

Implicit Bias and Pit Bull Welfare

Sandra Garrison, MSL, LSW, MBA

Master of Science
Animal Welfare and Behavior

Spring 2022

Advisor: Jenni Punt VMD, PhD

Advisor: Thomas D. Parsons, B.A., V.M.D., Ph.D.

Abstract

Breed Specific Legislation exists in 719 localities across the United States, the majority of places target Pit Bulls, either in conjunction with other breeds or solely. The negative view of Pit Bulls is based on a multitude of factors, one of which could be the perception of the likely owner of this breed. Pit Bulls are frequently associated with inner-city persons of color, although this has not always been the case. Other breeds have been identified in the past as being the most dangerous breed; however, Breed Specific Legislation started with the change in perception of the Pit Bull. This paper examines the correlation between areas which implemented Breed Specific Legislation and the racial demographics of the community.

Pit Bulls in America

Referenced as “The Most Dangerous Dog In America”, the Pit Bull is frequently viewed negatively by Americans (Twining et al., 2000, p. 1). The breed is associated with dog fighting and believed, by some, to be an evil and vicious animal, prone to attack humans, more so than other canines (Twining et al., 2000, p. 1) (Cohen & Richardson, 2002, p. 285). The media plays a role in the perception of the Pit Bull by characterizing the breed in a specific manner. Reports routinely portray the dogs as out of control and violent; and even a “deadly weapon” (Swann, 2010, p. 5). Thus, Pit Bulls are believed to be more dangerous, powerful, and vicious than other dogs; and are the focus of regulatory mandates, such as breed specific legislation (Linder, 2018, pp. 51, 54).

Despite the aura surrounding the Pit Bull and their violent nature, many of the beliefs have been dispelled as myths. “These myths include the idea that pit-bull-type dogs have greater bite strength, possess more aggressive tendencies, and bite or attack more frequently than dogs from other breeds” (Duberstein et al., 2021, p. 1). Other breeds, such as the Chow Chow, have been shown to be involved in more fatal attacks, yet they do not receive the same level of scrutiny as the Pit Bull (Mongrels & Men, 2016). In a study of veterinarians’ view of bite risk of dogs by breed, Chow Chows were identified as posing the highest risk; Pit Bulls were identified as medium risk (Kogan et al., 2019, p. 7). Comparable research based on owner’s assessment yielded similar results identifying non-Pit Bulls as aggressive in most situations, including towards owners and strangers (Duffy et al., 2008, pp. 453, 455).

Media coverage has exacerbated the thought that Pit Bulls are vicious and has not portrayed attacks by other breeds in the same light (Cohen & Richardson, 2002, p. 287) (Barnhard, 2018, p. 64). Ironically, Pit Bulls have not always been seen in this manner and other breeds have held the title of most aggressive breed. Pit Bulls were once depicted on recruiting posters for the armed services and the classic television show, “The Little Rascals”, and described as a friendly, loyal, family pet. In the late 1800’s, Bloodhounds were credited for the majority of dog attacks; the 1960’s and 1970’s saw the German Shepard rise to the top of the list (Linder, 2018, pp. 55, 58). The image of the Pit Bull transitioned during the 1980’s, when they were becoming popular with urban residents (Thompson et al., 2019, p. 4). The relationship between the Pit Bull’s association with inner city persons and alteration in public opinion is not based in fact. I will argue it stems, in part, from racial biases towards the perceived owners. Racial bias is not a new concept; however, little is known about its impact on animal welfare, specifically as it relates to the Pit Bull breed. I propose implicit racial bias in the United States adversely affects the welfare of the Pit Bull.

Implicit Racial Bias and Perceptions

Implicit racial bias, the unconscious association of certain traits with a specific race, skews peoples’ perceptions of an entire group of individuals. Although both are derivatives of institutional racism, implicit bias may be erroneously viewed by some as less offensive than explicit bias to evaluate as there is not an associated deliberate decision (Russell-Brown, 2018, pp. 186–190). This is not to imply implicit biases are

any less threatening, and, in some ways, are more dangerous due to their unintentional nature. Implicit biases have been described as a “major contributor to the perpetuation of discrimination” (Devine et al., 2012, p. 1267). Furthermore, these unconscious associations, often based on underlying stereotypes, can have substantial impacts on discrimination (Salmanowitz, 2018, p. 175).

Humans are inherently motivated to connect or compete with other groups, which creates a prime environment for categorization, leading to inequality (Amodio, 2014, p. 670). The continued disparities for persons of color, maintained partially by implicit bias, fortify the hierarchical social structure in America (Dovidio et al., 2018, p. 16). The alterations of perceptions caused, to an extent, by implicit biases are evident in the variation in opinions of the standing persons of color have in the U.S. when comparing White to Non-White respondents. Blacks are substantially more likely than Whites to view Blacks as being treated unfairly in a multitude of settings, including stores, restaurants, the workplace, and interactions with police. Whites were found to be approximately twice as likely to believe focusing on similarities versus differences is the key to improving race relations; whereas Black respondents were equally divided with respect to whether a focus on commonalities versus uniqueness would improve race relations (“The Black and White in America,” 2017, pp. 397–398). This demonstrates that not only do implicit racial biases adversely skew perceptions, but that their effect even alters the awareness of the extent of the issue. Furthermore, views on improvement vary greatly among racial groups.

Pit Bulls and Racial Association

After their fall from grace as an all-American dog, Pit Bulls began to be associated with urban persons of color. This, coupled with the likelihood of incidents involving Pit Bulls being reported more frequently in the media, resulted in the breed becoming a communal hatred (*Are Pitbulls the Black People of Dogs?*, n.d.). Furthermore, the media has depicted the owner’s of this breed as impoverished, gang members, and drug dealers (Cohen & Richardson, 2002, p. 299). The connection of Pit Bulls to inner city gangs comprised of persons of color in the news served to racialize the breed (Weaver, 2015, p. 345) and place both owner and animal in a criminalized persona. “If Blacks are perceived to have a propensity for aggressiveness and violence, then an observation that this group is more likely to own pit bulls may lead to the belief that the breed is attractive to Blacks because of its violent tendencies rather than companionship potential” (Thompson et al., 2019, p. 5). News reports have perpetuated this belief by utilizing language which presents the owners as people deemed as dangerous by most citizens. Owners have been portrayed as thugs and inner-city gang members, who intentionally treated the dogs in manners designed to make them as mean as possible (Twining et al., 2000, p. 2).

Pit Bulls became viewed as an “accessory” to the drug trade and “synonymous with a particular kind of criminal, urban deviance” (Swann, 2010, p. 5). This association was so ingrained that the mere belief a Pit Bull was present in a residence was deemed in some courts as acceptable for police to enter without knocking (Barnhard, 2018, p. 72).

Pit Bulls were linked to gangs, not only for the connection to drug dealing, but also their exploitation of dog fighting (Swann, 2010, p. 6). The joining of Pit Bulls and the African American Culture and dog fighting was solidified with the arrest of Michael Vick. His fame increased the attention on his case and he served to “put a face on the crime of dogfighting – a Black one” (Linder, 2018, pp. 57–58).

Linder’s research, evaluating the association of dog breeds to perceived owners, with a focus on the connection between the breed and the race of the owner, found a significant link between Pit Bulls and the belief the owner was young, Black, and male. Participants were provided with pictures of six different breeds of dogs, all with the same background, and asked to identify the most likely owner by gender,

race/ethnicity, and age. Of the one hundred seventy participants, 44% were male and 56% were female; 79% identified as White, 6% Black, 6% Hispanic, 6% Asian, and 2% other. Although various breeds were included in the study, of note, was the German Shepherd, as it had been deemed, prior to the Pit Bull, to be one of the most dangerous types of dogs. However, despite the perception of being dangerous, German Shepherds are not typically included in Breed Specific Legislation. Although study participants overwhelmingly associated both breeds with male owners, German Shepherds were largely connected to White owners and Pit Bulls to Black owners. The remaining four breeds included in the study were predominantly identified as being owner by White women. (Linder, 2018, pp. 59–64)

Although further research is needed to validate the premise implicit racial bias contributes to the negative perception of Pit Bulls, there appears to be a plausible connection. If this is in fact the case, implicit racial bias has a definitive adverse impact on the welfare of Pit Bulls, including breed specific legislation and increased presence in shelters, including the resulting adoptability issues.

The following will provide a detailed analysis of the impact racial biases have on the perception of Pit Bulls, and how this view stems from the believed owners of the dog versus any factual data. Furthermore, these erroneous viewpoints are the foundation of racialized practices, such as Breed Specific Legislation, which are determinantal to the welfare of the Pit Bull. Breed Specific Legislation by state will be compared for patterns and cross-referenced with Census Race Data to determine any correlations.

Breed Specific Legislation are ordinances, many of which are at the local level, that mandate restrictions on certain dogs based solely on their breed versus any observed behaviors or documented aggression. The directives range from declaration of a breed(s) to be considered dangerous to mandatory sterilization to outright bans. Several states have implemented legislation that prohibits municipalities from enacting such regulations. This paper compares the localities which have implemented Breed Specific Legislation to the corresponding census data pertaining to race to evaluate if a correlation exists. It is anticipated the localities with such regulatory requirements will have a larger representation of persons of color, when compared to places without Breed Specific Legislation.

RESULTS

Breed Specific Legislation across the United States

This section summarizes Breed Specific Legislation in the United States at a state level by reviewing information contained on three resources: BSL Census (<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022), ASPCA States Prohibiting Breed Specific Legislation (<https://www.asPCA.org/improving-laws-animals/public-policy/what-breed-specific-legislation>, accessed March 2022), and Best Friends Anti-Breed Specific Legislation by State (<https://resources.bestfriends.org/article/anti-breed-specific-legislation-state>, accessed March 2022). Data from the three websites was compiled and comparison was made to determine which states there was an agreement among the three sites that no state-wide legislation existed to prohibit localities from implementing Breed Specific Legislation.

There are twenty-five states which, per BSL Census have municipalities which have Breed Specific Legislation, and were not found by either the ASPCA or Best Friends to have state-wide regulatory bans on such laws. Nine states were identified by BSL Census to have state-wide prohibitions against Breed Specific Legislation, which were included on Best Friends list; however four states: Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Virginia were not included on the ASPCA listing. The only remaining discrepancy between ASPCA and Best Friends was South Carolina, which was reported by Best Friends as having prohibitions at the state level against Breed Specific Legislation. Nevada and Oklahoma were indicated

by both ASPCA and Best Friends as having state-wide regulation against Breed Specific Legislation; however, were not reflected the same by BSL Census. (See Table 1 for details).

Table 1: Breed Specific Legislation by State per Websites

State	Websites			State	Websites		
	BSL Census	APSCA	Best Friends		BSL Census	APSCA	Best Friends
Alabama	Permitted and exists	No	No	Montana	Permitted and exists	No	No
Alaska	N/A - None but no state reg	No	No	Nebraska	Permitted and exists	No	No
Arizona	No breed-specific by state	Yes	Yes	Nevada	N/A - None but no state reg	Yes	Yes
Arkansas	Permitted and exists	No	No	New Hampshire	N/A - None but no state reg	No	No
California	BSL despite state	Yes	Yes	New Jersey	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes
Colorado	BSL despite state	Yes	Yes	New Mexico	Permitted and exists	No	No
Connecticut	No breed-specific by state	No	Yes	New York	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes
Delaware	No breed-specific by state	No	Yes	North Carolina	Permitted and exists	No	No
Florida	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes	North Dakota	Permitted and exists	No	No
Georgia	Permitted and exists	No	No	Ohio	Permitted and exists	No	No
Hawaii	N/A - None but no state reg	No	No	Oklahoma	N/A - None but no state reg	Yes	Yes
Idaho	Permitted and exists	No	No	Oregon	Permitted and exists	No	No
Illinois	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes	Pennsylvania	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes
Indiana	Permitted and exists	No	No	Rhode Island	No breed-specific by state	No	Yes
Iowa	Permitted and exists	No	No	South Carolina	Permitted and exists	No	Yes
Kansas	Permitted and exists	No	No	South Dakota	No breed-specific by state	Yes	Yes
Kentucky	Permitted and exists	No	No	Tennessee	Permitted and exists	No	No
Louisiana	Permitted and exists	No	No	Texas	BSL despite state	Yes	Yes
Maine	No breed-specific by state	Yes	Yes	Utah	No breed-specific by state	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Permitted and exists	No	No	Vermont	Permitted and exists	No	No
Massachusetts	No breed-specific by state	Yes	Yes	Virginia	No breed-specific by state	No	Yes
Michigan	Permitted and exists	No	No	Washington	BSL despite state	Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Permitted and exists	Yes	Yes	West Virginia	Permitted and exists	No	No
Mississippi	Permitted and exists	No	No	Wisconsin	Permitted and exists	No	No
Missouri	Permitted and exists	No	No	Wyoming	Permitted and exists	No	No

<https://bslcensus.com>, <https://www.asPCA.org/improving-laws-animals/public-policy/what-breed-specific-legislation>, <https://resources.bestfriends.org/article/anti-breed-specific-legislation-state>, accessed March 2022

Table 1 represents the data gathered for each state from the BSL Census, ASPCA, and Best Friends Websites indicating whether or not the state has Breed Specific Legislation.

All three sources agree there are twenty-five states where no state-wide laws prohibiting local municipalities from implementing Breed Specific Legislation. Considering only these states, BSL Census reports 719 laws exist prohibiting, classifying, or otherwise regulating dogs based solely on breed. The majority of the regulations, 97.8% included Pit Bulls in the restricted breeds; 77.2% only listed Pit Bulls. A summary of the included breeds by state ordinance is illustrated in Table 2. Ironically, although studies identified specific breeds (Chihuahuas, Jack Russell Terriers, and Dachshunds) as aggressive in most circumstances (Duffy et al., 2008, p. 453), the only breed included in any of the legislation was the Chihuahua, and it was only cited in one (Hollister, California) of the 719 laws reviewed.

Table 2: Localities and Included Breeds by State

State	Number of Localities	Only Pit Bulls		Pit Bulls and Other Breeds		Pit Bulls Not Included	
		Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Alabama	11	7	63.6%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%
Arkansas	20	14	70.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%
Georgia	9	4	44.4%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%
Idaho	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Indiana	12	10	83.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%
Iowa	71	61	85.9%	10	14.1%	0	0.0%
Kansas	94	79	84.0%	15	16.0%	0	0.0%
Kentucky	31	19	61.3%	11	35.5%	1	3.2%
Louisiana	36	27	75.0%	9	25.0%	0	0.0%
Maryland	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Michigan	37	32	86.5%	3	8.1%	2	5.4%
Mississippi	47	29	61.7%	18	38.3%	0	0.0%
Missouri	90	77	85.6%	13	14.4%	0	0.0%
Montana	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
Nebraska	19	10	52.6%	9	47.4%	0	0.0%
New Mexico	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
North Carolina	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
North Dakota	15	9	60.0%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%
Ohio	83	75	90.4%	8	9.6%	0	0.0%
Oregon	3	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
Tennessee	40	35	87.5%	5	12.5%	0	0.0%
Vermont	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
West Virginia	8	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%
Wisconsin	66	50	75.8%	16	24.2%	0	0.0%
Wyoming	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>719</i>	<i>555</i>	<i>77.2%</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>20.6%</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>2.2%</i>

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 2 lists the number of localities within the twenty-five selected states which have Breed Specific Legislation. The targeted breeds of the legislation for each locality is defined based on solely Pit Bulls, Pit Bulls with at least one other breed, or Pit Bulls not targeted.

Over half (52.6%) of the ordinances banned the included breeds, 32.8% of the regulations served to identify the specific types of dogs as vicious and/or dangerous. The balance (14.6%) of the laws implemented a variety of restrictions including mandatory spay/neuter, enclosure requirements, leashing in public, and muzzling. Two ordinances, Colby, Kansas and St. Landry Parish, Louisiana, restricted the sheltering of Pit Bulls by not allowing public boarding and maintaining a no-adopt policy respectively. Table 3 summarizes the types of regulations by state.

Table 3: Localities and Type of Regulation

State	Number of Localities	Ban of Included Breeds		Label of Breed as Vicious, etc.		Other Restriction(s)	
Alabama	11	6	54.5%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%
Arkansas	20	16	80.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%
Georgia	9	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	4	44.4%
Idaho	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
Indiana	12	2	16.7%	5	41.7%	5	41.7%
Iowa	71	53	74.6%	16	22.5%	2	2.8%
Kansas	94	85	90.4%	4	4.3%	5	5.3%
Kentucky	31	12	38.7%	15	48.4%	4	12.9%
Louisiana	36	7	19.4%	21	58.3%	8	22.2%
Maryland	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Michigan	37	12	32.4%	18	48.6%	7	18.9%
Mississippi	47	18	38.3%	13	27.7%	16	34.0%
Missouri	90	57	63.3%	22	24.4%	11	12.2%
Montana	3	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%
Nebraska	19	11	57.9%	4	21.1%	4	21.1%
New Mexico	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
North Carolina	2	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
North Dakota	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Ohio	83	19	22.9%	58	69.9%	6	7.2%
Oregon	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%
Tennessee	40	19	47.5%	16	40.0%	5	12.5%
Vermont	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
West Virginia	8	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	1	12.5%
Wisconsin	66	34	51.5%	20	30.3%	12	18.2%
Wyoming	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>719</i>	<i>378</i>	<i>52.6%</i>	<i>236</i>	<i>32.8%</i>	<i>105</i>	<i>14.6%</i>

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 3 lists the number of localities within the twenty-five selected states which have Breed Specific Legislation. The type of regulation for each locality is defined by having a ban of the breed(s), labeling the breed(s) as dangerous, vicious, etc., or some other type of requirement.

The following sections will review the three anomalies in ordinances: Hollister, California – the only regulation which included Chihuahuas; Colby, Kansas – prohibits Pit Bulls from being publicly boarded; and St. Landry Parish, Louisiana – implemented a “no-adopt” policy for Pit Bulls. The respective regulations will be evaluated in greater detail to determine potential background and influential factors.

Anomalies in Breed Specific Legislation

Hollister, California – Regulation Includes Chihuahuas

The City of Hollister California Code of Ordinances, Title 6 – Animals, Chapter 6.20 – Mandatory Spay and Neuter Program, Section 6.20.010 A requires “the mandatory spaying and neutering of all restricted dogs...whose owners have not obtained an unaltered dog certification to maintain an intact restricted dog”. Section 6.20.030 identifies “restricted dogs” as Chihuahuas and Pit Bulls, as defined in Section 6.20.020 as the specific breeds “or any dog that exhibits physical traits of any one or more of the above breeds or any dog exhibiting those distinguishing characteristics which conform to the standards established by the American Kennel Club (“AKC”), United Kennel Club (“UKC”), or American Dog Breeders Association (“ADBA”) for any of the above breeds. These standards are listed on the clubs' websites.” Dogs trained and utilized by law enforcement or for search/rescue and/or breeding stock for such uses, identified by a veterinarian as unable to be desexed for medical reasons, or maintained in a licensed kennel for training or breeding are exempt from the statute. Additionally, the animal control supervisor

has the authority to issue certification for unaltered restricted dogs over the mandated age of six months, if certain criteria is met (*CHAPTER 6.20. - MANDATORY SPAY AND NEUTER PROGRAM | Code of Ordinances | Hollister, CA | Municode Library, n.d.*). The code was amended in 2010 with ordinance 1066. Per the findings utilized by the City of Hollister to support the ordinance, the regulation was a result of an increase in animal shelters of Chihuahuas and Pit Bulls, accounting for an approximate 20% per breed of all animal control intakes in 2009 and in 2010 as of the drafting of the legislation. Furthermore, it was stated in 2009 Chihuahuas and Pit Bulls represented 22% and 38% of euthanized dogs respectively. As of the drafting of the ordinance in 2010, the percentages were 26% for Chihuahuas and 34% for Pit Bulls (*Hollister_10_4_10_City_Council_OrdinanceMSN2.Pdf, n.d.*).

The Hollister, California Breed Specific Legislation does not identify Pit Bulls or Chihuahuas as dangerous or vicious dogs and the mandatory desexing, on face value, is resultant from an increase in “unwanted” dogs of the two breeds. However, there is likely underlying factors contributing to the influx of Chihuahuas and Pit Bulls; which may or may not be related to misperceptions arising from unconscious racial bias.

Colby, Kansas – Ordinance prohibiting boarding of Pit Bulls

The City of Colby, Kansas, Ordinance No. 1544 amended the Chapter II of the City’s Code relating to Animal Control Regulations by adding Article 4 – Licensing Requirements for an Animal Maintenance Permit/Kennel License. Section 2-402 – Maximum Number of Dogs and Cats, Subsection (B)5B8 states: “no animal maintenance permit/kennel license shall be issued to own, keep, or harbor a Pit Bull dog”.

Per the August 19, 2014 Minutes from the City of Colby, Kansas Council Meeting, Ordinance No. 1544 was unanimously accepted. The description in the minutes states the amendment to the City Code addresses the “location where kennels are permitted”, and that kennels are not “allowed in residential areas at all, allowed in commercial areas as long as they are enclosed, and industrial zones with inspections done by the Code Officer” (Bolyard et al., 2014).

Of note is the fact that nowhere in the documented discussion was the disallowance of Pit Bulls in shelters referenced; however, this was the only included breed in the legislation.

St. Landry Parish, Louisiana – Shelters have a non-adopt policy for Pit Bulls

Although reported on the Breed Specific Legislation Census Website, the listing of a shelter as not adopting out Pit Bulls is apparently a policy of the facility versus an ordinance of the locality (*Pit Bulls in St. Landry Parish given Second Chance at Life - KATC.Com | Continuous News Coverage | Acadiana-Lafayette, 2017*). However, the fact a shelter would not permit the adoption of a specific breed of dog is potentially more concerning on some level than a regulation as shelters are charged with protecting animals.

Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation

This section compares Census Data with municipalities having Breed Specific Legislation in one state within each of the four United States Regions as defined by the Census Bureau. In order to facilitate a robust comparison, the selected state in each area will be the one with the most ordinances.

The racial data by state is depicted in Appendix A - Table 4 with the selected states highlighted. In order to illustrate a relationship between race and Breed Specific Legislation, the self-identified race of persons residing in the four states, per the Census Data, will be compared between localities with, and without, regulatory mandates.

Data from the 2020 United States Census was accessed through the Census.gov website and information by state, county, and city were obtained. The Census has numerous categories for race and ethnicity, including singular and multiple identifications. For purposes of this comparison, the only data points utilized were those representing persons identifying as a single race or ethnicity. The data was then summarized by geographical locality (state, county, or city) by places with and without Breed Specific Legislation. (<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022).

Table 4a summarizes the census data by race to compare the states with and without Breed Specific Legislation. The states with regulations targeting Pit Bulls, either solely or in conjunction with other breeds are further delimited. Black or African American persons constitute 11.93% of the overall population; however, represent 15.59% of the population in states with Breed Specific Legislation targeting Pit Bulls. In the states without such regulatory restrictions, they account for 10% of the overall population. The increased representation of African Americans in states with Breed Specific Legislation could be indicative of an association between racial identity and Breed Specific Legislation.

Table 4a – Census Data by State, with and without Breed Specific Legislation

	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone
Total (Number)	334,735,155	65,329,087	269,406,068	191,722,195	39,944,624	2,252,011	19,621,465	622,109	1,692,341
States w/BSL	116,271,573	9,858,048	106,413,525	78,976,764	18,032,305	806,291	3,306,802	99,272	452,679
States w/ Pit Bull BSL	115,628,496	9,842,544	105,785,952	78,403,563	18,023,656	804,305	3,295,345	99,102	450,118
States w/o BSL	218,463,582	55,471,039	162,992,543	112,745,431	21,912,319	1,445,720	16,314,663	522,837	1,239,662
States w/o Pit Bull BSL	219,106,659	55,486,543	163,620,116	113,318,632	21,920,968	1,447,706	16,326,120	523,007	1,242,223
Total (%)		19.52%	80.48%	57.28%	11.93%	0.67%	5.86%	0.19%	0.51%
States w/BSL		8.48%	91.52%	67.92%	15.51%	0.69%	2.84%	0.09%	0.39%
States w/ Pit Bull BSL		8.51%	91.49%	67.81%	15.59%	0.70%	2.85%	0.09%	0.39%
States w/o BSL		25.39%	74.61%	51.61%	10.03%	0.66%	7.47%	0.24%	0.57%
States w/o Pit Bull BSL		25.32%	74.68%	51.72%	10.00%	0.66%	7.45%	0.24%	0.57%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 4a summarizes the overall census of all states, as well as dividing the state census data into those states identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. The states with Breed Specific Legislation are further delineated into states where the regulation includes Pit Bulls and those which do not include Pit Bulls. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

The correlation matrix of all state census data compared to the number of localities with Breed Specific Legislations indicates a positive relationship with persons identifying as White and an inverse one with Hispanic and Asian individuals. Interestingly there is no correlation with African Americans. This indicates the greater the number of persons identifying as White, the more likely there is to be Breed Specific Legislation. The opposite is true as related to persons reporting to be Hispanic and Asian; with a decreased likelihood of Breed Specific Legislation as the number of these groups increase. See Figure 1 for detail.

Figure 1 – Correlation Matrix: State Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation

	<u>BSLBin</u>	<u>BSLN</u>	<u>HisLat</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Native</u>	<u>OtherMixed</u>
BSLBin	1.00							
BSLN	0.86	1.00						
HisLat	-0.39	-0.46	1.00					
White	0.29	0.33	-0.79	1.00				
Black	0.13	0.19	-0.12	-0.47	1.00			
Asian	-0.50	-0.45	-0.45	-0.59	0.07	1.00		
Native	0.01	0.15	-0.15	-0.04	-0.35	-0.27	1.00	
OtherMixed	-0.41	-0.48	-0.48	-0.78	-0.16	0.54	0.19	1.00

Associations between the dependent variable, the number of breed specific legislations in a state, and several independent variables describing the proportion of deferent demographic groups in each state were calculated as Pearson's r in R using the command "rcorr" in the Hmisc package (R Core Team, 2020). Data in the analysis was limited to the continental 48 states as to eliminate states or territories with very skewed demographics (eg Hawaii has a disproportionate number of Hawaiians in their population). Demographic groups representing less than 1% of the US population were also eliminated for the list of independent variables. Final both dependent and independent variables were log transformed to help normalize the data priority to statistically analysis.

Comparing the number of Breed Specific Legislation in states where all three websites agree the ordinances are allowable, the selected states for further analysis with Census Data are: Kansas, Vermont, Mississippi, and Idaho, as indicated in Table 5.

Table 5 – States by Region and Number of Localities With Breed Specific Legislation

<u>State</u>	<u>Region</u>	<u>Number of Localities</u>
Kansas	Midwest	94
Missouri	Midwest	90
Ohio	Midwest	83
Iowa	Midwest	71
Wisconsin	Midwest	66
Michigan	Midwest	37
Nebraska	Midwest	19
North Dakota	Midwest	15
Indiana	Midwest	12
Vermont	Northeast	10
Mississippi	South	47
Tennessee	South	40
Louisiana	South	36
Kentucky	South	31
Arkansas	South	20
Alabama	South	11
Georgia	South	9
West Virginia	South	8
Maryland	South	4
North Carolina	South	2
Idaho	West	4
Montana	West	3
Oregon	West	3
New Mexico	West	2
Wyoming	West	2

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

Table 5 identifies each of the twenty-five states by region based on the US Census criteria and indicates the number of localities in each state which have initiated Breed Specific Legislation. The highlighted states represent the one, by region, with the largest number of localities with Breed Specific Legislation.

Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation – Idaho

According to the Breed Specific Legislation Census Website, Idaho has four localities in which there are regulations based on a dog’s breed. All four of the ordinances impact only Pit Bulls; two ban the breed and two identify them as dangerous or a nuisance. See Table 6 for specifics.

Table 6 – Idaho Localities with Breed Specific Legislation

Locality	County	Type of Regulation	Pit Bulls Included?	Other Breeds Included?	Ordinance
Ashton	Freemont	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6.12.020
Cascade	Valley	Dangerous	Yes	No	Section: 5-1-5
Georgetown	Bear Lake	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 60
Jerome	Jerome	Unlawful Property Nuisance	Yes	No	Section: 8.10.020

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 6 lists the localities and corresponding county which have Breed Specific Legislation in the State of Idaho. The type of regulation and whether or not Pit Bulls are included or if other breeds are included is indicated. The respective ordinance is listed.

Reviewing the US Census Data, Idaho’s population predominantly identifies as White, with approximately 79% of respondents indicating this race, without any additional races included. The next largest race/ethnicity was Hispanic/Latino, which accounts for slightly over 13% of the State’s residents. In the four counties where Breed Specific Legislation exists, persons identifying as Hispanic/Latino account for 20.76% of the population, which exceeds not only the state percentage, but the 12.78% representation in those counties without targeted regulations. Jerome County, in which there is an ordinance identifying Pit Bulls as an “Unlawful Property Nuisance” has a significantly lower percentage of residents identifying as White and a higher number reporting to be Hispanic/Latino (38% versus the overall state value of 13%).

Table 7 summarizes the census data by counties with and without Breed Specific Legislation.

Table 7 – Idaho Census by Counties With and Without Breed Specific Legislation

	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	More than One Race
Total (Number)	1,839,106	239,407	1,599,699	1,450,523	14,785	18,903	26,036	3,401	8,243	317,215
Counties w/BSL	55,743	11,575	44,168	41,889	86	257	192	56	182	13,081
Counties w/o BSL	1,783,363	227,832	1,555,531	1,408,634	14,699	18,646	25,844	3,345	8,061	304,134
Total (%)		13.02%	86.98%	78.87%	0.80%	1.03%	1.42%	0.18%	0.45%	17.25%
Counties w/BSL		20.76%	79.24%	75.15%	0.15%	0.46%	0.34%	0.10%	0.33%	23.47%
Counties w/o BSL		12.78%	87.22%	78.99%	0.82%	1.05%	1.45%	0.19%	0.45%	17.05%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 7 summarizes the overall census of all counties in Idaho, as well as dividing the county specific census data into those counties identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

Jerome Idaho Code of Ordinances, Title 8 – Health and Safety, Section 08.10.020 includes the violation of Title 6 – Animals if a Pit Bull is involved as an “Unlawful Property Nuisance”. Other included criteria relate to the sale of narcotics, and other criminal activity (*TITLE 8 HEALTH AND SAFETY1*, n.d.). Pit Bulls are frequently erroneously associated with narcotic distribution (Swann, 2010, p. 5). The inclusion of animal law violations solely related to Pit Bulls with drug distribution offenses is occurring in an area with a disproportionately higher representation of persons of color is potentially an indicator of bias towards potential owners of Pit Bulls versus any demonstratable infractions of the breed itself.

Our analysis of these data sets indicated no statistically significant correlation between the frequency of the population’s self-identified race and the number of Breed Specific Legislations per county in the State of Idaho.

Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation – Kansas

According to the Breed Specific Legislation Census Website, there are 76 municipalities in Kansas with ordinances related to certain dogs in 62 (59%) of the 105 counties. All of the regulations include Pit Bulls, and only 14 (18%) have at least one other restricted breed; the majority (89%) ban the breed(s). Sedgwick County had the most (5) localities with restrictions, followed by Dickinson County (4), and Butler County (3); twelve other counties had two municipalities with regulatory requirements, and the balance of the counties had one city/town with a related ordinance. See Appendix A - Table 8 for details by municipality.

Reviewing the census data for the Kansas Counties which contain localities which enacted breed specific legislation, thirteen have a higher percentage of Hispanic/Latino residents than the state rate. Of note are Finney, Ford, Grant, and Seward Counties, which all have a Hispanic/Latino population exceed 50%, compared to a state-wide rate of 13%. Only two counties, Sedgwick and Shawnee, had a greater percentage of African American residents than the state as a whole (8.6% and 7.6% compared to 5.6%); Sedgwick County accounts for an approximate 18% of the entire state’s population and has the most localities with Breed Specific Legislation in the State. Appendix A - Table 9 details the census data by county. It should be noted that on the aggregate, counties in Kansas without Breed Specific Legislation had a larger percentage of African American residents than those counties with Breed Specific Legislation. Table 9a illustrates the aggregate census data for Kansas by Breed Specific Legislation status.

Sedgwick County has five localities which have implemented breed specific legislation: Garden Plain, Maize, Mount Hope, Park City, and Wichita, census details highlighted in Table 10. Wichita’s population percentage identifying as African American exceeds that of the county in entirety (10.6% versus 8.6%). Perhaps even more significant is the fact that despite the city only accounting for an approximate 76% of the population of the county, African Americans residing in Wichita represent about 94% of those living in the county as a whole.

Table 9a – Kansas Census Data by Breed Specific Legislation Status

	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	More than One Race
Total (Number)	2,937,880	382,603	2,555,277	2,122,575	163,352	21,921	85,225	3,115	10,064	531,628
Counties w/BSL	2,192,268	277,157	1,915,111	1,608,486	103,108	16,168	65,747	1,724	7,345	389,690
Counties w/o BSL	745,612	105,446	640,166	514,089	60,244	5,753	19,478	1,391	2,719	141,938
Total (%)		13.02%	86.98%	72.25%	5.56%	0.75%	2.90%	0.11%	0.34%	18.10%
Counties w/BSL		12.64%	87.36%	73.37%	4.70%	0.74%	3.00%	0.08%	0.34%	17.78%
Counties w/o BSL		14.14%	85.86%	68.95%	8.08%	0.77%	2.61%	0.19%	0.36%	19.04%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 9a summarizes the overall census of all counties in Kansas, as well as dividing the county specific census data into those counties identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

Sedgwick County has five localities which have implemented breed specific legislation: Garden Plain, Maize, Mount Hope, Park City, and Wichita. The summary of the census data based on Breed Specific Legislation status is highlighted in Table 10. Notably, localities with Breed Specific Legislation have a large representation of African American residents than the entirety of the county (10.46% versus 8.61%) and

is substantially higher than those localities without Breed Specific Legislation (10.46% versus 2.26%). Wichita’s population percentage identifying as African American exceeds that of the county in entirety (10.6% versus 8.6%). Perhaps even more significant is the fact that despite the city only accounting for an approximate 76% of the population of the county, African Americans residing in Wichita represent about 94% of those living in the county as a whole.

Table 10 – Sedgwick County Census Data by Breed Specific Legislation Status

	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	More than One Race
Total (Number)	523,824	82,630	441,194	336,271	45,076	4,450	22,205	513	1,979	113,330
Places w/ BSL	405,133	73,446	331,687	239,856	42,391	3,462	20,092	433	1,621	97,278
Places w/o BSL	118,691	9,184	109,507	96,415	2,685	988	2,113	80	358	16,052
Total (%)		15.77%	84.23%	64.20%	8.61%	0.85%	4.24%	0.10%	0.38%	21.64%
Places w/ BSL		18.13%	81.87%	59.20%	10.46%	0.85%	4.96%	0.11%	0.40%	24.01%
Places w/o BSL		7.74%	92.26%	81.23%	2.26%	0.83%	1.78%	0.07%	0.30%	13.52%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 10 summarizes the overall census of all cities/localities in Sedgwick County, Kansas, as well as dividing the city/locality specific census data into those places identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

According to Wichita’s City Code, Title 6 – Animals, Chapter 6.04 – Animal Control and Protection, a Pit Bull is defined as:

Pit Bull dog is defined to mean any and all of the following dogs:

1. *The Staffordshire Bull Terrier breed of dogs;*
2. *The American Staffordshire Terrier breed of dogs;*
3. *The American Pit Bull Terrier breed of dogs;*
4. *Dogs which have the appearance and physical characteristics of being predominately of the breeds of dogs known as Staffordshire Bull Terrier, American Pit Bull Terrier or American Staffordshire Terrier.*

A dog which possesses five out of the following eight characteristics shall be considered to be a Pit Bull:

1. *Head is medium length, with a broad skull and very pronounced cheek muscles, a wide, deep muzzle, a well-defined, moderately deep stop, and strong under jaw. Viewed from the front the head is shaped like a broad, blunt wedge.*
2. *Eyes are round to almond shaped, are low in the skull and set far apart.*
3. *Ears are set high. Un-cropped ears are short and usually held rose or half prick, though some hold them at full prick.*
4. *Neck is heavy and muscular, attached to strong, muscular shoulders.*
5. *Body is muscular, with a deep, broad chest, a wide front, deep brisket, well-sprung ribs, and slightly tucked loins.*
6. *Tail is medium length and set low, thick at the base, tapering to a point.*
7. *Hindquarters are well muscled, with hocks, set low on the legs.*
8. *Coat is a single coat, smooth, short and close to the skin. Pit bull puppies have the same characteristics, though in juvenile or adolescent form. Muscles, along with breadth and depth of head and chest may be less developed. Specifically excepted from this definition is any dog with*

proof, by a written certification from a veterinarian licensed by the State of Kansas, that the dog does not contain in its lineage any American Pit Bull Terrier, American Staffordshire Terrier or Staffordshire Bull Terrier.

Section 6.04.052 – Restrictions on the Ownership of Pit Bulls mandates microchipping of any Pit Bull as defined by the statute. Additionally, no person is permitted to own more than two Pit Bulls, and no property is to house more than two of this breed. The ordinance indicates it is “unlawful” to have an unaltered adult Pit Bull, with the exception of a licensed breeder who is permitted to have only two unaltered Pit Bulls (*CHAPTER 6.04. - ANIMAL CONTROL AND PROTECTION | Code of Ordinances | Wichita, KS | Municode Library, n.d.*).

Our analysis of these data sets indicated no statistically significant correlation between the frequency of the population’s self-identified race and the number of Breed Specific Legislations per county in the State of Kansas.

Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation – Mississippi

Breed Specific Legislation is reported to be in effect in 35 (42.8%) of the 82 counties in the State of Mississippi. All of the 47 regulations include Pit Bulls, and 61.7% do not restrict other breeds of dogs. Of the localities with legislation, 38.3% instituted bans against the breed(s) and 27.7% declare the included breeds to be “dangerous” or “vicious”. See Appendix A - Table 11 for details.

The representation of African Americans in counties with breed specific legislation (40.2%) is higher than the aggregate for all counties (36.4%), and even more so when compared to counties without such regulations (32.8%). This potentially indicates a connection between persons of color and localities where breed specific legislation is implemented. See Table 11 and 11a for specifics.

Four counties in Mississippi, Bolivar, Hinds, Rankin, and Washington have three regulatory requirements governing pit bulls. Each of the four counties, per the BSL Census Website, have two localities in which legislation is implemented as well as a county initiated policy. Rankin County will be analyzed further in the next section as it was the only county in which all three regulations were verified per the website.

Table 12a – Mississippi Census Data by Breed Specific Legislation

County	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	More than One Race
Total (Number)	2,961,279	105,220	2,856,059	1,639,077	1,079,001	14,019	32,305	1,037	7,174	188,666
Counties w/BSL	1,448,880	49,718	1,399,162	752,587	582,705	8,913	14,865	392	3,144	86,274
Counties w/o BSL	1,512,399	55,502	1,456,897	886,490	496,296	5,106	17,440	645	4,030	102,392
Total (%)		3.55%	96.45%	55.35%	36.44%	0.47%	1.09%	0.04%	0.24%	6.37%
Counties w/BSL		3.43%	96.57%	51.94%	40.22%	0.62%	1.03%	0.03%	0.22%	5.95%
Counties w/o BSL		3.67%	96.33%	58.61%	32.82%	0.34%	1.15%	0.04%	0.27%	6.77%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 12a summarizes the overall census of all counties in Mississippi, as well as dividing the county specific census data into those counties identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

The City of Flowood bans the “keeping” of pit bulls, without first obtaining a variance from the city ordinance. Interestingly, included in the section with pit bulls are “wild animals” and “dogs trained for fighting”. In order to request a variance, the person must comply with the following:

- a. *Proof of a pen or enclosure with a concrete floor covering the entire enclosed area, chain-link fence at least 6 feet in height around the enclosure, and a roof or cover capable of preventing the Wild Animal, Pit Bull or fighting dog from escaping the pen or enclosure.*
- b. *A minimum of \$100,000 Home Owner’s Liability Policy and letter from the insurance company indicating their knowledge of the presence of the animal on the property. (Section 20, City of Flowood Amended Ordinance, 2010).*

Our analysis of these data sets indicated no statistically significant correlation between the frequency of the population’s self-identified race and the number of Breed Specific Legislations per county in the State of Mississippi.

Census Data and Breed Specific Legislation – Vermont

Vermont has ten localities in which Breed Specific Legislation exists in four of the fourteen counties; all of the regulations include Wolf-dog hybrids, but do not include other breeds, even Pit Bulls. Six of the towns are located in Windham County, two are in Rutland County, and the remaining two are in Lamoille and Caledonia Counties. All of the ordinances dictate the type of enclosure which must be utilized for Wolf-dog Hybrids. Table 13 indicates the localities and applicable ordinance.

Table 13 – Vermont Breed Specific Legislation

Locality	County	Type of Regulation	Pit Bulls Included?	Other Breeds Included?	Ordinance
Town of Brookline	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2013
Town of Castleton	Rutland	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2002
Town of Hyde Park	Lamoille	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2017
Town of Jamaica	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2002
Town of Newfane	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2004
Town of Pittsford	Rutland	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 1995
Town of Putney	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2013
Town of Rockingham	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2008
Town of Waterford	Caledonia	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2014
Town of Westminster	Windham	Enclosure	No	Yes - Wolf-dog	Ordinance 2018

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 13 lists the localities and corresponding county which have Breed Specific Legislation in the State of Vermont. The type of regulation and whether or not Pit Bulls are included or if other breeds are included is indicated. The respective ordinance is listed.

The counties with Breed Specific Legislation in Vermont account for slightly over 25% of the state’s population. Unlike the aforementioned states, counties in which Breed Specific Legislation exist, have a lower representation of African Americans (0.87% versus 1.35% aggregate and 1.5% on counties without regulation). Appendix A - Table 14 and Table 14a provide additional detail. It should be noted that Vermont is the only state with Breed Specific Legislation which does not include Pit Bulls.

Table 14a – Summary Vermont by BSL and Census Data

	Total	Hispanic or Latino	Not Hispanic or Latino:	White alone	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	Multiple Races
Total (Number)	643,077	15,504	627,573	573,201	8,649	1,986	11,457	170	2,561	45,053
Counties w/BSL	162,655	3,814	158,841	147,152	1,419	427	1,455	40	654	11,508
Counties w/o BSL	480,422	11,690	468,732	426,049	7,230	1,559	10,002	130	1,907	33,545
Total (%)		2.41%	97.59%	89.13%	1.34%	0.31%	1.78%	0.03%	0.40%	7.01%
Counties w/BSL	25.29%	2.34%	97.66%	90.47%	0.87%	0.26%	0.89%	0.02%	0.40%	7.08%
Counties w/o BSL	74.71%	2.43%	97.57%	88.68%	1.50%	0.32%	2.08%	0.03%	0.40%	6.98%

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 12a summarizes the overall census of all counties in Vermont, as well as dividing the county specific census data into those counties identified as having Breed Specific Legislation and those which do not. Racial data is based on the self-reported information for the US Census and includes only persons identifying as one race.

Our analysis of these data sets indicated no statistically significant correlation between the frequency of the population’s self-identified race and the number of Breed Specific Legislations per county in the State of Vermont.

Discussion

This study compared localities in which Breed Specific Legislation exists to the racial composition of the community based on census data. Comparison of states in totality, as well as a selected state within each region of the United States was conducted. The only significant correlation was found when all states were included in the data. This revealed a positive relationship between the prevalence of persons identifying as White and presence of Breed Specific Legislation. A negative correlation was found between individuals reporting to be Hispanic and those reporting to be Asian and the presence of Breed Specific Legislation. There was no relationship found between persons identifying as Black and Breed Specific Legislation, which was the hypothesis of the study. No correlations were found between the data points within the four states (Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, and Vermont).

Although the results of the research did not align with the initial hypothesis, it potentially is still indicative of implicit racial bias impacting the welfare of Pit Bulls. The correlation between the presence of individuals identifying as white and breed specific legislation may be due to biases towards persons of color. If persons identifying as white have biases towards persons of color, then they could push for legislation against dogs primarily associated with persons of color under the guise they are aggressive, violent, etc.

Breed Specific Legislation and racial composition of a community appear to be correlated indicating implicit bias may play a role in the perception of certain dog breeds, specifically the Pit Bull. More research is needed to gain a complete understanding of this relationship, however, the evaluation of communities which implemented such legislation and the corresponding census data is a start to understanding the connection.

Analysis of the timing of implementation of Breed Specific Legislation and the preceding incident would be essential in gaining a complete understanding of the influence of race in this regard. It should be noted that this research only focused on current regulations, many of which have been voided in recent years. Reviewing past Breed Specific Legislation and racial composition of the community could produce different results.

The increased awareness of disparities and systemic racism in our society intersecting with the focus on animal welfare creates an optimal scenario to continue the research in this regard. Linder (2018) has established people are more likely to associate Pit Bulls with persons of color. Despite research to the contrary, Pit Bulls continue to be demonized by many. Although other breeds have been identified as more aggressive than Pit Bulls, in most cases, they do not face the regulatory discrimination as Pit Bulls do through Breed Specific Legislation. The fact this study has defined a correlation between localities with such legislation and the racial composition of the area further solidifies the belief Pit Bulls are targeted not because of the animal itself, but because of the perceived owner.

References

Amodio, D. M. (2014). The neuroscience of prejudice and stereotyping. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, 15(10), 670–682. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3800>

Are Pitbulls the Black People of Dogs? (n.d.). The Faculty Lounge. Retrieved October 9, 2021, from <https://www.thefacultyounge.org/2008/02/are-pitbulls-th.html>

Barnhard, G. M. (2018). Breed-Specific Legislation: The Pitfalls of Pit Bull Prohibitions Notes. *Mid-Atlantic Journal on Law and Public Policy*, 4, 59–99.

Bolyard, M. L., Bolyard, L., Britton, F., Hake, M., Jennings, D., Mallory, P., Mariman, B., & Schmidt, S. (n.d.). *CONSENT AGENDA: A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 5, 2014 REGULAR MEETING B. APPROVAL OF PAYROLL ORDINANCE NO. 3239 C. APPROVAL OF GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 3240. 5. CHAPTER 6.04. - ANIMAL CONTROL AND PROTECTION | Code of Ordinances | Wichita, KS | Municode Library*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 20, 2022, from https://library.municode.com/ks/wichita/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT6AN_CH6.04ANCOPR

CHAPTER 6.20. - MANDATORY SPAY AND NEUTER PROGRAM | Code of Ordinances | Hollister, CA | Municode Library. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2022, from https://library.municode.com/ca/hollister/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT6AN_CH6.20MASPNEPR

Cohen, J., & Richardson, J. (2002). Pit Bull Panic. *The Journal of Popular Culture*, 36(2), 285–317. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5931.00007>

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. L. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(6), 1267–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003>

Dovidio, J. F., Pearson, A. R., & Penner, L. A. (2018). Aversive Racism, Implicit Bias, and Microaggressions. In G. C. Torino, D. P. Rivera, C. M. Capodilupo, K. L. Nadal, & D. W. Sue (Eds.), *Microaggression Theory* (Vol. 1–Book, Section, pp. 16–31). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119466642.ch2>

Duberstein, A., King, B., & Johnson, A. R. (2021). Pit bulls and prejudice. *The Humanistic Psychologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hum0000259>

Duffy, D. L., Hsu, Y., & Serpell, J. A. (2008). Breed differences in canine aggression. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 114(3–4), 441–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2008.04.006>

Hollister_10_4_10_City_Council_OrdinanceMSN2.pdf. (n.d.). Retrieved March 19, 2022, from http://www.theanimalcouncil.com/files/Hollister_10_4_10_City_Council_OrdinanceMSN2.pdf

Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, Hellyer, Oxley, & Rishniw. (2019). Small Animal Veterinarians' Perceptions, Experiences, and Views of Common Dog Breeds, Dog Aggression, and Breed-Specific Laws in the United States. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(21), 4081. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16214081>

Linder, A. (2018). The Black Man's Dog: The Social Context of Breed Specific Legislation. *Animal Law*, *25*(1), 51–74.

Mongrels & Men. (2016, September 2). PIT BULL DISCRIMINATION – A PEOPLE PROBLEM? By Elana Pisani. *The Anti Breedism Alliance*. <https://antibreedismalliance.blog/2016/09/02/pit-bull-discrimination-a-people-problem-by-elana-pisani/>

Pit Bulls in St. Landry Parish given second chance at life—KATC.com | Continuous News Coverage | Acadiana-Lafayette. (2017, February 18).

<https://web.archive.org/web/20170218193640/http://www.katc.com:80/story/34506043/pit-bulls-in-st-landry-parish-given-second-chance-at-life>

R Core Team (2020) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

Russell-Brown, K. (2018). THE ACADEMIC SWOON OVER IMPLICIT RACIAL BIAS: Costs, Benefits, and Other Considerations. *Du Bois Review*, *15*(1), 185–193. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X18000073>

Salmanowitz, N. (2018). The impact of virtual reality on implicit racial bias and mock legal decisions. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, *5*(1), 174–203. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lisy005>

Section 20, AMENDED ORDINANCE OF THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF FLOWOOD, MISSISSIPPI ENACTING REGULATIONS PROVIDING FOR THE KEEPING OF ANIMALS WITHIN THE CITY AND RELATED MATTERS (July 19, 2010)

Swann, K. E. (2010). Irrationality unleashed: The pitfalls of breed-specific legislation. *UMKC Law Review*, *78*(3), 839.

The Black and White in America: Views on Race and Inequality, Worlds Apart. (2017). *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, *10*(3), 397–406.

Thompson, A. J., Pickett, J. T., & Intravia, J. (2019). Racial Stereotypes, Extended Criminalization, and Support for Breed-Specific Legislation: Experimental and Observational Evidence. *Race and Justice*, 215336871987633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368719876332>

TITLE 8 HEALTH AND SAFETY1. (n.d.). American Legal Publishing Corporation. Retrieved March 19, 2022, from https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/jeromeid/latest/jerome_id/0-0-0-1230

Table 8 – Kansas Localities with Breed Specific Legislation

Locality	County	Type of Regulation	Pit Bulls Included?	Other Breeds Included?	Ordinance
Kiowa	Barber	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Ellinwood	Barton	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 8704
Fort Scott	Bourbon	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6.08.130
Hiawatha	Brown	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-401
Andover	Butler	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2.311
Augusta	Butler	Dangerous	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-101
Douglass	Butler	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
El Dorado	Butler	Limit in home, Spay/Neuter	Yes	No	Section: 6.20.040
Cottonwood Falls	Chase	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-201
Cherokee County	Cherokee	Ban	Yes	No	Cherokee County Sheriff's Office
Clay Center	Clay	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Miltonvale	Cloud	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-40
New Strawn	Coffey	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Udall	Cowley	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-301
Girard	Crawford	Ban	Yes	Yes	Ordinance 1138
Pittsburg	Crawford	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 10-105
Abilene	Dickinson	Ban	Yes	No	News article
Chapman	Dickinson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Hope	Dickinson	Ban	Yes	Yes	Ordinance 414
Solomon	Dickinson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-116
Kinsley	Edwards	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Moline	Elk	Ban	Yes	No	City Website
Hays	Ellis	Dangerous	Yes	No	Section: 5-123
Ellsworth	Ellsworth	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6.04.360
Holcomb	Finney	Ban	Yes	No	News article
Bucklin	Ford	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 302
Dodge City	Ford	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 3382
Ottawa	Franklin	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 3-329
Williamsburg	Franklin	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 395
Junction City	Geary	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 215.040
Ulysses	Grant	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Eureka	Greenwood	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Anthony	Harper	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-214
Attica	Harper	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-123
Hesston	Harvey	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-125
Santana	Haskell	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-202
Holton	Jackson	Ban	Yes	No	2016 Minutes
Jackson County	Jackson	Registration	Yes	No	News article
Jefferson County	Jefferson	Ban	Yes	No	Resolution 97-32
McLouth	Jefferson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-106
Ozawie	Jefferson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-110
De Soto	Johnson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-108
Overland Park	Johnson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6.10
Westwood	Johnson	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-108
Deerfield	Kearny	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2.301
Cunningham	Kingman	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-211
Kingman	Kingman	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Greensburg	Kiowa	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2.401
Altamont	Labelle	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 591
Parsons	Labelle	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 205-11
Lincoln	Lincoln	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-403
La Cygne	Linn	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Mound City	Linn	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Oakley	Logan	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-301
Hillsboro	Marion	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Marion	Marion	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-203
Blue Rapids	Marshall	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Waterville	Marshall	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 542
Lindsborg	McPherson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 8-260
Marquette	McPherson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-102
Plains	Meade	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Plainville	Meade	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Louisburg	Miami	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-302
Paola	Miami	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 200.210
Independence	Montgomery	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 10-60
Chanute	Neosho	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6.04.130
Burlingame	Osage	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Lyndon	Osage	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 556
Overbrook	Osage	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-21
Minneapolis	Ottawa	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 2-210
Phillipsburg	Phillips	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-302
Haven	Reno	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 510
Belleville	Republic	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 6.12.010
Sterling	Rice	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 1(b)
Prairie Village	Rooks	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-105
Russell	Russell	Dangerous	Yes	No	Section: 2.210
Salina	Saline	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 7-142
Garden Plain	Sedgwick	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 612
Maize	Sedgwick	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Mount Hope	Sedgwick	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2.401
Park City	Sedgwick	Ban	Yes	No	Animal FAQ
Wichita	Sedgwick	Spaying/Neuterin & Microchipping	Yes	No	Section: 6.04, 6.08.010
Liberal	Seward	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Seward County	Seward	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 2011-07
Auburn	Shawnee	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Rossville	Shawnee	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-301
Goodland City	Sherman	Limit in home, Spay/Neuter	Yes	No	Section: 2-232
Hugoton	Stevens	Dangerous	Yes	No	Section: 2-302
Argonia	Sumner	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 560
Colby	Thomas	Public boarding prohibited	Yes	No	Ordinance 1544
Alma	Wabaunsee	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 2-401
Neodesha	Wilson	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 6-124
Yates Center	Woodson	Ban	Yes	No	Ordinance 1096
Wyandotte County	Wyandotte	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 7-219

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 9 – Kansas Census Data by County

Locality	County	Type of Regulation	Pit Bulls Included?	Other Breeds Included?	Ordinance
Corinth	Alcorn	Vicious	Yes	Yes	Section: 6-1, 6-5.1
Kosciusko	Attala	Dangerous	Yes	Yes	Animal ordinance
Ashland	Benton	Ban	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Bolivar County	Bolivar	Dangerous	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Cleveland	Bolivar	Restrictions	Yes	No	Section: 10-55
Shelby	Bolivar	Restrictions	Yes	No	News article
Carroll County	Carroll	Restrictions	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Okolona	Carroll	Dangerous	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
West Point	Clay	Vicious	Yes	Yes	Chapter 4
Clarksdale	Coahoma	Restrictions	Yes	No	Section: 4-37
Crystal Springs	Copiah	Dangerous	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Collins	Covington	Ban	Yes	Yes	News article
Town of Leakesville	Greene	Ban	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Grenada	Grenada	Restrictions	Yes	No	Section: 7-61, 7-62
Byram	Hinds	Ban	Yes	Yes	2015 ordinance
Clinton	Hinds	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 1-6.1
Hinds County	Hinds	Ban	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Lexington	Holmes	Ban	Yes	No	News article
Mantachie	Itawamba	Dangerous	Yes	No	News article
Gautier	Jackson	Dangerous	Yes	Yes	Section: 4-62
Town of Prentiss	Jefferson	Ban	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Ellisville	Jones	Ban	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Laurel	Jones	Restrictions	Yes	Yes	Chapter 5
Town of Monticello	Lawrence	Ban	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Carthage	Leake	Ban	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Tupelo	Lee	Dangerous	Yes	No	Section: 6-96
Greenwood	Leflore	Restrictions	Yes	No	Section: 6-23
Leflore County	Leflore	Restrictions	Yes	No	News article
Columbus	Lowndes	Vicious	Yes	No	Section: 6-71
Ridgeland	Madison	Ban	Yes	Yes	Section: 14-171
Aberdeen	Monroe	Restrictions	Yes	No	Pit bull ordinance
Winona	Montgomery	Restrictions	Yes	No	2006 ordinance
Philadelphia	Neshoba	Dangerous	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Macon	Noxubee	Ban	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Booneville	Prentiss	Vicious	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
Brandon	Rankin	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 14-71
Flowood	Rankin	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 20
Rankin County	Rankin	Insurance/Enclosure	Yes	Yes	2010 ordinance
Morton	Scott	leashed at all times	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Indianola	Sunflower	Ban	Yes	No	Section: 12-27
Ripley	Tippah	Ban	Yes	No	City FAQ
Tippah County	Tippah	Restrictions	Yes	Yes	Unconfirmed
New Albany	Union	Restrictions	Yes	No	News article
Greenville	Washington	Restrictions	Yes	No	Section: 8-116, 8-117
Leland	Washington	Vicious	Yes	No	News article
Washington County	Washington	Restrictions	Yes	No	Unconfirmed
Town of Coffeerville	Yalobusha	Ban	Yes	No	Unconfirmed

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022

Table 12 – Mississippi Census Data by County

County	Total	Hispanic or Latino		Not Hispanic or Latino:		White alone		Black or African American alone		American Indian and Alaska Native alone		Asian alone		Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone		Some Other Race alone		Multiple Races	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Addison	37,363	1,153	3.09%	36,210	96.91%	33,440	89.50%	342	0.92%	80	0.21%	594	1.59%	10	0.03%	110	0.29%	2,787	7.46%
Bennington	37,347	939	2.51%	36,408	97.49%	33,897	90.76%	405	1.08%	63	0.17%	397	1.06%	5	0.01%	119	0.32%	2,461	6.59%
Caledonia	30,233	605	2.00%	29,628	98.00%	27,465	90.84%	214	0.71%	94	0.31%	363	1.20%	17	0.06%	119	0.39%	1,961	6.49%
Chittenden	168,323	4,751	2.82%	163,572	97.18%	142,880	84.88%	4,757	2.83%	291	0.17%	7,203	4.28%	49	0.03%	762	0.45%	12,381	7.36%
Essex	5,920	67	1.13%	5,853	98.87%	5,544	93.65%	15	0.25%	14	0.24%	16	0.27%	5	0.08%	5	0.08%	321	5.42%
Franklin	49,946	915	1.83%	49,031	98.17%	45,239	90.58%	321	0.64%	483	0.97%	312	0.62%	16	0.03%	120	0.24%	3,455	6.92%
Grand Isle	7,293	127	1.74%	7,166	98.26%	6,697	91.83%	49	0.67%	39	0.53%	30	0.41%	0	0.00%	16	0.22%	462	6.33%
Lamoille	25,945	651	2.51%	25,294	97.49%	23,585	90.90%	217	0.84%	88	0.34%	141	0.54%	1	0.00%	121	0.47%	1,792	6.91%
Orange	29,277	477	1.63%	28,800	98.37%	26,852	91.72%	151	0.52%	113	0.39%	160	0.55%	5	0.02%	119	0.41%	1,877	6.41%
Orleans	27,393	462	1.69%	26,931	98.31%	25,259	92.21%	127	0.46%	197	0.72%	119	0.43%	1	0.00%	59	0.22%	1,631	5.95%
Rutland	60,572	1,225	2.02%	59,347	97.98%	55,092	90.95%	493	0.81%	146	0.24%	458	0.76%	14	0.02%	171	0.28%	4,198	6.93%
Washington	59,807	1,569	2.62%	58,238	97.38%	53,704	89.80%	612	1.02%	135	0.23%	632	1.06%	23	0.04%	319	0.53%	4,382	7.33%
Windham	45,905	1,333	2.90%	44,572	97.10%	41,010	89.34%	495	1.08%	99	0.22%	493	1.07%	8	0.02%	243	0.53%	3,557	7.75%
Windsor	57,753	1,230	2.13%	56,523	97.87%	52,537	90.97%	451	0.78%	144	0.25%	539	0.93%	16	0.03%	278	0.48%	3,788	6.56%
Total	643,077	15,504		627,573		573,201		8,649		1,986		11,457		170		2,561		45,053	

<https://data.census.gov>, accessed March 2022

<https://bslcensus.com>, accessed March 2022