in the crate along with bedding, they can be used to keep a dog happily in one place or help a dog sleep.	Confinement devices (alternative to electric shock mats).	Between £50 - £100
Pee posts and training pads	Pads and posts attract dogs through their scent and can be used in toilet training.	Toilet training devices (alternative to electric shock collars).	Around £6 each

The Kennel Club: 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London, W1J 8 AB. T: 020 7518 1020

Information Guide 5:
Electric Shock Collars: Case Studies

The Kennel Club has produced this paper to raise awareness that electric shock collars fail to achieve their desired effect, cause other behavioural problems, and have a damaging long-term effect on a dog's welfare - even to the extent that some dogs require veterinary treatment after having a shock collar used on them. Some of the case studies given here are from the USA, however they are extremely relevant for consideration in this country. Since the American market is saturated manufacturers are beginning to sell electric shock collars and other electric shock training devices in the UK. Sales of electric shock collars are still relatively low, but growing, meaning that it is all the more important to ban them before they become the 'normal' way of training dogs. The following correspondence sent to the Kennel Club by academics, dog owning members of the public and breeders, detail their first-hand experiences of using electric shock collars.

1. Failure to achieve the desired effect:

- Shalise Keating[1] from Rochester, Minnesota reported the following in 1999:

"Our neighbour has an Irish Setter who wore a shock collar to prevent barking. She learned that if she kept barking that the collar would stop shocking her. So once she started barking she wouldn't stop. She also had big open sores on her neck all the time from the collar shocking her... If I'm outside with my dogs and she is in her yard, all I have to do is ask her to be quiet and she will be...The shock collar did nothing except give her sores on her neck, it didn't ever get her to stop barking and just spending time with her and helping her to understand what was wanted of her worked".

2. Cause of other behaviour problems:

- A Gundog trainer from Worcestershire reported:

"I have had the misfortune to see a dog, which due to a fairly minor training problem, received the electric shock collar treatment, from a 'professional' gundog trainer. The shock treatment did not solve the problem and turned a reasonably biddable dog into an aggressive, non-compliant animal that is no longer able to obey any command...and distrusts most human beings".

- Ms Val Palmer[2], a Bearded Collie owner has reported the following:

"I know of two Bearded Collies (brothers) that lived happily together for more than three years. The owner had a problem with one who was a 'barker' and was advised to buy an electric shock (anti-bark) collar. However when the dog received a shock, it turned on its mate, as it did not know where the shock had come from. On the third day his mate turned on him and a fight took place. The owner took the collar off but every time the dog which had worn the collar barked his mate turned on him and fights continued to occur".

3. A damaging long term effect on a dog's well being:

- Lesley Gray wrote to the UK Leonberger Association to report a case of a shock collar causing long-term damage. It published this in its Newsletter no: 21, Aug/Sept 2006.

"At a recent event one of the participants put an electric shock collar (anti-bark collar) on a dog to stop it barking. The dog screamed in agony and panic. As the collar was noise activated, the more she screamed, the more the collar administered shocks. Within a few days the dog had lost all the fur from her neck".

- Heather Lawson[3] formerly of the Regina Humane Society, Saskatchewan, Canada reported the following in June 1999:

"A dog surrendered to us had a shock collar on to 'teach' her not to leave the yard...Every time she went to leave the yard her owner would shock her. When we got her in we put her in a run, she shook looking at the door and would not come out."

---

[1] Shalise Keating is contactable via e-mail on shalise@rconnect.com
[2] Ms Val Palmer is contactable via e-mail on Karakarakk@aol.com
[3] Heather Lawson is contactable via e-mail on nook98@hotmail.com

- Anjelica Steinker[4], M.E.D of the Courteous Canine Inc, Dog School and Doggie Gym reported:

"A friend of mine rescued a Jack Russell Terrier (after) a professional dog trainer had used an electric shock collar to help house train her. When the terrier came to my friend she was very fearful of urinating and constantly checked herself, presumably for urine. It took several months to housetrain this dog because of all the fear that was caused by the shock collar".

- Cheri and Ron O'Bryan[5] of Showtime Gordon Setters and Afghan Hounds also reported their experience of electric shock collars:

"My Gordon Setter bitch was born very independent, showing no signs of shyness, fear, etc. She was placed with a gentleman as a hunting companion... When the bitch turned 10 months he called stating she should be euthanased, I offered to take her back...Upon clipping her neck/throat area I found two sets of scars and hair-loss around the adam's apple area. It was obvious a shock collar caused them. At the time any pressure put on her collar caused her to fly to the ground and not move...She would in the middle of play, spin in circles, screaming and crying...In the runs she would stand still with her head and tail down...Any slight hand gesture would send her flying to the ground where she would stay shaking and we would literally have to carry her away to calm her down...I believe from talking to other sporting dog owners and field trainers, that she was exposed to the electric shock collar from a very young age.

4. Cause of Veterinary Treatment

- The Whole-Dog-Journal.com (a monthly guide to natural dog care and training) ran an article on Rufus, entitled 'Simply Shocking', by Pat Milller.

(Photograph taken from Whole-Dog-Journal.com)[6]

"Rufus was a typical adolescent Labrador Retriever: Rufus's energy was a bit much for the younger children...A pet supply store (sold) a product that promised to solve problems with the push of a button. One rainy afternoon, a neighbour, sent his son out to the pen to take Rufus for a walk. Rufus wouldn't let the boy get near him. He said: "Rufus had this green colour round his neck under the training collar. I carefully removed the collar to find a huge gaping hole in Rufus' neck, under one of the prongs". Dr Susan Benson of the Animal Medical Centre in Preston, Idaho who treated Rufus' injuries claimed: "This was one of the worst electrical burns I have seen other than dogs who have had contact with high power lines."

- The following text is an extract from an article published in the Brighton Evening Argus on Thursday 25 October 2001, entitled "Collars 'Turned Dogs into Killers", by Carrie Buckle.

"A woman who used electric collars in a bid to tame her dogs today called for them to be banned after her pets killed another dog. She sought the help of a behaviourist when (the dogs) started to run away...but the first time the dogs got a shock was by mistake, after a small dog they were walking past made Miss Langridge jump. From then on her pets associated the shocks with small dogs and became afraid of them". Miss Langridge described the incident: "I saw an old lady walking towards me with her little Shih Tzu...As she passed my dogs went for her dog...It was taken to the vet but they had to put it down...(my dogs) had never harmed anything before. They grew up around animals...I realised they connected the pain of the electric shock with little dogs because of the first time I used the collar".

[4] Anjelica Steinker is contactable via e-mail on angelica@courteouscanine.com
[5] Cheri and Ron O'Bryant are contactable via e-mail on jazzman@acmenet.net
[6] The Whole Dog Journal http://www.whole-dog-journal.com

A

Response to Scottish Executive consultation on the use, sale, distribution and possession of electronic training aids.

Document 9

The RSPCA welcomes the opportunity to respond to this consultation on the use, sale, distribution and possession of electronic training aids. This is an important issue and the RSPCA believes the use of such of such devices is cruel and unnecessary. Although the RSPCA does not respond to or cover animal welfare matters in Scotland it hopes the comments enclosed in this document assist with the formulation of legislation on this matter.

1. *Should sonic or spray collars be treated differently to devices which transmit an electric shock or static pulse?*

Training or control aids that work by distraction, such as air puff collars, are more humane alternatives to devices that work through delivery of painful or distressing experiences, and can on occasion complement reward-based training methods rather than directly counter them as in the case of electric shock devices.

2. *Do you agree with what we intend to cover? If not, what should be covered (and what should not be covered) and why?*

The RSPCA agrees with the Scottish Executive's current plans to legislate for "any collar, mat, lead or other device used or designed or intended to be used to train or control an animal by means of transmission of an electric current or other electric impulse which causes shock, pain or other stimulus to an animal wearing, or otherwise in contact with the device. *[The Scottish Executive does]* not intend any prohibition or control to apply to electric boundary fences used to contain livestock or horses." Obviously when detailed proposals are brought forward the Society will consider those carefully to ensure adequate animal welfare protection.

The RSPCA believes this definition is sufficient to cover the number of devices that cause concern with one small change. The word 'visible' can usefully be added before the words 'electric boundary fences' to ensure that it is clear that buried electric fences which animals cannot see and hence may not understand how to avoid, will not be included in the equipment excluded from the prohibition. Whilst the RSPCA concurs with the view that conventional, visible electric fencing used to contain livestock and horses need not be included in this definition, it is important that there is no possibility of a loophole in the law existing such that buried electric fencing can be used. The Society believes that the ability of animals to be able to connect a shock/pulse they might receive with a physical barrier they can see and touch is essential if they are to be able to understand and learn how to avoid such a shock in future.

3. *Do you believe that the provision of "unnecessary suffering" in section 19 and the need to protect an animal from suffering and injury in section 24 of the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 are sufficient to protect animals who wear electric shock or static pulse collars or come into contact with "scat mats"? If not, why not?*

While the RSPCA believes such devices can cause unnecessary suffering (it has been documented they can cause injury[123]), the Society feels it is important that any legislation

[1] EFRA Select Committee, Question 200
[2] Seksel, K., 1999. Comments on collars policy. *Australian Vet Journal*, **77**. pp 78

should reinforce the intent of the welfare offence within the 2006 Act. That is, to promote a positive attitude towards animals under the control of man and their appropriate and responsible care.

The RSPCA does not believe that negative or punishment training devices fit into this ethos or modern animal training. The welfare offence provides for improving the standard of care and understanding by owners of their animals and thus training techniques should reflect this. Interestingly, a recent study found that the use of punishment techniques in the training of dogs was associated with an increase in the incidence of problem behaviours[4]. Thus the use of such devices may not even assist owners with ensuring they care for their animals properly or responsibly.

Furthermore, whilst such devices are 'lawful' there may remain a defence for using such a device for anyone prosecuted under sections 19(4)(c) or 24(2) of the 2006. This, if the Scottish Executive believes such devices should be prohibited, could potentially provide a loophole in the law and only a prohibition could satisfactorily close it.

4. *Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 15 be banned? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support a ban? If you believe that any of the devices should not be banned, why have you reached that decision and what evidence do you have to show that these devices do not adversely affect the welfare of animals?*

The RSPCA believes that no technical device should be used or offered for sale where an animal can be subjected to a painful stimulus at the direct instigation of a human or where a painful stimulus is delivered as a result of an animal's action from which it cannot retreat. Thus all of the devices listed in paragraph 15 of the consultation document should be banned. The following information provides just some reasons why the RSPCA believes all such devices should be banned.

Such devices are currently freely available to the public on the open market and are sold with minimal instruction, adding to the scope for their misuse either through ignorance by owners untrained to use them, or through malice by those intent on deliberate cruelty.

As mentioned above poorly designed devices can cause injury to the animal and buried/hidden electric fence systems are associated with a number of problems. Dogs may run at and cross the boundary if, for example, they see something to chase and in a state of excitement, forget about or ignore the shock caused as a result. Once they are outside, they cannot get back in without receiving another shock, which discourages them from returning. Some dogs learn that if they sit by the fence and wait for the bleeping to cease, this is a signal that the battery has died, so giving them the opportunity to get out without receiving a shock. Also, unlike a conventional fence, these fences do not stop other dogs or children entering the designated area. This leaves the resident dog vulnerable to possible attack by intruders, and intruding children vulnerable to attack by the resident dog.

---

[3] Polsky, R.H., 1994. Eletronic shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association.* **30** (5). pp 463-468

[4] Hiby, E.F., Rooney, N.J., & Bradshaw, J.W.S., 2004. Dog training methods: their use, effectiveness and interaction with behaviour and welfare. *Animal Welfare* **13** (1). pp 63-69.

The arguments in favour of the use of such negative or 'aversive' methods to solve a behaviour problem are flawed. Aversion therapy relies on the forming of a negative 'association of ideas' in an animal's mind. Thus, unless the delivery of the aversive experience (e.g. the electric shock or static pulse) is timed absolutely perfectly in all instances, the wrong association may be formed in the animal's mind, leading to an escalation of the existing unwanted behaviour or even the development of a new unwanted behaviour. For example, shocking a dog when he/she eventually returns to the owner, having initially failed to come when called, is likely to result in even more reluctance to return to the owner next time. Similarly, owners delivering numerous shocks to a dog because they are angry or frustrated long after the initial unwanted behaviour will serve only to confuse the dog and/or lead to the wrong associated of ideas with regard to the reason for the punishment[5].

Pain caused by an electric shock is a well-documented stimulus for aggression in a wide variety of species[6]. Problems with shock collars causing aggression have been documented. For example, there have been instances when the use of shock collars in an attempt to prevent aggressive behaviour has led to redirection of aggression, such that dogs have attacked other dogs or people[7] because they associated them with the shock they received, or were about to receive. In cases of inter-dog aggression, shock collars can enhance aggression if used when dogs are fighting[8]. Some dogs may also learn that shocks are only applied when the collar is worn, leading to the unwanted behaviour returning after the collar is removed[9].

Also, aversive therapy of his kind is aimed at preventing only the symptoms of a problem, and does nothing to address the root cause(s).

The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) urged police forces not to use electric shock collars in 2000 after an ACPO sub-committee on dog training heard evidence from the RSPCA and other animal welfare groups. This was followed by a ban later in the year[10]. The armed forces dog unit has also recently prohibited the use of electric shock collars.

As a justification for the use of these devices, it is argued by those against a ban that it is the only way to control a dog that persistently chases livestock. The RSPCA believes this is a flawed argument as dogs should be on leads near livestock.

The use of electric shock collars and 'hidden' fences can result not only in failure to prevent unwanted behaviour but can actually escalate it and/or cause the dog to develop further behavioural problems such as fear or anxiety[11]. Research clearly shows that the collars cause

---

[5] Schalke, E., et al. 2005. Stress symptoms caused by the use of electric training collars on dogs in everyday life situations. *Current Issues and Research in Veterinary Behaviour Medicine: papers presented at the 5th International Veterinary Behaviour Meeting*. Purdue University Press, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA.

[6] Heacock, D., Thurber, S., & Vale, D. 1975. Shock-elicited aggression by human subjects. *Journal of Social Psychology* **95**. pp 55-59

[7] Polsky, R., 2000. Can aggression in dogs be elicited though the use of electronic pet containment systems? *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, **3** (4). pp 345-357

[8] Tortora, D.F., 1982. Understanding electronic dog training part 3. *Canine Practice* **9** (4). pp 8-17

[9] Polsky, R.H., 1994. Electronic shock collars – are they worth the risks? *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association*, **30** (5). pp 463-468

[10] http://newswww.bbc.net.uk/1/low/uk/744922.stm

[11] Schilder, M.B.H., & Van Der Borg, J.A.M., 2004. Training dogs with help of the shock collar: short and long term behavioural effects. *Journal of Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. **85**, pp 319-334.

pain and distress, and that dogs may begin to associate the mere presence of their owner with the unpleasant experience, so leading to a breakdown in the relationship and chronic stress for the dog on a day to day basis[12].

Even some manufacturers claim that it is not a good idea to use electric fences if the dog is small or timid as a minute electric shock may traumatise them too much and that larger dogs may be resilient to the shocks, or find ways to out-smart the system[13]. This would seem to suggest that there are recognised welfare problems within the industry itself, and the fences will only work on a small proportion of dogs anyway[14].

5. *If there was to be a ban, what are your views on whether the ban should be limited to a prohibition on the use of the devices or whether the ban should extend to the sale and distribution of the devices?*
6. *Do you believe that a ban should extend to the possession of these devices? If so, for what reasons.*

There are currently no harmonised European rules on the use of shock collars or electronic training aids and none are envisaged in the future. However restricting the use, sale and distribution of goods would have to be justified under Article 28 of the Treaty of Rome. Case law suggests that imported goods, which are subject to mere selling arrangements, are not caught by Article 28, provided that the same selling arrangements apply equally to domestically produced products[15]. Also, a Member State is not under an obligation to create a market for something just to benefit importers particularly if it has banned the market for its own citizens.

So any response should be proportionate to the problem and the only effective means to protect animal health and welfare and the same rules should be applicable to local producers. If Scotland prohibited the sale and distribution of such devices (regardless of where they were produced) this would appear to be non-discriminatory. Furthermore the Scottish Parliament is the arbiter of decisions based on moral grounds in its territory. The RSPCA believes that there should be a prohibition on the use, possession, sale and distribution of such devices to prevent the concerns raised in the scientific literature. The RSPCA further believes that such a move could be consistent under Article 28 of the Treaty of Rome.

From an enforcement perspective it is important there is a consistency of approach from the three administrations (Scotland, England and Wales). If not then there could be a 'tourist' trade in the use of such devices – a good example of this is the concerns raised about tail docking. To ensure effective enforcement the Society supports a prohibition on the use, sale, distribution and possession of such devices.

[12] Beerda, B., Schilder, M.B.H., Vabn Hooff, J.A.R.A.M., et al. 1998. Behavioural saliva cortisol and heart rate responses to different types of stimuli in dogs. *Journal of Applied Animal Behaviour Science*. **58**. pp365-381.
[13] http://www.dogs-r.us.com/eletronic-fences.html
[14] *ibid.*
[15] Keck & Mithouard C-267/91 and C-268/91, Rec. I-6097 ECJ 1993

7. *Should any of the devices listed in paragraph 15 require a licence either by the operator or the seller? If so, which ones and why? What evidence do you have to support that such a restriction is required?*

The RSPCA does not believe that anyone should be licensed to use such devices because they are in essence cruel and there are other more humane and effective means for training animals.

8. *What criteria or conditions should be placed on the issue of a licence? Explain why you think that this is necessary.*

See answer to question seven.

9. *Do you have any views on which body would be best placed to issue licences?*

See answer to question seven.

10. *What effect would a ban on the use and sale of electric sock or static pulse collars in Scotland have on your business or organisation? Please detail the affect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 15.*

The RSPCA does not believe that a ban on such devices would have a harmful effect on any business that supplies them because currently sales to the UK are quite low[16] (unfortunately the RSPCA does not have specific information on sales within Scotland). However, there is an opening in the market that could be exploited, so it would be beneficial to ban their sale and use now, as the 2006 Act presents an opportunity before they become more widely used.

11. *What affect would restricting the sale of electric shock or static pulse collars to licence holders have on your business or organisation? Please detail the affect for each of the training devices listed in paragraph 15.*

See answer to question seven.

[16] EFRA Select Committee, Question 198

Document 10

THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

Richard Lochhead
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and Environment
The Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

19 July 2013

Dear Mr. Lochhead,

Re: Defra Funded Research Studies on Electric Shock Collars

I am writing to request a meeting to outline our concerns regarding the recently published Defra funded research project final reports into the use of electric shock collars on dogs which are titled:

1. 'Effect of pet training aids, specifically remote static pulse systems, on the welfare of domestic dogs' (AW1402) and

2. 'Studies to assess the effect of pet training aids, specifically remote static pulse systems on the welfare of domestic dogs; field study of dogs in training' (AW1402a).

The first research project (AW1402) showed that dog owners who used electric shock collars tended to either not read the user manuals or chose to not follow the advice. More worryingly, the researchers also noted that some electric shock collars did not provide a manual at all.

The final conclusion of the project demonstrated that there were both negative behavioural and physiological changes witnessed in a certain proportion of dogs that were trained with the electric shock collar in comparison to the non-electric shock collar control group of dogs in the study.

The second study also concluded that electric shock collars are not more effective than positive reinforcement methods (such as reward based training) for recall and chasing, which are cited as the two main reasons for the use of electric shock collar training on dogs.

The Kennel Club was extremely disappointed that the Electric Collar Manufacturers Association (ECMA) was asked to be involved in the second research project (AW1402a) by designing both the training protocol as well as recommend industry trained professionals to take part in the study. However, despite this clear bias in the study, the research project concluded that there was enough evidence both in negative changes in behaviour and physiology of the dogs to argue that the use of electric shock collars even by ECMA selected trained professionals to an industry standard still had a negative impact on dog welfare.

Both project findings and conclusions have tremendous implications on animal welfare and fully support the certainty of many animal welfare organisations such as ourselves that fundamentally all electric training devices fail to address the underlying behaviour problems and can cause further behaviour problems by training a dog to respond out of fear of further punishment rather than a natural willingness to obey. The availability of positive training methods far outweighs the need for techniques based on aversion or pain.

In your response to Jim Hume's written question on the 10th of June 2012, you mentioned that the use of electric shock collars would be considered once the Defra funded research projects were peer reviewed and made public. Furthermore, you stated that the Scottish Government policy in relation to regulatory burden would only be imposed when there is clear evidence that it will improve animal welfare in a proportionate manner.

In light of Defra's research projects publication, the Kennel Club would like to arrange a meeting to discuss this important issue in greater detail and hear directly from the Minister regarding his Department's next steps in this matter.

If this would be possible, I would be grateful if you could contact me on 0207 518 1020 or email [redacted] to suggest an appropriate date.
I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]
Kennel Club Secretary and Communications Director

Document 11

THE KENNEL CLUB
Making a difference for dogs

Richard Lochhead
Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and Environment
The Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP

3 October 2013

Dear Mr. Lochhead,

Re: Pet Training Aids Parliamentary Question

I am writing to highlight the Kennel Club's concerns regarding your recent written answer to Claire Baker MSP's Parliamentary question [S4W-16776] tabled on the 25th of August 2013.

Our first concern relates to your statement that the research did not provide adequate evidence of long-term or significant damage to the welfare of dogs that would justify a ban. The second research study funded by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (AW1402a) concluded that "*there was evidence that some dogs that had received e-collar training experienced long term negative welfare consequences. In particular, dogs with previous experience of e-collars showed an increase in salivary cortisol and intense behaviours and a reduction in relaxed behaviours in the training context compared to dogs who had not been exposed to e-collar training*" (pg. 14).

Our second fundamental concern is in relation to the announcement that the Scottish Government will cooperate with Defra to draft guidance regarding how electric shock collars can be appropriately used. However, the second research study funded by Defra (AW1402a) clearly argues that even if electric shock collars are used by professional dog trainers to an industry set standard of training protocol, the use of these devices still has a negative impact on animal welfare. Furthermore, *"even with best practice as advocated by collar manufacturers and trainers, there were differences in the behaviour of dogs that are consistent with more negative emotional states (including anxiety and aversion) in some dogs trained with e-collars, that these differences persist for the duration of the initial training periods, and that there is some evidence of elevated arousal upon the later return to the training situations by these dogs."* (pg. 16)

The study also concluded that electric shock collars are no more effective than reward based training techniques in helping prevent dogs chasing livestock, which is the often cited reason for the justification of the necessity to use them.

1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London W1J 8AB
Telephone 0844 4633 980 Facsimile 020 7518 1058
email info@thekennelclub.org.uk www.thekennelclub.org.uk

For these reasons, the Kennel Club believes electric shock collars do have a long term negative impact on dog welfare and that guidance is inadequate and would therefore be ineffective in preventing unnecessary pain and distress to dogs as is supported by the Defra funded research.

I am in the process of organising a meeting with the Scottish Animal Welfare team to discuss the Defra findings and their implications on dog welfare and legislation. However, we would still very much welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with you. If this is possible, please contact me on [redacted] or [redacted]

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]
Kennel Club Secretary and Communications Director

Document 12

Hi [redacted]

Thanks for getting back to me.

I am still waiting to hear back from one MSP who has raised the issue of ESC in the Scottish Parliament (mainly waiting to hear when is normally the better time to come up and meet MSPs....from the past, I think we normally went on the Monday to Tuesday or Tuesday to Wednesday). Would you happen to which days are better for them?

Kind regards,

[redacted]
Public Affairs Officer
Tel: [redacted]
The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London. W1J 8AB
www.thekennelclub.org.uk

Get involved: www.thekennelclub.org.uk/kccampaigns
Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/KCLovesDogs
Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/KClovesdogs

From: [redacted]
Sent: 12 September 2013 10:39
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Electric Shock Collars

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your email and I apologise about the delay in getting back to you. I was waiting to hear back on a few things regarding dates in Scotland before replying.

I am happy to come and meet you and your colleagues. I would ideally like to time it with meetings with MSPs on the same issue. It will either be only me or one other colleague from my team might join me.

Could you please send me dates which would be most suitable for you and your team in the meantime?

Many thanks and kind regards,

[redacted]
Public Affairs Officer
Tel: [redacted]
The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London. W1J 8AB
www.thekennelclub.org.uk

Get involved: www.thekennelclub.org.uk/kccampaigns
Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/KCLovesDogs
Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/KClovesdogs

From: [redacted]
Sent: 28 August 2013 16:22
To: [redacted]
Subject: Electric Shock Collars

Dear [redacted],

The Kennel Club has long campaigned to prohibit the use of electric shock collars across the UK. We were successful in helping achieve such a ban in Wales and would like to see this replicated in Westminster and the remaining devolved administrations.

The Defra funded research studies' findings greatly favour our electric shock collar campaign. The first Defra project concluded that there was great variability in how ESCs were used on dogs and showed that owners worryingly tended to either not read or follow the advice in the manuals. The main conclusion was that there were significant negative welfare consequences for some of the dogs that were trained with ESCs in the study.

However, ESC advocates argued that this study was flawed as the ESCs were not used to industry standards which may have prevented unnecessary pain and distress to dogs. Consequently, Defra funded a second study which was designed to use ESCs on dogs by trained professionals according to industry standards. For this reason, the Electronic Collar Manufacturer's Association (ECMA) were asked to design both the training protocol as well as recommend industry trained professionals to take part in the study. However, despite this obvious bias in the study, the research project concluded that there was enough evidence (both in behavioural and physiological changes) to argue that the use of ESCs even by industry trained professionals still had a negative impact on dog welfare.

We are due to meet Lord de Mauley next week to discuss his department's findings as well as the Northern Ireland Minister. I wrote to Richard Lochhead to request a meeting to discuss the Scottish government's position on electric shock collars in light of these studies being published and have now received a reply stating that should I wish to discuss this further, it is best to contact the Animal Welfare officials. I was given your contact details to arrange this meeting.

Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

[redacted]
Public Affairs Officer
Tel: [redacted]
The Kennel Club, 1-5 Clarges Street, Piccadilly, London. W1J 8AB
www.thekennelclub.org.uk

Get involved: www.thekennelclub.org.uk/kccampaigns
Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/KCLovesDogs
Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/KClovesdogs

****

The primary objective of the Kennel Club is to promote, in every way, the general improvement of dogs and furthermore to protect and promote the dog's varied roles in society.

Visit the Kennel Club website for all your canine needs. If you register with our new website you will have access to eNewsletters relating to different disciplines, be able to respond to online polls and collect articles of interest in your 'My Articles' area. Please register at www.thekennelclub.org.uk today!

Document 1

Electric Shock Collars: Countries Supporting a Ban

Electric training collars are banned in Denmark, Australia, Germany, Switzerland and Slovenia, and in Austria a ban is under way. The FCI[1] also prohibits any use of shock collars.

Austria: In June 2004 Austria introduced new animal protection legislation, which "put the country high on the list of European nations regulating the fate of their animals"[2]… The legislation is being phased in over several years and is expected to be in full effect by 2009. "The law foresees a ban on the sale of puppies or cats in shops and the training of dogs with electric shock collars"[3]…Animal rights' activists say that while marking a step in the right direction, the new law in some respects still is not as far advanced as legislation in countries such as **Sweden, Norway and Switzerland[4]".**

Australia: Electric shock collars are banned in most states in Australia under the Cruelty to Animals Act – they are a restricted import in Australia, though there are exemptions for when veterinarians prescribe their use[5]. In New South Wales, Parramatta Local Court fined pet supplies company Kra-mar Pet Supplies $2,500 and ordered them to pay total costs of $6,691 after the company pleaded guilty to selling an electrical device manufactured for the purpose of administering an electric shock to an animal as the sale, possession and use of electrical collars is illegal under the New South Wales Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1997[6].

Germany: The German Animal Welfare Act enforces the utilitarian principle that there must be good reason for one to cause an animal harm and identifies that it is the responsibility of human beings to protect the lives and well being of their fellow creatures. Article 3, paragraph 11 states that: "It shall be prohibited to use a device which by applying direct electrocution considerably restricts the species-specific behaviour of an animal, in particular its movement, or forces it to move thereby causing the animal considerable pain, suffering or harm, unless federal or Land provisions authorize such practices"[7].

Switzerland: The Swiss Animal Protection Ordinance 1981, Article 34, states that: "Training instruments may not be applied in a manner to cause injury or major pain to the animal, provoke it, or cause it great fear"[8] and that "Training instruments delivering electric shocks, making acoustic signals, or using chemicals are prohibited, with the exception of whistling during training or the professional application of bordering systems"[9]. Swiss law also states that the cantonal authorities may grant persons with the necessary specialist knowledge permission to use such training instruments only for exceptional therapeutic purposes[10]. Permission is granted only when person handling the dog has passed a theoretical exam consisting of four parts (principles of animal learning, ethics, techniques and legislation) and a practical exam to demonstrate they can operate and understand the functioning of instruments emitting electric shocks, including instruments unknown to them. Since 2001 only about 30 people in Switzerland have passed the exam. The Swiss animal welfare legislation is also undergoing a revision, which will also forbid the use, advertising and the sale of training devices emitting electric shocks

---

[1] The Fédération Cynologique Internationale represents canine organisations around the world. It includes 80 members and contract partners.
[2] Water and Woods.net: 'New Law for Austrian Animals', June 1 2004, http://www.waterandwoods.net/forum_viewtopic.php?8.662
Supported by:
Kole, William J: 'Austria Enacts one of Europe's Toughest Animal Rights Laws', FactoryFarming.com, May 28 2004, www.factoryfarming.com/issues_austria.htm
[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid
[5] The Australian Customs Service: 'Prohibited and Restricted Imports', www.customs.gov.au/site/page.cfm?u=4369
[6] RSPCA: 'Pet Supplies Company Fined Over Sale of Electronic Collar', February 6 2004, http://www.rspcansw.org.au/rspca-electr_collar_2-04.pdf
[7] Michigan State University, College of Law, Animal Legal and Historical Center, http://www.animallaw.info/nonus/statutes/stdeawa1998.htm
[8] Michigan State University, College of Law, Animal Legal and Historical Center, Michigan http://www.animallaw.info/nonus/statutes/stchapo1981.htm
[9] Ibid
[10] Ibid

Slovenia: Slovenian Law for the Protection of Animals prohibits the use of certain methods and objects used to train dogs, including electric shock collars.