An Examination of Emotion-Based Strategies in 'Altruistic' Mobilisation: A Case Study of the Animal Rights Movement

Rebecca Grivas

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

March, 2008

School of Psychology & Department of Linguistics The University of Adelaide, South Australia

Table of Contents

Abstract	vi
Declaration	vii
Acknowledgments	viii
Introduction	1
Movements and Mobilisations	1
The Meaning and Existence of Altruism	3
The Case of Animal Rights	7
Discourse Psychology, Discourse Analysis and Functional Grammar	8
Overview of the Thesis	10
A Short Note on Terminology	13
Chapter 1: Social Mobilisation	15
1.1 Introduction to Social Movements	15
1.2 Social Mobilisation	18
1.3 Environmental Factors	18
1.4 Social Identity	23
1.5 Ideology	33
1.6 Summary: Developing an Understanding of Altruistic Movements	39
Chapter 2: Overview of the Animal Rights Movement	42
2.1 Animal Rights and Animal Welfare	42
2.2 Vivisection and the Anti-Vivisection Movement	44
2.3 The Animal Rights Movement	49

2.4 Ethics and Animal Rights	53
2.5 Contemporary Issues and Perspectives in Environmental Ethics	55
2.5.1 Consequentialist Approaches	57
2.5.2 Deontological Approaches	59
2.5.3 Constructionist Approaches	60
2.6 Summary: Through a Glass Darkly	63
Chapter 3: Methodology	65
3.1 Language and Social Movements	65
3.2 The Role of Language in Psychology	67
3.3 Semiotics and Structuralism	70
3.4 Social Semiotics	74
3.5 Language as a Social Semiotic	75
3.6 Introduction to Functional Grammar	79
3.6.1 Metafunctions	79
3.6.2 Genre	81
3.6.3 Register and Register Variables	82
3.6.4 Realisation	84
3.7 The System of Appraisal	86
3.8 Analytic Procedure	90
3.9 Analytic Content and Issues	91
3.9.1 Description of Data	92
3.9.2 Issues Pertaining to Web Traffic	93
Chapter 4: Preliminary Analysis	97
4.1 Altruistic Social Movements	97
4.2 Description of Data	101
4.3 Animal Rights Mobilisation Rhetoric: Preliminary Analysis	102
4.3.1 Anti-Vivisection and Traditional Mobilisation Strategies: Social Identity	104
4.3.2 Anti-Vivisection and Traditional Mobilisation Strategies: Cost-Benefit	108
4.3.3 Emotion Based Appeals	111

4.3.4 Evaluating Actions	112
4.3.5 Evaluating Experimenters	115
4.3.6 Evaluating Animals	116
4.4 Pro-Research Mobilisation Rhetoric: Preliminary Analysis	118
4.4.1 Pro-Research and Traditional Mobilisation Strategies: Social Identity	119
4.4.2 Pro-Research and Traditional Mobilisation Strategies: Cost-Benefit	122
4.4.3 Evaluating Animals	126
4.4.4 Evaluating Research	128
4.5 Summary: Emotional Persuasion in Altruistic Movements	130
Chapter 5: The Use of Emotion in Mobilisation	133
5.1 Emotion and Social Mobilisation	133
5.2 Social Influence, Persuasion and Minority Opinion	134
5.3 Persuasion and Emotion-Based Appeals	137
5.4 Understanding Emotions	141
5.4.1 Evolutionary Approach	142
5.4.2 Cognitive Approach	143
5.4.3 The Social Construction of Emotions	145
5.4.4 Emotion in Discourse	148
5.5 Social Movement Theory and Emotion	149
5.6 Summary: Positioning a Reader through Emotion-Based Strategies	152
Chapter 6: Linguistic Analysis of the Anti-Vivisection Movement	156
6.1 Examination of Anti-Vivisection Rhetoric	156
6.2 Description of Method and Data	157
6.3 Framing Vivisection	159
6.3.1 Animal Suffering	161
6.3.2 Legitimate Emotional Responses	164
6.3.3 Pro-Research Supporters	166
6.3.4 Evaluating Research Organisations	167
6.3.5 Evaluating Science	170

6.4 Strategies for Generating Moral Shock: The Use of Narrative	176
6.4.1 Anthropomorphism	177
6.4.2 Nasty, Brutish and Short	179
6.4.3 Encouraging Empathy	182
6.4.4 The Use of Personal Pronouns	183
6.5 Summary: A Basis for Emotion-Based Mobilisation	186
Chapter 7: Textual Analysis of the Pro-Research Movement	187
7.1 Examination of Pro-Research Rhetoric	187
7.2 Description of Data	190
7.3 Framing of Animal Research	191
7.3.1 Medical Research as Ethology	191
7.3.2 Human and Animals	194
7.3.3 Animals in Research	197
7.3.4 Animal Suffering	202
7.3.5 Evaluating Animal Rights Activists	203
7.4 Fear and Guilt Persuasion: Positioning the Reader Emotionally	206
7.4.1 Evaluating Medical Research	209
7.5 Summary: Fear and Guilt Based Persuasion	210
Chapter 8: Examination of the Visual Material	214
8.1 Imagery in Social Movements	214
8.2 Visual Analysis and Social Semiotics	215
8.3 Description of Data	221
8.4 Overview of Visual Imagery Used in the Corpora	222
8.5 Photographs of Humans	223
8.5.1 Pictures of Families	224
8.5.2 Pictures of Researchers	231
8.5.3 Pictures of Patients	235
8.5.4 Humans in the Animal Rights Movement	239
8.6 Photographs of Animals	242

8.6.1 Establishing Eye Contact	242
8.6.2 Pictures of Bodies	245
8.6.3 Pictures of Procedures	247
8.6.4 Animals in the Vivisection Movement	251
8.6.5 Companion Animals	253
8.7 Summary: Imagery as an Emotion-Based Strategy	253
Chapter 9: Conclusions	259
9.1 The Animal Rights Movement: An Example of an Altruistic Movement	259
9.2 Framing the Animal Rights Movement: Consideration of Findings	260
9.2.1 Deciding What Counts as 'Animal'	260
9.2.2 On the Issue of Animal Suffering	263
9.2.3 The Nature of 'Good' and 'Bad' Science	265
9.2.4 Supporting or Rejecting Animal Research	266
9.2.5 The Use of Imagery as Evidence	268
9.2.6 Emotional Positioning through Linguistic and Visual Strategies	270
9.3 Implications for Social Mobilisation	273
9.4 Creating Moral Shock: Implications for Altruistic Mobilisation	279
9.5 Conclusions: Emotion-Based Strategies in Social Movements	281
References	284
Appendix One	299
11	_

Abstract

This thesis examines the emotion-based strategies employed by activists for the purpose of persuading individuals to participate directly in social movements. In particular, the emphasis is placed on getting people involved in 'altruistic' mobilisation; a descriptive utilised in order to distinguish these movements from previous research done in which a tangible material gain is presented as an inducement for participation. The thesis investigates the animal rights movement as it pertains to the issue of animal vivisection, and endeavours to identify the linguistic strategies employed by these activists with the goal of understanding how to facilitate 'altruistic' movements more generally.

A textual analysis, which was consistent with Halliday's (2004) systemic functional linguistics, was conducted on mobilisation pamphlets written by groups seeking support for either animal vivisection or animal rights. To this end, the analysis considered both the original movement (i.e. the anti-vivisection movement) and the counter-movement (i.e. the pro-research movement). The analysis considers the linguistic and visual strategies used by movement organisers in placing a moral onus on the reader to support the movement.

From this analysis it is argued that the success of the animal rights movement stems from its ability to present graphic visual imagery that supplies evidential support for the claims being made in text. In addition, the animal rights texts have been able to frame the issue of animal vivisection in terms of emotional appeals designed to elicit feelings of moral outrage in the reader. It is posited that the animal rights movement has been able to effectively combine images and emotion-based linguistic strategies in order to facilitate the consideration of the issue in terms of an 'ethical identity' that helps generate moral outrage in the reader and thereby encouraging participation in the movement.

Declaration

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for the award of any other

degree or diploma in any university and, to the best of my knowledge and belief,

contains no material previously published or written by another person, except

where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent for this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the Adelaide University

Library, to be made available for loan and photocopying.

Rebecca Grivas

March, 2008

vii

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge my two supervisors; Professor Martha Augoustinos and Dr Peter White, for their support, suggestions and guidance during the course of my candidature.

In particular, I would like to thank Martha for introducing me to the world of Discursive Psychology and for 'discoursing' about animal ethics with me.

I am also especially grateful to Peter; firstly, for agreeing to take me on as a student, and secondly, for his efforts in teaching me functional grammar.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge the following people who read drafts; drank lattes; shared specialist knowledge; and provided tactical advice regarding all manner of evasive manoeuvres: Andrew Borlese, Brian Dare, Dr Danielle Every, Dr Edwina Farrall, Michael Farrall, Debbie Geertshuis, My GEMP cohort (especially Olivia, Meg, Prue, Meredith, Norm & Björn), Astrid Kuivasaari, Dr Kieran O'Doherty, Birgit Pfitzer, Dr Dorota Pomagalska, Carola Sanders, Joanne Tan, Kiaran Thorpe, Professor Deborah Turnbull and Dr William Winser.

To Rachael, Leah, Naomi and Evelyn: thankyou for patiently listening to me talk endlessly about 'all this stuff'.

Finally, I would like to thank my father, Dallas, for his endless encouragement and support. You are the best!