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Abstract

This study explores whether the beliefs, attitudes, and policy practices of California animal welfare and control leaders are accurately reflected and in accord with position statements encountered in the animal welfare literature regarding the no-kill philosophy. Key issues examined include responsibility for animal control, mission fulfillment, quality of life for sheltered animals, public expectations of animal welfare and control agencies, financial impacts of various policy options, terminology in current usage, and future trends. Study findings demonstrate that the literature is not an accurate reflection of leaders' perceptions. Rather, the findings suggest that there is in actuality far less disagreement between open-door and no-kill animal agency leaders regarding no-kill policy issues than there is between proponents of these issues writing in animal control and welfare publications. Results suggest, contrary to the literature, that it is possible for leaders of these differing philosophies to partner together in addressing the animal welfare issues in their communities.
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Chapter One

This study investigated the degree of controversy among leaders in the California animal welfare and control fields regarding the no-kill philosophy. Perceptions of these leaders were compared to determine the extent of their differences on the no-kill policy issue, and whether these differences are as strong as the literature suggests. Creative solutions based on these findings are proposed in the conclusion section of this thesis.

Background of the Issue

For decades, animal welfare organizations have played valuable roles in our society by protecting animals from abandonment, abuse, and neglect. These nonprofit organizations began in the late 1800s largely to protest abuses of carriage horses, but quickly expanded their concern to animals of all species. Today, they provide a myriad of services intended to advocate for animals in their communities.

Humane societies or societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals (SPCAs) often operate shelters for lost or abandoned animals, reunite lost animals with their owners, find new homes for abandoned animals, provide low-cost pet sterilization programs, conduct education programs promoting kindness to animals, investigate cases of animal cruelty and abuse, and may provide animal control or sheltering services through contracts with municipal governments.

Humane societies provide animal control-related services for a number of reasons. Their contracts with municipalities in providing full or partial animal control services, or sheltering for the stray animals impounded by the municipal agency's officers, offer steady funding. It is not uncommon for these contracts to compose a major portion of a nonprofit animal welfare agency's annual budget. Examples of such services include impounding stray animals, enforcing animal control laws, investigating reports of animal abuse, removing dead animals from public property, responding to animal-related emergencies, and enforcing animal licensing requirements.

In addition, it is usually more cost-effective for a municipality to contract with a nonprofit humane society for services rather than perform them itself. The labor costs alone allow for a significant savings, and nonprofits have a greater ability than municipalities to attract donations to support their operating costs. Also, construction of animal housing facilities can cost millions of dollars. Municipalities with strapped budgets are reluctant to commit such sums to construct their own facility when there is a private contractor available to provide the service.

Many humane societies also bring a sense of mission to a field that was traditionally looked upon by municipal agencies as a low priority in the civic system. Animal control was often seen by municipalities as a public service, not an animal service. Consequently, when these duties were performed by the municipality, attention was focused more on public safety and rabies control rather than on adoption of homeless animals.

The perception that low-quality animal care was provided by municipal agencies years ago caused many humane societies to assume these functions themselves. Humane societies believed that, by performing animal control themselves, they were following their mission by helping animals more than the municipal agencies did. Their missions usually emphasized animal care, cruelty investigations, and strong adoption programs over public safety. Consequently, for nearly 60 years, most nonprofit animal welfare agencies have been providing animal control and/or sheltering services for the municipal areas that they serve.

By providing these municipal services, however, nonprofit animal shelters have suffered image and financial problems. Employing animal control officers to facilitate the animal control service, many animal shelters are viewed as the “police” by the constituents of their communities.

The shelters also often are mistaken to be municipal agencies instead of nonprofit organizations. This causes fund-raising problems, as donors believe that their taxes are paying for the operations of the animal shelter and, therefore, may not make personal contributions. Donors may also feel they should not be subsidizing activities they believe are the government’s responsibility.

Nevertheless, the largest public relations issue these animal shelters face is the euthanasia of unwanted animals. Although most successful nonprofit animal welfare agencies have regular and loyal donors who support them in their mission, the majority of the general populace focus negatively on the humane societies’ role in the euthanasia of unwanted animals. Many citizens are unwilling to contribute to shelters that perform euthanasia, and may be unwilling to visit the shelter to adopt an animal because they know that not all animals they see will find homes.

Even humane societies that do not have animal control or sheltering contracts contend with this issue. As long as they accept all animals brought to their shelter, humane societies must perform euthanasia. One reason for this is because not all of the animals they accept will be adoptable. Examples of such animals are those that are sick, aged, injured, aggressive, or illegal to own in that particular jurisdiction. These animals are euthanized because they cannot be offered for adoption, or the shelter cannot afford the
time and money to rehabilitate them.

Another reason for euthanasia is the fact there are more unwanted animals than there are homes to care for them. When an animal shelter does not restrict admission of animals, it must perform euthanasia to make room for the new arrivals. Animal shelters that do not restrict admission of animals are called “traditional” or “open-door” shelters. The term “traditional” refers to the fact that performing euthanasia has been a consequence of animal sheltering for as long as humane societies have existed. The term “open-door” is a more recent term used to describe the philosophy of such shelters—that they do not turn away any animal.

The euthanasia of unwanted animals has always been a cause of concern among people who care about animals. These people have attempted to reduce the numbers of unwanted animals by promoting the sterilization of pets, responsible pet ownership, and by discouraging the breeding of more animals. Until recently, the role of a community’s animal shelter has remained largely as described above. This, however, is beginning to change.

The concept of “no-kill” nonprofit animal welfare organizations is gaining more attention in the animal welfare field. No-kill shelters are normally defined as nonprofit animal welfare agencies where animals are offered for adoption, and continue to be sheltered until they are adopted into a new home. By definition, euthanasia is not performed at these facilities (or it happens very infrequently). Consequently, it is not uncommon for an animal to be at such a facility for a number of months, sometimes even years, before the institution finds it a home.

No-kill agencies are generally selective about the animals that they accept into their facilities. Obviously, animals deemed unadoptable by the agency are not accepted because the agency will find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find these animals new homes. Animals that are sick, ill, have poor temperaments, or suffer from some similar disability are often declined for admittance.

Usually a no-kill agency fills up quickly and has no room to accept more unwanted animals, even if it would be able to find them homes. In some cases, these animals are then taken by the owner to a local “open-door” animal shelter, which takes in all animals regardless of their condition.

For the purposes of this study, “sanctuaries” are not included in the concept of no-kill agencies. Sanctuaries are places where unwanted/homeless animals are placed for the remainder of their lives, with no intention of offering these animals for adoption. In addition, “collectors” are not included in this definition. A collector is an individual who
amasses a large number of animals, often because he or she does not want to see the animals euthanized. The collector maintains the animals as a private individual instead of an established organization.

The line between collectors and no-kills can certainly blur, as some collectors refer to themselves as no-kill organizations. For the purpose of this paper, however, collectors are individuals, not agencies, and are not included in the definition of no-kill organizations.

No-kill agencies began appearing about 15 years ago in response to the growing public concern over the euthanasia of unwanted animals. These organizations were often started by groups of individuals as alternatives to open-door shelters. They began in response to the media campaigns against pet overpopulation launched by many open-door animal shelters. These campaigns were often graphic, depicting barrels of dead animals in the hopes of shocking the public into becoming more responsible pet owners. The theory was that if the general public was confronted with these images, they would sterilize their pets to prevent more unwanted animals from being born and consequently euthanized.

Instead, this publicity caused people to view the humane societies in a negative light. Concerned people began to form small groups to formulate alternatives to the traditional sheltering model. Initially, these no-kill groups were small and non-influential. They were considered to be a "fringe" element by more traditional animal welfare workers. The general industry opinion at that time was that these organizations could not survive or succeed because they would rapidly fill up with animals, and the cost of maintaining populations of animals for extended periods of time would be prohibitive. In the beginning, these small organizations lacked the sophistication in fund-raising, marketing, and management to truly promote their organizations and establish them as viable entities.

Nevertheless, no-kill agencies were inspired by their mission and public opinion opposing euthanasia. This encouragement caused the no-kill community to grow into professional, established entities. The no-kill philosophy was adopted at some open-door agencies. Several larger, traditional nonprofit animal welfare agencies have adopted the no-kill philosophy. The first annual no-kill conference of people interested in this issue, hosted by Doing Things For Animals, Inc. (DTFA), occurred in 1995. The 1996 national conference of DTFA was cosponsored by the American Humane Association, a national animal welfare organization.

Due to the increasing strength of the no-kill movement, the no-kill concept has been the topic of heated controversy within the animal welfare field. The emergence of this movement has stirred a debate in the animal welfare literature, and may have caused some open-door leaders to reevaluate and redefine their organizations' missions.
Statement of the Issue

The debate which appears to be at hand revolves around which philosophy animal welfare and control leaders feel is the correct belief for their agencies to follow. Open-door leaders have been highly critical of the no-kill philosophy, for many reasons. The public now challenges open-door leaders to explain why their organizations euthanize animals, when no-kill shelters are able to avoid it. The competition for the fund-raising dollar is another source of concern for open-door leaders, who find it difficult to compete with no-kill appeals that promise that those organizations will not euthanize animals. Many open-door leaders also feel that the quality of life for animals in no-kill facilities is substandard and inhumane.

No-kill leaders have just as many disagreements with the open-door philosophy. They view these agencies as betraying the animals that they are supposed to serve. They believe that the term “euthanasia” is not a suitable term to describe the killing of unwanted animals, and instead refer to it as murder. Open-door leaders are just as unhappy with the term “no-kill” because they believe that it paints them in an unfair light, as “kill” agencies. Proponents of the two philosophies also disagree on who should bear responsibility for animal control—private or municipal agencies. The public's expectation of animal shelters and the financial impact of either philosophy are other areas of debate.

These are all positions put forth in the literature written on this subject. These writings, by both open-door and no-kill proponents, would seem to indicate that there is a vast chasm between the two philosophies. Most articles promoting one philosophy over the other contain very strong and often offensive language which criticizes the beliefs of the opposing faction. In reading these publications, one would imagine that there could never be a melding of philosophies, or even agreement about certain key points.

However, actions taken by some leaders of nonprofit open-door organizations contradict the open-door position as presented in these writings. This discrepancy raises the question whether the literature is a true reflection of the perceptions of leaders in this field. Their actions, and a beginning interest in dialogue among proponents of each philosophy, may mean that there may not be as much disagreement between the two positions as the literature suggests.

This paper gathered the perceptions of leaders in this field regarding the open-door/no-kill controversy. By studying leaders' perceptions, this study explored creative solutions to what appears to be two conflicting camps on this philosophical issue.
Normative Definitions of Relevant Variables

**Animal control contract**: A legal, written document between a municipality and a humane society, in which the humane society agrees to provide full or partial animal control and sheltering services in exchange for a fee.

**Animal control services**: Services to manage the impact of unattended animals on public safety, health, and welfare. Such services include enforcing animal control laws, investigating reports of animal abuse, removing dead animals from public property, responding to animal-related emergencies, and enforcing animal licensing requirements.

**Animal sheltering services**: Services provided by a humane society or SPCA that involve providing care and sheltering for animals on behalf of the municipality of that area.

**Animal welfare organization**: A nonprofit organization dedicated to advocating for animals on their behalf.

**Euthanasia**: The act of causing death painlessly. In an open-door animal shelter, animals are euthanized because they are sick, injured, behaviorally unsuitable for adoption, too old, too young, or there is not enough space in the shelter.

**Financial impact**: The budgetary consequence of a decision or action. In this study, the financial impact of adopting either a no-kill or open-door philosophy is examined.

**Future**: The prospect of what is to come; the eventual destiny of the organization. This study will examine whether leaders plan to change their organization's philosophies in the future.

**Humane society or SPCA**: These terms are used interchangeably to denote nonprofit animal welfare organizations that operate shelters for lost or abandoned animals, reunite lost animals with their owners, and attempt to find new homes for abandoned animals. In addition, such agencies may provide low-cost pet sterilization programs, conduct education programs promoting kindness to animals, investigate cases of animal cruelty and abuse, and may provide animal control services through contracts with municipal governments.
Leader: The highest-ranking employee of an organization, such as executive director, chief executive officer, or president.

Mission: A nonprofit agency's purpose and reason for existence. In this study, mission speaks to how a leader defines his/her agency's role in the community.

No-kill shelter: A humane society that normally restricts admission of animals to only those that it will be able to find homes for. Euthanasia is not performed at these facilities, or it is performed infrequently as a measure of last resort.

Open-door or traditional shelter: These terms are used interchangeably. A humane society that does not restrict admission of animals, and consequently must perform euthanasia.

Perceptions: An opinion or judgment reflecting one's belief. This study examines the perceptions of leaders regarding the no-kill philosophy.

Public expectation: What the constituents of the community served by a humane society consider to be proper or necessary services and actions by that agency.

Quality of life: The degree of humane existence for an animal in an animal shelter. In this study, quality of life consists of housing, food, medical attention, socialization, exercise and rest.

Suitable: An acceptable state of affairs. This study explores what leaders believe to the best terms used to describe certain aspects of animal welfare.

Specification of the Research Questions
The proposition that guided this study was that there would be fewer differences between the perceptions of leaders of no-kill and open-door philosophies than were indicated in the literature. These relatively concurring perceptions would indicate that leaders of open-door shelters may actually agree with some or all of the no-kill philosophy. It was also anticipated that the perceptions of leaders of no-kill organizations would not be as negative with regard to open-door sheltering as the literature suggests.

This relative lack of difference in perception between proponents of the no-kill and
open-door philosophies suggested that leaders' work locations, whether at a no-kill or an open-door organization, would not necessarily make a difference in how they would perceive the open-door/no-kill issue. The arguments of the no-kill movement, coupled with the perceived improvements in service delivery by municipal animal control agencies, have encouraged leaders of nonprofit open-door agencies to consider returning animal control duties to municipalities, and to re-examine their agencies' role in the euthanasia of society's animals.

The no-kill philosophy states that animal control is best left to municipal agencies, making government responsible for society's unwanted animals. No-kill advocates believe that an animal shelter should only accept animals that will be adopted. The resources saved from caring for and euthanizing unadoptable animals should be used for other animal-related activities. The open-door philosophy counters that a humane society does not fulfill its mission if it selectively admits animals, and then houses them for unacceptably long (in their opinion) periods of time.

This study identifies seven key differences between the two philosophies and examined each case. To test the extent of the open-door/no-kill debate, animal welfare and control leaders were asked to share their perceptions regarding the following questions:

**Which type of agency do leaders perceive should be responsible for animal control?**

One question explored in this study was leaders' perceptions of which type of agency (nonprofit or municipal) should be responsible for animal control. The no-kill position is that nonprofits should not be performing this work. The traditional position among many open-door animal welfare leaders has been one in which they believe they are best suited for performing animal control and sheltering services, because they feel municipal agencies will not stress animal welfare as much as their agencies do. Many humane societies currently provide animal control and sheltering services under contract for their respective municipalities. If the leaders of such humane societies perceive that the no-kill position is correct, they may decide to relinquish their agency's contracts.

**Which philosophy do leaders perceive as best performing its mission?**

Although relinquishing animal control and sheltering contracts is a necessary step toward becoming a no-kill shelter, it does not mean that the agency will make the philosophical transition. Leaders of open-door humane societies may believe that it is not their agency's responsibility to provide animal control, but may still want to remain open-door. One argument that has been laid out by no-kill proponents is that it is not a humane society's responsibility to perform the euthanasia of a community's unwanted animals. Therefore, this study also examined leaders' perceptions whether no-kill animal sheltering supports or
contradicts their organization's mission.

**Which philosophy do leaders perceive provides the best quality of life for the animals?** One topic of intense debate throughout the literature is the quality of life for animals in no-kill facilities. Since animals are housed in no-kill shelters until they are adopted, they may be there for a number of months. The open-door literature states that this extended confinement is inhumane for the animals. It also suggests that no-kills are often overcrowded, unsanitary, and prone to disease. This study explored how leaders perceived the quality of life for animals in no-kill facilities, to determine whether they would be willing or reluctant to adopt the no-kill philosophy.

**What do leaders perceive as the public's expectation of animal shelters?** Despite leaders' personal beliefs about which is the best philosophy, they may not implement it if they perceive the public to be opposed to such a change. On the other hand, perhaps they would be willing to change philosophies if they believed that their organization would receive stronger public support. Since nonprofit animal welfare organizations largely exist to fulfill a societal need, public support of their organizational philosophy is crucial. This study explored what leaders believe to be the public's expectation of their agencies.

**What do leaders perceive as the financial impact of each philosophy?** It is highly unlikely that a leader would adopt a certain philosophy at the risk of bankrupting the agency. On the other hand, if leaders believe that one philosophy has clear advantages over another in attracting resources, they may be encouraged to adopt that position. Additionally, the open-door literature has charged that no-kill proponents are really motivated by a perceived greater ease in attracting donations. If open-door leaders believe this is true, they may be ethically unwilling to adopt a no-kill philosophy.

**Do leaders perceive the terms used to describe this issue as suitable?** One of the main arguments currently proposed in the open-door literature is that the term “no-kill” unfairly labels the activities of their shelters. By contrast, if one philosophy can call itself “no-kill,” then the other is subsequently referred to as “kill.” Additionally, the no-kill literature has stated a dislike for the term “euthanasia” to describe the killing of unwanted animals. This study measured whether there was truly a strong disagreement about the use of these terms, and also explored what other terms might be used instead.

**What do leaders believe to be the future for California animal welfare and control regarding the no-kill philosophy?** Some open-door agencies have either changed or announced plans to change their organizations' policies from open-door to no-kill. This study examined whether other leaders share similar plans. Perceived board support for the idea was one factor in evaluating leaders' responses. Also, leaders' philosophical preferences for the type of policy they would rather work under, the policies they are
currently working under, and their future plans to change were explored. Finally, the willingness of respondents to reach consensus with their counterparts holding different philosophies was investigated to determine how likely these leaders would be to set aside their differences.

**Importance of the Study**

The open-door/no-kill subject is of great interest and debate in the animal welfare and control fields. No-kill organizations are gaining strength and momentum, and may exert increasingly strong influence in shaping the philosophies that other animal welfare leaders adopt for their agencies. If leaders of open-door organizations adopt some or all of the no-kill philosophy, their agencies' roles in their communities may significantly change.

This study explored whether leaders believe the no-kill strategy is a viable option, suitable for any animal welfare agency to adopt, or a limited option suitable only for a select number of animal welfare agencies that meet certain criteria. These agency leaders' views concerning the viability of the no-kill option can provide guidance for agencies that are debating which strategy to adopt.

This study also illuminates areas of concern that should be explored before a leader promotes a new philosophy within the organization. Such concerns include the financial impact of adopting either philosophy, the quality of life for animals housed at no-kill facilities, the ethics of restrictive admission policies, and responsibility for performance of animal control services.

The issues explored in this study are emotionally charged and difficult to discuss unless they are researched impartially. People often have an emotional investment in their perceptions. Leaders supporting either philosophy may be personally disliked by those from the other camp. Egos and personality differences cloud the issues. One goal of this study was to find ways for both philosophies to reach some common ground. The findings arrived at by studying this issue impartially can, it is hoped, help generate productive dialogue between groups holding differing views.

**Limitations of the Study**

Animal welfare and control workers are notoriously overworked and have little time to respond to surveys. Although the survey instrument was designed for ease of completion, some leaders were reluctant to take even that small amount of time to complete it.

Many groups lacked paid staff and were run solely by volunteers. The databases used for selecting the respondents, although the best available, were not complete. All available
telephone databases were used to call the agencies directly, to confirm names and addresses of the leaders. However, not all agencies had telephones or returned their messages. In the case of the USF database, which was compiled by IRS 990 filings, agencies that had an outside preparer file their returns had that preparer listed as the contact for the agency.

The sampling procedure used to identify participants excluded some leaders from being approached. Those municipal agencies of smaller populations (cities with less than 100,000 residents, and counties with less than 200,000 residents), and nonprofit organizations that have not filed an IRS 990 form since 1993 were not solicited for their opinion. Although this selection criteria (more fully discussed in Chapter Three) was chosen to include those leaders most likely to be familiar with this issue, it may still have omitted some leaders who could offer opinions.

Relying on the opinions of leaders may be somewhat slanted because each person may have a vested interest in his or her organization's mission. On the other hand, the differences in leader opinions may be more general, affecting all agencies equally.

By registering opinions, respondents may demonstrate their belief that there is a cause and effect relationship between two variables when, in fact, the effect is caused by a third, unrelated variable.

Differences in the amount of community support received by each organization may also have influenced the responses of leaders. Levels of this type of bias are difficult to interpret.

Another limitation is the fact that people's perceptions are inherently biased by what they can see. Perceptions are not facts and should not be construed as such. This is an emotional topic of debate, and personal feelings can cloud objective judgment. Nevertheless, a survey of perceptions is important because these are perceptions that leaders will use when making decisions regarding the future that their agencies will play in this field.
No-Kill Literature

The no-kill debate has been the subject of many articles in industry publications over the last decade. The debate started when no-kill organizations, or their proponents, began challenging the role that traditional animal shelters were playing in their communities. No-kill proponents wrote strong statements regarding the traditional open-door shelters' roles in euthanasia.

No-kill proponents suggested that traditional animal shelters had institutionalized euthanasia, and by practicing and accepting it, allowed it to grow and become a routine event that no longer merited concern. They stated that traditional animal shelters had become apathetic about euthanizing mass numbers of animals for population control measures. By not taking an aggressive enough stance against euthanasia, no-kill proponents claimed, traditional open-door shelters contributed to or even worsened the problem (Duvin, 1989; Forel, 1993; Pardue, 1988). A fairly representative statement of this perception is presented by Curley (1991):

Today's shelters act for all the world like landfills for living refuse, politely reminding people not to litter while gathering up with some zeal all the dogs and cats within reach. Most puzzling is the silent conviction with which they go about this unpleasant work, failing to notify an apathetic public that pets are not disposable. County dumps do a better job of admonishing a wasteful citizenry. (p. 24)

Most open-door shelters refer to euthanasia as a "necessary evil" or use some similar phrase to point out that they do not cause the pet overpopulation problem — irresponsible pet owners do. The no-kill argument, at presented by Duvin (1990, 1992) is that this thinking has led to a complacent mind-set regarding euthanasia.

Countless millions of precious beings have died — and continue to die — because for decades our movement has swept away their bodies in deadly silence. Something is terribly wrong, not just with shelters, but the entire movement — a movement able to live comfortable with the knowledge that we kill our closest companions without even waging a ferocious public battle for them. (Duvin, 1990, p. 53)

In some of these published statements, unwanted animals were compared to orphaned children. No-kill activists pointed out that society would not tolerate euthanasia at childrens' orphanages, and should not tolerate it at our nation's animal shelters either. David Patrice Greanville asked, "Is it possible to imagine a truly civilized society sending upwards of 17 million healthy children to their deaths every year for no other reason than
a failure to attract foster parents?” (Greanville, 1990, p. 44). He and other no-kill proponents call upon open-door shelters to stop euthanizing animals and find other solutions to deal with the pet overpopulation crisis.

The language used by no-kill activists has often been confrontational and has incited anger among open-door shelter proponents. No-kill activists have referred to open-door shelters as “slaughterhouses” and “landfills for living refuse.” They have denounced euthanasia as “murder” and a “holocaust,” and employees of open-door shelters as “ignorant,” “obsolete,” “complacent,” and “uninspired.”

**Open-Door Response**

As one might imagine, vocabulary such as this has offended and angered many in the open-door field. Open-door advocates have stated that attacking the employees of open-door organizations will not resolve the problem of euthanasia of unwanted animals. They argue that euthanasia is the only available option for addressing the pet overpopulation crisis at this time, and is being performed by people deeply concerned about this problem (Mullen, 1990; Stuart, 1990; Troiano, 1990; White, Wright, & Newkirk, 1990).

Some open-door proponents have regarded members of the no-kill community as unrealistic, naive animal activists who do not have the direct experience of running shelters and euthanizing unwanted animals that they do. They characterize no-kill proponents as theorists who speak without any experiential basis for their ideas, who do not understand the reality of dealing with unwanted animals (Fox, 1988; Fakkema, 1987; Arluke, 1991).

Open-door advocates also cite a list of concerns they have about the no-kill movement. For many reasons, open-door shelter proponents believe that no-kill agencies not only fail to provide an adequate solution to the pet overpopulation problem, but in fact do harm to the animals and the animal welfare movement.

**Admission Policies**

Open-door proponents believe that no-kill shelters are not true havens or shelters for animals because of their restrictive admittance policies. Open-door people feel that theirs are the true animal shelters because they accept all animals, regardless of an animal's condition or temperament (Arnold, 1995).

Many open-door workers have written articles challenging the admittance policies of no-kill shelters—for example, the no-kill organization policy of not accepting animals that they cannot place into new homes. Open-door advocates question whether no-kills can accurately describe their work as “sheltering,” since they do not accept all animals in need.
of shelter. They argue that euthanasia is a kinder fate for an animal than being turned away by a no-kill shelter, to face starvation, disease, and abuse. Those concerned about options other than euthanasia for unwanted animals tell stories rife with incidents of neglect, starvation, and cruelty.

This argument that euthanasia is a regrettable necessity is presented in the following passage:

For a shelter to be a true haven for lost or unwanted animals and provide a comprehensive service to the public, its doors must be open to all animals. A shelter that turns away an animal being surrendered, or asks someone to keep the animal until space opens up at the facility, risks losing that animal to abandonment or some other cruel fate. Similarly, a shelter that cannot accept an animal found running at large or rescued in a cruelty case is not acting in the animals' best interests . . . . Euthanasia of shelter animals to make room for others is a tragic necessity that prevents animal suffering. ("Seven Basic Policies," 1996, p. 13)

Ken White, currently the executive director of the Arizona Humane Society, has referred to no-kills as "... turnaways, contending that they take in only the most adoptable animals and leave the dirty work of killing to others" (Clifton, 1995, p. 16).

No-kill shelters are often described as being "selectively humane" because they choose which animals they will accept, and those they will not (Donald, 1991). They are also said to displace the problem of pet overpopulation, because the unadoptable animals they turn away are merely taken to an open-door shelter in the area and euthanized anyway, or else they are turned loose to fend for themselves (Fox, 1988; Kay, 1991; "No Room," 1981).

Arluke's 1991 study of open-door shelter workers summarized the open-door perceptions of no-kill shelter staff. This report described the open-door workers' bewilderment at how their no-kill counterparts could turn away animals, knowing that the animals would be euthanized elsewhere (Arluke, 1991).

Quality of Life

Another reason open-door shelter advocates disapprove of no-kill facilities is the "quality of life" factor. Because no-kill shelters do not euthanize animals as a means of population control, animals are housed there indefinitely until they are placed into new homes. Open-door proponents believe that this is inhumane. They cite the psychological needs of companion animals, and state that no-kill shelters cannot meet these needs. Companion animals by definition crave human contact, they say, and housing them for extended periods of time without adequate human socialization and affection is cruel ("No

“No kill” shelters allow some pets to spend years, or even their entire lives, in confinement waiting for adoption. If you interact with our shelter animals, it becomes obvious that they crave the companionship of one person or family — the security of a home. There is no way any agency can provide this optimum quality of life to hundreds of homeless animals over the very long-term . . . . Companion animals are social animals, needing human company. Depriving them of this for months on end is not in the best interest of the animal. (p. 2)

Open-door advocates also cite instances in which unacceptable quality of life in no-kill shelters means not merely insufficient physical contact but criminal cases of neglect and abuse. Without the proper controls, no-kills can become overrun with animals, they state. When this happens, the no-kill staff is unable to provide adequate care to the animals in its shelter. Accumulation of filth, starvation, disease, and other maladies have haunted no-kills, which began with good intentions but have often wound up in the court system facing criminal charges of animal abuse (“Ann Fields,” 1995; Nielsen, 1987; Clark, 1994).

One no-kill advocate urging no-kill shelters to perform their mission properly, said, “There are no set standards for no-kill sheltering . . . cost-cutting measures can quickly escalate into inadequate care . . . instead of lifetime havens to nurture homeless companion animals, they become filthy, disease-ridden deathtraps” (Kay, 1991, pp. 41-42).

Fund-raising Strategies

Open-door proponents have openly questioned the motives of opponents who support adoption of a no-kill policy. Many open-door advocates believe that the no-kill movement is really just a strategy to raise more money from a public largely uneducated about the pet overpopulation problem. No-kills lead the public to believe that euthanasia is unnecessary, open-door critics claim, and prey on the kind hearts of people who do not want to see animals killed (Lapham, 1996; Salisbury, 1996; “Animal Control and Rescue,” 1996).

Others suggest that shelters have a financial incentive to become no-kill, especially if they do not perform animal control services. This is because euthanasia is unpopular with the public, and potential contributors are more likely to donate to a shelter that does not euthanize animals (Clifton, 1994).

Open-door shelters are able to cite cases of true fraud by unethical individuals who ran no-kill shelters, raised large amounts of money, and drew large salaries while little of the
donations went to actual animal care and housing. These cases have done great damage to the reputation of no-kills among the animal welfare community (“Woofs & Growls,” 1996).

However, there are legitimate no-kill shelters that discuss their no-kill policy in mailings, explaining why potential donors should give to their organizations. Donors will often ask leaders of open-door shelters why their shelter must euthanize, since some other organization that they are receiving mailings from is able to avoid it. The open-door shelters feel as though they are always on the defensive. They find it difficult to explain the difference between open-door and no-kill, and to justify why their organization should receive that donor’s contribution. Many voice sentiments similar to the one stated below:

What of the animal shelters that advertise in fund-raising brochures that they never put animals “to sleep”? These shelters certainly have great appeal for kind-hearted but unrealistic animal lovers. While they are probably telling the truth and may work hard at placing pets in homes, these shelters do great injustice to the SPCAs by making those groups out to be the bad guys. . . . It is wrong for a shelter to publicize and capitalize on a no-kill policy, utilizing the good intentions of uninformed donors to perpetuate itself while other shelters, that bear the brunt of the burden, continue to go unhelped. (Curtis, 1982, p. 46)

Misleading the Public

Both open-door and no-kill proponents believe that the other side is misleading the public about the pet overpopulation problem. Open-door proponents believe that no-kills mislead the public about this issue by giving the public a sense of complacency about the lack of homes available for unwanted animals. By leading the public to believe that they are able to find homes for all animals, some open-door leaders feel that no-kill shelters tell the public that spaying and neutering, and other activities that go with responsible pet ownership, are unnecessary.

No-kill advocates, however, have a very different philosophy about what animal welfare organizations should be telling the public. They believe that by stressing the euthanasia of unwanted animals, open-door shelters discourage members of the public from coming to their facilities because they know they will see animals that may be ultimately euthanized. Many members of the public do not want to be confronted with this fact, and would rather avoid seeing the animals altogether. This serves to reduce adoptions by reducing the numbers of people willing to come to the shelter to adopt (“Prepare for Post-Pet Overpopulation,” 1995; “Adoption Pact Update,” 1996). Richard Avanzino, president of the no-kill San Francisco SPCA, said:
We don't have to show people barrels of dead animals because we don't have barrels of dead animals. We show people animals who are going to be going home. People aren't afraid to come in here, they're not going to be made sad. (Clifton, 1995, p. 17)

No-kill proponents also believe open-door shelters encourage abandonment of animals, because people are unwilling to bring strays or their own pets to a facility where the animals may ultimately be euthanized. The result, no-kill proponents assert, is that more animals are abandoned, thereby increasing injury, disease, starvation, or other cruel fates that await animals that are left to fend for themselves (“San Francisco Adopts,” 1994; Messina, 1993; Dorschner, 1992).

One open-door advocate recognized this dilemma and characterized it in the following statement:

One of the most difficult problems we face in this issue is that we end up trying to sell death over life. Convincing people that it is in the best interest of their animal to kill it is next to impossible in a society that condemns killing. Do we really expect people to accept that their animal is better off dead than alive? (Donald, 1991, p. 6)

Terminology

Terminology has been a sore point for both the no-kill and open-door communities. No-kill proponents prefer the term “kill” rather than “euthanasia.” They use similar words, such as “slaughter” and “murder,” to describe the same thing. The editors of The Animals' Voice magazine made this argument when they stated, “Atrocities are not less atrocities when they occur in animal shelters, either, and are done in the name of mercy. Murder is murder.” (“The Animals’ Voice,” 1990, p. 52).

In defining “euthanasia,” one no-kill advocate wrote:

The vast majority of these animals are not suffering from any painful or terminal affliction when they are killed—hence, such killing cannot be thought of as “euthanasia” in the way that we apply that term to humans. Their lives are taken not out of mercy, but out of convenience. (Pardue, 1988, p. 44)

Paradoxically, open-door advocates dislike the term “no-kill” to describe the work of that type of shelter. Open-door advocates believe the term “no-kill” unduly focuses on the negative aspects of their own work, placing them in a defensive position. And, as most no-kills must euthanize animals occasionally, open-door advocates feel that this term leads the public to erroneously believe that euthanasia never happens at no-kills (Kay, 1991; Messina, 1993; Clifton, 1996).
"Defensiveness" of the Open-Door Community

Responses from the traditional shelter community to statements made by no-kill advocates are seen as defensive and closed-minded by no-kill challengers, who believe the open-door community is refusing to heed their ideas and proposals to look for new solutions addressing animal sheltering needs in our society (Foran, J. & Forel, E., 1994; "In the Name of Mercy," 1990; McFarland, 1992). The no-kill proponents often cite arguments similar to that proposed by Ed Duvin:

It is always educational to see our major organizations blindly clinging to the status quo, utilizing every means at their disposal to avoid sober introspection. They are the architects of the present shelter system and reflexively defend their territory, however, it's that very defensiveness that leads to the process of institutionalizing failure, substituting well-rehearsed excuses for creative solutions. With their limited tolerance for "outsiders" who have the temerity to raise questions about their performance, they resort to a "bunker mentality"—often missing both the positions and intent of their critics. (Duvin, 1990, p. 10)

Animal Control Issues

The central theme of this debate—that the euthanasia of unwanted animals is a means of population control—is intricately entwined with animal control services. Many humane societies have become the animal control providers for the communities that they serve. One obligation of animal control is to impound all stray or unwanted animals. Consequently, these agencies must be open-door shelters. Open-door facilities often begin as an alternative to the municipal animal shelter in town, to provide what they believed to be a better solution for the animals and the community.

Open-door facilities began assuming responsibility for animal control years ago when humane societies originally founded to prevent cruelty to animals decided that it was better to assume animal control responsibilities rather than witness the poor conditions of municipal dog "pounds." Stories abound about the horrendous conditions in the early animal pounds in this country. It was not uncommon for dogcatchers to drown, club, strangle, shoot, suffocate, or use other means of extermination to kill excess animals in their municipalities. The housing conditions were inhumane as well, and little or no efforts were made to find these animals new homes (Duvin, 1992; Widerman, 1983).

As a result, humane societies changed from being outside animal advocates to managing the shelters where the animals were brought. With this change came the role of the humane society in performing euthanasia. However, as the years passed the original
role of animal protector became meshed with animal policing activities, not of the human offenders but the animals themselves. This dichotomy has led many to question the role that humane societies should be playing in their communities, particularly the issue of who should bear the responsibility of euthanizing unwanted animals (Granberry, 1993; Duvin, 1992; “Prepare for Post-Pet Overpopulation,” 1995).

In describing the consequences of this decision, Ed Duvin said, “Humane Societies made the tragic mistake of moving from compassionate oversight of animal control agencies to directly operating the majority of kill shelters, thereby tacitly putting their stamp of approval on killing as a population control measure” (Duvin, 1990, p. 53).

No-kill advocates urge humane societies to return the function of animal control to the municipal communities that require it. They believe that by having taxpayers pay the price for irresponsible pet ownership and overpopulation of animals, more public attention will be focused on resolving the issue. This will also eliminate the confusion of serving two missions—animal protection as well as human protection. No-kill advocates believe that one agency cannot do both well.

In addition, many humane societies have performed their municipal animal control services at a financial loss to their agency. They have subsidized these functions with donations from the public. This is money that could have gone to low-cost sterilization or education programs, say no-kill proponents, and should be spent on more proactive means of addressing pet overpopulation (Duvin, 1992).

In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Humane Society (WHS) has stopped providing animal control services for that city. The executive director, Victoria Wellens, summarized their reason for doing so:

Over the years, WHS has saved Milwaukee County taxpayers millions of dollars, but our animal control contracts have consistently underfunded the animal control services we provide. As a result, we have been forced to use private contributions to underwrite publicly mandated services, leading to an inadequate reserve fund for building a much-needed new facility. The time has come to separate the government-mandated and funded animal control services from the privately supported animal welfare, adoption, outreach, and education service of WHS. (Clifton, 1996, p. 9)

The Washington Humane Society in Washington, D.C. experienced similar problems. It began providing animal control services in 1980 after abuses at the city's animal shelter were discovered. Since that time, they have consistently been forced to use donations to subsidize publicly mandated services, often on 45-day contracts which preclude long-term budgeting and management strategies. The Washington Humane Society even gave up the

A number of open-door shelters choose to provide animal control and sheltering services because they believe they can provide the best care for the animals, while stressing strong adoption programs and other activities that improve the lives of the animals in their communities. Some open-door shelters have no choice: They are municipal agencies, and their very reason for existence is to provide animal control functions. Such municipal agencies are not generally charitable institutions, but they face the same challenges as nonprofit, open-door shelters: They must euthanize animals, and they face financial problems as well (Martin, 1996; Granberry, 1993).

New Trends

As a result of such funding problems, some nonprofit animal shelters with animal control/sheltering contracts have handed these functions back to municipal governments. Although this is a relatively new trend, successful transitions, as in San Francisco, Calif., have shown that it is possible. The San Francisco SPCA provided animal control and sheltering services for 84 of the 101 years it has been in existence. In 1989, the SFSPCA returned this responsibility to the City of San Francisco. By returning the responsibility for animal control back to the municipalities, nonprofit animal shelters have been able to discontinue subsidizing city services and refocus their resources more proactively on animal issues.

By discontinuing their participation in animal control services, some open-door animal shelters are redefining their mission. Although operators of animal shelters once believed that they needed to be the providers of animal control and sheltering because municipal agencies would not do it well, they don't necessarily believe this any more. Most municipal animal control agencies have improved dramatically from the old stereotypical "pound," and provide proper care for the animals in their shelters. Many even have their own sterilization programs, and conduct active adoption programs as well.

Humane societies are also beginning to realize that the public's expectation of their role in the community is to care for and adopt animals, not kill them. By becoming no-kill, they are able to generate greater support for their organization. This increased support, combined with no longer facing the financial drain of animal control, allows humane societies to concentrate more on proactive solutions to reduce the numbers of unwanted
animals. Richard Avanzino, president of the San Francisco SPCA, states:

In 1989, after 101 years, the SFSPCA returned the animal control contract to the city. We've worked very hard since then to regain the trust of the community that we are not going to kill animals. We're getting the people to bring those animals in so that we can neuter them, put them up for adoption, and end this cycle of abandonment, uncontrolled breeding, and killing. (Clifton, 1995, p. 16)

Some suggest that the ideal model for a community is for a municipal animal control agency to provide the animal control and sheltering of stray animals, while the local humane society becomes a no-kill shelter and divorces itself from the euthanasia of animals. By doing this, it is felt that the community will be more willing to support the humane society, and that the society will then have more resources with which to operate. These resources can even be used to assist the municipal animal control agency with adoption, education, or cruelty investigation programs (Nash, 1995).

The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), the oldest and largest animal shelter in the nation, ceased providing animal control services to New York City and became a no-kill shelter on January 1, 1995. The Wisconsin Humane Society in Milwaukee discontinued their animal control services as well. These changes in large, established organizations signal a new trend emerging.

This movement has also attracted many grass roots organizations that are finding individual ways to reduce the incidence of animal euthanasia in their communities. In Southern California, the cities of Mission Viejo, San Clemente, Irvine, Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Seal Beach, and Huntington Beach have city-owned, no-kill shelters. Volunteers help to run the shelters and adopt pets through foster homes (Messina, 1993).

The Los Angeles Times reported on November 14, 1993, about three private animal adoption agencies—the Lange Foundation, the Amanda Foundation, and the Friends of Animals Foundation—that either temporarily adopt animals out of shelters to find them permanent homes, or accept such animals before they are brought to shelters. These organizations are attempting to alleviate the burden of animal shelters by taking some of the unwanted animals themselves (Timnick, 1993).

Open-door shelters are finding ways to make the public more willing to visit their facilities, thereby increasing adoption and reducing animal abandonment. Many have built new shelter facilities in the last few years. These new shelters break from the old "pound" image of concrete block and chain link fence. They are built with attention to customer service and atmosphere enhancement, and often resemble shopping malls or parks ("A Pound Where," 1993). Tawa (1993), observing this new trend, writes:
The thinking is that potential owners will flock to an upscale shelter for the ambiance, the way shoppers do to marble-floored department stores with tuxedo-clad classical pianists . . . . The Pasadena complex is only part of a nationwide movement toward kinder, gentler animal centers. (p. B7)

The no-kill movement has motivated many people and organizations to redefine what role animal shelters can take in a community. The extent to which this redefinition will happen will depend upon the leaders of the animal welfare movement, who are primarily responsible for how their agencies define their missions. This study explores how leaders feel about the research questions posed in Chapter One, and explores creative solutions to the apparent differences dividing the two camps on these controversial issues.
Subjects/Respondents

The survey subjects for this study were chosen based on several criteria. The first criterion was that the respondents lead an animal welfare or animal control organization within the state of California. Leaders were identified as the highest ranking officer of the organization, such as executive director, board president (if there is no staff), or other such designation. Whatever the actual title, these were the persons ultimately responsible for their agencies' activities and direction. Only the leaders of these organizations were surveyed, on the assumption they are likely to have better insights into the open-door/no-kill controversy than lower-ranking employees. In addition, they have stronger influence than lower placed employees in determining whether their agencies will ultimately adopt a different operating philosophy. Also, it is highly likely that leaders recruit staff of similar philosophy. Surveying staff as well as the leaders would likely have been redundant, and could have resulted in larger organizations skewing the research results due to their greater representative number of employees who would have been surveyed.

Each organization whose leader was selected for the study was required to be either a municipal agency or a 501(c)(3) organization. The 501(c)(3) requirement was because some private individuals call themselves “no-kill organizations” in describing their individual volunteer work. They may find lost animals and place them in new homes through ads in the newspaper or other such avenues. They are not, however, part of an organization or operating a bona fide animal shelter. Such individuals are unlikely to act as change agents or industry leaders in promoting a certain philosophy. The 501(c)(3) status requirement for the organizations represented by the survey subjects ensured that only leaders of true organizations were selected.

The four types of agencies that leaders were selected from were: open-door humane society, no-kill humane society, municipal animal control organization, or nonsheltering animal welfare organization. These categories contain nearly every type of organization in California involved with the issue of unwanted companion animals.

One might question why leaders of municipal agencies and nonsheltering agencies were included in this study. Although leaders of municipal agencies do not have the option of changing their agency's mission from open-door to no-kill (municipal agencies must be open-door to accept all animals that might affect public health or safety), their perceptions are nevertheless important. If they are willing to support the no-kill philosophy, they will likely be willing to partner with the no-kill agencies in their community. Such cooperation
would likely improve chances that a no-kill facility would be successful there. In addition, although nonsheltering animal welfare organizations do not provide care or housing of unwanted animals, they are as involved in the pet overpopulation issue as those organizations that do. The leaders of these organizations can easily serve as proponents of either philosophy and can influence the opinions of others.

The subjects were chosen by their membership or listing in one of two directories. Leaders of municipal animal control organizations were identified by the membership list of the California Animal Control Directors Association (CACDA). Only those agencies that serve a minimum city population of 100,000 or county population of 200,000 were surveyed. This was because many smaller cities and counties operate their animal control activities as a subsection of another municipal agency, such as public works or maintenance. Such smaller agencies are unlikely to have a level of understanding concerning this topic sufficient to offer meaningful data.

Leaders of both no-kill and open-door, nonprofit animal welfare organizations were identified through a search of the California Nonprofit Database. This database is administered by the Institute for Nonprofit Management at the University of San Francisco. It is the most comprehensive single source of information on California's nonprofit sector. The search parameters were animal welfare organizations with 501(c)(3) status that filed an IRS Form 990 for Fiscal Year 1993 or later. This parameter was chosen to include only those organizations that have been large enough and active enough to have filed a recent return, as the Internal Revenue Service requires annual returns only for organizations who receive $25,000 or more per year. Those organizations that have not filed prior to 1993 were considered to be not sufficiently active to be involved with this issue, and would not be likely to supply meaningful data.

Some of the respondents were listed on both the CACDA and the California Nonprofit Database lists. These two lists were cross-referenced to prevent the same individual from being surveyed twice. For those names that were repeated, a review of their type of organization was performed. They were then listed under the one category most representative of their type of organization. For example, a leader of a nonprofit open-door organization identified on the CACDA list was considered first a leader of a nonprofit organization, and his/her response was included in the responses in that category.

In addition, agencies that do not deal, at least in part, with animal species normally found in animal shelters were not included in the survey. Examples of these are agencies that deal with marine mammals, wild horses and burros, or native wildlife.
Research Design

The research was conducted by a mailed questionnaire sent to the leaders of 291 California animal welfare/control organizations identified by the above parameters. A census was conducted of this population.

In the questionnaire, respondents provided data indicating the type of organization for which they work. The categories available for selection were nonprofit open-door animal shelter, nonprofit no-kill animal shelter, nonprofit nonsheltering animal welfare organization, and municipal animal control agency. A space was provided to describe an “other” classification if these did not adequately describe a leader’s organization. This information made it possible to interpret the results in the context of which type of organization the leader works for. It also enabled comparisons to be made between the philosophies of leaders of the different types of organizations.

Due to the large number of participants identified, a mailed questionnaire was used, because personal interviews with this number of subjects would not have been feasible. The research was designed to provide a descriptive, cross-sectional study of the attitudes of individual leaders of animal welfare and control organizations. The questionnaire measured leaders’ perceptions about the effect the no-kill movement is having on the traditional animal sheltering model in the context of the research questions proposed in this study.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was used to solicit responses from the research subjects and was designed to ensure ease of completion. To this end, narrative responses were avoided. Instead, respondents were asked to mark the response category that best represented their opinion. In two questions, respondents were asked to suggest an alternative term to describe “open-door” or “no-kill.”

Issues for study were those identified as main themes in the literature review. Questions raised in the questionnaire related back to these issues.

Subjects were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements that describe certain philosophies within the animal welfare/control field, using an interval scale of 0 to 10 (0 = no agreement, 10 = full agreement). These statements focused on the effect that no-kill organizations are having on the animal welfare field, the role of the animal shelter in the community, and who should bear the responsibility for animal control in the community.

Drafts of the questionnaire were reviewed by the director of the San Francisco
Department of Animal Care and Control. The drafts were then pretested on five middle- to-upper management staff of an animal welfare organization. This questionnaire is presented as Appendix A.

**Procedures**

Each agency selected by the criteria described above that had a business telephone was first telephoned to ensure the information provided by the CACDA and California Nonprofit Database lists was correct. The address and name of the leader of that organization were verified, as well as the open-door/no-kill status of the organization. Any necessary corrections were made to the survey respondent database.

The survey was mailed to the subjects when as much information as possible was confirmed. The survey also included a letter explaining the nature of the project and requesting the subject's participation (Appendix B), and instructions for completing the survey (Appendix C). A self-addressed, stamped, number 10, first-class envelope was enclosed for returning the survey.

After two weeks, those respondents who had not yet returned a survey were mailed a reminder letter, asking them to complete and return the survey promptly. A telephone number to request a replacement survey was included. This letter is presented as Appendix D.

Two weeks following the reminder letter mailing, those subjects who had not returned their surveys and had listed telephone numbers were telephoned. They were asked one final time to complete the survey. Two final weeks were allowed to receive these surveys. At the end of this period, analysis of data began.

**Operational Definitions of Relevant Variables**

Normative definitions of relevant variables were derived from the responses given to the survey questions.

**Animal control contract**: Respondents of nonprofit organizations were asked if their agency has a contract to perform animal control or sheltering services with their municipality. This variable was measured by question 42, which asked if respondents have such a contract, and if so, what kind.

**Animal control services**: This was measured by question 42, which asked the leaders if their organizations perform animal control services.
Animal sheltering services: This was measured by question 42, which asked the leaders if their organizations perform animal sheltering services.

Animal welfare organization: This was measured by question 43, which asked each leader to identify which type of organization that they work for.

Euthanasia: Leaders' perceptions of the definition of euthanasia were measured by questions 30 and 31.

Financial impact: Financial Impact was operationalized through questions 7 - 16 and 25. These questions measured leaders' perceptions of various ways that the no-kill or open-door philosophies impact an organization's ability to attract resources.

Future: Questions 24, 27 - 29 and 38 - 41 measured leaders' perceptions of the probable future for their organizations. These questions measured what philosophy the leaders believe will be most likely for their organization to adhere to.

Humane Society or SPCA: Question 43 recorded which type of agency the survey respondents work for.

Leader: Leader was measured in question 44, in which the respondent stated their job title.

Mission: How the leaders defined “mission” was measured in questions 1 - 6, 18, 22, and 37. These questions measured leaders' perceptions of what an animal welfare agency's mission should be.

No-kill shelters: No-kill shelters were operationalized in questions 39 and 43, in which the respondents stated whether they work for a no-kill organization. These questions measured the number of no-kill respondents.

Open-door or traditional shelter: Open-door shelters were operationalized in question 43, in which the respondents stated whether they work for an open-door organization. This measured the number of open-door respondents.
Perceptions: Perceptions were measured on the ordinal scale used by the respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the survey questions.

Public expectation: Leaders' perceptions of public expectation were measured in questions 17, 19-21, and 36. These questions measured leaders' perceptions of what their constituents expect of their organizations.

Quality of life: Leaders' perceptions of quality of life for sheltered animals were measured in questions 23 and 26, which asked respondents to state their level of agreement with those questions.

Suitable: The suitability of survey terms was measured by leaders' responses to questions 30 through 35.

Treatment of Data
The data were analyzed quantitatively to identify what the perceptions were of leaders in the animal welfare field, regarding the research questions proposed in Chapter One. In addition, the responses of leaders of nonprofit open-door, nonprofit no-kill, nonprofit nonsheltering, and municipal animal control agencies were compared to determine whether differences of perception exist between the four groups. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) measures were used to measure the significance of differences between groups.

Interval data were gathered to describe the perceptions of leaders regarding the no-kill philosophy's effect on the research questions discussed in Chapter One. Subjects' levels of agreement with the various questionnaire statements were compared with policy positions identified in the literature. Standard measures—mean, frequency, and standard deviation—were used to analyze responses to the single variable questions.
Chapter Four

This chapter presents the results of the data collected. A demographic profile of the respondents is presented, as well as a discussion of the findings regarding the research questions presented in Chapter One. Differences between groups are analyzed to determine the degree of similarity in perceptions among leaders of different types of animal control and welfare organizations.

Demographic Profile

Based on the parameters chosen to define the survey population, 291 agencies were identified as meeting the population criteria. Surveys were sent to the leaders of these 291 agencies. Twenty-two surveys were returned as undeliverable; one agency was incorrectly identified as meeting the selection parameters; five respondents refused to complete the survey when the researcher contacted them; and two agencies had closed. Of the revised population of 261 agencies, 143 returned surveys, for a 55-percent response rate.

The agencies the respondents worked or volunteered for belonged to one of the four categories stated in question 43 of the survey: nonprofit open-door animal shelter, nonprofit no-kill animal shelter, nonprofit nonsHELTERING animal welfare organization, or municipal animal control agency.

As outlined in Table 1, the pattern of survey responses was relatively evenly distributed: nonprofit no-kill animal shelters (31.5%); nonprofit nonsHELTERING organizations (25.2%); municipal animal control organizations (22.4%); and nonprofit open-door organizations (21.0%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type organization</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-door</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsheltering</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal agency</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Frequency Distribution for Type of Agencies Responding to Survey
Frequency distributions were calculated to determine how many of these organizations had contracts for performing animal control and/or sheltering functions. Table 2 illustrates the responses. As expected, all of the municipal agencies (N=32) reported that they perform animal control and sheltering. Additionally, none of the nonprofit nonsheltering organizations (N=34) performed either of these functions.

Less expected was the response from the nonprofit no-kill organizations. While the vast majority (80%) did not have animal control/sheltering contracts, nine leaders reported that their agencies performed animal control or sheltering. Of these nine responses, three reported they had contracts to perform animal sheltering, and six reported that they had contracts to perform both animal control and sheltering. The apparent contradiction (discussed in Chapter Two) of a no-kill shelter performing animal control and sheltering is a new phenomenon that would make an interesting topic for future research.

Of the responding nonprofit open-door shelters, 73.33% had contracts to perform animal control and/or sheltering. Of these 22 agencies with contracts, 18 had contracts to perform both animal control and sheltering. Four agencies had contracts to perform sheltering only.

Table 2
Frequency Distribution for Animal Control Contract Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type organization</th>
<th>Animal control</th>
<th>Animal sheltering</th>
<th>Animal control and sheltering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-door</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsheltering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

The first research question proposed in Chapter One was: **Which type of agency do leaders perceive should be responsible for animal control?** Survey questions 1 through 6 sought to gather leaders' perceptions regarding this question. This question addressed the issue of whether nonprofit agencies should be performing a service many believe may be the responsibility of municipal government. Responses to this question conveyed how leaders feel about this issue. Table 3 summarizes the responses.

Survey question 1 stated: **Humane societies should perform animal control because they might emphasize the animals' welfare more than municipal agencies do.** The means for responses demonstrate all groups except municipal animal control agencies were slightly higher than midpoint in agreeing with this statement. The differences in responses are significant at the .05 level. Municipal animal control respondents disagreed, with a mean response of 2.28. Open-door leaders had a mean of 5.70, while no-kill and nonsheltering leaders had means of 6.40 and 6.49 respectively. From these responses, it appears leaders of nonprofit animal welfare agencies continue to believe municipal agencies focus less on animal welfare than do humane societies. The perceptions of these leaders remain consistent with the reasons why humane societies began animal control and sheltering decades ago. It is not surprising municipal leaders do not agree with this statement, because agreement with it would reflect negatively on the quality of their work.

Survey question 2 stated: **By addressing both animal welfare and public safety, humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts have two conflicting missions.** The response from leaders of open-door agencies was neutral, with a mean of 5.0. This is significant because 73.33% of these organizations have contracts to perform animal control/sheltering. They are probably in the best position to have the most experience in this area. Their response does not negate the question of conflicting missions.

The leaders of the other three types of organizations disagreed with this statement. Nonprofit no-kill leaders had a mean response of 4.51. Municipal leaders disagreed with a mean of 3.66. Nonsheltering leaders disagreed the strongest of the four groups, with a mean response of 2.97. The majority of people involved in animal welfare/control do not see a conflict in mission for nonprofit humane societies that perform animal control. In fact, the agencies that actually do this are neutral on the issue. Differences in responses among these groups were not significant at the .05 level.

Survey question 3 stated: **The law enforcement aspect of cruelty investigations is best left to municipal agencies.** None of the group respondents agreed with this statement;
however, they varied in the degree of their disagreement. These differences were significant at the .05 level. Open-door leaders disagreed most strongly with this statement, with a mean of 2.23. Nonsheltering respondents disagreed with a mean of 2.61. Even municipal leaders did not support this statement. While their mean response of 3.81 was not as strong as the open-door and nonsheltering leaders, their disagreement with this statement indicates they believe that nonprofit agencies are able to perform animal cruelty investigations as well or better than municipal agencies.

Leaders of no-kill shelters had a mean response of 4.05. They do not support the position put forth in the no-kill writings. These writings state that nonprofit agencies should divorce themselves from involvement with law enforcement activities. The general level of disagreement with this statement is consistent with the reasons why nonprofit agencies entered the animal control/sheltering fields in the first place. It appears that there is still a general lack of trust regarding municipal agencies' performance in this area.

Survey question 4 stated: The law enforcement aspect of animal control work is best left to municipal agencies. This question separated cruelty investigations from the issue of routine animal control work, such as removing dead animals from public property, capturing stray animals, and issuing citations resulting from cruelty investigations. These were separated because addressing animal cruelty has always been a cornerstone of the animal welfare movement, whereas animal control work has not. Respondents answered with a generally low level of agreement with this statement. However, their responses were not as strong as they were for question 3. Differences were not significant at the .05 level. Open-door leaders disagreed with a mean of 4.20. No-kill leaders disagreed with a mean of 4.14. Nonsheltering and municipal leaders disagreed with means of 3.64 and 4.09 respectively. All four groups seemed comfortable with the idea that law enforcement activities are legitimate pursuits for nonprofit animal welfare organizations.

Survey question 5 stated: Municipal animal control agencies stress adoption programs as strongly as nonprofit humane societies. There was a wide difference in response to this question between municipal animal control leaders and leaders of the other three groups. These differences were significant at the .05 level. As one might expect, municipal leaders tended to agree with this statement, while the nonprofit agency leaders disagreed with it. Means analysis demonstrates this difference most clearly. The mean of the open-door response was 2.57, the mean of the no-kill response was 3.35, and the mean of the nonsheltering response was 2.72. The mean of the municipal agency leaders' responses was 6.59. As with question 1, it is not surprising that municipal leaders agreed with this statement, as disagreement would reflect negatively on the quality of work that municipal
agencies do. From these results, we can see nonprofit animal welfare agencies continue to distrust the efforts of municipal agencies in managing adoption programs.

Survey question 6 stated: Nonprofit humane societies that perform animal control are often mistaken to be municipal agencies by the public. Differences in responses were significant at the .05 level. Open-door leaders strongly agreed with this statement, with a mean response of 8.90. The low standard deviation for their mean further indicates uniformity of opinion. Of the four groups, open-door leaders agreed most strongly with this statement. This is most likely due to the fact that they are the ones who most strongly feel the effect of the public's confusion. Not surprisingly, municipal leaders showed the lowest level of agreement with this statement, although they did agree with it. They are probably the least likely to feel the effect of such a mistaken identity. The mean for leaders of municipal agencies was 6.78.

No-kill leaders had a mean response of 8.07, while nonsheltering leaders had a mean of 7.25. From these results, it is apparent that the public confusion around agency identity is a problem all four groups recognize. It is interesting that even though the no-kill literature uses this issue as a rallying cry to dissuade nonprofits from performing animal control work, open-door leaders agree even more strongly with this statement.

In analyzing the responses to the above survey questions, it appears most animal welfare and control leaders believe nonprofit humane societies are best suited to perform animal control and sheltering. Although performance of animal control and sheltering services is perceived to cause public confusion regarding the nonprofit status of these organizations, this confusion does not impact on these agencies enough to preclude them from providing these services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>No-kill Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Nonsheltering Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Municipal Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humane societies should perform animal control because they emphasize animal welfare more than municipal agencies (.0000).*</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane societies that perform animal control have conflicting missions (.0007).</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty investigations are best left to municipal agencies (.0545).*</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The law enforcement aspect of animal control is best left to municipal agencies (.8977).</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal agencies stress adoption programs as strongly as nonprofit humane societies (.0000).*</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit agencies that perform animal control are often mistaken to be municipal agencies (.0016).*</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
The second research question posed in Chapter One was: Do leaders perceive an animal shelter best performs its mission when it is open-door or no-kill? Survey questions 18, 22, 24, 25, 36, and 37 addressed this question. Tables 4, 5, and 6 summarize the responses. This question was explored because of the great debate in the no-kill and open-door literature about the proper mission of animal shelters, and how they fulfill their mission in the community. Some no-kill proponents have suggested that being open-door enables the public to disregard their responsibility towards their pets, because open-door shelters make it too easy for an owner to relinquish them (Brestrup, 1996). The open-door literature proposes a shelter must accept all animals to be of true service to its community.

Survey question 18 stated: An animal shelter adds more value to the community when it is open-door. The large differences in response to this statement are consistent with the evidence in the literature review. People in this field have taken strong stances on either side of the issue. These differences were significant at the .05 level. As might be expected, no-kill shelters tended to disagree with the statement; however, their mean response of 4.27 is only slightly less than neutral on this subject. Slightly higher than neutral were the nonsheltering leaders, with a mean of 6.06. The open-door and municipal leaders indicated much stronger agreement with this statement, with mean responses of 7.90 and 8.59, respectively. Of particular interest are the low standard deviations for these two groups, indicating homogeneity in their responses. Additionally, while the range of scores for no-kill and nonsheltering leaders encompassed all choices on the survey instrument (0 through 10), the lowest selection for open-door leaders was 3, while no municipal leaders chose 0 as a response. This is significant because the distribution of responses was weighted towards agreement, demonstrating that open-door leaders feel strongly that the community needs open-door shelters.

These responses indicate that a strong difference of opinion exists between leaders of no-kill and open-door agencies. Also, it demonstrates that no-kill leaders tend to disagree with this statement less than the literature suggests. This may indicate that no-kill leaders do recognize the importance of having a place where all animals will be accepted.

Survey question 22 stated: It is ethical for an animal shelter to have restrictive admittance policies. As might be expected, no-kills most strongly agreed with this statement. What was unexpected was the lower degree to which they agreed. Their mean of 6.28 is not necessarily strong. This is surprising, because this statement speaks to the heart of their mission and operational values. Open-door and nonsheltering leaders responded more similarly, with means of 4.14 and 4.28 respectively. Municipal agency
leaders were lowest in agreement with this statement, with a mean of 3.53. The differences were significant at the .05 level.

Survey question 24 stated: **No-kill shelters provide an acceptable alternative to open-door shelters for their communities.** There was a wide variance in agreement with this statement. Differences in responses were significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders agreed with it, with a relatively strong mean of 7.76. Nonsheltering leaders slightly agreed, with a mean of 5.86. Both open-door and municipal leaders disagreed, with respective means of 3.63 and 4.13. This is consistent with the positions reflected in the literature.

The divergent responses to question 24 suggest that respondents may have interpreted the question quite differently. These differences in interpretation were identified through two notes written by respondents in the survey margins. These respondents answered the question assuming it to be an either/or proposition, in which a no-kill shelter theoretically replaced the open-door shelter in the community. This would be an absolute alternative. Other respondents may have answered the question assuming an equal alternative option, in which the no-kill and open-door shelters both existed in the community and the no-kill was merely another option for the public.

Survey question 25 stated: **With a restrictive admissions policy, no-kills are better able than open-door shelters to expand their ancillary animal welfare services.** Differences in responses were not significant at the .05 level. No-kill and nonsheltering leaders were the only respondents to agree with this statement, with no-kills having the strongest agreement of all the groups. Nevertheless, they were not extremely strong agreements, with the mean for no-kills at 6.41 and nonsheltering at 5.57. On the other hand, open-door leaders tended not to agree with this statement, reflected in their mean score of 4.67. Least of all in agreement were municipal leaders, with a mean score of 4.50. Still, these last two scores were not strong in disagreement either. The lack of strong perceptions may indicate that this is a relatively new concept in no-kill sheltering. Leaders may not be as inculcated with this idea as they are with some of the older philosophies.
Table 4
Perceived Mission Fulfillment for Open-Door and No-Kill Philosophies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An animal shelter adds more value to the community when it is open-door (.0000).*</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ethical for an animal shelter to have a restrictive admittance policy (.0041).*</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill shelters provide an acceptable alternative to open-door shelters (.0021).*</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kills are better able than open-doors to expand their ancillary services (.0592).</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
Survey question 36 stated: **A humane society best serves its community when it (choose one):** (a) accepts all animals, or (b) restricts admissions of animal to focus resources on other animal welfare activities. Except for the no-kill response, which was almost evenly divided between selections (a) and (b), all other leaders most strongly agreed that humane societies best serve their community when they accept all animals. Of the 39 no-kill responses, 21 believed that an animal shelter best serves its community when it accepts all animals, while 18 did not. Of the 27 open-door respondents, 23 believed this to be true, as did 30 of the 35 nonsheltering leaders. Municipal leaders believed this as well, with 25 of 32 stating that humane societies best serve their communities when there is no restrictive admittance policy.

These results suggest a strong disparity still exists between how open-door and no-kill leaders define their responsibilities toward their communities. It is interesting to note that nonsheltering leaders, who do not need to adopt either philosophy for their own organization, strongly agreed with the open-door position on this issue. It may be likely that municipal leaders did not agree as strongly because many no-kill shelters work closely with municipal agencies, accepting animals for which the municipal agency cannot find homes. It is possible that municipal agencies have had more opportunity to benefit from no-kill shelters' assistance, and are more willing to consider restricted admission policies as an acceptable practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Leaders' responses</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepts all animals</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricts admission of animals to focus resources on other activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey question 37 stated: A humane society best serves its mission when it (choose one): (a) accepts all animals, or (b) restricts admissions of animals to focus resources on other animal welfare activities. Responses were more dispersed for this question. Twenty-five out of 27 open-door leaders believed that a humane society best serves its mission when it accepts all animals. Only 14 out of 37 no-kill leaders agreed with this position. Both nonsheltering and municipal leaders agreed with the open-door position as well. Twenty-four of 34 nonsheltering leaders agreed, as did 24 of 31 municipal leaders.

Several no-kill respondents pointed out that the reply to question 37 depended on what an organization's mission was. Their point was that this was not a philosophical question, but rather a technical one, speaking to how an organization defines its mission. That is, if it is a no-kill agency's mission to restrict admissions of animals, and they do so, then they are best serving their mission. However, the lack of agreement with the no-kill position indicates that the other three groups of respondents still believe that an animal shelter should accept all animals brought to it.

Analysis of the responses to question 37 suggests that the no-kill and open-door leaders are still divided over this issue. The main difference lies in whether restrictive admittance policies are considered acceptable.
Table 6
Perceived Suitability of Admission Policies

Proposition
An animal shelter best performs its mission when it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Leaders' responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepts all animals</td>
<td>Open-door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts all animals</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricts admission of animals to focus resources on other activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The third research question posed in Chapter One was: Which philosophy do leaders perceive as providing the best quality of life for the animals in their care? Survey questions 23 and 26 addressed this question. Table 7 summarizes these responses. As this has been a strong issue for open-door leaders, this question was posed to determine how beneficial they believe the no-kill philosophy to be for the animals in their care. If open-door leaders perceive that the quality of life is unacceptable for animals in no-kill facilities, they will be unwilling to adopt the no-kill policy for their own agencies.

Survey question 23 stated: No-kill facilities provide an adequate quality of life for the animals in their care. Differences were significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders were strongest in agreement with this statement. However, with a mean response of 6.98 the strength of their agreement was lower than expected. Nonsheltering leaders agreed with the statement as well, but only slightly above neutral, with a mean response score of 5.41. Both open-door and municipal leaders disagreed with this statement, with mean scores of 4.27 and 3.84 respectively. Clearly, open-door leaders remain concerned with the quality of life for animals in no-kill facilities. Additionally, the lower-than-expected response from no-kill leaders indicates that, although they believe the no-kill position is acceptable, they do have concerns that some no-kill facilities may fail in their attention to quality of life.

Survey question 26 stated: No-kills can easily become overwhelmed with animals. The groups did not report as expected on this. From a review of the literature, one would expect the open-door and municipal leaders to be the strongest in agreement with this statement. However, it was the no-kill and nonsheltering leaders that agreed most strongly. In fact, nonsheltering leaders agreed the most with this statement, with a mean of 8.83 and a relatively low standard deviation of 1.95. Close behind the nonsheltering mean was that for the no-kill leaders, at 8.48. This seems odd, since no-kill shelters almost always restrict admissions of animals. They are in a better position than open-door shelters to control the population of animals in their facilities.

Third highest in agreement were municipal leaders, with a mean of 8.09. The lowest level of agreement was shown by the open-door leaders, with a mean of 6.73. Although this is a level that demonstrates agreement with the statement, it is surprising that it is not higher, since it is a position that open-door advocates often put forth in the literature. The differences were significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of these responses demonstrated no-kill and open-door leaders continue to disagree over whether no-kill shelters provide animals an adequate quality of life. All respondent groups agreed that no-kill shelters could easily become overwhelmed with animals.
Table 7
Leaders' Perceptions of Quality of Life in No-Kill Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>No-kill Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Nonsheltering Mean (S.D.)</th>
<th>Municipal Mean (S.D.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No-kill facilities provide an adequate quality of life for the animals in their care (.0000).*</td>
<td>4.27 (2.18)</td>
<td>6.98 (3.03)</td>
<td>5.41 (2.51)</td>
<td>3.84 (3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kills can easily become overwhelmed with animals (.0064).*</td>
<td>6.73 (3.46)</td>
<td>8.48 (2.35)</td>
<td>8.83 (1.95)</td>
<td>8.09 (2.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates statistical significance.

Note: Values enclosed in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level.
The fourth research question posed in Chapter One was: What do leaders perceive as the public's expectations of their agencies? Survey questions 17, 19, 20, 21, and 36 addressed this question. Question 36 has already been reported above, and will be revisited when conclusions are drawn. Table 8 summarizes the rest of the responses. This research question was selected to explore what leaders believe their constituents in the community expect from them. Responses were compared against the type of shelter each leader represented.

Survey question 17 stated: The public expects an animal shelter to accept every animal brought to it. Differences were not significant at the .05 level. Strongest in agreement with this statement were the nonsheltering leaders, with means of 9.36 and a standard deviation of .90. In fact, not one of these leaders selected an agreement score of less than 7. Close behind the nonsheltering leaders were the municipal agency leaders, with a mean of 9.13 and a standard deviation of 1.52. They, too, did not have scores that extended to 0, or no agreement. The lowest agreement level chosen in this group was 4. Open-door leaders had a mean of 8.77 and a standard deviation of 1.83. No open-door leaders chose less than 5 on the agreement scale. Finally, no-kill leaders had a mean score of 8.51 and a standard deviation of 2.30. Their level of agreement went as low as 2 on the response scale.

Clearly, all leaders strongly believe that the public expects animal shelters to be open-door. This can have consequences for open-door leaders who are considering changing their organizational philosophy to no-kill. They may have a very difficult time convincing the public that this is the proper thing to do. The responses of no-kill leaders suggest they already struggle with the public over this concept.

Survey question 19 stated: Most members of the public do not know the difference between open-door and no-kill shelters. All groups agreed with this statement, especially nonsheltering leaders (mean = 8.08). No nonsheltering leader selected an agreement level lower than 3. No-kill leaders had a mean of 7.38 and municipal leaders had a mean of 7.31. Open-door leaders had a mean of 6.67. These results suggest that leaders of all agencies routinely educate their citizenry regarding their organizational philosophy. The results also suggest open-door leaders must regularly explain why they must perform euthanasia, and no-kill leaders must routinely explain why they cannot accept every animal. Differences were not significant at the .05 level.

Question 20 stated: Most members of the public would rather abandon an animal than bring it to an open-door shelter where it may be euthanized. Differences between groups were significant at the .05 level, but none of the respondent groups demonstrated strong
beliefs regarding this question. Consistent with the no-kill literature, no-kill leaders agreed with a mean of 6.78. Nonsheltering leaders were only slightly above neutral, with a mean of 5.11. Both municipal and open-door leaders slightly disagreed, with means of 4.38 and 4.37, respectively. From these responses, it appears open-door and municipal leaders do not feel the practice of euthanasia is discouraging the public from bringing animals to open-door or municipal shelters.

Question 21 stated: **Euthanasia of unwanted animals discourages potential adopters from coming to open-door shelters.** None of the respondent groups agreed with this statement, and the differences in responses were not significant at the .05 level. Slightly less than neutral, with a mean of 4.77, no-kill leaders did not support the above statement. Yet, this statement is one of the positions put forth in the no-kill literature. The no-kill leaders did not respond as no-kill literature predicts they will. Nonsheltering leaders had a mean response of 4.06, municipal leaders had a mean response of 3.09, and open-door leaders had a mean response of 3.73. The counter-argument to question 20 is that euthanasia of unwanted animals encourages potential adopters to come to open-door shelters in the hope of saving animal lives. Many people who work in this field are familiar with the adopters who ask to see “death row” or the next animal that is going to be euthanized, for their purpose in adopting from that shelter is specifically to save an animal from euthanasia. From the respondents' answers, it appears that euthanasia policies are not impacting their adoption programs.

An analysis of responses to research question 21 demonstrated that most open-door and no-kill leaders are in agreement regarding public expectations of animal shelters. They agreed: the public expects an animal shelter to accept all animals; the public does not understand the difference between the no-kill and open-door philosophies; and the public does not view euthanasia as a deterrent to potential adoptions. Only no-kill leaders believed that the public would rather abandon an animal than bring it to an open-door shelter.
Table 8
Leaders' Perceptions of Public Expectations of Their Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th></th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th></th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public expects an animal shelter to accept every</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal brought to it (.1530).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most members of the public do not know the difference</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between open-door and no-kill shelters (.1588).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public would rather abandon an animal than bring</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it to an open-door shelter where it may be euthanized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.0001).*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanasia of unwanted animals discourages potential</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopters from coming to open-door shelters (.1410).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Values in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
The fifth research question posed in Chapter One was: **What do leaders perceive the financial impact of either philosophy to be?** Survey questions 7 through 16 address this question. Tables 9 and 10 summarize these responses. The perceived financial impact of either philosophy was explored because that perception could determine whether an agency changes its organizational philosophy. In addition, the open-door literature suggests that no-kill leaders choose that philosophy due to the greater ease in attracting resources. Answers to survey questions reveal whether this belief is shared by animal welfare and control leaders as well.

Survey question 7 (rephrased here for clarity) stated: **The public is less likely to donate to nonprofit humane societies that perform animal control, because the public believes that these organizations are already supported through their taxes.** All groups agreed with this statement. Differences in responses between groups were significant at the .05 level. Not surprisingly, municipal agencies were least in agreement with this statement with a mean of 5.63. This is probably due to the fact that they are not nonprofit agencies and do not have the direct experience of the open-door nonprofit shelters. In comparison, the mean for the open-door shelters was 7.47. This group had the highest level of agreement with this statement, followed by no-kill leaders with a mean of 7.02. Nonsheltering leaders agreed with a mean of 6.33. The financial impact for a nonprofit organization that performs animal control is perceived to be a decrease in donations.

Survey question 8 stated: **Humane societies with animal control contracts that decide to become no-kill will have difficulty replacing that contract revenue with other funding.** Open-door leaders agreed with this statement, with a mean response of 6.47. This is possibly because they have the most experience with this dilemma, and may be too dependent on their contract revenue to change philosophies. No-kill leaders tended to agree, with a mean of 6.00. The two groups lowest in agreement were municipal leaders and nonsheltering leaders, with means of 5.78 and 5.53 respectively. This low level of agreement may be because, due to the nature of their organizations, neither of these groups have had to explore the possibility of giving up contract revenue. Nonsheltering agencies do not have contracts, and municipal agencies cannot divest themselves of them. Differences in responses were not significant at the .05 level.

Animal control and welfare leaders perceive that making an organizational transition in philosophy from open-door to no-kill would be difficult because it would involve developing alternative funding sources. As the competition for the philanthropic dollar is always strong, this may be a deterrent to agencies considering such a change.
Survey question 9 stated: **Humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts should not use private donations to subsidize providing these services for their communities.** Differences in responses were significant at the .05 level. Only the open-door leaders agreed with this statement, although the mean of 5.80 does not imply they had strong feelings about this subject. The other three groups tended to disagree with this statement. Municipal leaders had a mean response of 4.72, while no-kill leaders had a mean response of 4.57. Least of all in agreement were nonsheltering leaders, with a mean response of 3.14.

It is surprising that the no-kill leaders disagreed with this statement, because it is an argument regularly put forth in the no-kill literature. No-kill writings state that nonprofit animal welfare agencies should not perform animal control because it is not financially conducive to fulfilling their missions. These writings also state donors contribute to nonprofit animal welfare agencies to help animals, not euthanize them. Because euthanasia is a regular result of animal control work, the no-kill literature argues donations to nonprofit agencies performing animal control are being misused.

It is likely the open-door leaders agreed most with this statement because many of them perform animal control and sheltering. These leaders have to evaluate their budgets, donations, and services to ensure that revenue is being channeled to the appropriate programs. They face this dilemma much more than the other respondent groups and probably have greater insight into its nuances.

Survey question 10 stated: **Humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts are compensated adequately by the municipal governments that hire them.** Differences were significant at the .05 level. Municipal leaders disagreed only slightly with this statement, with a mean of 4.97. This may be due to the fact they are not nonprofit humane societies and do not share the experience of nonprofit budgeting with their nonprofit peers. Pay scales and benefits are higher in municipal animal control agencies than in nonprofit humane societies, so the municipal leaders may not feel the lack of compensation as strongly.

Nonprofit leaders disagreed much more strongly with this statement. Nonsheltering organizations disagreed with a mean of 2.46. No-kill leaders disagreed with a mean of 3.08. Theoretically, a similar argument can be made for nonsheltering leaders as was for the municipal leaders; that is, the absence of such contracts precludes them from making a completely informed judgment. However, many nonsheltering organizations work closely with the nonprofit animal shelters in their community. They very likely have first-hand observations to enable them to respond to this statement knowledgeably.
Open-door leaders disagreed with a mean of 2.77. This response is in conformity with the arguments set forth in the no-kill literature that call for humane societies to discontinue providing animal control and sheltering services. Several nonprofit, open-door agencies profiled in the literature review claimed to have had to provide animal control and sheltering services to their communities at a loss, to the detriment of their mission and budget. The open-door response to this survey indicates California nonprofit, open-door animal shelter leaders share the no-kill proponents' perceptions regarding this inequity in funding.
Table 9
Perceived Financial Impact of Animal Control Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is less likely to donate to nonprofit humane societies that perform animal control (.0315).*</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane societies with animal control contracts will have difficulty replacing that contract revenue (.6401).</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane societies should not use private donations to subsidize animal control and sheltering services (.0365).*</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane societies with contracts are compensated adequately by municipalities (.0020).*</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
Survey question 11 stated: **Open-door shelters experience a decrease in donations due to no-kill solicitations.** The mean scores varied from a low of 4.73 for no-kill leaders to a high of 6.03 for municipal leaders. Nonsheltering leaders had a mean score of 4.88 while open-door leaders more closely approached the municipal leaders' response, with an open-door mean of 5.80. Differences were not significant at the .05 level.

The open-door response is another surprising result. The open-door literature would lead a person to believe open-door leaders are deeply resentful of no-kill solicitation tactics, and their financial situations suffer deeply as a result. However, the mean response of the open-door leaders, at 5.80, is not a powerful level of agreement with this statement.

Survey question 12 stated: **It is easier for no-kill shelters than open-door shelters to raise money.** As might be expected from the literature review, the open-door leaders most strongly agreed with this statement, with a mean of 7.27. Municipal leaders had a mean of 6.88 and were next highest in agreement. No-kill leaders agreed with this statement as well, with a mean of 6.29. Finally, nonsheltering organizations agreed with a mean of 5.97. Differences were not significant at the .05 level.

This shows there may be a perceived financial incentive to become no-kill. Although not explored in this study, it would be interesting to note whether leaders believe the greater ease in fund-raising would offset loss of contract revenue for open-door agencies providing animal control services that decide to adopt a no-kill policy, thus giving up their animal control role and the associated contract revenues.

Survey question 13 stated: **An agency's financial circumstances are a factor in determining whether it can become a no-kill facility.** Differences were significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders slightly disagreed with this statement, demonstrated by their mean of 4.77. All three other groups agreed with this statement, indicating a disparity of perceptions between no-kill leaders and leaders of the other types of agencies. In particular, municipal leaders were strongest in their agreement, with a mean of 7.25. Open door and nonsheltering leaders had similar means of 6.37 for both groups. This suggests wealthier agencies are more likely to be successful in making such a transition.

Survey question 14 stated: **The no-kill philosophy is motivated by the greater ease of attracting donations.** Differences were significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders did not agree with this statement, with a mean of 2.22. Nonsheltering leaders disagreed, with a mean of 3.37. Open-door leaders agreed with the statement, although not strongly, with a mean of 5.63. Municipal leaders were fairly neutral, leaning towards disagreement, with a mean of 4.97. The open-door response shows there is still some distrust among those
leaders regarding the motives of no-kill proponents. Their agreement, however, is not nearly as strong as the literature proposes, and speaks more positively about their perceptions of no-kill leaders.

Survey question 15 stated: Only wealthy open-door organizations can become no-kill. Differences were significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders disagreed most strongly with this statement, with a mean of 2.47. All other leaders disagreed as well, but not to such an extent. Nonsheltering leaders had a mean of 3.38. Municipal leaders had a mean of 4.19 while open-door leaders were the least in disagreement, with a mean of 4.47. These responses indicate leaders believe it is possible for less affluent agencies to adopt this philosophy. This can be encouraging to those leaders who want to change their organizations' philosophies, and are concerned about the financial impact.

Survey question 16 stated: Volunteers would rather donate their time to a no-kill organization rather than an open-door organization. Volunteer time is a valuable commodity which can affect an organization's success as strongly as cash donations. All leaders agreed with this statement, to varying degrees, indicating that euthanasia is a troubling issue for volunteers. Differences were not significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders agreed most strongly with the statement, with a mean of 7.27. Open-door leaders were lowest in their agreement to the point of being close to neutral, with a mean of 5.60. Both nonsheltering and municipal agencies agreed with means of 6.33 and 6.19 respectively.

The lower open-door response is probably due to the fact the volunteers who donate their time to open-door agencies share the same philosophical direction as the agency itself. It stands to reason they would not volunteer at an agency whose practices they strongly disagreed with. It also follows that the leaders of open-door organizations believe their volunteers are supportive of their organizational mission. The same logic holds true for the no-kill response. Volunteers for no-kill shelters probably feel even more strongly in their opposition to euthanasia, and therefore choose to volunteer their time at no-kill agencies.

Analysis of the responses to this research question revealed that performing animal control subjects nonprofit agencies to financial risk, and yields no offsetting benefit; whereas there are financial incentives for an open-door shelter to become no-kill.
Table 10
Perceived Financial Impact of No-Kill Solicitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>No-kill Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Nonsheltering Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Municipal Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-door shelters experience a decrease in donations due to no-kill solicitations (.1974).</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easier for no-kills to raise money (.3173).</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An agency's financial circumstances determine whether it can become a no-kill facility (.0205).*</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The no-kill philosophy is motivated by the greater ease of attracting donations (.0001).*</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only wealthy organizations can become no-kill (.0485).*</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers would rather donate time to no-kills (.0838).</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
The sixth research question posed in Chapter One was: **Do leaders perceive the terms currently being used to describe the two philosophies to be suitable?** Survey questions 30 through 33 addressed this question. Table 11 summarizes these responses. Terminology is an important issue because the literature shows neither side in the debate is satisfied with the terms currently being promulgated. These terms serve as irritants to the people involved in this issue, and divide proponents of each philosophy.

Survey question 30 stated: **Euthanasia is a term that can be applied to the humane killing of all animals, regardless of the reason.** Although differences were significant at the .05 level, it was very surprising to learn all groups agreed with this statement. One would expect the open-door and municipal leaders to agree, which they did with respective means of 8.28 and 8.81. However, no-kill leaders also agreed with this statement, contrary to expectations raised by discussion of this issue in the literature. The no-kill leaders' mean was 6.49. Although not as strong as the open-door and municipal leaders, nor as strong as the nonsheltering mean of 7.23, the 6.49 mean response is still significant because a reader of the literature would expect a mean much lower. Apparently, the term euthanasia is not as offensive to no-kill leaders, who accept it as an adequate term.

Survey question 31 stated: **“No-kill” is misleading since most no-kills euthanize some animals.** Surprisingly again, no-kill leaders agreed at a slightly higher rate than average for agreement with this statement, with a mean of 5.47. This may indicate they would be willing to consider other terms to describe their philosophy. As might be expected, municipal and open-door leaders agreed strongly with this statement, with respective means of 8.28 and 8.23. Nonsheltering leaders had a mean of 7.03. Differences were significant at the .05 level. These responses suggest that a new term to replace “no-kill” would be acceptable to adherents of this philosophy.

Survey question 32 stated: **No-kill animal agencies should not be called “shelters” because they do not provide shelter for all animals in need.** Both no-kill and nonsheltering leaders disagreed with this statement, with respective means of 2.59 and 3.94. Open-door leaders agreed most among the four groups, but their mean of 5.93 was not in itself an extremely strong level of agreement. Municipal leaders agreed with a mean of 5.31. Differences were significant at the .05 level. It appears that although open-door and municipal leaders agree with this statement, it is not an issue of strong concern for them. They are willing to describe no-kill facilities as “shelters.”

Survey question 33 stated: **The term “no-kill” creates an antagonistic relationship between no-kill and open-door organizations.** Open-door leaders strongly agreed with
this statement, with a mean of 8.13 and a standard deviation of 1.87. In fact, the lowest response any open-door leader gave on the agreement scale was 5. Clearly, they feel very strongly about this topic. Also agreeing with the statement were municipal leaders, with a mean of 7.59. Nonsheltering leaders agreed as well, with a mean of 5.94. No-kill leaders did not agree with this statement. Their mean was 4.63. This is probably due to the fact they do not encounter the problem of having to explain to the public why their organization is not no-kill. They do not need to be defensive for the reason that the other organizations do. Differences were significant at the .05 level.

Responses to this research question showed that the term “euthanasia” is acceptable to all groups, and that the term “no-kill” is misleading and generates antagonism toward open-door shelters. Responses to this question also demonstrated that open-door leaders do not believe that no-kill facilities should be called “shelters.”
Table 11
Perceived Suitability of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th></th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th></th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th></th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanasia is a term that can be applied to the humane killing of all animals,</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regardless of the reason (.0169).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No-kill” is misleading since most no-kills euthanize some animals (.0007).</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill animal agencies should not be called “shelters” since they do not provide</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelter for all animals (.0003).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The term “no-kill” creates antagonism between the two philosophies (.0000).</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
The final research question posed in Chapter One was: What do leaders believe may be the future for California animal welfare and control regarding this issue? Survey questions 27 through 29 and 38 through 41 address this issue. Tables 12 through 15 summarize these responses. This question was explored in the hope of identifying future trends and creative solutions to the problems identified in this paper.

Survey question 27 stated: **Open-door and no-kill shelters should cooperate with one another.** Differences were significant at the .05 level. All four groups strongly agreed with this statement. No-kill leaders agreed most strongly, with a mean of 9.43 and a standard deviation of 1.35. Additionally, no no-kill leader selected less than 5 on the agreement scale. Nonsheltering organizations agreed quite as strongly, with a mean of 9.42 and standard deviation of 1.23. No nonsheltering leader selected less than a 5 on the agreement scale as well. Open-door leaders were next highest in agreement, with a mean of 8.47. Municipal leaders also agreed, with a mean of 8.28. It appears that despite differences of opinion in certain areas, open-door and no-kill leaders are willing to cooperate in addressing the animal welfare issues they both struggle with. This desire for partnership intimates that many of the current disagreements can be overcome.

Survey question 28 stated: **No-kill shelters are or will become a viable force in the animal sheltering community.** All groups agreed with this statement, but no-kill leaders were significantly higher in their level of agreement, with a mean of 8.32. Nonsheltering leaders were next highest in agreement, with a mean of 6.89. Municipal leaders were third highest in agreement, with a mean of 6.28. Open-door leaders agreed with a mean of 6.23. Differences were significant at the .05 level. From this data, it appears all groups believe no-kill shelters are not a passing anomaly, but have established themselves as another element of the animal welfare community.

Survey question 29 stated: **The open-door and no-kill philosophies are too extreme to allow for the establishment of productive relationships with one another.** All leaders disagreed with this statement, supporting the findings from question 27. Differences were not significant at the .05 level. No-kill leaders disagreed most strongly, with a mean of 1.77. Municipal leaders were next lowest in agreement, with a mean of 2.59. Closely following them were the nonsheltering leaders with a mean of 2.61. Open-door leaders disagreed with this statement, with a mean of 2.83. Supporting the findings in question 27, this response further indicates the possibility of the two philosophies becoming less combative.
Table 12
Perceived Future for California Animal Welfare and Control Regarding the No-Kill Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-door and no-kill shelters should cooperate with one another (.0239).*</td>
<td>8.47 2.55</td>
<td>9.43 1.35</td>
<td>9.42 1.23</td>
<td>8.28 2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill shelters are/will become a viable force in the animal sheltering community (.0094).*</td>
<td>6.23 3.57</td>
<td>8.32 2.56</td>
<td>6.89 3.10</td>
<td>6.28 3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two philosophies are too extreme to allow the establishment of productive relationships with one another (.3418).</td>
<td>2.83 3.05</td>
<td>1.77 2.51</td>
<td>2.61 2.79</td>
<td>2.59 2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values in parentheses represent ANOVA significance values at the .05 level. *Indicates statistical significance.
Survey question 38 asked: Which type of organization would you rather work for? (a) open door, or (b) no-kill. The responses indicate most leaders are currently working for the type of organization they prefer. Twenty-four of 28 open-door leaders stated this is the type of organization they would prefer to work for. Of the no-kill leaders, 33 of 36 stated they prefer to work for no-kill organizations. Municipal leaders stated they prefer to work for open-door organizations, with 28 out of 32 choosing this answer. Nonsheltering leaders, who do not accept animals and do not have a no-kill/open-door policy, were more evenly split. Thirteen stated they would prefer to work for an open-door organization, while 18 preferred to work for a no-kill agency.

This may indicate leaders' unwillingness to promote changes in their organizations' philosophies. For example, if this many open-door leaders prefer working for that type of organization, it is unlikely they would lobby to change the agency's philosophy from open-door to no-kill.
Table 13
Which Type of Organization Would the Respondents Rather Work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-door</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-kill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey question 40 asked: If your organization is not no-kill, are there plans to become no-kill within the next five years? This question did not apply to no-kill or nonsheltering leaders, because no-kill agencies have already adopted this policy and nonsheltering organizations do not shelter animals anyway.

Only 2 of 30 municipal leaders stated they had plans to become no-kill. Only 2 of 26 open-door leaders demonstrated this intention. Open-door organizations are completely comfortable with the philosophy that their organization has taken, and do not intend to change.
## Table 14

*Responding Organizations' Plans to Become No-Kill Within the Next Five Years*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaders' responses</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey question 41 asked: **Does your board of directors support a no-kill philosophy for your organization?** One hundred percent of no-kill leaders stated their board supports a no-kill philosophy for their organization. Only 2 of 23 open-door leaders indicated their board feels this way. Interestingly, 4 out of 25 municipal leaders reported that their boards supported a no-kill philosophy. This may indicate a trend of municipal agencies partnering more with their communities to reduce the number of euthanized animals. Fifteen out of 22 nonsheltering leaders stated their board supported a no-kill philosophy.

An analysis of the responses to this research question showed all leaders surveyed believe no-kill agencies are here to stay, that the two philosophies should cooperate with one another, and there is room for the two philosophies to reach consensus on important issues. Additionally, results demonstrated leaders of the different philosophies are currently working for the type of organization whose philosophy they support. Very few open-door leaders plan to change their organization's philosophy to no-kill, and boards are supportive of the organizational philosophies of their organizations. From these results, it appears unlikely this field will see a significant change in missions for open-door organizations.
Table 15
Perceived Board Support for the No-Kill Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived board position</th>
<th>Open-door</th>
<th>No-kill</th>
<th>Nonsheltering</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support no-kill philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support no-kill philosophy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five

This chapter presents the conclusions developed from analysis of the data discussed in Chapter Four. Proposals addressing the open-door/no-kill controversy are suggested, along with recommendations for further research.

Review of the Problem

The emergence and establishment of nonprofit, no-kill humane societies has, according to accounts in the literature, purportedly created a schism between leaders of no-kill and open-door animal welfare organizations. This schism is most clearly evidenced in the related literature on this topic. These writings suggest adherents of each philosophy are hostile to the beliefs of the opposing faction, regarding what role an animal shelter should play in its community.

Recent actions taken by leaders of open-door organizations, however, reveal some may support part or all of the no-kill philosophy. A small number of no-kill municipal shelters have been formed, calling into question some of the arguments promulgated in the literature.

This study examined the perceptions of animal welfare leaders regarding the no-kill philosophy. It investigated whether the positions put forward in the literature are an accurate reflection of these leaders' perceptions. By examining these perceptions, this study explored creative solutions to what appears to be a philosophical division between groups on this issue.

Discussion of the Findings

Respondents to this study totaled 143 subjects. Of these, 21.0% worked for nonprofit, open-door humane societies, 31.4% represented nonprofit, no-kill humane societies, 25.2% were leaders of nonprofit, nonsheltering agencies, and 22.4% worked for municipal animal control shelters.

Twenty-two of the 30 responding open-door shelters had contracts for animal control and/or sheltering. Nine of the 45 no-kill agencies had similar contracts. The fact no-kill agencies are involved in animal control and sheltering raises many questions about how they are able to accomplish this. All of the 32 municipal agencies performed animal control and sheltering, and none of the nonsheltering agencies performed these services.

It was hypothesized that open-door and no-kill leaders would be most dissimilar in their responses to the survey questions, because of the disagreement between these two
groups evident in the literature review. In this survey, however, it was the municipal leaders who exhibited the greatest disparity in perceptions with the no-kill leaders. This evidence demonstrated that within the nonprofit world there is not as much of a dichotomy between the open-door and no-kill philosophies. This is possibly because, due to the fact that both types of organizations are nonprofit, the nonprofit open-door leaders have a closer understanding of nonprofit, no-kill issues. The type of organization they lead (nonprofit, rather than municipal) seems to be a stronger unifying force than the type of philosophy (open-door/no-kill) of their organizations.

Responsibility for animal control.

Six survey questions were designed to gather leaders' perceptions regarding which type of agency should be responsible for animal control services. Analysis of the responses indicated leaders believe that nonprofit humane societies are best positioned to provide animal control/sheltering services.

Nonprofit respondents perceived humane societies to be superior to municipal agencies in emphasizing animals' welfare, conducting cruelty investigations, performing animal control services, and quality of adoption programs. Municipal leaders agreed that humane societies could better conduct cruelty investigations and perform animal control services as well or better than they could, but did not agree that humane societies stressed animal welfare and adoption programs more strongly than municipal agencies. This is not surprising, because agreement with those two latter criteria would indicate municipal leaders believe they are failing to provide adequate animal care. Their response also may suggest municipal leaders care as much about animals as animal welfare agencies do, but lack the resources to perform these services as well.

None of the groups believed providing animal control services conflicts with the mission of humane societies, as is suggested in the no-kill literature. Open-door leaders were only neutral on this subject. Their lack of agreement with this proposition indicates that they do not perceive a basis in reality for the discord suggested by the literature.

This lack of perceived conflict is consistent with the reason that humane societies became involved in animal control years ago. Humane societies believed they could perform the job better than the systems set up by municipalities. Surprisingly, the no-kill leaders agreed that providing animal control is not a conflict for nonprofit humane societies. This agreement is inconsistent with the no-kill literature, which strongly states that humane societies should not be performing animal control. The no-kill respondents in this survey did not support this view as presented in the literature.
One no-kill position stated in the literature suggests nonprofit agencies that perform animal control are often mistaken for municipal agencies by the public. All responding groups agreed with this statement. This misconception probably results in many difficult situations for nonprofit agencies that choose to perform animal control.

**Financial impact.**

One consequence for nonprofit organizations mistaken for municipal agencies is reduced donations. Animal welfare and control leaders believe the public is less likely to contribute to nonprofit agencies that perform animal control, probably because these agencies are often mistaken to be municipal agencies and not nonprofits. Many citizens believe their tax dollars are already paying for the operation of the local open-door animal shelter, particularly if they see its employees in uniforms enforcing local animal control ordinances.

Although nonprofit animal shelters that provide animal control and sheltering services are funded indirectly with tax dollars through animal control contracts, all responding groups agreed these animal control contracts do not adequately compensate nonprofits for their services. This position is consistent with the no-kill literature, which discussed several case studies in which humane societies were losing money on their contracts each year. These case studies showed agencies were actually using private donations to subsidize their animal control services. When asked whether this was an acceptable practice, nonprofit open-door leaders were the only respondents who felt that this was unacceptable, while all other response groups did not object. This is most likely because open-door leaders grapple with this question as a matter of routine business operations. The other categories do not have to grapple with this issue, because they are not nonprofit organizations with municipal contracts. Municipal agencies are not nonprofits, and nonsheltering and no-kill agencies do not have municipal contracts (with the rare no-kill exceptions discovered through this study). Of particular note is the no-kill leaders' acceptance of this position, since the no-kill literature strongly states donations should not be used in this manner. Again, no-kill respondents did not support the no-kill argument encountered in the literature, which stated donations should not be used to support animal control services.

All study respondents agreed that if a humane society were to relinquish its animal control contract, the agency would have difficulty replacing that revenue. This expectation may deter some nonprofit agencies from relinquishing their animal control
contracts, and if valid, supports the no-kill literature statements that humane societies have become too dependent on municipal income. While most leaders believe, however, that an agency's financial circumstances determine whether it can become a no-kill facility, none of the respondents believe that only wealthy organizations can become no-kill.

Leaders also agree it is easier for no-kill shelters to raise money, and volunteers would rather donate their time to a no-kill facility. Both nonprofit open-door and municipal leaders believed that their agencies experience decreases in donations because contributions are diverted by no-kill solicitations. Since the competition for the philanthropic dollar always continues, this may serve as an ongoing source of contention. It may also cause open-door leaders to consider changing their organization's philosophy to no-kill.

Open-door nonprofit leaders only slightly agreed with the position stated in the open-door literature that the no-kill philosophy is motivated by the greater ease of attracting donations. This is heartening to those who would like to see a consensus develop between adherents of the two philosophies.

Which philosophy best serves its mission?

All groups, including no-kill leaders, believed a humane society best serves its community when it does not have a restrictive admittance policy. This is likely due to the leaders' perceptions that the public expects an animal shelter to accept every animal brought to it, and leaders' concerns over what alternatives would be available for animals that were turned away.

When asked whether a humane society best serves its mission when it accepts all animals, no-kill leaders stated it did not. A majority of 62% believed a humane society best fulfills its mission when it restricts admission of animals to focus its resources on other animal-welfare related activities.

The difference in perceptions between duties to the community and fulfillment of the organization's mission identifies a fundamental difference between open-door and no-kill agencies, which is that open-door shelters exist to fill a societal need, but that the mission of no-kill shelters is more internally driven. One no-kill advocate even suggested that by accepting all animals, open-door shelters enable the public to be irresponsible pet owners by allowing them an "easy out" for disposing of their unwanted animals (Bestrup, 1996). No-kills do not identify their role as a public service or community-focused one, but rather one established by their own goals and ideals. These goals may not be the same as their community's needs.
Quality of life.

Survey respondents' perceptions regarding quality of life were representative of the positions discussed in the literature. Neither open-door nor municipal leaders believe the no-kill philosophy in practice provides an adequate quality of life for shelter animals, while the no-kill and nonsheltering leaders believe it does. All agree strongly no-kills can easily become overwhelmed with animals.

Public expectations.

Four survey questions were designed to gather leaders' perceptions regarding four key arguments from the literature. Each response group of leaders agreed that the public expects an animal shelter to accept every animal brought to it. It is interesting to note that although the no-kill leaders agreed that the public expects them to accept all animals, their shelters have restrictive admittance policies. Certainly this causes difficult situations for the no-kill shelters when they have to explain to a customer why they won't accept that customer's animal. This is probably why no-kill leaders were the only group to agree that the public would rather abandon an animal than bring it to an open-door shelter. The people they turn away likely state they will turn the animal loose, believing it will have a better chance for survival than if sent to an open-door shelter where it may be euthanized.

Open-door shelters have similar difficulties in helping customers understand the nature of their operations. Customers are often unable to understand why the open-door shelter cannot guarantee their animal a new home. As a result of such experiences, all animal control and welfare leaders believe the public does not discern the difference between no-kill and open-door shelters.

Finally, none of the leaders surveyed believe euthanasia discourages potential adopters from visiting open-door shelters. Although some people may feel that way, apparently there are even more who want to "save a life" and visit the open-door shelter just for that purpose. Again, the no-kill respondents did not support the arguments reported in the no-kill literature, which suggest that open-door euthanasia discourages adoptions.

Terminology.

All groups, including no-kill, agreed that "euthanasia" is an acceptable term to describe the killing of animal in animal shelters. This is contrary to the no-kill position stated in the literature, which dismissed the term "euthanasia" in favor of "murder," "slaughter," or holocaust." Apparently, the term "euthanasia" is an established and accepted expression
which can continue to be used without debate.

If "euthanasia" is preferred over other words, it may be acceptable to the leaders for the term "no-kill" to be set aside. This is additionally supported by all respondent groups' perceptions that the term "no-kill" is misleading, because most no-kills euthanize some animals.

Yet, no-kill leaders did not agree that the term "no-kill" creates an antagonistic relationship with open-door groups. This is probably because the people who feel the brunt of the public's antagonism as a result of the term "no-kill" are the open-door leaders. Open-door, municipal, and nonsheltering leaders all responded that the term "no-kill" does create enmity between the two philosophies.

Open-door and municipal agencies slightly agreed that no-kills should not be called "shelters" because they do not provide shelter for all animals in need. No-kill and nonsheltering leaders did not support this position.

All these findings beg the question of what to call "no-kill" shelters? Respondents were asked to give suggestions for what to call no-kill and open-door shelters, in the hope of establishing a new terminology that would be acceptable to all groups. Unfortunately, no new or creative terms were presented. At best, some suggested the term "adoption centers" to replace "no-kill" shelters. This may be the best solution, for it offers a palatable term that accurately describes the activities of the organization.

**How may the no-kill movement impact the future of the California animal welfare and control field?**

Respondents were asked six survey questions designed to measure their perceptions of what impact the no-kill philosophy may have on their agency, and what effects it would have on the California animal welfare and control field. Their responses were extremely encouraging to animal welfare and control workers who would like to see this issue brought to resolution.

Because it is unlikely that open-door leaders will partner with a faction whose practices they do not view as sustainable, open-door animal welfare and control leaders were asked whether they thought the no-kill philosophy was an established animal welfare practice. Both groups agreed that no-kill shelters are an established part of the animal welfare field. This suggests that these open-door leaders would be willing to explore ways to partner with no-kill agencies, since they recognize them as a sustainable force in the animal welfare field.
All groups also strongly agreed there is room for consensus between the open-door and no-kill philosophies and efforts should be made to cooperate with one another. These expressed beliefs do not conform to the arguments present in the literature, which continue to pit the two philosophies against each other. Perhaps, as the initial uproar over disagreements between the open-door and no-kill philosophies has passed, proponents of both philosophies are now willing to find ways to partner with one another.

Respondents also were asked several questions regarding their preference for working for an organization with either a no-kill or open-door philosophy, and what their current organizations plan to do regarding this issue. From their responses, it was very clear leaders are currently working for organizations that operate under the philosophy that they themselves presently support. It would be unlikely for them to leave their employment solely for the purpose of seeking a job at an organization of the other philosophy. Interestingly, nonsheltering leaders were almost evenly split in their preference for which philosophy they would rather work under. Since the nature of the work in their current positions dictates they do not have to adopt either philosophy, it appears that neither the no-kill nor the open-door philosophies have a stronger attraction over the other for the nonsheltering leaders.

Additionally, only two open-door and two municipal leaders stated that their agencies plan to become no-kill within the next five years. Clearly, there is no trend toward altering operational philosophy at animal shelters anytime in the near future.

Conclusions

Respondents did not support many of the arguments presented in the literature regarding the open-door/no-kill controversy. The hypothesis that the literature concerning the no-kill/open-door controversy does not accurately reflect the views of animal control and welfare organization leaders was supported.

Although the no-kill literature states nonprofit humane societies should not be performing animal control, none of the respondents agreed with this position. Respondents, including no-kill leaders, believe that nonprofits are best positioned to perform animal control and sheltering for their communities.

All respondents did agree, however, nonprofits are not compensated adequately for their animal control and sheltering services. Also, contrary to the literature, all groups except open-door leaders believe that donations should be used to subsidize nonprofit animal control services. The open-door leaders only slightly disagree with this position. These sentiments indicate a problem for nonprofit animal welfare organizations that
perform animal control and sheltering services. Leaders of such organizations perceive the
public is less willing to donate to their agencies because they are mistaken for municipal
entities. Further, the leaders may expect that donations be used to support the kinds of
services that are supposed to be fully paid for by contracts with local municipalities, but
rarely are. Consequently, open-door nonprofit shelters that provide animal control and
sheltering services must balance providing services for which they are not adequately
compensated, and which negatively impact fund-raising opportunities, with public
expectations that the donations they do receive should not subsidize those same services.

One way for nonprofit open-door shelters to address the problem of being mistaken for
municipal entities, and for open-door and no-kill agencies being mistaken for each other, is
to develop proactive public relations campaigns to educate the public about the role each
type of organization plays in the community. Since the public is largely uneducated about
the differences between open-door and no-kill shelters, often confuses nonprofits with
municipal agencies, and has conflicting expectations regarding the services provided by
differing agencies, a better effort of educating the public would be of great benefit to all
involved.

Leaders' perceptions regarding the issue of acceptable terms also were not in
agreement with arguments encountered in the literature. Use of the term “euthanasia” to
describe that activity does not offend the surveyed leaders. Many expressed
dissatisfaction with the term “no-kill,” however, and agreed the term should be replaced
with a more palatable and accurate phrase. The most commonly suggested replacement
term was “adoption center.” This actually may work quite well, because it clearly
indicates the primary purpose of such an agency. This would also help the public
differentiate between what happens at no-kill shelters and open-door shelters. Results
from this study suggest no-kills should become known as “adoption centers” or “adoption
agencies,” and open-door shelters should continue to be referred to as “animal shelters.”
Neither term is offensive to practitioners of the other approach, and use of these more
accurate terms will redress the public confusion issues discussed above.

Although the surveyed leaders agreed open-door shelters that choose to relinquish their
animal control contracts will need to have sound financial plans in place before doing so,
very few open-door leaders indicated that their organizations plan to change to a no-kill
philosophy. Most leaders were working at agencies whose organizational philosophy
they support. Consequently, it is unlikely we will see a significant change in how
California animal welfare and control is performed because these leaders have no desire to
change the organizational philosophy at their agencies.
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Although the above findings and suggestions speak to the key points or symptoms that open-door and no-kill leaders have been arguing about, they fail to identify the key underlying issue at the heart of this debate, which is how organizations define their missions. This key to resolving the alleged controversy over no-kill policy became apparent in analyzing the responses to the survey questions. While authors promoting either the open-door or no-kill philosophy have been arguing in the literature about which philosophy is the one true way to help animals, analysis of animal welfare and control leaders' perceptions reveals this issue is really a question of mission, and there are actually two missions, not one, being confused in this debate.

The no-kill and open-door philosophies are rooted in how their leaders and proponents identify their missions in relation to their communities. Simply “helping animals” does not adequately describe the activities, values, and challenges of either position.

No-kill agencies have an internally-driven mission to address issues they choose to address. They do not believe a community's surplus animal problem is their responsibility, nor that humane societies should be performing euthanasia of unwanted animals. Consequently, they limit the animals that they house to only those that will be successfully adopted. They then use their additional resources to focus on other animal welfare-related activities, such as spay/neuter clinics and education.

Open-door agencies have an externally-driven mission, guided by what they determine to be the needs of the community. Their mission dictates that, on behalf of the community, they accept all animals brought to their shelter. Consequently, they must perform euthanasia to make room for additional animals when facility capacity is exceeded.

The reason the open-door/no-kill debate has continued for so long is that animal welfare advocates who have been arguing for both philosophies have been trying to force both philosophies to fit the same mission. This is rarely possible. Instead, proponents of both philosophies should recognize that this futile effort should be set aside in favor of finding ways to work together to address the companion animal overpopulation problems in their communities. There are clearly ways in which open-door and no-kill organizations can work together to be a greater force for the benefit of unwanted animals than either could ever possibly be independently. Some of the strongest levels of agreement registered in this survey were endorsements of such cooperation. It is time to begin.
Recommendations for Further Research

Further exploration into ongoing partnerships between open-door and no-kill organizations would be important to those agencies that wish to pursue such a venture. A few examples of such cooperation already exist, such as the partnership between the San Francisco Department of Animal Care and Control and the San Francisco SPCA. These two agencies signed the Adoption Pact, an agreement which guarantees that no adoptable animal is euthanized in San Francisco.

There are examples of no-kill municipal agencies, but little has yet been reported about them. Qualitative studies of such organizations can provide very useful information about how these agencies are able to combine animal control and sheltering services with a no-kill policy.

More information is available from other animal welfare and control agencies outside the state of California. Due to the financial cost involved in surveying a national sample, this study was limited to California. Many animal welfare and control organizations across the country, however, are grappling with the very same issue. Researching this topic nationally might determine whether this study's findings were unique to California or are representative of conditions nationwide.


Appendix A

[SURVEY HAS BEEN REFORMATTED FOR INCLUSION IN THIS THESIS]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Agreement</th>
<th>Agree Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Humane societies should perform animal control because they might emphasize the animals' welfare more than municipal agencies do.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. By addressing both animal welfare and public safety, humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts have two conflicting missions.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The law enforcement aspect of cruelty investigations is best left to municipal agencies.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The law enforcement aspect of animal control work is best left to municipal agencies.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Municipal animal control agencies stress adoption programs as strongly as nonprofit humane societies.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nonprofit humane societies that perform animal control are often mistaken to be municipal agencies by the public.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The public is less likely to donate to nonprofit humane societies who perform animal control because they believe they are already supporting these agencies through their taxes.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Humane societies with animal control contracts that decide to become no-kill will have difficulty replacing that contract revenue with other funding.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts should not use private donations to subsidize providing these services for their communities.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Humane societies with animal control/sheltering contracts are compensated adequately by the municipal governments that hire them.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Open-door shelters experience a decrease in donations due to no-kill solicitations.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is easier for no-kill shelters than open-door shelters to raise money.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. An agency's financial circumstances are a factor in determining whether it can become a no-kill facility.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The no-kill philosophy is motivated by the greater ease of attracting donations.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Only wealthy open-door organizations can become no-kill.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Volunteers would rather donate their time to a no-kill organization than an open-door organization.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The public expects an animal shelter to accept every animal brought to it.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. An animal shelter adds more value to the community when it is open-door.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Most members of the public do not know the difference between open-door and no-kill shelters.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Most members of the public would rather abandon an animal than bring it to an open-door shelter where it may be euthanized.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Euthanasia of unwanted animals discourages potential adopters from coming to open-door shelters.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is ethical for an animal shelter to have restrictive admittance policies.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. No-kill facilities provide an adequate quality of life for the animals in their care.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. No-kill shelters provide an acceptable alternative to open-door shelters for their communities.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. With a restrictive admissions policy, no-kills are better able than open-door shelters to expand their ancillary animal welfare services.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. No-kills can easily become overwhelmed with animals.

27. Open-door and no-kill shelters should cooperate with one another.

28. No-kill shelters are or will become a viable force in the animal sheltering community.

29. The open-door and no-kill philosophies are too extreme to allow for the establishment of productive relationships with one another.

30. Euthanasia is a term that can be applied to the humane killing of all animals, regardless of the reason.

31. "No-kill" is misleading since most no-kills euthanize some animals.

32. No-kill animal agencies should not be called "shelters" because they do not provide shelter for all animals in need.

33. The term "no-kill" creates an antagonistic relationship between no-kill and open-door organizations.

34. The best term to describe animal shelters with restrictive admission policies that do not euthanize animals is:

35. The best term to describe animal shelters that accept all animals and consequently perform euthanasia is:

36. A humane society best serves its community when it (choose one):
   a. accepts all animals
   b. restricts admissions of animals to focus resources on other animal welfare activities

37. A humane society best serves its mission when it (choose one):
   a. accepts all animals
   b. restricts admissions of animals to focus resources on other animal welfare activities

38. Which type of organization would you rather work for?
   a. open-door
   b. no-kill

39. Is the agency that you work for a no-kill organization? (circle one) yes no
40. If your organization IS NOT no-kill, are there plans to become no-kill within the next five years?
   (circle one) yes no

41. Does your board of directors support a no-kill philosophy for your organization?
   (circle one) yes no

42. Does your organization have a contract to provide animal control or sheltering services for your community?
   (circle one) yes no
   If yes, which type of contract?
   a. sheltering only
   b. animal control only
   c. animal control and sheltering

43. The type of organization that you work for: (circle one)
   a. non-profit open-door animal shelter
   b. non-profit no-kill animal shelter
   c. non-profit nonsheltering animal welfare organization
   d. municipal animal control agency
   e. other ________________________

44. The following information is strictly confidential. It is used for tracking and data analysis only.
   Your name: ____________________________ Your title: ____________________________
   The name of the organization that you work for: ____________________________
   Business telephone: ____________________________

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 12, 1997.

Thank you very much for your participation!
Appendix B

Marcia Mayeda
107 S. Mary Ave. #6
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
home (408)735-0508
work (408)654-5880

January 29, 1997

Dear Colleague:

I am a student in the Masters of Nonprofit Administration program at the University of San Francisco. I am also the Director of Animal Services for the Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley. These two activities have given me a great interest in studying the effect that the no-kill movement is having on the traditional model of animal sheltering in this state.

For my masters thesis, I am gathering the perceptions of leaders in the California animal welfare and control fields regarding this issue. Your opinion is important, because as such a leader you have unique insights and a strong influence in how your agency may respond to this philosophy. By gathering your perceptions of this issue, I hope to learn whether we will see changes in how we address the companion animal overpopulation issue.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in this project. Enclosed is a survey designed to gather your opinion regarding this topic, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience in returning it. The survey is very easy to complete, and should take no longer than twenty minutes to finish.

Your participation in this study is very important. I sincerely thank you in advance for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Marcia Mayeda
Appendix C

Survey Instructions

This survey is designed for ease of completion. It should only take approximately 20 minutes to complete. I am conscious of the time constraints that you deal with daily, and sincerely appreciate your taking the next few moments to complete the questionnaire.

- Terminology regarding the no-kill philosophy is one area that has caused a heated debate in this field. Nevertheless, it is critical for survey respondents to use the same definitions in completing this survey, to ensure consistency of intended responses. While people may personally differ in how they may define terms, for the purposes of this survey, the following definitions are used:

  **No-kill:** Organizations that do not euthanize animals, except in extreme circumstances. No-kill organizations generally restrict admission of animals based on space available, and the "adoptability" of the animal.

  **Open-door:** Organizations that accept all animals brought to their shelter, regardless of space available or the "adoptability" of the animal. As a result, euthanasia is routinely performed to make room for more animals that are arriving.

- In completing this questionnaire, you will be asked to share your level of agreement with various statements. These statements address various issues often discussed in animal sheltering. If you sense a bias in any of the statements, this is completely unintentional. Some statements are merely reproductions of comments already heard in the animal welfare movement. Their inclusion in this survey in no way supports or challenges their content.

- To mark your response, please circle the number that best represents your opinion for each statement. The choices are on a scale numbered 0 through 10. 0 indicates no agreement. The numbers rise along the scale, progressively indicating stronger agreement. 10 indicates total agreement.

- To save paper and mailing costs, the survey is printed on both sides of the paper. Please make certain to complete all questions.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the survey. Please return the survey by **February 12, 1997**. If you have any questions, you may contact me at:

Marcia Mayeda
Home (408)735-0508
Work (408)654-5880

*Thank you very much for your assistance with this project!*
February 15, 1997

Dear Colleague:

Recently you were sent a survey designed to gather your perceptions regarding the effect that the no-kill philosophy is having on California animal welfare and control. You were selected to participate in the survey because of your leadership role with a California animal welfare or control organization. Your response is crucial to ensure the integrity of this survey.

I have not yet received your survey, and would like to urge you to find a few moments to return it soon. Some participants of nonsheltering animal welfare organizations have questioned whether it was appropriate for them to respond, since they do not shelter animals. If you represent such a shelter, I strongly encourage you to participate. You have a great deal of knowledge about this issue and can provide an objective opinion.

If you have already returned your survey and it has crossed in the mail with this reminder, please disregard this correspondence. If you need a replacement survey, please call me at (408)735-0508 to request one. It will be sent to you immediately.

Data analysis will begin on February 28, 1997. Please return your completed survey by February 25. Again, your participation is critical for the success of this project. Thank you in advance for your valuable time and very important contribution!

Sincerely,

Marcia Mayeda
University of San Francisco
Master of Nonprofit Administration candidate