

University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2018

Gender and leadership in animal sheltering organizations.

Jennifer Blevins Sinski
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sinski, Jennifer Blevins, "Gender and leadership in animal sheltering organizations." (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2969.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/2969>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

GENDER AND LEADERSHIP IN ANIMAL SHELTERING ORGANIZATIONS

By

Jennifer Blevins Sinski
B.A., Bellarmine University 2000
M.A.T., Bellarmine University, 2002
M.A. Murray State University, 2010

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Sociology

Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2018

Copyright 2018 by Jennifer Blevins Sinski

All rights reserved

GENDER AND LEADERSHIP IN ANIMAL SHELTERING ORGANIZATIONS

By

Jennifer Blevins Sinski
B.A., Bellarmine University 2000
M.A.T., Bellarmine University, 2002
M.A. Murray State University, 2010

A Dissertation Approved on

4/9/18

By the following Dissertation Committee

Dissertation Director
Dr. Cynthia Negrey

Dr. Patricia Gagne

Dr. David Roelfs

Dr. Robert Carini

Dr. Nancy Theriot

DEDICATION

This Dissertation is dedicated to my Husband

Dr. Joseph Sinski

And my Daughter

Brittany Marie Williams

And my furry family members – Chloe, Cuddles, Tribbles & Yoshi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Committee Chair, Dr. Cynthia Negrey for her infinite patience throughout this long process. I also thank my committee members, Dr. Patricia Gagne, Dr. David Roelfs, Dr. Robert M. Carini, and Dr. Nancy Theriot for their support throughout the project. Last, but not least by far, I would like to thank my family for cheering me on and encouraging me to continue.

ABSTRACT

GENDER AND LEADERSHIP IN ANIMAL SHELTERING ORGANIZATIONS

Jennifer Blevins Sinski

4/9/2018

This study explores the connection between gender, leadership and implementation of best practice strategies to reduce or eliminate euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals in animal sheltering organizations. The purpose of this mixed methods study utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews is to explore the impact of gender and animal sheltering leadership on organizational policies, as well as workers', and volunteers' attitudes toward reducing euthanasia in sheltering organizations. It is anticipated that the knowledge generated from this research will provide new insights into animal sheltering policies and procedures and inform sheltering organizations about the connection between gendered leadership in animal sheltering organizations and euthanasia rates.

In the United States we are experiencing a paradigm shift regarding animals in society culturally, scientifically and relationally. Attitudes toward animals are changing from animal as object to animal as subject. This paradigm shift converges center stage with the problem of pet overpopulation in the United States and the use of euthanasia to address that problem

The findings for this dissertation are divided into three chapters, four through six. Chapter four focuses on identity issues via the ethic of care and ethic of justice

framework. Chapter five focuses on altruistic leadership, organizational learning and the impact that leadership has on the sheltering organization. Chapter six combines identity, leadership and organizational issues to examine the impact on the sheltering organization and policies. The final chapter, seven, provides analysis of the previous three chapters and the closing of the dissertation.

While qualitative analysis of in-depth interviews found support for difference between gender use of ethic of care and ethic of justice, quantitative significance was not found between gender and the two scores of care and justice. A significant difference was found on ethic of care scores between former and current employees, with former employees having significantly lower ethic of care scores. Women held higher scores on a measure of altruistic leadership and several areas of organizational learning. Female leaders also have a significantly lower rate of canine euthanasia rates within the organization. A regression analysis finds that leader gender, altruistic leadership score, private organizations, fostering, and transporting significantly predict rates of canine euthanasia in sheltering organizations. Finally, leaders, workers and volunteers in sheltering organizations are strongly impacted by their work. Case studies of both a toxic environment where change was not successful and a supportive environment where change was successfully made to reduce or remove euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals highlights the centrality of the work to meaning of identity for individuals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	12
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	67
CHAPTER FOUR IDENTITY ISSUES.....	74
CHAPTER FIVE ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES	101
CHAPTER SIX IDENTITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES	128
CHAPTER SEVEN ANALYSIS.....	163
REFERENCES	209
APPENDICES	231
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	267

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Ethic of Justice and Care by Gender.....	76
2. Ethic of Justice and Care by Currently and Formerly Employed	80
3. Crosstabulation of Gender and Animals as Central to your Identity	83
4. Attitudes about Animal Issues by Gender	85
5. Analysis Organizational Learning Scores by Altruism	105
6. Altruistic Leadership Score, Organization Learning Capacity Score Differences by gender	107
7. Crosstabulation of Leader Gender and Collaborations.....	116
8. Altruistic Leadership Scores by Organizational Type	121
9. High/Low Altruism score and Leader Gender on Canine Euthanasia.....	130
10. Multiple Regression Analysis	147

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study explores the connection between gender, leadership and implementation of best practice strategies to reduce or eliminate euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals in animal sheltering organizations. The purpose of this mixed methods study utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews is to explore the impact of gender and animal sheltering leadership on organizational policies, as well as workers', and volunteers' attitudes toward reducing euthanasia in sheltering organizations. It is anticipated that the knowledge generated from this research will provide new insights into animal sheltering policies and procedures and inform sheltering organizations about the connection between gendered leadership in animal sheltering organizations and euthanasia rates. This research employed both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to illustrate the phenomena under examination. The participants of this study included self-selected survey respondents and volunteers for in-depth interviews chosen for analysis by their organizational position and type. Interviews were conducted with current and former shelter leaders, current and former shelter workers, current and former shelter volunteers.

This chapter begins with an overview of the context and background that frames the study. Following this is the problem statement, the statement of purpose, and accompanying research questions. Also included in this chapter is a discussion regarding research approach, researcher's perspective and researcher's assumptions. The chapter

concludes with a discussion of the proposed rationale and significance of this research study and definitions of some of the key terminology used.

Background and Context

Despite the fact that many families in the United States adopt companion animals and include them as family members, the number one risk factor for death of healthy, adoptable companion animals is entry into a sheltering organization (Association of Shelter Veterinarians, 2010). It is estimated that 12 million companion animals entered shelters or rescues yearly and approximately eight million are humanely euthanized (Kass 2001, J. Scarlett 2012). Unfortunately, this number isn't widely known by the general public as 85 percent of survey respondents from a recent study done by Pet Smart Charities (2014) greatly underestimated this number. Today's animal sheltering organizations range from large, well-resourced facilities to small rescue groups operated by a single person from home. Publicly operated animal shelters must admit all animals dropped off to the shelter or picked up by animal control officers from the street (J. M. Scarlett et al 2002). Privately operated shelter systems can restrict admissions, choosing only a certain type of companion animal or refusing animals due to illness or behavior problems (Arluke 1991). Furthermore, shelters may offer different programming to address the problem of pet overpopulation including fostering, adoption, low-cost spay and neutering, transportation and behavioral counseling (Frank 2004, Frank 2007, Coate 2010). Traditionally operated shelters continue to euthanize for time/space consideration while others have moved to significantly reduce euthanasia rates and only euthanize companion animals for illness or severe behavioral problems. The fragmented and

heterogeneous nature of the industry is further complicated by the lack of direct oversight of the industry.

The history of animal sheltering is intertwined with the history of women's rights advocacy both in the United States and the United Kingdom. Women advocated for protection of animals prior to obtaining the right to vote and women continue to make up approximately 80 percent of the volunteers and workers in the animal protection movement (Munro 2001). But while women have made up the majority of the workers and volunteers, men have and continue to be the leaders of the large organizations in the field of animal protection (Garner 1995, Munro 2001, Gaardner 2008). As women move into leadership positions in animal sheltering organizations, we are also seeing a change in organizational sheltering policies. Communities around the United States are questioning the necessity of high euthanasia rates when other sheltering organizations are successfully employing best practice strategies to significantly lower euthanasia rates.

The Association of Shelter Veterinarians, The Humane Society of the United States and the ASPCA include adoption partnerships, fostering programs, volunteer programs and humane education and advising as best practice strategies to increase live release rates. In order to reduce euthanasia rates within the shelter, leaders must explore collaborative partnerships with organizations that can assist in providing alternatives to euthanasia. Public shelters have historically been underfunded and understaffed (Scarlett 2008) and simply don't have the staff or the funds to work through the alternatives. Creating partnerships requires the leader to share responsibilities and authority with others outside the organization. A leadership style that is relational and open to sharing responsibility as well as authority works to create these types of collaborative efforts.

Hamilton (2010) documented community-wide efforts of creating organizational social change for companion animals in a county in Florida. He identified five types of challenges including two specific to the leadership of animal sheltering directors – creating coalitions and collaboration and integrating professional and volunteer animal protection organizations. Both of these challenges required the ongoing leadership efforts of the shelter director.

Given that research indicated shelter leadership contributed to adoption of low-kill or no-kill policies (Hamilton 2010), it is important to explore the connection between the influx of women into the field of public and private, non-profit shelter leadership and lower euthanasia rates. Research on differences in leadership styles between men and women indicated support for the idea that gender does impact leadership style, specifically surrounding issues of care and altruism. The moral orientation of leaders – either centered on ethic of justice or ethic of care – influences leadership style as well (Simola 2012) possibly hindering or helping the adoption of low-kill or no-kill policies. Furthermore, while gender isn't a condition of either ethic of care or ethic of justice, some research indicated that men more often identify as ethic of justice than women (Gilligan 1993).

Sensemaking takes place in organizations in which actors who are concerned about their identity within the social world of the workplace retroactively put into language the specific ongoing circumstances (Weick 1995). Previous research indicated that people involved in the field of animal sheltering often choose to do so because they felt that caring for animals was central to their identity (Arluke 1991). Given that part of the “work” often requires the euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals, it is

important to analyze the role that sensemaking plays in dealing with “dirty work” and stigma (Hughes 1951). Additionally, critical sensemaking acknowledged the role that context, power, and power relationships play and in order to explore how change comes to an organization or not, subtle ways in which sensemaking is restricted or legitimated is important (Thurlow and Mills 2015).

Companion animals are an important part of American family life with over 60 percent of American families owning pets counting approximately 78.2 million dogs and 86.4 cats living in homes (Association 2012). According to the American Pet Products Manufacturers Association (APPMA), Americans spent \$53.33 billion dollars in 2012 on our companion animals (Association 2012). Companion animals are often described as members of the family sharing in familial rituals like birthday parties and holiday gift giving (Irvine 2004, Sanders 2003, Holak 2008). They serve as work partners and therapists in the capacity of guide dogs, seizure alert companions, and emotional support partners. Not only do companion animals share our lives and hearts, many people are deeply concerned with unwanted and abused companion animals. A study done by Frank (2007) found that 20 percent of Americans donate to animal welfare organizations and animal protection advocacy groups. It is evident that companion animals are very much a part of our social world.

Despite the deep and enduring connections that companion animals provide for society members, unwanted healthy and adoptable companion animals are euthanized in shelters across the country. Commonly referred to as the problem of pet overpopulation, lost or unwanted companion animals are housed in animal sheltering organizations. Scarlet (2001) estimated that between four and six million dogs and cats were euthanized;

other researchers place the figure at a far higher number, about 18 million dogs and cats euthanized per year in the United States (Morris and Zawistowski 2004). Euthanasia rates have been decreasing over time, down from over 20 million dogs and cats during the 1970s (Voith 2009). The United States spends approximately one billion dollars annually to impound, house and euthanize companion animals (Development 2010). More funds are desperately needed by animal sheltering organizations with needs assessments performed by animal welfare organizations indicating a dire need for more financial support (Scarlett 2004, Scarlett 2008). Due to the organizational structure of the sheltering industry, it is difficult to find firm data regarding the number of animal sheltering and control organizations in the United States. Shelters are operated by local, county and state governments, non-profit animal welfare organizations, or a partnership between both. Estimates vary from 4200 to 5000 (Scarlett 2004, Morris and Zawistowski 2004, Rowan 2006, Miller 2007). Data on the animals held in shelters proves even more difficult to obtain (Frank 2007). Statistical information about the companion animals held in the shelters are based on estimates as very few studies have been done on the population of companion animals held in shelters (Kass 2001, Scarlett 2004, Winograd 2007a; Marsh 2009, Newbury et al. 2010)

Given the large number of animals cared for in these facilities and the large number of dollars necessary to provide this care, surprisingly few studies have been done on animal care and sheltering in the United States (Arluke 2002). In 1994, the National Council on Pet Population Study surveyed animal shelters throughout the United States to determine statistics on animals cared for in these facilities. Much of the research published to date on the data surrounding animal sheltering utilizes the NCPPS database

(National Council 2001, Kass 2001, Scarlett 2004). Smaller state and county surveys of animal shelters have been performed more recently (Hamilton 2010).

Collecting data from animal shelters remains difficult for a number of reasons. First, these organizations are operated by counties, local governments, nonprofit organizations or publicly funded shelters contracted with other state shelters or nonprofit organizations to provide services (Morris and Zawistowski 2004; Miller 2007; Newbury et al 2010) and do not report to any overarching regulatory body. Second, animal shelters follow different policies regarding the care of the animals held there. Third, even definitions of what constitutes a healthy pet, an unadoptable pet and an adoptable pet are different between these organizations making data collection and comparison very difficult (Accords 2004, Marsh 2009, Newbury et al. 2010).

Problem Statement

Does gendered leadership situated in an ethic of care versus an ethic of justice impact adoption of organizational strategies that reduce or remove euthanasia of healthy and adoptable companion animals? Does gendered leadership impact sensemaking regarding euthanasia? Does gendered leadership impact employees' and volunteers' attitudes toward companion animals? Does organizational policy impact leader, worker, and volunteer relationships with companion animals?

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this mixed methods research utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews is to explore the impact of animal sheltering leadership on organization policies and workers, and volunteers' attitudes towards reducing companion animal

euthanasia in the sheltering organization. To illuminate the problem, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. How does ethical decision making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?
2. How does gendered leadership impact adoption of evidence-based best practice strategies to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia in animal sheltering organizations?
3. How does gendered leadership impact sensemaking surrounding issues of companion animal care in the shelter organization.
4. How has the increasing need of collaborative efforts within and between organizations changed leadership?
5. How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?
6. How do the narratives created by organizational leaders impact workers and volunteers?

Research Approach

With the approval of the University of Louisville's Internal Review Board, the researcher used an online survey to capture over 343 responses and conducted 49 in-depth interviews with leaders, workers, and volunteers. This research used both quantitative and qualitative field research to determine whether the ethic of care or ethic of justice impacted the implementation of animal sheltering policy and how gender differences in leadership impacted the organization and its employees, and volunteers. Given that policy changes are situated around euthanasia of companion animals, and the

leadership directed to achieve those strategies, it was important to analyze how the members of the organization reacted to potential social change.

Assumptions

Based on the researcher's background and experience in the sociology of animals and society, two primary assumptions were made regarding this study. The first of these assumptions is that in the United States we are experiencing a paradigm shift regarding animals in society culturally, scientifically and relationally. Attitudes toward animals are changing from animal as object to animal as subject. This paradigm shift converges center stage with the problem of pet overpopulation in the United States and the use of euthanasia to address that problem. The second assumption is that the creation of meaning by individuals regarding their relationship with a companion animal is constructed within a shifting social context, and adopters may find even a lack of symbolic language to describe the bonded pair. Previous sociological research provided support for the ability of companion animals to be actively involved in a relational bond (Sanders 2003, Irvine 2004, Arluke 2006) As animals are given kinship status, many adopters identified the care for their companion animal as central to their identity (Sanders 2003, Arluke 2006, Irvine 2012), and this animal-valued identity holds forefront during ethical and moral decision-making (Noddings 1984, Donovan 2007, Hens 2009).

The Researcher

At the time of conducting this research, the researcher was employed as a graduate teaching assistant at the University and a full-time graduate student in the sociology department. While the researcher has previously volunteered at a local humane society, she is not currently employed and/or volunteering for any sheltering

organization. The researcher has previously adopted shelter pets and currently shares her home with four canines. Thus the researcher brings to the inquiry process an understanding of the relationship and attachment between humans and companion animals and her experience as a woman in the caretaking role of companion animals. While this experience may have served to be beneficial to the interview process, it may have also created a possible source of bias. The researcher remained committed to ongoing critical self-reflection via journaling and open dialogue with academic peers and advisors, as well as procedural safe guards included in the process of conducting grounded theory research. The researcher endeavored to maintain objectivity throughout the data collection and analysis despite her deep connection to companion animal welfare.

Rationale and Significance

While previous research has explored differences in leadership styles of men and women, no research to date has explored the topic of gender and leadership in animal sheltering organizations. Feminist Ethic of Care Theory has been applied to issues of animal rights and animal rights activists, but the connection between gendered leadership and ethic of care applied in animal sheltering organizations and the impact that has on euthanasia rates of healthy, adoptable companion animals has not been explored. Previous sociological research regarding reasons for adopting animals, reasons for turning family pets into animal shelters, and the impact of euthanasia on animal shelter employees has been done. No research to date has explored how gendered leadership and ethical decision making (ethic of care versus ethic of justice) impact shelter employees

and volunteers. Nor has the issue of critical sensemaking and decision making been explored within the animal sheltering environment.

This research provides a new insight into the importance of leadership utilizing an ethic of care on organizational attitudes towards evidence-based, best practices that work to reduce or eliminate the need to euthanize healthy, adoptable companion animals.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Pet Keeping and Animal Sheltering

While historically people have kept non-human animals as companions, the species and purpose of the animal in the home has dramatically shifted over time. Even the boundary between what is human and what is animal has shifted (Ingold 1980; DeMello 2012). In fact, the boundary between nature and culture overlapped and blurred in early primitive and non-western societies. Early societies of hunters and gatherers viewed animals as equals and garnered their permission before hunting and consuming them (Ingold 1980; Serpell 1986; DeMello 2012). Several different cultures around the world worshipped gods or spirits that could assume either human or animal form. Other cultures observed kinship bonds with animals where animals recognized as totems provided genealogical figures from whom family members could be traced (DeMello 2012). Historically in western cultures when the shift from hunting to agriculture occurred, the boundary between nature and culture or human and non-human animal becomes clearly demarcated (Ingold 1980; Serpell 1987). Humans gained control over animals by domesticating them requiring animals to depend upon humans for their care. Humans then transcended the realm of nature (DeMello 2012).

Religious beliefs reify the boundary claiming human superiority over nature. The great chain of being, a medieval notion, situated man above all others, placing animals in a hierarchy moving from God to man to animal. The Catholic Church identified the practice of pet keeping as heresy, which further challenged the boundary between humans and animals (Walsh 2009; DeMello 2012).

Archeological evidence found in early grave sites determined that wolves and humans shared living space almost 14,000 years ago. These wolves evolved over time into the domesticated dog (Serpell 2009; Walsh 2009; Udell, Dorey and Wynne 2010). By 9000 years ago, cats along with dogs provided integral service to agricultural societies by herding animals and clearing rodents from living areas (Serpell 2000). Early Egyptians treated both cats and dogs with respect. Cats, associated with the goddess Bastet, were worshipped and dogs, thought to be loyal companions, served as guides in the afterlife. Owners grieved the passing of companion animals with ritual embalming and burial (Walsh 2009). The importance of the companion animal human bond was recognized in early Greek literature and Homer wrote about the dog's loyalty in Odysseus with Argus recognizing his long-lost master. The remains of a dog named Delta, found in Pompeii, wore a silver collar engraved with his name providing further evidence of the bond between humans and companion animals. (Walsh 2009). The Romans also commemorated their relationships with companion animals in literature. Lyrical verses written by the poets Ovid, Catullus and Martial all celebrated the lives of various pets. Emperor Hadrian erected elaborate tombstones for his favorite dogs suggesting a deep grieving process on the loss. (Serpell 1987).

During the Middle Ages, companion animals were associated with the upper class. Royalty carried small lap dogs and noble ladies fed morsels of table food to their tiny companions. In fact, the monasteries of the time were often overrun with various animals from birds, rabbits, cats and dogs that visiting noble ladies brought with them during their visits (Ritvo 1987; Serpell 1987). In Asia, some companion animals were so loved and doted on that they had personal servants assigned to their care. Pekinese dogs, bred very tiny, were kept by Chinese royalty to warm their laps and carried in the sleeves of their robes throughout the castle (Walsh 2009). The wealthy and elite held the financial resources to obtain pure bred companion animals while the poor were only able to keep the animals that royalty considered to be dirty and diseased. Ritvo (1987) argued that the wealthy had the resources to feel comfortable incorporating nature into their family domicile while the poor did not have access to these same resources and would have been much more hesitant to incorporate something as dangerous as nature into their familial home. Despite the number of wealthy that owned pets, they were often satirized for having close relationships with their pets. The Catholic Church viewed pet keeping as a waste of time and money and pet keeping became associated with women, causing pet keeping to be considered feminizing and inferior (Serpell 1986; Bartlett 2005; DeMello 2012).

The common practice of naming animals kept as pets originated in the eighteenth century (DeMello 2012). At about this same time, businesses evolved that serviced companion animals; veterinarians, making medicines, breeders, and commercial pet food makers. In 1860 the first dog kibble producer began selling commercially in England but did not reach the United States until the twentieth century (Serpell 1986; Ritvo 1987;

DeMello 2012). Although pet keeping was beginning to be more acceptable, attitudes toward cruelty were quite different than they are today. Both Europeans and Americans remained quite indifferent toward animal suffering taking part in such sports as dog fighting, badger baiting and rat killing (Ritvo 1987; DeMello 2012). The rise in modern pet keeping is associated with the movement to cities, the rise of the middle class and the disappearance of farm animals from communities. City life conquered nature thereby allowing humans to comfortably invite nature into their homes. The loyal and safe companion animal emulated the appropriate relationship a Victorian family should have with nature. The middle class had fewer children and could now comfortably afford both the time and cost of pet keeping (Ritvo 1987; Walsh 2009; DeMello 2012). At this same time, fancy dog, rabbit and cat clubs appeared which focused on breeding and showing companion animals. Ritvo (1987) argued that the Victorians' fixation on breeding canines and felines was in part due to human's newly acquired dominion over nature. By controlling the sexuality of animals, the owner exercised dominion over this "wild" aspect of nature. Mixed breeds, considered distasteful by the middle class, expressed the inability of the lower classes to control nature.

Humane education and institutionalized animal protection appeared during the Victorian era along with the increased interest in pet keeping. Grier (2006) claimed that Victorian families used companion animals to teach their children about responsibility, kindness and self-control, all middle-class virtues. Pet keeping was a way to instill these types of virtues in young children, which would then carry over to treating others in the same manner. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was established in

Great Brittan in 1824 and the Cruelty to Animals Act was passed in 1974, which regulated animal experimentation.

As the role of animals in society has changed over time, so have the roles and responsibilities of animal shelters or pounds changed in the United States. It is at this point within the timeline that Irvine (2003) situates the construction of the problem of pet overpopulation and the development of organizations and institutions to deal with the problem. Prior to the Civil War, the concept of a “homeless” pet didn’t exist. While unowned companion animals did likely roam the streets, it wasn’t until claims makers described “homeless” pets to be problematic that they became as such.

During the early 1800s, pound masters worked to round up wandering livestock within the community and returned the animals charging a fee to the owner of the cow, horse, goat or pig. These animals represented an economic value for families and were quickly retrieved by their owners allowing pound masters to make a living from the fees collected. Moving from agricultural to the urban setting, the municipal pounds were tasked with collecting companion animals. As these animals held little economic value for any owner, fewer animals were retrieved and the pound master killed the majority (Miller 2007). The fear of the scourge of rabies carried by roaming dogs in urban areas caused large scale round ups of homeless dogs who were euthanized by pound masters (Irvine 2003). In 1866, Henry Bergh founded The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) partially in response to perceived abuses by the local pound master. Following encouragement from Bergh, Caroline Earle White started a similar organization, the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (PSPCA) in 1868. Although she started the organization, as a woman she was not

allowed to take a leadership position in the organization. In her place, Mrs. White's husband served as president. Several years later, the organization started a women's branch of the PSPCA and Caroline served as president. One of her first programs was to convince the city government to contract with the WSPCA to care for city strays. Philadelphia contributed \$2,500 to the organization for their service (Coleman 1924, Irvine 2003, Nicoll, Trifone and Samuels 2008). While White was one of the first women to advocate for animals in the United States, she was certainly not the last. She began a long tradition of women involved in leadership of animal welfare organizations which continues today with current estimates suggesting that advocacy groups are made up of approximately 70 percent women (Coleman 1924; Gaardner 2008). In answer to numbers of stray animals on the street, New York City officials paid local men and boys .50 cents per animal to round up stray dogs to relinquish to the dogcatcher. These animals, kept in a shed without food or water, were killed by drowning in a barrel filled with water, covered with a slated lid. In 1877, the *New York Telegram* reported the numbers killed each day and on certain days, the public gathered by the river to watch the dog catcher load dogs into an iron crate that was dropped into the East River (Winograd 2007). In 1894, the ASPCA ended the practice and the city abolished the position of pound master. The ASPCA took over the housing and sheltering of companion animals in New York City (Winograd 2007). Here begins the tradition of private, non-profit organizations contracting with governmental offices to perform the responsibilities of sheltering unwanted, homeless companion animals. Private non-profit organizations like the ASPCA continued to grow in part to respond to perceived abuses in municipal or public shelters operated by county or local governments. While sheltering practices and

facilities have greatly changed over time, what remains is the contentious and suspicious relationship between the public shelter and animal control operations and non-profit animal welfare organizations.

History of Activism by Women on Animal Welfare

Historically, women have often been grouped together with animals in reference to their supposed inferiority to men. Both groups were also classified as property owned by men, and women's bodies were often medicalized and treated as other. It is this commonality with animals that perhaps drove early nineteenth century women (Eaton, Adams and Donovan 1996; Gaardner 2008). Early feminist writer, Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1864) compared women's position in society to that of a horse: "The labor of women in the house, certainly, enables men to produce more wealth than they otherwise could; and in this way women are economic factors in society. But so are horses."

Caroline Earle White also initiated the American Anti-vivisection Society in 1883, following in the footsteps of early feminists in Great Britain. There many women had enlisted their support in anti-vivisection organizations including Francis Power Cobbe, an author and activist, who led both suffragette and anti-vivisection organizations. In 1903, the Brown Dog Affair occurred and became a flash point for women in support of anti-vivisection. Lizzy Lind af Hageby, a Swedish feminist, attended a medical vivisection and wrote the experience in her diary which she published. A small brown terrier was cut open while fully conscious and without appropriate anesthesia. She wrote

A large dog, stretched on its back on an operation board, is carried into the lecture-room by the demonstrator and the laboratory attendant. Its legs are fixed to the board, its head is firmly held in the usual manner, and it is tightly muzzled. There is a large incision in the side of the neck, exposing the gland. The animal exhibits all signs of intense suffering; in his struggles, he again and again lifts his body from the board, and makes powerful attempts to get free. (1903:19-25)

Despite women's active involvement in issues of animal protection and welfare, they were denied higher leadership positions in organizations like the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and local SPA organizations (Monro 2008).

Women's support for animal welfare and protection continued throughout the twentieth century, although the ideology shifted from that of a reformist body with a moralizing overtone to one of care orientation (Monro 2008). Adams and Donovan (1995) describe women's involvement as directed by an "ethical responsibility" derived from an "historical praxis of care." "This loss of purpose both mirrored and was reinforced by the growing feminization of the cause. Increasingly, the cause of animal protection was given over to women, and subsequently, children" (MacCulloch 1993:45-46). The association between women and animal welfare began to become fused with an emotional overtone and has received critique from the "rational-centered" animal rights movement led by men such as Peter Singer and Tom Reagan. In fact, feminist theorists suggest that it is precisely the claim that women's bodies somehow interrupt their rationality and thus causes their exclusion from the moral community, in the company of nonwhite men and animals (Donovan and Adams 1995). Patriarchal oppression rooted in "the male ideology of transcendent dualism" contributes to the oppression of both animals and women and man's superiority is communicated by contact with "a higher power/knowledge called god, reason or control" (Ruether 1974:195). Furthermore, Adams and Donovan (1995) claim that female subjection and abuse and animal exploitation and abuse are nearly universal in all human societies. Women must not forget their link to animals with whom they share centuries of objectification and exploitation, but rather remain bonded, respectful and conscious of the sacredness of this

connection. To ignore the euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals for reasons of time and space is a “profound betrayal of our deepest commitments.”

One of the few companion animal fields occupied primarily by men, veterinarians, has drastically changed over the last decade. In 1970, only 10% of the field was comprised of women but by 2015 that figure had changed to 67% (Smith 2002; Irvine 2010). Furthermore, some veterinary schools have reported entering classes of almost 100% female. Research disagreed on the impact of the feminization of the field. Irvine (2010) argued that despite the feminization, female veterinarians continued to sustain the status quo by employing discursive strategies to avoid challenging the masculine ethic of the field. Smith (2002) provided evidence that females have and continue to change the field of veterinary science and suggested that shortages in the areas of care for laboratory animals and meat production was due to female ethic of care.

Centered on the connection between women, care and animals, research has explored differences between women’s and men’s attitudes toward animals.

Feminist Care Ethic

Much of the research in developing a feminist care ethic originated with Carol Gilligan in her ground-breaking book, *In A Different Voice* (1982). Gilligan argued that women held different moral ethical frameworks than men and critiqued Kohlberg’s *Stages of Moral Development* as being developed from a predominantly male sample. Similar to Dorothy Smith’s standpoint theory (1987), Gilligan maintained that applying a research originating from and standards developed mostly by men discredited a woman’s experience. Women also must effectively distance themselves from the experience by creating a “process of bifurcated consciousness that required the creation of an inner

division or psychic split” (Gilligan 1982:xiii). She argued that while the male model of moral ethics focused on justice and rights, restricting what the self and others can do, a female model incorporated relationships, a relational position of self and caring relationship between self and others. She referred to the male model as a “justice orientation” and the female as a “responsibility orientation.”

Using a relationship model, Gilligan argued that women care more about connecting with others and building relationships, while men are focused on a more hierarchical pecking order. Therefore, women make decisions based on the idea of our human interrelatedness and connectedness and how decision-making will impact self and others. Gilligan defined logic of ethic of care as “inductive, contextual and psychological” as opposed to the “justice oriented” logic of “deductive, analytical and mathematical” (1982). Furthermore, Gilligan constructed the application of care ethic in “resistance to the injustices inherent in patriarchy” where one must recognize the “importance of everyone having a voice and being listened to carefully and heard with respect” (1995:120-127).

Building on Gilligan’s ethic of care model, Nell Noddings (1984) outlined an ethics of care situated within relationships rather than justice. She described ethical caring as “a state of being in relation, characterized by receptivity, relatedness and engrossment” (1). She defined the basic human affect of joy to be at the root of the relation of caring. She described it as “the recognition of and longing for relatedness that form the foundation of our ethic, and the joy that accompanies fulfillment of our caring and enhances our commitment to the ethical ideal that sustains us as one-caring” (1). In *Caring* (1984) Noddings developed the two-stage model of “caring-for” referring to an

actual state of nurturing or applying caring services and “caring-about” referring to a state where one nurtures caring intentions. Noddings (1984) developed a model of caring obligation moving in concentric circles from the center outward following a diminishing pattern supporting her idea that care was limited. She also addresses the possibility of care for animals and develops the possibility of a reciprocal, caring relationship.

Others have applied the feminist ethic of care model to the area of animal ethics and ecofeminism. Early animal rights advocates argued from a rights or justice orientation for animal rights (Singer 1975; Regan 1983). Feminists challenged this rights-based argument declaring that a “like us” argument fails to acknowledge the differing experiences of animals as an equal rights approach to the law fails to address differing statuses between men and women (Adams 2007). Rights approaches also supported a more abstract and formalistic framework that constructs universal applications while feminists argued that many situations involving animals required a situational response based on an historical and contextual understanding(Adams 2007). Finally, rights based approaches to animal ethics ignores and devalued a loving and caring relationship when in fact the absence of love created the context for animal abuse and violence toward animals(Adams 2007). Josephine Donovan (1995:109) described feminist ethic of care as “women’s relational culture of caring and attentive love – we should not kill, eat, torture, and exploit animals because they do not want to be so treated and we know that. If we listen, we can hear them.” In other words, women should not only perceive our interconnection with animals but also morally attend to the needs and requirements of living beings as separate from our personal needs and desires.

Animal Welfare and Animal Ethics

Sociologists theorize varying reasons for the slow growth of scholarship in human and non-human relations and animals in society. Arluke (2002) surmised that researchers in other fields such as race, gender and class fear limited resources for support of research will be directed away from these fields. Peggs (2012) suggested that sociology remains grounded in “humanness” and the sociological knowledge arising from the human standpoint ignores the role of animals and takes the human way of looking at the world for granted. Nibert (2003) suggested that sociology questions the naturalness of the notion of oppression for humans but accepts the devaluation of animals as natural thus rendering non-human animals invisible. Feminist theorists suggested that women’s involvement with animal care and advocacy stigmatizes the study of animals. It is precisely because of women’s association with animals that the study of animals is devalued (Donovan 1993; Munro 2001; Beers 2006; Haraway 2008).

Given the undeniable evidence that animals do occupy a position of prominence in our lives – the economy of pet keeping, language, narrative, institutions, government - much of the debate about companion animals or non-human animals is based on their differentness from humans, establishing what humans have that makes them different from other animals. Although several sociologists have focused on establishing the thinning or disappearance of this divide between us and them, human attitudes towards animals are established in this difference (Sanders 1990; Sanders 2003; Irvine 2004a; Arluke 2006; Irvine 2012). The divide between humans and non-human animals, and nature and culture has been argued by philosophers, scientists and laypeople since the time of the ancient Greeks. Aristotle argued that animals lack the power to speak,

therefore they do not have rationality and humans reign superior over animals. In opposition to Aristotle, Pythagoras declared that animals must live in common with humans. Although other philosophers in addition to Pythagoras argued against Aristotle, Judeo-Christian thought borrowed heavily from Aristotle. Human's dominion over all other creatures situated humans second only to God in the hierarchy (DeMello 2012). Thomas Aquinas divided the world between those that have reason and immortal souls and all other creatures that have no soul relegating animals to the status of non-personhood. Descartes based treatment of animals on their lack of language, referring to them as machines that could feel no pain or hold no consciousness. John Locke disagreed with Descartes suggesting that animals do feel pain and that cruelty to animals is wrong but not because of the status of animals. Rather, cruelty was wrong because it was bad for humans. During the eighteenth century philosophical thinkers began to change thinking about animals. Rousseau described animals as sentient creatures that should be protected from cruelty. Jeremy Bentham furthered that argument by stating "the question is not, Can they reason? Nor Can they talk? But, Can they suffer?" (DeMello 2012).

While the rise of early animal welfare organizations occurred during the Victorian era, more recently three main divisions have been established: animal welfare groups, animal rights groups and animal liberation groups (Unti 2001; Greenebaum 2009). While holding some overlapping philosophies, animal welfare groups accept the humane use of animals and companion animals. In 1975, Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation* established the animal rights movement, along with the organization of Animal Rights International by Henry Spira (Unti 2001). The animal rights movement centered on a justice-focused

approach to an ethic of animal treatment. The animal liberation movement was established with the publication of Tom Regan's *The Case for Animal Rights* expressed critique of current views of animals rejecting the current political and capitalistic ideology regarding animal ownership (Unti 2001). The animal welfare groups hold conflicting ideology with the rights and liberation groups. The latter two do not support ownership of companion animals while welfare groups advocate for the humane treatment of companion animals (Greenebaum 2009). It is the distinction between a companion animal and other animals that animal welfare concerns itself with.

Companion animals, or pets, are defined differently. First pets, allowed in our homes, are given names and never eaten (Thomas 1983). Pet owners or guardians describe companion animals as members of the family. Humans treat them as children or infants and much of domesticated animal's appeal comes from the neonate qualities they have developed over time (Serpell 2002). Companion animals are valued for their emotional support rather than their individual economic value or working value the way that livestock are valued (Blouin 2013). While many Americans value their companion animals and treat them like members of the family and individual subjects, others view pets as either workers or objects that provide service to their owners (Greenebaum 2004; Sanders 2003; Blouin 2013). Some owners combine both subject and object view by petting and cuddling with them as puppies and then relinquishing them to shelters when their cute puppy behaviors become annoying as adults (Irvine 2002). Differences in owner attitudes towards companion animals have been associated with cultural variations and biographical and demographic factors like race, gender, family structure and socio-economic status (Podberscek 1997; Brown and Katcher 2001; Brown 2002; Campbell

2013). While research has been conducted connecting varying attitudes toward animals to various attributes, this does little to explain how to deal with the ambiguous attitudes toward animals that are held by U.S. pet owners. Pets may be in danger of being treated like objects, which may be abused or mistreated or thrown away after the initial attraction has worn off. Tuan (1984) argued that dominance explains the ambiguous treatment of companion animals. On one end of the dominance scale sits mistreatment and abuse while on the other end of the dominance scale sits endearment. Dominance goes a long way toward explaining disparaging treatment of animals even between the same owner and the same pet. Pet keeping requires that we decide when our pets eat, drink, defecate and sleep. We also train our pets to behave in ways that might not be normal for a dog or cat to behave (Wrye 2009). While the dominance model does explain some treatment of pets, it ignores the efforts of owners to have reciprocal relationships and interactions with pets according to Irvine (2002).

Research also indicated that pets have a positive health impact on humans. Owning pets reduced the risk for heart attacks and certain types of cancers (Wells 2009; Larson et al. 2010; Urbanski and Lazenby 2012). Companion animals can provide positive emotional support reducing problems experienced from depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (Winefield, Black and Chur-Hansen 2008). Psychological research has also focused on the relational aspects of companion animals exploring the friendship and companionship that pets provide for their guardians. Two different theories supported the positive health impact that animals have on pets. The first, the biophilia hypothesis, suggested that the human brain is hardwired to pay attention to animals as they provide a food source, which increases fitness. This hypothesis is not

often supported because animal welfare is not part of the consideration. The second hypothesis, social support theory, has been supported by extensive research indicating the health benefits of social support to both human and animals. Animals are considered to be a source of social support and are often referred to as family members or friends (Beck and Katcher 2003).

It is for all these reasons listed for owning companion animals that ethicists have attempted to development an ethic for regarding and treating companion animals with respect. Burgiss-Jackson (1998) suggested that our relationship with pets is like that of parent/child; therefore, our duty to the companion animal is the same as our duty to our children. Because we create a situation of reliance upon our support and care of the animal, we therefore are treating them like children. Therefore, when a person takes custody of that animal they should be held liable for its care. A pet guardian must provide for both psychological and physical needs of their pet. As dogs are pack animals, leaving a dog tied to a chain in the yard for 24 hours a day, seven days a week is wrong and unethical. Another ethical argument described companion animals' relationships with humans as one of benevolent slavery (Hanrahan 2007). Humans have the right to end a companion animal's life by euthanasia. This same behavior is not considered either ethical or legal towards one child. According to Hen (2009), neither parent/child nor master/slave explains the relationship between humans and companion animals. Domestication required an active level of trust between species, and in the case of humans and dogs the process required cooperation between the two and both are equally changed in the process. This places dogs in a special position and thus should be ethically treated differently. Methods of training focused on supporting the

human/animal bond must be used. Clotheir (2002:29) stated that “each relationship with an animal and human is a bridge uniquely shaped to carry only those two and so must be crafted by them.” Hen (2009) argues that as dogs enter into emotional relationships with guardians they must be extended the ethics of personal attachment. Society must extend laws to protect animals from abuse and to provide adequate and comfortable shelter for homeless pets. Society must also provide the funds and resources to adequately provide said care for pets in shelters. Recent research suggested that inadequate housing facilities and lack of activity for shelter animals caused behavioral problems and physical changes in hormone production (Dalla Villa et al. 2013). Adopting shelter pets must be encouraged and children should be educated early on regarding proper methods to care for and train a companion animal. Furthermore, owners of specific dogs are endowed with specialized responsibilities for that animal. Such responsibilities included providing healthy food, adequate exercise and appropriate medical care for the companion animal and committing to that animal for their relatively short life (Hens 2009).

Given the ethical considerations regarding humans and non-human animal relationships, our relationships with animals allow us to euthanize an animal only in order to end physical suffering. Rollin (1991) argued that given the ethical considerations humans must provide for companion animals if we truly consider them as relationship partners, attention must be focused on our moral treatment of them. Euthanizing millions of healthy and adoptable companion animals is problematic within this framework. Italy passed legislation that makes it illegal to euthanize healthy shelter dogs (Dalla Villa et al. 2013). Dalla Villa et al. (2013) suggested that veterinarians must address the problem, given that they are endowed with “Aesculapian authority” - the authority that comes

along with the ability to heal in a culture – they are in an advantageous position to help. Veterinarians can call for society to do the right, ethical thing to regarding treatment of companion animals in society. Dalla Villa et al. (2013:1156) maintained that they “educate the society to the unnoticed implications of that ethic in the companion animal era, something society has deftly side-stepped.”

Convenience euthanasia of companion animals has been identified as a source of major stress in a survey of pre-vet students, as well as with in-service veterinarians (Rollin 2011). Describing convenience euthanasia as a moral stressor for veterinarians, Rollins associated this stress with an increased risk of suicide among veterinarians. In a survey of animal care workers, shelter workers identified euthanasia as extremely stressful and is associated with increased job strain, home/family life strain and substance abuse by workers (Reeve 2005). Shelters with high euthanasia rates experienced higher turnover rates among employees and volunteers (Rogelberg et al. 2007). Another study found higher rates of post-traumatic stress disorder among workers who routinely euthanized companion animals (Rohlf and Bennett 2005). Overall research indicated that euthanatizing healthy and adoptable companion animals as an answer to the problem of pet overpopulation takes an emotional toll on society (Voith 2009) and comes with a cost for all involved.

Gender and Leadership in Organizations

Women have been involved within leadership of non-profit animal welfare organizations for a century but more recently they are moving into leadership positions in the public shelter system. Simultaneously, there is an increase in public shelters adopting low-kill policies by incorporating collaborative arrangements with volunteers and

nonprofit organizations to provide services, such as fostering, adoption and transportation to parts of the country where there are fewer unwanted companion animals.

Given that research indicates that shelter leadership contributes to adoption of low-kill or no-kill policies, it is important to explore the connection between the influx of women into the field of public shelter leadership and lower euthanasia rates. Research on differences in leadership styles between men and women indicated support for the idea that gender does impact leadership style. Helgesen (1995) documented style differences and similarities between gender. Men more frequently cited identification with their jobs and position and described their daily routines by numbers of interruptions, difficulties or task fragmentation. They spent little time on tasks that were not associated with work and noted a reluctance to share information with others. Women, in contrast, reported positive associations with time spent with others not specifically associated with work and scheduled time for meetings to share organizational information. They reported that part of their jobs as leaders required them to maintain positive relationships with others. Eagly et al. (1992) found support for attitudinal differences in a meta-analysis of workers' reports on male and female leaders. The analysis suggested that men received more support for traditional, autocratic behavior while women leaders were supported for a more participative leadership style. Statham (1987) described the differences between 22 women and 15 men in a study of managerial styles. Women were more likely to be focused on a person-invested style, working closely with workers to ensure task completion while men were focused more on a need to back away from workers while still taking responsibility for task completion. Rosser (2010) documented that female

deans in an academic setting were rated as more effective leaders than their male counterparts and cited collaborative efforts and relational aspects.

The effectiveness of a more relational focused type of leadership is at the core of the model of an effective leader and a number of current leadership models claimed to meet this requirement including transformational, servant and ethical leadership (Bass and Riggio 2006; Mallén et al 2015; Escrig et al 2016,). A behavior associated with these leadership models is altruism and Simmons (1991) described the behavior as benefiting another's welfare over self without reward and on a voluntary basis. Research on altruistic leadership showed that an altruistic leader effected the organizational climate and performance and favored context that are participative, open and cooperative (Yen and Niehoff 2004). Other research identified altruistic leadership as best suited to address the new business environment that requires a focus on ethical behavior, teamwork, collaboration and transparent decision-making (Gardner et al. 2005). Furthermore, organizational citizenship behavior which includes altruism has been associated with a positive influence on organizational learning (Gardner et al. 2005). Finally, previous research has indicated that authoritarian leadership inhibits organizational learning while altruistic leadership encourages a safe and supportive environment where employees feel able to take risks and feel supported (Fry et al 2005)

In their study of altruism and organizational learning capacity, Mallén et al. (2015) developed a measure of altruistic leadership testing for altruistic behaviors and five scales of organizational learning - experimentation, risk acceptance, interaction with the environment, dialogue, and participation in decision making. Using their measure, they tested 253 individuals from 43 Spanish companies via a telephone survey. Their

findings from this study supported the original hypothesis – a moderate and significant relationship between altruistic leader behaviors and organizational learning capability, and the relationship between organizational learning capability and organizational performance is also positive.

Building on Mallén et al. (2015) study, Escrig et al (2016) examined the role that altruistic leadership and organizational learning capacity played in organizational radical innovation. Radical innovation focuses on a completely new way of completing a process and are revolutionary in design thus influencing other organizations in addition to their own (Verganti, 2008). As radical innovation required risk taking and collaborative environments, Escrig et al (2016) tested whether altruistic leadership may create an organizational context that fosters experimentation, risk taking, participative decision making, dialogue and interaction with the external environment which, in turn, facilitates radical innovation. Using the scale developed by Mallén et al (2015) and a five-item radical innovation scale, they tested 402 Spanish firms. Again, the study found positive support for altruistic leadership fostering the positive organizational learning capacity that fosters radical innovation. The leader provides “intellectual stimulation” to engender creative and out-of-the-box thinking in members of the team

Simola et al (2002) sampled 55 employees within the Canadian university system that held leadership positions, along with 391 of their followers. The leaders were assessed using the first component of the Measure of Moral Orientation which provides nine dilemmas that measure a preference for either ethic of care or ethic of justice. These dilemmas are followed by six to nine statements that suggest possible solutions or answers using a 4-point Likert scale to the extent with respondents agreeing or

disagreeing. Half of the answers aligned with ethic of care, the other half with ethic of justice. The followers were sampled using the 45-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire short form developed by Bass and Avolio (2000) to identify whether leaders showed transactional or transformational leadership traits and behaviors. The researchers hypothesized that transformational leaders would be associated with an ethic of care, while transactional leaders would align with the ethic of justice model of moral reasoning. Findings supported both of their hypotheses. Additionally, gender – after controlling for age and propensity for justice and care – was associated with transformational leadership. The followers perceived women to hold higher levels of transformational leadership. Simola et al (2010) claim that despite the fact that women more often display evidence of ethic of care, both their research and prior meta-analysis suggested that only women display use of ethic of care (196).

Gender Differences in Attitudes toward Companion Animals

Herzog (2007) provided a meta-analysis of gender differences in attitudes toward animals, noting that most studies identified that in response to questions regarding the use of animals, women are more sympathetic than men to animal welfare and less supportive of animal research. 84 percent of the studies examined found that men were more supportive of animal experimentation. In comparison, none of the studies found that women were more supportive of animal experimentation. Men and women reported equal support for companion animal attachment in the home in 18 telephone survey studies. Herzog (2007) also examined participation in animal welfare organizations and all studies examined found a 3-1 female to male ratio in grass roots animal activism, although he found more men than women in leadership positions in animal welfare or

animal sheltering. Finally, a very large male to female gender effect size was found regarding support for animal hunting and animal cruelty, with men more readily in support of animal hunting than females.

Research has also focused on the differences between men's and women's view of their roles in the natural world and how this view connects to attitudes toward animal welfare (Kruse 1999). Men more often hold the view that it is acceptable to control and use the natural world while women more often express concern for ethical relations with nature. Munro (2001) found significant gender differences in seven issues regarding the use of animals including hunting wild animals with guns, poisoning feral animals for population control and performing operations on animals without proper anesthesia or pain control. Martin and Glover (2008) found that female veterinary students were more likely to have nontraditional views on animals with more support for increased legal status of animals, a less utilitarian view of animals and conceived animals as purely property far less than males.

Emotion Work

Hochschild (1983) distinguished between emotion work and emotion labor where work is the internal management of self-emotion and labor is the outward display of emotion used to manage others' emotions. Research on animal shelter workers' emotion work and emotion labor has been done in recent years. Using participant observation, Taylor (2010) observed shelter workers at "The Shelter," a non-profit organization that shelters and rehomes companion animals. She recorded the use of emotion management both of self and other as occurring on a daily basis. The largest area of focus was managing the anger and frustration that staff felt toward members of the public who

abused animals, surrendered their animals, or stigmatized the workers for euthanizing their unwanted animals. She identified how female shelter workers used anger as part of their group labor. Workers were expected to show anger within the group when animals entered the shelter showing signs of abuse. Taylor also identified that the workers acted on their anger collectively as animals “appeared mysteriously in the shelter overnight” after cases of possible animal abuse were identified. Irvine (2002) describes the fine line workers must negotiate with managing their own emotions when working to educate members of the public regarding their faulty assumptions about animal behavior. She related the narrative of an employee who nodded and managed her anger while she tried to explain to a potential adopter that one didn’t “spank” a puppy over an accident while potty training.

Arnold Arluke described the “caring-killing paradox” (2006) where individuals identified themselves as being an “animal person” but then were faced with a sense of inauthenticity, as they euthanized healthy companion animals because of lack of space within the shelter. Shelter workers are attracted to the occupation because of their desire to be in the presence of and care for animals. Many have histories of owning several companion animals and cared greatly for them. They were drawn to the field to improve the welfare of the animals held in the shelter and instead had to euthanize animals as a regular part of their job duties. Arluke argued further that until recently shelter workers could maintain their humane image to the public because there was little or no organized criticism claiming that euthanasia was cruel. Therefore, strategies like those discussed earlier worked successfully. During the past decade, organized groups became concerned

over the high euthanasia rates at shelters and animal shelters began moving toward no-kill or low-kill policies, increasing the stress felt by shelter workers in traditional shelters.

Collaboration

Snavely and Tracy (2000) explored collaboration in rural, nonprofit organizations in the Mississippi Delta area of the United States. They explained that communities were changing attitudes about what services governments should offer, in conjunction with increased expectations for nonprofit responsibilities are creating practices of collaboration. Collaboration could be seen as an antidote to government bureaucracy or a creative solution to draw on multiple sectors that benefited communities. Organizational leaders often expressed difficulties communicating between members of the group because of differences in purpose, procedures, accountabilities and power (Huxham and Vangen, 2000). Much research has been done on the barriers to doing collaborative work and one area of focus has been on territorial behaviors (Axelsson and Axelsson, 2009). Many leaders within organizations viewed their work responsibility as their territory. When entering into collaborative associations with others, efforts to work together can be perceived as territorial aggression and leaders may respond by expending effort toward protecting their territory. This may interfere with the work of collaboration. In order to effectively operate collaborative efforts, members must see beyond their own interests and relinquish control of territories if necessary (Axelsson and Axelsson, 2009, p.324). Behavior that described sacrifice of self-interest for a common purpose is altruism. Here one places the needs of community and cohort above self. Axelsson and Axelsson (2009) explained that for social service organization collaborations the service provided by an agency is seen within a continuum of service provided by the group to the community.

Altruism is one aspect of transformational leadership and worked to maintain a healthy collaboration with other organizations.

In a case study of a Swedish collaboration for social services that existed for ten years, Axelsson and Axelsson studied the role of leadership, specifically the role of altruism in successful collaborations. One of the major themes found in qualitative interviews was trust. Initially all members reported levels of distrust and suspicion regarding various memberships in the collaboration, but when positive experiences occurred over time, trust was developed. Developing this trust required leadership with a holistic attitude toward the entire project. Previous research has identified these aspects in organizations that were dominated by women. Furthermore, research has identified that those followers rate women as having these types of traits in their leadership styles. As women move into leadership roles in public animal sheltering organizations, the masculine organizational culture of aggressive, territorial management may change toward collaborative enhancing features of management.

Trust was the focus of a study of a cross-sectoral interorganizational network (Lee et al. 2012). They found that trust building wasn't a simple process but involved attributes of trustors, trustees, and their relationships. One of their hypotheses in the research was that participants would have higher levels of trust for collaborative partners who shared a similar mission to their own organization. They found that it was easier to trust others who held similar goals, values and perspectives. This research confirmed that collaboration between organizations who viewed animal euthanasia as a viable option to address the problem of unwanted companion animals and those organizations who

opposed the use of euthanasia as a solution may be very difficult and speaks to the continued hostility between such organizations.

Animal Sheltering: Social Action and Framing

Given the emotional and relational nature of the issue of the paradigm shift in attitudes regarding companion animals, an understanding of collective action within this arena must incorporate emotions, personal values and an ethic of care. While resource mobilization theory focused on rational actors organizing through formal organizations to obtain resources and mobilize them (Zald 1966; Buechler 1995; Buechler 1997), new societal theorists have developed an alternative approach. This theoretical perspective identified activists that worked to change cultural beliefs and norms, modernizing organizational forms, creating new language and new goals (Melucci, 1994) but this doesn't have to be attained through membership in a formal organization. Rather, NSM theory ordained a "variety of submerged, latent and temporary networks that often undergird collective action, rather than assuming that centralized organizational forms are prerequisites for successful mobilization" (Buechler 1995:159). Networking rather than formal organizational membership is one option for sharing in a collective identity, and Melucci (1988) suggested that movements be seen as movement networks or movement areas. New Social Movement activists work to make change on a personal level by living one's life in a certain way (Cherry 2010) and these "changes" are part of a collective identity.

NSM activists work to share these changes with others and thereby make change externally. Previous researchers have identified animal welfare and animal protection organizations within the NSM framework (Jasper 1998; Cherry 2010). Through the work

of large, well-organized associations like the Humane Society of the United States and the ASPCA, the message to “adopt, don’t shop” and “save one at a time” has been widely internalized. Melucci (1988) identified the importance of a shared, collective action project to garner collective identity. Adopting shelter companion animals provides the opportunity to take part in such a project. Previous research suggests that the reason euthanasia is so widely accepted as a solution to pet overpopulation is because the problem appears to be so overwhelming (Frank 2007). In order to counter feelings of inadequacy in the face of such a large problem, claims makers have worked to frame one of the solutions as shelter adoption rather than purchasing from breeders or puppy mills, thus placing the answer into individual hands. Adopting a shelter companion animal thus becomes part of the solution, creating a collective identity of shelter adopters who frame their individual action as a moral requisite and then working to convince others to take part in the “solution” as well. Through the use of Facebook and other social media, a network of animal welfare activists is created, even though individually many of these people would not identify themselves as being an “activist” for a particular organization. Organizations working together have generated the message about “saving one at a time,” and this message has become the mission of many individuals adopting from animal shelters and rescues across the United States. Through the use of emotion generating messages, new “stranger” individuals are convinced to join the movement (Jasper 1995; Jasper 1998) and make ethical and moral decisions to “save one animal at a time.”

Identity construction is embedded in social movement framing activities arising from SMO actors’ claims about three relevant categories of actors described as identity fields: protagonists, antagonists and audience (Hunt, Bedford and Snow 1994). Frames,

often defined as interpretive schemata, are used to simplify one's view of the world by pulling from context both past and present (Snow and Bedford 1992). Social movement organizations provide frames for understanding and solving social problems, and these frames must resonate with an individual's understanding of the world and personal identity in order to recruit them.

Snow and Bedford (1992) coined the term "master frames" to refer to a foundational frame from which framing is built. Comparatively, master frames are more generic and overarching than movement-specific collective action frames as paradigms are to specific theories. Opposition to frames proposed by antagonists or opponents of the framework are referred to as counter-frames (Bedford and Snow 2000). Through counter-framing efforts, changes to the currently held interpretive schemata are proposed and the resulting rhetorical battle between movement organizations – a framing contest – erupts. Frame disputes take place within movements and are disagreements regarding the present or projected reality of the action or issue at hand.

While overall it appears that animal sheltering organizations exist to provide shelter for unwanted and homeless animals, lying beneath this apparent surface are two radically different frames. The "historic master frame" provides shelter for animals but places companion animals in the property arena. When turned in to sheltering organizations, some effort may be made to rehome animals. When this is not possible, they are (usually) humanely euthanized. Rather than viewing animals as property, counter master framing efforts focus on situating animals as kin. Within this framework the master frame's vision of reality is challenged. According to this counter master frame, if animals are truly kin then humane euthanasia is questioned. While the calls for action

may be coming from the organizational level, the changes are being made one household at a time.

Euthanasia and Sensemaking

Sensemaking is described as a process that is retrospective as actors “concerned with identity in the social context of other actors engage ongoing circumstances from which they extract cues and make plausible sense” (Weick, Sutcliff and Obstfeld 2005:409). Given that many animal shelters must kill the healthy, adoptable animals that their organizational mission requires them to protect and care for, sensemaking can be problematic. Furthermore, many members of sheltering organizations obtained positions within the organization to “make a difference” in the lives of the animals they care for. Many of these employees maintained that love and caring for animals was very much a part of their identity. Much of the time sensemaking occurs in a swift, subtle and ongoing way and is often simply taken for granted as happening behind the scenes. When sensemaking is made explicit, actors perceive something in the world as out of the ordinary, outside of the expected state of the world. In order to make sense, actors look to pull from the framework of the organization so that they may swiftly resume activity and continue action. The framework included organizational policies, plans, accepted justifications, expectations and previous leadership. Given that killing healthy companion animals is viewed by many as morally reprehensible and that many of the employees working in shelters hold caring for animals as a central tenet to their own identity, the framework used to justify the action becomes very important to the organization. As the organization is exposed to no-kill and low-kill policy used effectively in other organizations, it becomes much more difficult to “make sense” of

traditional euthanasia policy. The continued action without reflective interruption becomes necessary in order to “ignore” the conflicting data sources. The organizational narratives facilitate the ongoing action and are used to deflect outside data.

Animal shelters are an example of an organization where sensemaking plays an integral part in their continued operation. Research on ‘dirty work’ and ‘stigma’ provided the framework for employees to maintain their sense of an animal-centered identity despite the severely conflicting action with intention. As they are a public institution supported by tax dollars, citizens that are very concerned about high euthanasia rates at their local shelter system are exerting more pressure. One of the ways this pressure is exerted is through the use of language. As sensemaking is based on the communication between individuals using words and symbols, language becomes an important part in sensemaking. “The image of sensemaking as activity that talks events and organizations into existence suggests that patterns of organizing are located in the actions and conversations that occur on behalf of the presumed organization and in the texts of those activities that are served in social structures” (Weick, Sutcliff and Obstfeld, 2005:410). Euthanasia bears a much different connotation than the term killing, and within each term lies a different narrative. Public shelter systems have pushed back against using the term killing in reference to the process of euthanasia and without the comfort of narrative embedded in “euthanasia,” it is very difficult to again “make sense.” Communities are forcing shelter systems to account for their “kill rates” emphasizing a sea change in narratives.

So given these two narrative frames, legitimacy becomes imperative to understand. How does one narrative become legitimated and ultimately the reality over

another narrative? Weick's framework of sensemaking doesn't address the issue of context or of power and power relationships (Helms Mills, Thurlow and Mills 2010, Thurlow and Helms Mills 2015). In order to understand the process of change from the individual understandings to the organizational level, as well as the process of whose narrative becomes privileged in the process, the issues of power and knowledge and the structure of power relationships must be explored via Critical Sensemaking (CSM). CSM incorporates formative context, which refers to the institutional practices that shape society's actions. As these organizational rules and norms inform sensemaking they also serve to restrict choices for action (Thurlow and Helms Mills 2015). The context will make some narratives more plausible or legitimate in the eyes of the members. Given that most animal shelters operate on limited funds provided by either taxpayers or donated by citizens, members of the organization will take narratives that save funds or reduce expenditures as more legitimate or plausible. Organizational rules or routines are another example of a formative context that works to shape possible action by members (Helms Mills, Thurlow and Mills 2010). Public shelters that are required to accept all animals that enter the building often have rules that require a certain number of cages to stay open and available. In order to meet this rule, oftentimes healthy and adoptable companion animals are euthanized to maintain the appropriate ratio of empty to full cages. This rule shapes the possible organizational changes that may be implemented.

Sensemaking does not necessarily require accuracy; rather it involves a continued redrafting of a narrative to make it comprehensible by the actors involved. It is important for leaders, workers and volunteers to maintain their sense of identity and experience support from their community. If they cannot achieve support from their wider

community, the closer community of co-workers becomes even more important and influential. If the leadership within the shelter organization utilizes a traditional euthanasia policy, then in order to support and find support from coworkers, they will engage in methods of controlling the narrative. These methods are reviewed in the literature on stigma, identity and emotion work.

Stigma and Dirty Jobs

Much of the divisiveness both currently and historically within the animal sheltering industry has focused on the topic of euthanasia. Similarly, much of the research within the field of sociology of work and animal shelters focuses on the “dirty work” aspect of the work. Here research centered on either the stigmatizing effects of the “dirty work” on animal shelter workers and the resulting behaviors or strategies that workers implement to deal with the perceived threat to their own social identity. Another area of research within this vein is the psychological damage that the “dirty work” caused for shelter workers.

The term “dirty work” was coined by Hughes (1951) to refer to tasks and occupations that require workers to perform tasks considered by the public to be disgusting, degrading, or morally tainted. In turn, this perception directly impacts workers. Society considers the individuals or groups performing the dirty tasks to be personally tainted. Stigma refers to the personal taint – the calling into question of a group or individual’s identity. Society considers these workers to be “spoiled, devalued or flawed” (Goffman 1963). Goffman (1963) described this as the level of discrepancy between what is expected by society and what a person presents. While Goffman and Hughes focused on the individual level of stigma, other researchers applied the model to

whole occupations or groups of people and how these occupations must deal with the stigma brought on by the work they do (Kreiner 2006). Animal Shelter workers are one of these occupations that have been studied due to the task of euthanizing companion animal for reasons including time/space consideration (Baran 2012).

Occupations can be considered stigmatized in three ways: by being physically tainted, socially tainted or morally tainted (Hughes, 1951; Goffman, 1963). Later research by Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) developed criteria for each area of taint. Animal shelter directors' work is associated with all three. Physical taint is associated with occupations that must deal physically or tangibly with "dirty" or "offensive" items or may be performed under "noxious" or "dangerous" conditions (Ashfort and Kreiner 1999). Animal shelter directors must be trained and certified to perform euthanasia on companion animals held in the shelter. They must both administer the dose of medications (or in some cases the gas required in the chamber) to companion animals. Furthermore, they must cremate or store the dead bodies for delivery to the crematorium, requiring hands-on physical contact with the bodies. Many animal welfare organizations distribute the pathos-loaded images of beautiful canine and feline bodies in order to generate the stigma associated with the animal shelter directors.

The second area of taint associated with stigma is the social taint. This area focuses on occupations that have direct contact with stigmatized populations in society. Shelter dogs and cats are socially stigmatized simply by being nonhuman and second by being unwanted (DeMello 2012). Public animal shelters are often responsible for caring for animals that have been picked up after police arrest criminals or animals that have been become physically aggressive towards humans. Pit Bulls have become the poster

children for aggressive, unwanted urban animals and research indicates that in urban public shelters Pitts make up more than half the population (DeMello 2012).

The third and final area of stigma deals with moral taint. Clinton Sanders (1996) claims that more people than ever suffer from conflict regarding the use of animals in our society. Animal rights activists argue that the differences between human and nonhuman animals are far fewer than the commonalities and are working to blur the boundaries between the species (Cherry 2010). Changes in state law regarding shelter policies and the current public pressure on animal sheltering organizations to move toward a low-kill or no-kill policy reflect the moral taint that society associates with euthanizing healthy and adoptable companion animals (Veterinarians 2010). Despite the changing attitudes toward non-human animals, Kentucky public shelters continue to euthanize on an average of 58 percent of the companion animals in their facilities (Sinski 2012).

Given that the occupation of animal shelter director can be associated with all three levels of taint, society stigmatizes the group. Kreiner et al (2006) developed a typology of occupational dirty work. They classified dirty occupations with the depth of the dirty work and the breadth of the dirty work as either high and low, creating a four-panel model of dirty work. Depth refers to the intensity to which a worker is directly involved with the “dirt.” On the other hand, breadth refers to the centrality of the “dirt” to the occupation. Using the Kreiner et al (2006:622) model, animal shelter directors rank as dealing with “pervasive stigma.”

Baren et al (2012) noted that the procedure of euthanasia required at least two people, one to hold the animal in the prescribed manner and one to administer the injections. The holder is required to comfort the animal with gentle strokes while the

second employee injects the medication. Once injected, the animal's respiration stops after ten seconds and the employees must use several steps to assure the animal is dead. The process of euthanasia is very much a hands-on act, an emotional act and a technical act that requires direct contact with death, clearly within the "dirty work" zone.

Some research has explored the way that stigmatized groups respond to the threat to their social identity. Goffman (1963) suggested that the experience of stigma causes individuals to suffer from low self-esteem. More recent work focuses on the response of groups and group-level strategies within stigmatized occupations (Burke and Stets 2009). Kreiner, et al (2006) suggested that when faced with strong occupational stigma, employees will either exit the occupation or utilize active defense tactics to lessen cognitive, affective, and behavioral strain (624). Occupations that are classified as having "pervasive stigma" tend to experience strengthen entitativity – a perception among individuals that they are group like. This produces a boundary between "us" and "them" and in turn "us" begins to question the legitimacy of the stigma espoused by "them." In essence, the organization circles the wagons and responds to the threat as a collective. The group then uses three strategies to deal with the stress; ideologies, social weighting and behavioral and cognitive tactics (Kreiner et al. 2006).

Stigmatized occupations are often associated with ideologies or belief systems that are utilized to reframe, refocus and recalibrate the meaning of their work (Kreiner 2006). Qualitative studies of animal shelter workers have documented how workers reframe their work by explaining that euthanizing animals is actually saving animals from a "fate worse than death" (Arluke 1991, Irvine 2004).

While defensive ideologies work to restructure the meaning of the work, social weighting focuses on outsiders to the profession. Here the credibility of outsiders is questioned by the group of stigmatized workers. In other words, the group condemns the “uneducated” outsiders. In the case of shelter workers, the public is considered naive about the extent of the problem of pet overpopulation and doesn’t realize that there are no other options at some point except for euthanasia (Arluke 2006). Shelter workers also identify the general public as the source of the problem as they are the ones who feel animals are disposable and may be dropped off when they tire of their pet (Irvine 2004).

Finally, stigmatized workers use behavioral and cognitive tactics to either attack the source of the stigma or deal with the negative effects of the stigma (Kreiner 2006). Arluke (2006) finds that shelter workers use gallows type humor to deal with euthanasia. Irvine (2004) details that shelter workers will call in sick on days when euthanasia is to occur and also share emotional outbursts such as crying or talking about the euthanized animals.

Other research on euthanasia suggests that workers who euthanize animals in many different occupations are at risk for experiencing problems with traumatic stress and post-traumatic stress disorder. In a 2005 study of workers who euthanize animals in shelters, surgeries and laboratories, Rohlf and Bennett found that people who reported high levels of concern for the animals suffered from higher levels of euthanasia-related stress. Their study also found that occupational context was not associated with different levels of stress even though the occupations reasoned differently about administering euthanasia. Eleven percent of their sample reported intrusive traumatic symptoms associated with their work. They also identified a negative relationship between social

support satisfaction and levels of stress indicating that social support acts as a buffer against the stress. Another study of euthanasia rates, euthanasia practices and employee turnover in animal shelters indicated that when the rate of dog euthanasia increases at a shelter, employees are affected and job turnover increases. When euthanasia rates spiked, they find that so do employee turnover. Cat euthanasia did not provide the same impact. The study also indicated that when animals were euthanized for severe health problems or severe behavior problems did not increase turnover, while euthanasia for time and space did increase employee turnover. Lopina, Rogelberg and Howell (2012) found that in their research of animal shelter workers providing information about the job specifically focusing on euthanasia as a job component prior to beginning work reduced employee turnover at shelters. Additionally, utilizing maladaptive coping styles to deal with work-related stress increased employee turnover at animal shelters. They suggested that organizations should have emotional support services in place for workers that are responsible for euthanizing animals to help them learn appropriate coping styles.

Animal Sheltering

Today's animal sheltering organizations range from large, well-resourced facilities to small rescue groups operated by a single person from home. Rescue organizations differ in that they do not shelter animals, rather they place animals in foster homes while searching for an adopter to rehome. All publicly operated animal shelters must admit all animals dropped off to the shelter or picked up by animal control officers from the street. Privately operated shelter systems can restrict admissions, choosing only a certain type of companion animal or refusing animals due to illness or behavior problems. Furthermore, shelters may offer different programming to address the problem

of pet overpopulation including fostering, adoption, low-cost spay & neutering, transportation and behavioral counseling (Irvine 2003; Miller 2007). Many traditionally operated shelters continue to euthanize for time/space consideration while many shelters are acquiescing to public pressure to reduce animal euthanasia by moving to significantly reduce euthanasia rates and only euthanizing companion animals for illness or severe behavioral problems (Scarlett 2004; Arluke 2006). The fragmented and heterogeneous nature of the industry is further complicated by the lack of direct oversight of the industry. Currently 18 states require shelters to be licensed or registered but the regulations are either loosely monitored or not monitored at all (Veterinarians 2010). Kentucky legislated the creation of an advisory board, along with minimum requirements for facilities and animal care but provides no enforcement or ability to check up on the county facilities (Fund 2010).

Addressing the Problem of Pet Overpopulation

Over 250,000 companion dogs and cats are euthanized in Kentucky every year (ACAB). In the City of Louisville, Louisville Metro Animal Services euthanized 8,065 animals in 2010 (LMAS 2011). Despite an ongoing focus to reduce euthanasia rates for companion animals, thousands of animals continue to die simply to make room for facilities to house more animals (Marsh, 2007; Scarlett and Johnston, 2012). One of the most often discussed tools used to combat pet overpopulation is high volume, low-cost spay and neuter clinics (Marsh 2007). While the use of spay and neuter is advocated by veterinary medicine professionals, animal sheltering professionals, animal welfare organizations and academics in the field, research studies performed to date have provided mixed results when attempting to measure their impact on the problem of pet

overpopulation. Many of the researchers have identified inaccurate data or missing data as a barrier to measuring the impact of high volume, low-cost spay and neutering on euthanasia rates in community shelters (Humane Research Council, 2006; Marsh 2007; Association of Shelter Veterinarians, 2008; Scarlett and Johnston, 2012).

In addition to contributing to a reduction in shelter intake numbers, spaying or neutering a pet can reduce behavioral problems such as roaming, marking and aggression. Providing access to low-cost spay and neuter facilities, as well as requiring that adopted pets be spayed or neutered before they leave a facility will decrease the number of unwanted litters produced (Zanowski 2012). Prior research suggests that low-cost spay and neuter programs impact shelter euthanasia rates (Frank and Carlisle-Frank 2007, Zanowski 2012). In a series of studies done in the early 1990s, researchers found that providing low cost spay and neuter reduced shelter intake rates in communities by 22 percent, euthanasia rates by 30 percent and shelter costs by \$3.00 per every \$1.00 spent (Zanowski 2012). Using a theoretical formula, Frank (2004) found that unwanted litters of puppies and kittens increase numbers of adoptable animals in shelters causing competition for homes. Less competition for permanent homes creates more demand for adoptable pets, which decreases shelter euthanasia rates. Frank (2007) analyzed data collected by Maddie's Fund, an organization that provides grants to animal welfare groups who provide low-cost spay and neuter programs to determine whether private veterinarians experienced a decrease in service. Rather than a decrease, the research indicated that private veterinarians experienced an increase in spay and neuter volume. He suggests that the resulting media exposure from the low-cost spay and neuter

education programs resulted in higher overall rates of spay and neuter in the five communities studied.

Finding the evidence to support an inverse relationship between spay and neuter programs and shelter intakes rates is more difficult due to difficulty obtaining accurate data regarding shelter intake and euthanasia rates (HRC 2006). Controversy between animal welfare organizations and concerned individuals about shelter policies regarding animal euthanasia versus no-kill shelter policies has made obtaining data difficult (Marsh 2009). Louisville is no different as the policies of Louisville Metro Animal Services ranked highly in the recent mayoral election cycle. This lack of access to accurate data presents special problems for low-cost spay and neuter programs to assess their impact on the problem of pet overpopulation, but the Humane Research Council developed a set of best practices for data collection for animal welfare organizations to use in program evaluation. One of these best practices includes tracking the number of completed spay and neuter surgeries in the target population.

Adoption and fostering programs have also been associated with reductions in euthanasia rates for community shelters. The Humane Society of the United States estimates that between three and four million dogs and cats were adopted from shelters in 2012. Extensive advertising and media campaigns over the last decade have raised awareness about the “adoption option” (Frank 2007a). Over recent years, organizations have worked to increase adoption rates by partnering with other organizations to offer animals at several convenient locations and hours that meet adopters’ schedules. PetSmart partners with shelters throughout the United States to offer shelter animals for adoption. As cities and states pass ordinances against selling non-shelter pets through

traditional pet stores, adoption rates from local shelters have increased (Williams 2012). Transportation programs also work to increase adoptions. These programs work to move animals from high kill shelters to areas of the country that have lower volume shelters. The only problem with these types of programs is one of disease transmission, and many of the shelters who need to move animals the most have the least resources to address problems of disease transmission. Without meeting the levels of precaution necessary, these shelters cannot take part in or form partnerships with other shelters (Williams 2012). One of the problems associated with adoption programs involves the qualifying process. Animal welfare workers identify that finding the appropriate adopter for shelter pets was one of the most important jobs at the shelter (Irvine 2002; Taylor 2004). Owners must fill out an application and meet a series of requirements in order to qualify with the adopting organization. Taylor (2004) found that over 50 percent of adopters applying to adopt animals in a shelter in the United Kingdom were turned down during the initial interview process, many times for low incomes. Research on the impact of socio-economic status on pet attachment found either there was no statistical difference or that lower income was associated with stronger pet attachment (Weiss and Gramann 2009). Finally, shelters have to work to overcome the stigma associated with homeless animals. Many people think that shelter animals have been turned in because of behavior problems that cannot be addressed or that only large breed aggressive dogs are available within the shelter system (Mornement et al. 2010).

Behavior assessment and behavior training programs are another effective tool in reducing euthanasia rates and shelter intake rates. Domesticated animals are kept as pets because the behaviors of the animals fit well with humans living conditions. Both dogs

and cats also express behaviors that encourage emotional and social attachment with humans. Companion animals have facial expressions and facial composition that encourage human anthropomorphizing (Hecht, Miklosi and Gacsi 2012). Unfortunately, many companion animals that exhibit behaviors that humans find problematic end up in the shelter system and often euthanized (Mornement et al. 2010). Aggression, improper elimination, hyperactivity, and destructiveness are cited by owners turning in the animal to shelters (Salman et al. 1998; New 2000; Salman et al. 2000). Upon entering the shelter system, dogs are given behavior assessments to determine whether they will make likely adoption candidates. If the companion animal fails the assessment, they are often euthanized (Kass et al. 2001, Mornement et al. 2010). A recent study of behavioral assessment protocols used in shelters found that most protocols were not based on scientific evidence proving reliability and validity but were created by in-house employees (Scarlett et al. 2002). Furthermore, many of the assessments were given within the first few minutes or hours of entering the shelter system, a very stressful period for any animal. Given that the results literally determine life or death of any companion animal, behavior assessment protocols developed and given appropriately can greatly reduce euthanasia rates based on behavior problems (Salman et al. 2000). Given the shortage of employees, time and financial resources in many shelter environments, behavior assessment protocols are often overlooked. Providing behavior training to correct problematic behaviors for companion animals also requires the same resources.

Many of the programs that have been identified as effective in reducing shelter euthanasia rates require extensive resources that are often difficult for animal shelters to commit. Community partnering is one way that such problems can be overcome. One of

the first successful community partnering efforts started in 1994 in San Francisco between the SPCA and the Animal Control (Weiss et al. 2013). Many programs have since been modeled on their effective partnering program to increase live release rates of shelter animals. In Louisville, Kentucky, the Kentucky Humane Society, Alley Cat Advocates and Metro United Way recently obtained a community-partnering grant from the ASPCA to fund a program geared to reduce the euthanasia rates of feral cats. This program has successfully lobbied Metro Government to change restrictions on trap, neuter and release of feral cats and have successfully removed them from the shelter system (2011). In a study that examined all community partnering programs from 2007 to 2011 monitored through Maddie's Fund Granting Agency, all communities experienced a significant increase in their live release rates (Weiss et al. 2013).

Many programs like community partnering require organizations to assemble complete and accurate data (Zawistowski et al. 1998; Rowan 2006; Marsh 2009). Partially, in response to the problems often cited with data, many granting agencies are requesting that animal welfare organizations provide data that accurately assess the performance of their programs and measures the impact of the projects that grantors are funding (HRC 2006). These requirements present animal welfare organizations with many challenges regarding the collection of reliable and accurate data from their community. Many organizations do not have computers and therefore track data using paper and pencil. If organizations do have computers, they may use different software making comparisons difficult (Weiss et al. 2013). Irvine (2012) discusses the tyranny of forms. Forms are developed by claims makers within the organization and may not fully collect the data needed. Additionally, many animal welfare workers and volunteers do

not have experience or training in the practice of program evaluation and data collection (Sandra Newbury et al. 2010). Furthermore, time and funds are always in short supply. Peter Marsh, the author of *Replacing Myth with Math: Using Evidence-based Programs to Eradicate Shelter Overpopulation*, calls for animal welfare organizations to work smart in the battle to reduce euthanasia in companion animals. Marsh calls for “data-driven programs” and “implementation of current researched methods” to play a significant part in reducing shelter euthanasia.

The structure of sheltering organizations also plays a significant role in making data collection difficult. There are no overarching organizations that require such data to be collected and submitted in a timely and organized fashion (Zawistowski et al. 1998). Policies within shelters also impact how and what data are collected (Arluke 2006). In 2004, a conference titled the Asilomar Accords was organized and 64 coalitions were developed to aid in data collection. Part of the conference focused on developing shared language and definitions surrounding adoption and euthanasia – much of the conflict between “no kill” and “traditional” sheltering organizations centers on the language of euthanasia and how to define a healthy and adoptable dog versus a sick or behaviorally challenged dog (Weiss et al. 2013).

Sociology and Companion Animals – Animal Sheltering

Animals and society and the human-nonhuman animal bond are growing areas of research in sociology. In fact, early on Max Weber encouraged research on the relationship between humans and other animals. But despite a history of relationships over 14,000 years and the importance that people in current society place on the companion animals in their homes, often referring to them as family members, many

sociologists remain uninterested and ambivalent about this field of study. In a study of *Introduction to Sociology* textbooks performed by Steven and Janet Alger (2003), the researchers found that animals were mentioned in textbooks in a way that reinforced Mead's perspective that animals cannot communicate using language. Despite recent advances in the scientific study of animals, very few mentions of sign language used by primates or discussion of the human-companion animal bond were made. If the subject was broached, there were no citations for any recent research done on the subject. Alger and Alger (2003) point out that no mention was made of early primitive humans' ability to create material structures (tools, houses) and social structures (family, kinship) despite not having vocal chords which are the apparatus necessary for spoken language. Their content analysis also indicated that animals were most often mentioned in the socialization chapters when discussion of the "Harlow" experiments occurred. While the various textbook authors noted in their "Harlow" coverage that primates needed socialization by other primates in order to develop in a proper primate fashion, they indicated in their chapters on Culture that animals did not have culture (Alger and Alger 2003:77).

Clifton Bryant, one of the first sociologists to explore this area of research, declared that sociologists were "derelict" in their attention to the "zoological component in human interaction and attendant social systems" (Bryant 1979). Many researchers in the field attribute this generally to symbolic interactionism and specifically to G.H. Mead. While Mead acknowledged humans' direct connection to the animal world, he utilized language to create the barrier between us and them. R. W. Connell (1997:1520) argues that during the time Mead spent in Germany, much of the work being done in

sociology focused on determining “the central proof of progress” and determining whether this occurred through “physical evolution from lower to higher human types or through an evolution of mind and social forms and whether competition or cooperation was the motor of progress.” Furthermore, Connell (1997:1545) argues that a hierarchy was built into the idea of progress. The sociological “canon” includes classics that have “patterns of hegemony inscribed.” In this canon, certain writers and problems were excluded from the classics. Connell (1997:1546) ascribes this canon-making process with the reasons why issues surrounding gender and race have not been reestablished as “central concerns of sociological theory.” Myers (2003) argued that this omission caused “blind spots in sociological theory” regarding animals and society.

Beginning in 2001, the Animals and Society section of the American Sociological Association focused on encouraging sociologists to explore the nature of human/non-human animal relationships (Kruse 2002). Myers (2003:47) describes the intersection of animals and sociology as occurring in two ways. Relationships between society and animals can be studied empirically by describing both the enduring and changing patterns. For example, using sociological constructs and methods to study the animal rights movement or animals as social facilitators would be an application of such research. The second area of intersection between animals and sociology should be in addressing “blind spots in sociological theory,” thereby addressing the scientific advancement in the area of animal behavioral studies not currently included in the field. Given the Meadian view of animals, it is no wonder that many sociologists look first to symbolic interactionism. Arluke and Sanders (1996) suggest that although sociologists have primarily seen animals in the Meadian vein – that animals can only exist in the here

and now, without possessing a self-concept or self-reflection. They argue this vision is garnered from an anthropocentric ideology rather than a systematic study of data or thoughtful examination on the part of the scientist. They claim this anthropocentric ideology is as damaging as the male-centered (androcentric) ideology used to create a vision of women's experience. Only through research that acquires an empathetic understanding of the study of "alien" behavior can we come to an understanding of that behavior as reasonable.

Sociologists have focused on the job of working with animals in both public and non-profit animal sheltering organizations, in veterinarian practices and in scientific laboratories (Arluke 1991; Sanders 1995; Sanders 1996; Irvine 2002; Arluke 2006; Sanders 2010). Much of this work examines aspects of euthanizing healthy, adoptable animals. Research done on jobs that contain aspects of "dirty work" are often stigmatized due to the public's view that these jobs are "disgusting, degrading or objectionable" (Baran et al. 2012) Furthermore, the people that perform these jobs are impacted personally by the stigma placed on them by society (Baran 2012). Some research has been done on the implications of animal euthanasia on human emotions and the propensity of animal shelter workers to develop PTSD (Arluke 2004). The "caring-killing paradox" refers to people who express a deep caring and connection to animals and identify this as the reason they entered the field of caring for animals. Once into the field, they are faced with killing those animals they wished to help (Arluke 2006). Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) identified that people doing "dirty work" overcame threats to their social identities by utilizing the cognitive tactics "ideology manipulation" and "social weighting." Building on this research, Kreiner, Ashfort and Sluss (2006)

combined the theories of system justification and social identity to explain how people within groups, as well as individually, perceives their places in the social world. While the area of research focusing on animals and society shows continued growth, very little applied research has been done (Arluke 2002).

Animals as Agents

The notation of agency involves two aspects of associated with human behavior. At the center of the notion is the idea of a self, which can make choices, pursue intentionality and be motivated. The second aspect is the concept of social through which the self emerges from or through interactions with differing selves (Carter and Charles 2013). Research in the field of animal studies and sociology have offered examples of animal agency (Sanders 1990; Bekoff 2001, Irvine 2004a ; Bekoff 2006) and research is beginning to focus on the macro-societal changes that are being formed as relationships shift between animals and humans (Carter and Charles 2013). Researchers in the field of animal studies address the notion of animal agency by claiming that many animals have developed sophisticated social societies and forms and through these interactions indicate a sense of self (Sanders 1990; Bekoff 2001; Haraway 2003; Irvine 2004). As Irvine (2004:176) states “human self-hood is different in degree rather than kind from that of animals.” Scientific research is amassing evidence of various types of symbolic language used by animals to communicate strategic intention (Bekoff 2006, Carter and Charles 2013). Even issues surrounding whether animals suffer, feel pain, have emotions and feelings are currently being addressed in scientific research and mounting evidence suggests that in varying degrees they do. As the evidence mounts,

public attitudes have also begun to change and a paradigm shift in how we treat animals both companion and otherwise is rising.

Furthermore, as animal studies research in the field of social sciences moved from studying how animals might benefit humans into a second wave of social science research in the area of animals and society, loosely referred to as post humanist research. Here the categories of human and animal are brought into question, and boundaries – if any – are identified as messy and used to identify another as an “Other” (Taylor 2012). The boundaries between human and animal are created to further political ideology. Post humanists point out that animals are embodied beings that live their lives entangled with humans rather than abstract categories that serve to provide a ruler for the measurement of humanity (Cherry 2010; Taylor 2012; Carter and Charles 2013). By ridding the framework of these socially constructed categories, it becomes easier to study human and animal “relatings” (Haraway 2008) and allow ourselves to look at the “knottings” that the human animal relationship creates. As Taylor (2012) explains, traditional sociology only allows us to study the human/companion animal relationship from the human point of view, but by utilizing the post humanist framework one can now study the knot – the performative relationship – created by the two. This methodological restriction connects to the argument faced by second wave feminists who faced sociological methodology that wouldn’t incorporate methods that included “writing out a women’s point of view.” In order to explore this shift in paradigm – these knottings of humans and companion animals as kin, partners, work teams or family – new methodologies that break through the anthropological framework are being developed.

Institutional Theory

In conjunction with increasing numbers of women leaders in the field of animal sheltering and partnerships between public and private organizations, the practice of low-kill or no-kill sheltering practices expands into the public shelter system despite strong rhetoric by public shelters against the practice. What motivates the drastic change in policy and practices by traditional animal shelters? Does the expansion of women into the field diffuse ethic of care to inform shelter policy? Or is this the mimetic isomorphism of institutions? For those institutions that have not changed practices or policies, what makes them isolated from the pressure to conform?

DiMaggio and Powell (2007:359) examined the *Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields* explaining that organizational changes occur making them more similar but not necessarily more effective. An organizational field is one where groups that are connected and have structural equivalence identify organizations. They identify four parts whereby institutions are defined as fields. First an increase within the interaction among the organizations within the field, followed by patterns of coalition and domination by certain organizations. Next there is an increase in the information presented to the organization, and finally recognition among participants within a set of organizations that they are involved together. Once a certain level of adoption of a specific practice has been adopted, it appears as the legitimate practice the “master frame” and all organizations must adopt it to be considered legitimate themselves.

Although animal sheltering organizations have been described as heterogenic (The Association of American Veterinarians 2010), many coalitions are developing between public shelter system and private, non-profit organizations. While there is no

one professional organization that is responsible for licensing or oversight of animal sheltering organizations, granting agencies like the ASPCA and Maddie's Friends are encouraging communities to form these types of coalitions to reduce euthanasia rates of companion animals by increasing fostering, adoption and spay/neuter programs. States such as Kentucky are encouraging collaborations for counties that can't afford to house and care for companion animals in a humane manner by writing policy. The Kentucky Humane Shelter Law requires every county to provide such services or enter into an agreement with other counties or non-profit organizations to provide care for their population of companion animals (Sinski 2012). Among animal sheltering organizations, collaborations and coalitions have become quite common. Furthermore, communities that have entered into such agreements have achieved a reduction of euthanasia rates, sometimes quite significantly (Association of Shelter Veterinarians 2010). These types of efforts are beginning to achieve legitimacy and large non-profit animal welfare groups are incorporating these behaviors.

Three mechanisms of isomorphic change include coercive, mimetic and normative (DiMaggio and Powell 2007). Coercive isomorphism arises from political influence, while normative is associated with professionalization. As community members involved in organizations that work to reduce or remove euthanasia rates organize and lobby for state and local governments to make changes to euthanasia policy, this pressures animal sheltering organizations to adopt the practices. Furthermore, many animal shelters rely on private funds and volunteers to provide the services they currently offer. These efforts encourage shelters to adopt practices to reduce euthanasia if they are losing donations and volunteer staff. Normative isomorphism could be associated with

the increase of women into leadership positions with animal sheltering organizations. As women move into these positions, they may be more likely to adopt practices that are in-line with the ethic of care and transformational leadership as argued above.

But as research from Kentucky's public shelter system highlighted, many organizations remain strongly opposed to considering methods that work to reduce euthanasia rates. Powell (2007) argued that interest in why organizations conform doesn't explain why they resist conforming. Goodstein (2007) identified conditions under which organizations respond to change by adding new programs and others that might make an organization react differently. His model rests on the argument that organizations balance compliance with competing costs and benefits of compliance or resistance. While he applied his model to analyze why some organizations chose to adopt work/family conflict reduction strategies and others resisted these policies, it can also be used to analyze the paradigm shift in animal sheltering. He identified five factors: cause, constituents, content, control and context.

Cause (Goodstein 2007) refers to the expectations or underlying rationale associated with the pressure. In the case of reducing or removing euthanasia policies in animal sheltering, advocates argue that utilizing other methods (the no-kill solution) addresses a critical societal concern about killing companion animals. Many people identify their companion animals as "members of the family" (DeMello 2012). Goodstein argues that the claims of societal concern and social fitness are especially salient for large organizations that experience pressure from their many constituents to observe said pressure. Therefore, the greater the organizational size the more responsive the animal sheltering organization will be to pressure for social change.

The second area, constituents (Goodstein 2007), refers to the critical constituents who play a role in no-kill or low-kill advocacy. Volunteers are an important constituent within the animal sheltering community. Many shelters rely on volunteers for a large percentage of their labor force. Again, larger organizations require more volunteers while smaller, rural shelters may operate with little or no volunteer support. Here the greater the need for volunteer help plays a role in how responsive the animal sheltering organization will be in responding to calls for social change. Another force within the area of constituents would be organizational donors. Donors may withhold dollars from organizations that continue to routinely euthanize companion animals for time/space. Again, shelters that rely on donations for a large part of their budget will feel more pressure to make social change.

Content (Goodstein 2007) refers to the institution that is pressuring for social change. If the State is legislating policy change for shelters then policy will be widely accepted. If the pressure is originating from communication action organizations like No-Kill Louisville then the policy change will be less widely accepted. In the case of Kentucky, the legislature enacted minimum care requirements that did not expressly require specific reasoning for using euthanasia. In other words, they did not require shelters to cease and desist euthanizing animals for time/space reasoning. The legislation did address methods of euthanasia, and requirements for enacting adoption policies directed at increasing likelihood of adoptions (increasing hours open to public, facility standards, five day holds). This greatly reduces the likelihood that small organizations would adopt social change. Recently, the Kentucky Humane Society obtained a large community grant from the ASPCA that requires them to partner with Louisville Metro

Animal Services to incorporate strategies to reduce euthanasia. Grants and partnerships on the scale received by KHS increase the likelihood of adopting social change.

The fourth area is control (Goodstein 2007) which describes the ways that institutional pressures are enforced. If no legal pressure exists then the primary mechanism is voluntary diffusion. As more and more animal shelters adopt no-kill or low-kill policies, the policy becomes legitimated. Organizations such as Shelby County Animal Services, who were early adopters of the policy change, become models for other county shelters. As the policy diffuses throughout the state, shelters must compete for resources and in order to remain competitive will feel more pressure to adopt the policy change. Recently, J.B. Ogle Animal Services, operated by the city of Jeffersonville, adopted the policy change. Louisville Metro Animal Services is working toward the policy change. This diffusion pressure to change is related to the fifth area, context, which describes the pervasiveness of the organization that has instituted the policy change.

Context (Goodstein 2007) can also refer to the costs of instituting the policy change. Advocates for no-kill policy argue that instituting adoption, fostering and rescue pulls are less expensive than euthanizing and cremating the animals (Morris and Zawistowski 2004). Arluke (2002) specifically calls for more applied research to be done by sociologists to determine the efficacy of programs like adoption, fostering and low-cost spay and neutering on the problem of pet overpopulation. Without reliable research to guide policy, it is very difficult to legitimate alternative policy change.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Problem Statement

Does gendered leadership situated in an ethic of care versus an ethic of justice impact adoption of organizational strategies that reduce or remove euthanasia of healthy and adoptable companion animals? Does gendered leadership and ethic of care/ethic of justice impact employees' and volunteers' attitudes toward companion animals? Does organizational policy impact leader, worker, volunteer or adoptor relationships with companion animals.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this mixed methods research utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews is to explore the impact of animal sheltering leadership on organization policies and workers', and volunteers' attitudes towards reducing companion animal euthanasia in the sheltering organization. To illuminate the problem, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. How does ethical decision making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?
2. How does gendered leadership impact adoption of evidence-based best practice strategies to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia in animal sheltering organization

3. How does gendered leadership impact sensemaking surrounding issues of companion animal care in the shelter organization.
4. How has the increasing need of collaborative efforts within and between organizations changed leadership?
5. How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?
6. How do the narratives created by organizational leaders impact workers and volunteers?

Rationale for Mixed Methods Research Approach

With the approval of the University of Louisville's Internal Review Board, the researcher used an online survey to capture over 353 responses and conducted over 48 in-depth interviews from leaders, workers, and volunteers. This research used both quantitative and qualitative field research to determine whether the ethic of care or ethic of justice impacted the implementation of animal sheltering policy and how gender differences in leadership impacted the organization and its employees, and volunteers. Given that policy changes are situated around the euthanasia of companion animals and the leadership directed to achieve those strategies, how the members of the organization reacted to potential social change. Researchers, including social scientists claim that using mixed methods – both quantitative methods and qualitative methods – is both a compatible and effective method of conducting research (Brewer & Hunter, 1989; Reichardt & Rallis, 1994).

Research Sample

This research utilized both an online survey and personal in-depth, semi-structured interviews done via telephone and recorded digitally. Consent for the online survey was given verbally and individuals were given the choice to either consent and continue with the survey or if no consent was provided, the browser was forwarded to an article written by the researcher and published on the Bark website. Both the survey questions and the in-depth, semi-structured interview questions were approved by the University of Louisville's Internal Review Board. Using opportunity sampling (Jorgensen 1989) and snowball sampling methods (Charmaz 2006), advertisements for the survey were placed on Bark's social networking sites and website. An advertisement was also featured in the editorial section of Bark Magazine. Advertisements were distributed at the "No More Homeless Pets" Conference held in October where hundreds of shelter personnel and animal advocates attended. Respondents often shared the survey link with other members of their organization. In order for respondents to be included they were asked whether they were 18 years old or older and whether they were either employed currently as a leader, worker or volunteer with a sheltering or rescue organization or whether they were formerly employed within any of those categories. Also, respondents were asked if they had adopted from an animal sheltering or rescue organization.

Theoretical sampling (Jorgensen 1989) from the group of respondents who had volunteered to take part in an in-depth, semi-structured interview allowed the researcher to obtain interviews from all categories of respondents, and also allowed for the researcher to obtain interviews from a variety of types of organizational leaders, workers, and volunteers. Although both survey respondents and interview subjects were all linked

to animal sheltering or rescue organizations in some form, there were differences among them in other areas including age, gender, income, and education. Approximately 353 respondents completed the online survey and 49 interviews were completed with subjects identifying as shelter/rescue leaders, workers, and volunteers, all from the United States.

Overview of Research Design

Shelter leadership (current and former), employees (current and former), and volunteers (current and former) were administered a survey that incorporated the Measurement of Moral Orientation (MMO-2) (Liddell 1990) to determine the use of either ethic of care or ethic of justice. This measurement tool is the only paper instrument designed to measure a tendency toward ethics of care and justice. Revised in 2006, the MMO-2 now consists of seven first-person stories followed by a series of reaction statements whereby the respondent reports using a Likert-type scale. While initially utilized to measure college students' responses, researchers have utilized the tool to measure adults' ethical orientation as well (Liddell 2006). The MMO-2 describes moral dilemmas common to traditional-aged college students and requires them to rate whether they strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the listed responses. In three of the dilemmas, the reference to college was removed and instead of college newspaper or college organization, the dilemma reflects simply newspaper or organization. Test and retest reliability studies by Liddell and Davis (1996) found correlation coefficients between two testings with care scale (.85) and justice scale (.79). Liddell (1998) found the construct validity of the MMO by comparing the paper and pencil instrument with semi-structured interviews indicating that the scores correlated significantly. Permission was granted via email from Dr. Liddell to utilize this

instrument for this purpose. Demographic information was collected on the organization and individual, as well as two questions written to gather information regarding sensemaking by respondents. All respondents were asked four attitudinal questions about companion animals and animal welfare that were taken with permission from the Humane Resource Council's "Humane Trends Study." This survey has been given each of the past six years, and data are available for comparison. Finally, the shelter leaders, employees and volunteers were asked to respond to a measure of altruistic leadership developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) and utilized by Malico, Chiva, Alegre and Guinot (2008). These four variables are measured on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 equals strong disagreement and 5 equals strong agreement. The variables are worded slightly differently for leaders to self-assess and for employees and volunteers to assess the leadership within the organization. These four items originally proposed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) are: (1) The leaders of this organization put the interests of the people above their own, (2) The leaders of this organization do all they can to help people, (3) The leaders of this organization sacrifice their own interests to meet the needs of others and (4) The leaders of this organization go beyond the call of duty to help others. For these surveys, the word "people" was changed to animals. The final questions for the shelter director, employee and volunteer surveys measured organization-learning capability, which helps to determine how quickly an organization can sense, act and adapt to change. This scale developed by Chiva et al (2007) consists of five dimensions and a total of 14 items. These five dimensions are experimentation, risk acceptance, interaction with the environment, dialogue, and participation in decision making. This scale was also utilized in research on altruistic leadership and performance by Mallén,

Chiva, Alegre and Guinot (2008). The survey was housed on the internet and the URL was provided to possible subjects. The consent form was completed electronically. Previous research indicates that dynamic web-based survey instruments increase response rate (Baruch and Holtom 2008). Web surveys also have the ability to better engage the respondent (Christian, Parsons and Dillman 2009). Layout of the survey on the webpage is an important consideration, and suggestions for scalar responses provided by Christian, Parsons & Dillman (2009) were followed in the development of the survey instrument.

In-depth interviews were conducted with members of each of the three categories of individuals who identified as being willing to be interviewed. While survey participation allows for a broad overview, in-depth interviews allow for depth and scope. Theoretical sampling (Jorgensen 1989) was used to identify in-depth interview subjects based on the four categories and on the specific attributes of shelter administration whether by public shelter, private nonprofit shelter or collaboration of both. Throughout the interview process, several questions were changed, modified or added to the interview based on comparative analysis and in the moment conversation. Carol Gilligan emphasized the importance of asking subjects real questions – ones that come from interest in the conversation, and some additional questions stemmed from this type of interaction and interest within the conversation (Gilligan 1993). I entered the social world of animal shelter directors in the role of an outside-observer researcher (Adler and Adler 1987). To enhance the validity of the data, I digitally recorded and transcribed all interviews (Arksey and Knight 1999), omitting any names mentioned by respondents. At certain points throughout the interview process, it became necessary to recontact interview subjects to clarify or ask an additional question after a new category appeared.

This was only done when subjects had given permission to contact them again if needed. Surveys and interviews have corresponding numbers for identification. The list of names/numbers, surveys, recordings and transcriptions were stored in a locked office in Lutz Hall on Belknap Campus. I used established methods of analytic induction in analyzing open response survey data and interview transcripts (Charmaz 1983; Strauss and Corbin 1994; Huberman and Miles, 1994). Finally, all notes from interviews were analyzed and conceptual memos (Charmaz 1983) were written to further analyze themes and concepts identified from the notes.

Ethical Considerations

The University of Louisville Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this research proposal. The researcher took seriously her responsibility to protect human subjects and consent was obtained prior to survey completion, as well as prior to the interview process. The University of Louisville IRB approved consent form was used to obtain consent for the interview and both the researcher and subject signed each form. As the survey was given via an online platform, an online consent form was used. Both forms were approved by the IRB. Additionally, it was determined that this research posed little or no risk to human subjects; yet, all efforts were made to ensure the rights and protection of all subjects involved. Furthermore, as confidentiality is of primary concern to protect human subjects during research, the researcher remained committed to protecting and securing the names and identities of any participants. All materials were kept in a locked drawer and in locked and password protected folders.

CHAPTER FOUR

ISSUES OF IDENTITY

The purpose of this mixed methods research is to explore the impact of gender and animal sheltering leadership on organizational policies and workers' and volunteers' attitudes towards reducing companion animal euthanasia in the sheltering organization. The findings chapters are separated into three categories beginning with identity issues, followed by leadership issues and ending with organizational issues. The research questions addressed in this study cross the three chapters and are partially answered in each chapter. This chapter contains the key findings from the 343 survey respondents and 49 in-depth interviews of current and former shelter leaders, workers and volunteers and is focused on identity issues. The final summary and conclusion chapter will bring the three areas together to address research questions in full.

Chapter four quantitative findings focused on gender differences in leaders', workers', and volunteers' ethic of care score, as well as differences between former and current leaders', workers', and volunteers' ethic of care score. The quantitative analysis also included gender differences in ranking animals as important to identity, as well as issues and social action in animal welfare. The qualitative findings explored gender differences in leaders, workers', and volunteers' description of self, philosophy of animal care, philosophy of euthanasia, the importance of animals to respondents and descriptions of work-life balance in sheltering. The chapter ends with a qualitative analysis of gender

differences in the ways participants saw changes in animals sheltering and attitude towards animals in society.

Although a significant non-gendered difference was found between current and former leaders, workers, and volunteers on the ethic of care score, no significant gender differences occurred overall. Differences between gender were identified in leaders', workers', and volunteers' qualitative description of self, philosophy of euthanasia and animal care, and reports of animals as central to identity. Work-life balance was described differently by gender, although overwhelmingly participants described sheltering as requiring more than 40 hours a week. Even though the ethic of care score and ethic of justice score was not significantly different between females and males, a common theme across the qualitative findings is that women framed answers in an ethic of care while men framed answers in an ethic of justice.

GENDER AND ETHIC OF CARE

The first research question addressed in this chapter is "How does ethical decision-making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?" Finding one combined both quantitative and qualitative data from the Ethic of Care and Ethic of Justice scores and the interview question based on the Ethic of Care Interview. While there is no statistical significance between women and men on the score of ethic of care or ethic of justice, qualitative evidence from in-depth interviews suggested women identified caring and relational issues in their description of self more often than men, women identified animals as central to self more often than men, and women described care for self as important while no men mentioned care for self.

Shelter leadership (current and former), employees (current and former), volunteers (current and former) were administered a survey which incorporated the Measurement of Moral Orientation (MMO-2) (Liddell, 1990) to determine the use of either ethic of care or ethic of justice. This measurement tool is the only paper instrument designed to measure a tendency toward ethics of care and justice. Revised in 2006, the MMO-2 now consists of seven first-person stories that are followed by a series of reaction statements whereby the respondent reports using a likert-type scale. While initially utilized to measure college students' responses, researchers have utilized the tool to measure adults' ethical orientation as well (Liddell 2006). The final MMO-2 score provided a Justice score and a Care score. Chronbach's alphas for the 22 item care score and 22 item justice score was .77 and .70 respectively. The results of the t-tests are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Care and Justice Score by MyGender

	MyGender						95% CI for Mean Difference	t	df
	Male			Female					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
Care Score	59.23	8.45	26	61.38	7.26	267	-1.37, 5.65	1.25	28.71
Justice Score	71.09	5.56	26	70.50	7.06	267	-2.37, 3.47	.38	28.11

* p < .05.

While the mean score is lower for men than women, there are no significant difference (p < .05) between male and female workers, volunteers and leaders on both the Care and Justice score of the Measure of Moral Orientation.

Describe Yourself to Yourself

During the in-depth interviews, all participants were asked “to describe yourself to yourself.” This question was used by Gilligan (1993) in her exploration of ethic of care in interviews. In my study, leaders, workers, and volunteers highlighted care and justice ethic differences. Males’ responses focused on self (6), while females’ responses centered on relational aspects (17).

All but three of the women described themselves in terms of how they related to other people and/or animals; the word most often used was compassionate. A female director of a non-profit shelter described herself as “passionate, dedicated, exhausted, driven, kind, compassionate, and I’d like to think educated.” Another female director stated that she “would describe myself as pretty well educated, responsible, reliable, a hard worker. I think I’m a good communicator and a good listener. Pretty creative, I guess that’s about it. Stubborn.” A final excerpt from a female volunteer highlights the relational aspect of the self-description as she balanced others’ needs with her own: “I am compassionate and smart and intuitive. I try very hard to be balanced and open and to advocate my value system not overtly but in practice.”

While women focused on the relational in their self-descriptions, men focused first on descriptions of themselves in more detail than women. A male former director of a public shelter stated “I do care about trying to live an ethical life and this is part of it. So, from a Myer-Briggs standpoint I’m feeling perceiving, introverted, whatever the fourth one is. Judging, perceiving, I’m about equal between sensing and intuiting. I’m not as strategic as some, but I don’t care to take things apart and put them back together.” A male director of a non-profit shelter said “I like to think of myself as objective. Objectivity comes before everything else. Get all the information in and then make a

decision based on that information afterwards and that I think is my biggest piece and that is how I take my role here. I think that that is how I would describe me. If someone was to describe me back, I think that's how they would describe me as fair and objective.” Finally, a male shelter worker reflected on his work ethic in his self-description: “Willing to go above and beyond the lot people ask of me. I'm tough on myself because I always want to keep improving because I always want to excel and become better. I never want to stay stagnant. I always work. I'll give more than what I'm ... I'll give as much as I possibly can, but I'm very tough on myself. I'm sure because I want to be the best, I'm going to be the best.”

Two of the six men (1/3) interviewed mentioned animals in their self-descriptions, while 15 out of the 20 (3/4) women mentioned companion animals or shelter animals in their self-descriptions. Of the two men that mentioned animals, one stated, “I care very much for my own fur-babies and those that we care for here.” The other male former shelter director said, “I try to be the person that my dog thinks I am.” A female shelter worker at a non-profit shelter stated “I think that I’m certainly an animal lover and I wouldn’t say that is the top thing in my list of descriptions but it’s one of the defining things about me.” Another female public shelter director stated, “The shelter has, for so long, . . .such a big part of my life has revolved around animal welfare that I think that almost defines who I am.” Women mentioned their connection to animals more often than men and in complete and richer detail than did the two men who did cite animals in their self-descriptions.

Further analysis of the self-description responses by high care score, medium care score and low care score revealed additional findings. Eight participants – all females -

received a high care score, 17 – five males and twelve females –received medium care scores and one participant – a male – received a low care score. Of the high care score category, six women noted the importance of taking time out to care for one’s self. One female shelter director in this category noted, “I do like a certain amount of chaos at my job but like at home I get to be a little bit quieter. I like interacting with people, but I also need to have that alone time to kind of regroup and re-center.” Another high care score female director described herself as “needing my me time” and that “animals don’t judge me for this.” Another female leader of a public shelter identified her lack of “me time” as problematic, expressing her desire to balance the time for caring for others and the time spent caring for herself. “I’m somewhat of an introvert and do like time to myself. Not that I don’t have my short-comings because I definitely do think that I spread myself too thin but get overwhelmed and then deny myself that I’m actually doing it to myself.”

Current and Former Leaders’ and Workers’ Ethic of Care

The second finding addressed the ethic of care measure score and partially the research question, “How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?” Survey respondents identified whether they were currently employed in animal sheltering or whether they were no longer employed in sheltering. Former leaders, workers, and volunteers provided reasons for leaving the sheltering industry in an open response question on the survey. Previous research (Rohlf and Bennett 2005; Adrian, Deliramich and Frueh 2009; Rollin 2011; Baran 2012; Diverio and Tami 2014) indicated high rates of burn-out and turnover in animal sheltering organizations. Upton Sinclair (1946) detected the slaughterhouse effect, whereby slaughterhouse workers become immune to the violence of the slaughterhouse work, and become more violent

themselves from the long-term exposure. Other research has confirmed the slaughterhouse effect (Fitzgerald, Kalof and Dietz 2009). It is possible that a similar impact on animal shelter workers who euthanize healthy, adoptable animals as part of their regular work duties could be identified in a reduction of score on the measure of ethic of care. In an independent t-test (Table 2) comparing the means of the ethic of care scores and ethic of justice scores of currently employed shelter leaders and workers and formerly employed shelter leaders and workers, the currently employed group has a significantly higher mean score on the measure of care. The ethic of justice score was not significantly different between current and formerly employed leaders and workers.

Table 2

Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Care Score by Former or Current workers and leaders (CurForm)

	CurForm						95% CI for Mean Difference	t	df
	Currently in Sheltering			Formerly in Sheltering					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
Care Score.	62.04	7.54	173	60.2	7.30	118	.09, 3.57	2.08*	256.67
Justice Score	70.99	6.31	173	71.5	5.85	118	-1.92, .92	-.69	261.4

* $p < .05$.

Leaders and workers currently employed in sheltering have a significantly higher Care score than those formerly employed in sheltering, $p < .04$). The average age of currently employed leaders and works are 35 to 44 while formerly employed leaders and workers were slightly younger at 25 to 34.

Of the survey participants who were former employees (153) and leaders (15) of sheltering organizations, 10 former leaders and 113 workers entered an answer in the open response question, “What are your reasons for leaving animal sheltering?” The

response given most often by former shelter leaders centered on disagreements over animal care philosophy (6/10), low wages (5/10), fatigue/burnout (5/10), PTSD from euthanasia (2) and sexual harassment (1/10). One survey participant stated:

There were several reasons. After 25 years, I was experiencing severe burnout. Coupled with a small salary for the amount of work being done, disagreements with the BOD over operating procedures that I felt went directly against what was best for the animals in our care. It was time for a change (Former Shelter Director).

Another mentioned euthanasia. “Honestly, I was sick of euthanizing animals and feeling like nothing would ever change. The system was extremely corrupt.” She then further stated that, “Animal sheltering is nuts when there's no government oversight.”

The formerly employed workers and volunteers at animal sheltering organizations offered both different and similar reasons for leaving their positions. The most often mentioned reasons for volunteers to leave their position were moving from the area (25/113), long hours and low pay caused me to find another job (20/113) and no longer have the time to volunteer (17/113). Other reasons provided were compassion fatigue (13/113), disagreement of philosophies of animal care (10/113) and tired of euthanizing or seeing euthanasia (10/113). One female volunteer explained her decision to cease volunteering as “Too expensive and time consuming and I needed to dedicate that time to my career at this point but hoping to get back to it soon.” Highlighting her disagreement regarding philosophy of animal care, this former full-time female worker stated, “dishonesty- purposeful misrepresentation of breeds, temperaments resulting in high failed adoption rates. A push towards ‘no-kill’ at the expense of mental health of some animals in the shelter. In the private shelter- poor screening of new hires, some people should NOT work with animals.” Describing the impact of working long hours and

receiving low pay, this female former full-time employee noted, “No insurance, PTO, often no overtime paid, poor management, feeling replaceable, no promotion of self-care, no encouragement our interest for avoiding burn out or compassion fatigue with employees. I would have gladly worked there forever if I could have...” A female shelter volunteer described her reasons for moving to another organization:

“Left one org when the leaders all abused their power and it became about their male egos and not the animals. Many went to jail. Sick of men leading animal rescues for their own benefit (money for shelter was being used to buy themselves homes, vacations etc.) Found another rescue org where things are more evenly distributed and the men really do care about the animals.”

In addition to the open-ended survey responses discussed above, the in-depth interview asked former leaders, workers, and volunteers to describe their reasons for leaving the previous position. Of the in-depth interviews, participants included ten former leaders, four former workers and two former volunteers. Francis, a former volunteer at a private shelter explained her reasons for leaving her position:

When some of the shelter staff is being rude, when you're like, ‘Hey, listen. These conflicts really aren't doing anything for the overall mission.’ Then they get mad at you and everything. Yeah. For me, I'm just like, "Okay. Fine." I'll just back off and everything. Should I find myself back in the area again, I will remember that. Think about how best to volunteer because I want to help animals but I don't want to support people that are just not really ... It's just really frustrating because I think it just takes away from the overall mission that's trying to be accomplished.

James, a former private shelter manager, highlighted corruption in upper management as his reason for leaving employment, “We had an executive director that was corrupt, that was euthanizing dogs and animals and they were embezzling. It's a very, very, very dark story.” Another male shelter worker, Karl, explained his disagreement with the Board of Directors:

“They (the organization) take in a lot of money, but then a lot of it was spent on ... Well, we need new trips or we need to do educational trips for the group or we

need to go to this seminar in Canada. But they don't have enough ... Look we're going to have this huge Christmas party for the staff and order food for the staff for a job well done for this, but it should be going to the animals. This sounds awful. This sounds truly awful, but I would never give ... After what I've seen, I don't think I'd ever donate to a humane society again and that sounds awful.

Gwen, a former shelter director, explained the relief she found after leaving her position. “I was dealing with compassion fatigue all the time. I would go through periods of time where I would want to resign, and then I’d change my mind. We’d go on vacations, and I just couldn’t stop thinking about it... I did feel supported by my husband, but he was very happy when I left!”

Gender and Animals as Central to Identity

The third finding focused on survey respondents’ answer to the question, “Do you identify animals as central to your identity?” This finding provided a partial answer to the research question, “How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?” Table 3 shows that a significantly higher percentage of female directors strongly agreed that they identified animals as central to their identity, while female and male workers similarly stated that they somewhat and strongly agreed. Table 3 below provides these findings.

Table 3

Crosstabulation of Gender and Do you identify animals as central to your identity?

Group	Animal Identity	Gender		χ^2
		Female	Male	
Directors	Somewhat Agree	4 (9.5%)	5 (45.5%)	.005*
	Strongly Agree	38 (90.5%)	6 (54.5%)	
Workers	Somewhat Agree	40 (17.8%)	2 (16.7%)	.933
	Strongly Agree	185 (82.2%)	10 (83.3%)	

*p > .05.

A Chi-square test was performed and indicated a significant relationship for leaders of animal sheltering organizations between gender and animals as central to my identity,

$p=.005$ and no significance for workers, $p=.922$. 90.5% of female leaders strongly agreed with the question while only 54.5% of males strongly agreed. Both female (82.2%) and male (83.3%) workers and volunteers strongly agreed almost equally.

All of the female directors who were interviewed said that animals played a large role in both their childhood and adulthood, while only one male director made this same distinction. “My first babysitter was a dog,” declared Bernice, a director of a private/public shelter collaboration. “I was a kid on a farm and our shepherd just shepherded us all over the place.” “The rescue is in me. Even as a kid I would pack home stuff all the time. I was always taking home some kind of an animal,” claimed Donna. Grace, a director of a public shelter, described her current relationship with her companion animals as, “So, I live alone with just my animals, so for me they truly are companions and they are the things that I really look forward to about my home. Things like I garden and I do cooking and I do other things. But, I don’t want to do any of those things without having my animals around. They’re just so much a part of me.” The one male director of a public shelter, Warren, described how his childhood revolved around animals:

Animals for me, I grew up in this really rough neighborhood here in town. My parents are super strict, so I could never go out and hang out at the park with the neighborhood kids because they didn't want me to fall into the negative cycle. All I had growing up were my first friends were animals, and so they occupied a huge space of my childhood and ultimately really kept me out of trouble.

Gender and Animal Issues

The fourth finding continued to explore the meaning of animals to leaders, workers and volunteers but specifically focused on the current public issues surrounding protection of animals and personal actions that individuals may choose to take to address

these public issues. All survey respondents were given a measure developed by Humane Research Council (2016). One series tested respondents on knowledge regarding various public issues impacting animals, while the second series questioned respondents about how likely they were to make personal choices based on those issues. A gender difference emerged from the statistical analysis. Finding four stated that females scored significantly higher than males on a measure of “How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making personal choices.” Females and males scored about equally on a measure of “How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals.”

A Manova was run to determine the differences between gender and two measures of attitudes toward animal welfare issues. The first measure totaled a series of questions measuring knowledge about issues that affect animal welfare. These included animals in circuses and rodeos, animals in laboratories, animals in pounds and shelters, animals in zoos and aquariums, animals kept as companions/pets, animals raised for food, endangered species, horses and dogs used in racing, and wildlife on public lands. The second measure totaled answers to a series of questions regarding importance of animal protection and personal choices. These included attending circuses or rodeos, buying clothing, buying food, buying consumer products, going hunting or fishing, going to do or horse races, and voting for a political candidate.

Table 4. Attitudes about animal issues by gender analysis Manova

Dependent Variable	Df	Sig.	F	Partial η^2	Gender	Means	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower	Upper
Attitudes about animals	1	.83	.044	.001	Female	36.12	35.41	36.83
					Male	36.91	33.97	38.81
How knowledgeable do you feel about animal welfare issues	1	.004	8.46	.03	Female	35.78	35.22	36.61
					Males	32.77	30.82	34.73
Importance of Animal Protection and Personal Choices								

The Manova revealed a statistically significant difference between gender and the measures of knowledge and personal choice, $F(2, 273) = 5.23, p = .006$, Wilks' $\Lambda = .964$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Significant univariate main effects were found for “How important to you is protection of animals and personal choices, $F(1, 274) = 8.46, p < .05$ $\eta^2 = .03$. The assumption of homogeneity of covariance was met, BoxM $F(9, 5650.91) = 23.24, p < .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was checked with the Levene’s test and met with: Knowledge, $F(3, 274) = .520, p > .05$. The homogeneity of variance assumption was violated for Personal Choice, $F(3, 274) = 3.22, p < .05$. Due to the size of the sample, I proceeded with the interpretation of the test despite the violation. The test indicated that females scored significantly higher on the measure of personal choice than males, while both females and males scored about equally on the knowledge measure.

This analysis indicated the possibility that while all survey respondents were knowledgeable about issues facing the care and protection of animals, women leaders, workers and volunteers were more likely to make changes in their personal life to act on

these issues. For instance, women were more likely to avoid buying fur or leather due to their concern about protection for animals or avoid going to the circus or horse races due to the concern about mistreatment of the animals at these events.

Gender and Philosophy of Animal Care

In-depth interviews included questions regarding philosophy of animal care. Interviewees were also assigned a low, mid, and high care score based on their survey score from the Measure of Moral Orientation (Liddell 2006). The fifth finding answers the research question, “How does ethical decision-making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?” In finding five, differences were found in the philosophy of animal care between females and males, and high care, mid-care and low care scores. Men focused on efficiency of care while women focused on meeting individual needs of animals. Men described animal care in business terms while women used care terms.

Twenty-one female directors and workers and six male directors and workers discussed their philosophy of animal care during the in-depth interviews. Of these interviews, no women referred to the business of sheltering and five of the six men used business terms and an ethic of justice to describe animal care. Edward, a director of a public/private collaborative shelter, described his philosophy of care as “We ran over capacity every day. I’d say we have to get them out – get them adopted, fostered or back home.” Bob, male director of a private shelter, focused on safety first, “Yeah we got a staff, safety has to be first. But secondly, we are put in trust of the ultimate fate of those animals, and it is a matter of life and death. So, it’s just something that requires best efforts.” Another referred to the importance of “merchandizing used animals, providing

value in them” in order to move animals out of the shelter. In contrast, women focused on an ethic of care in their descriptions of animal care philosophy. Carol, a director of a public/private collaborative shelter, focused on the needs of individual animals in the style of ethic of care “I think you should understand what your species is and you should understand how they live and react to things and try to tailor your care and emotional and group housing that you do there to that particular breed or species because that’s how you are going to have better outcomes.” “My personal belief is that every animal has potential for rehabilitation. However, whether that environment, whether that person, whether that people, whether that whatever can support that, that's the reality decision. You know?” commented Cara, an employee at a public shelter.

Of the directors and leaders who participated in the interviews, five scored high on the ethic of care score, three scored low on the scale and seven scored at the mid-level of care. The five participants that scored in the high-care range all mentioned individualizing care, providing for species-appropriate enrichment and reducing the stress of the shelter environment. Lisa highlighted reducing stress-related behaviors in her animal care philosophy as “We've always had a small shelter and sometimes the stress on the animals just being closely confined has been really hard, especially. The dogs you really notice the difference in behavior, you know, with cage aggression and things like that. I'm a real dog person, so it bothers me the most when I see dogs, although I don't like seeing cats in any situation, either. As stress free as possible, as healthy as you can possibly make it.” Barbara explained the need for enrichment articles: “Now every cat has a bed, every cat has hopefully a pouch or something, some kind of toy or some kind of enrichment, all the dogs are walked three to four times a day. So, it’s really important

to me that they're taken care of well, and not just that they're there. There's more to quality of life than just life for me."

Seven leaders scored in the mid-care category and in a similar fashion focused on providing more than basic care without mentioning the behavioral problems created by sheltering as those high care score directors provided. Douglas, a director at a public shelter, described shelter animals as needing more than food and care. "If you are going to house them, you have to provide the best possible care you can. Animal care extends, again like I said, it is making sure you take care of not just their basic needs medically or food and water and shelter but that you should be providing things that's not just including locking them in a cage 24 hours a day."

Low-care scorer (three) centered their philosophy of animal care on ethic of justice. Edward, a former public shelter director provided a very different philosophy of care. "The way to look at it is hospice. It sounds awful when I say it like that, but that's what you're running in an animal shelter. Sometimes they get better and maybe they'll leave, but a majority of them don't, regrettably. That's the situation we're in." Donna described her philosophy as, "if we're putting our hands upon any animal, we have an obligation and a responsibility to know something about what we're doing before, not after we put our hands on that animal." Finally, a director described the unfairness of the shelter animal's plight: "It could be the end of their life and they don't deserve that. It's not their fault that they're there. Sounds awful. It's the person's fault. Yeah."

Gender and Philosophy of Euthanasia

During in-depth interviews, interviewees were asked to describe their philosophy of euthanasia. Finding six partially answers the research question "How does ethical

decision-making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?” In finding six, gender differences were identified in the philosophy of euthanasia. Men tended to focus on their personal responsibility for making the decision while women more often described their efforts to ensure the animal was well cared for during the procedure.

Grace, a shelter director, provided a very succinct example of caring in her description of her philosophy of euthanasia: “Our people are trained in and know how to do euthanasia in the best way possible. And the animals that are dying are comfortable and the person who is leading them out of this life cares about them, and they feel that they are being cared for. That final touch is very important. Having said that, the actual work of it, we need to make sure that we do it at all times above board and as best we can.” Cara, a full-time employee at a public shelter, described the special care they provide the animals throughout the euthanasia process. “We are also one of the few shelters in the city that has a pre-sedative that we use. We work very hard to sing and feed hot dogs and play with the animals and all of those kind of things before it happens. Ultimately, we wish it never had to happen,” Another female director, Gwen, focuses on the animal suffering:

So, I would never say that euthanasia is the worst thing that can happen, because it's not. I've seen a lot of animal sufferings that euthanasia is truly the best outcome for them. It bothers me when there's suffering that is not alleviated, whether that is through medication, whether that's through a foster home, or whether that's through euthanasia. Suffering is not okay with me, so in that regard, euthanasia is absolutely a part of my personal philosophy.

Bob, a private shelter director, focused on his responsibility for authorizing the procedure:

I think it was having to sign off on the killing we had to do. We had a protocol that required B**e or me or both to sign off on every ‘euthanizing,’ which is just not a term I like. But and there were times when I, they were based on staff recommendations and there were times that we made them go back and try more. I made it a point to meet each animal before we killed it to get an understanding of it, and that’s just hard, and it ought to be hard.

David, a private shelter director, related an unfortunate experience of when authority and responsibility collided:

Well the one incident that occurred during the transition was that a pit bull was admitted when the lines of authority were not clear yet. I was taking charge as the interim director, but the former director was still there. She was not around when I checked this animal. It was an animal I was taking particular interest in and she killed it. She killed it when I wasn’t there, and I elevated that issue to the police chief to whom that shelter reported and was able to get a rule in that there would be no euthanasia without my signing off on it thereafter. But that was just not one of those bitter human things that caused a dog its life, and that I can still workup a pretty good choke on that one, because that was done to teach me a lesson that ended in that and yeah.

Gender Differences in Work-Life Balance

This section continues to highlight the impact that sheltering has on identity.

While previous sections have described the impact on identity within the confines of the organization, we now shift to the impact of sheltering on the individual’s personal life.

Although leaders, workers and volunteers were not directly asked about work-life balance, they were asked to describe a usual working day. Almost all of the leaders and workers mentioned that the work of sheltering is more than a 40 hour week position.

Finding seven partially answers the research question, “How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?” Finding seven focused on the theme of working over 40 hours a week, with some females describing the interruption caused to their personal life and some men declaring that working more than 40 hours is requirement of the job.

Some female directors (8 out of 19) mentioned the impact that the work of sheltering has on their personal life and family relationships. A female director with a mid-care score, explained the disruption she had experienced in her family life: “I really missed out on a lot with my kids. When I was doing I couldn’t go to basketball games. We are open on the weekends, and they went someplace and Ray my husband had to go with them.” April, a former director at a public shelter, explained that the stress and long hours of her job “put a great deal of stress on my marriage and my husband wanted me to quit.” Here, a public shelter director explained with a shaky voice how the actual work of sheltering impacted her family directly.

It takes an emotional toll – it isn’t so much the recognition, it is just the bashing and name calling. It takes a toll on you – especially if you have children. They will say to them well I heard that ‘your mom’s a murderer.’ That hurts our children too. People have no idea. Yeah, and where we do school programs and we take animals to the school our kids are in that school and you have other kids that say we know your mom is there and we know your mom murders those dogs and cats. It doesn’t just take a toll on us but it takes a toll on our families too.

Some male directors (4 out of 7) focused on the fact that sheltering work exceeded the normal 40-hour week schedule. Warren, a male director at a public shelter, explained his schedule noting, “I’m usually always on my phone, and then I go home. That’s when I usually get a lot of my more clerical stuff done. I work a solid eight to ten hours here, and then I go home and work a few hours just to get caught up on email.” Douglas mentioned much the same but highlighted that this was a required part of the job.

If you do 40, you are really lucky. While unhealthy, I feel like if you are not dedicated to this job through and through, you are not going to make it anyway. Not that you should be sacrificing all of your life outside of work but you are going to have to accept. I did it in sales as well. You are going to have to accept that you are just not in a 40 hour work week. Especially when you get into leadership roles and this is true along all parts of business, when you get into

leadership roles, your phone is going to ring off hours. That is just what comes along with that gig as well.

Ned, a former director at a public/private collaboration, described “the work-life balance at the humane society was awful. You never make enough money, and you deal with a lot of crap. It was very difficult, though.”

CHANGES IN ANIMAL SHELTERING – GENDER

During the in-depth interviews, participants were asked about changes they had seen in attitudes towards animals and in the work of animals sheltering over the last decade. This finding partially answered the research question, “How has the change in attitudes over time towards companion animals in society altered or impacted animal sheltering organizational leadership and policies?” In finding eight, 40% of the female interview participants and 13% of the male interview participants mentioned the topic of gender when asked about changes in animal sheltering over the last decade.

Female shelter directors (current and former), female workers (current and former) and female volunteers (17 of 43) mentioned gender as a point of change in animal sheltering over the last decade. Three themes were identified in these mentions of gender as a change element. The theme most often mentioned was that more women were entering the sheltering industry, followed by more men were entering the sheltering industry and third was that despite the influx of women, top positions in large organizations continue to be male. For males that mentioned gender, it was that they wished to see more men enter the field.

Grace, a public shelter director noted that several decades ago men dominated the field. “When I first starting working in the ‘70s, it was generally all male dominated. Initially, I was the only woman that worked, and really I was just a girl. I was the only

girl there.” Another experienced shelter director, Donna, stated: “Hmm, there are certainly women in all kinds of leadership positions in animal sheltering now. I was the second woman ever to be a humane officer animal control officer in my shelter. The executive director that was there when I was hired was a man, but not long after that they hired a woman director. So, I kind of grew up in sheltering under a woman director.”

April, the director for a public/private collaboration, explained that “there’s definitely a significantly higher percentage of female trainers than males, same with volunteers and lower level employees like shelter employees and such tend to be predominantly women.” She also added that there continues to be problems for women in sheltering much the same as in other industries. “But I do think that there are the same issues as those across the board, pay gap, not as much promotion, not as fast a promotion, those kinds of things I do see. But I don’t think they’re as rampant as they are in other industry settings.”

Carole, the director of a public/private collaborative shelter, explained the gender changes she had seen over the past decade. “With a lot of the newer groups that are up now yeah it’s a lot women, a lot of women vets too in our area. I’m going to say that predominantly in, it’s predominantly female anymore. There might be one shelter that’s got a male ED, the rest of the shelters and most of the rescue groups will have females even though there are males in their organizations and a lot of them do provide a lot of useful help and input.” Carol continued by providing her explanation of why men don’t want to work or volunteer in sheltering:

Not many of the men, well with a lot of the small organizations who have to do if they are not getting paid. Or I mean they’re not getting paid much so you’re not going to get a man to really get in there, and want to do something for pretty much for free basically. I find a lot of men don’t get quite as involved as far as helping with special projects and stuff. I demand that we had a mixed board when we set our organization up that we would have men or it wouldn’t, it wasn’t going

to be all a bunch of hens. I mean we are going to have men on the board and I find if men are on board I'm not, they don't follow through as well on stuff they should do, and aren't as willing to hold their hand up, and say I'll do it.

Hera, a director at a public shelter, described the increasing role of women in sheltering, especially in the area of social media. "I do see more women doing it now more so than men and there are more rescues popping up helping us – more and more if you get on Facebook about every 10 to 15 minutes you will see where someone has posted something about someone somewhere needing assistance. We work with rescues." Hera added her reasoning why she thought women were moving into the field of animal sheltering. "Women are more accepting – I haven't worked with a lot of men in this field but I have worked with male animal control officers. I think that women working with them are better just because most of the time it is women that are running the rescues and they all have the same mentality about wanting to save the animals. Sometimes men have a harder core than women."

Marie, a rescue coordinator at a breed rescue, decried the lack of males in the sheltering world:

We need more men. That, to me, is something very interesting to look into. I'm sure that you do that in your research, but it's crazy to me how many women I meet on a daily basis, just even trying to coordinate a home visit through different states. To coordinate a home visit in a different state, I reach out to 4 or 5 different shelter directors. They're always women. Always. All the volunteers are always women. It's interesting that our director is a male. That rarely happens. It's just interesting to me how it's just women, and not men. I wonder why. Men don't care I guess? I don't know.

In contrast to Marie, a volunteer at a private sheltering organization, Davina, explained that she was seeing more men enter animal sheltering. "I can tell you what's changed. I just thought about this. I would say when I first joined the organization, there were maybe two men. The number of men has expanded exponentially in the last three

years, and they're young, straight men as well which is new. We have a lot of older retired men and we had the occasional gay man, but we have a wide variety of men, and they're getting more and more involved, and that's bringing the whole organization to me as a whole to become a more well-rounded organization.”

A male director, Warren, noted the lack of racial diversity as problematic for animal sheltering.

It is interesting because animal welfare is a lot of I think white women, right? Every time I go to conference, and I spoke at the ***** conference actually this past year and had a woman come up to me. She was Hispanic, and she said, "It's so great to see someone of color up there," and I was like, oh, I did not even think of that. In my conversations with *****, because I'm going to start consulting, they think it'll be helpful to have someone maybe who looks like the people, who is different and relatable in pushing some of the mission forward

James, a director of a public shelter, discussed gender in his reflection on change in the animal sheltering industry. “Well I’ve always been interested in the observation that humane stuff tends to be a female endeavor and frankly I think that’s too bad for a lot of men who ought to be involved in it. But it’s something that I don’t really have a very good handle on, but it’s certainly true all over the place that most of the leadership of shelters except, or of the humane movement I guess is the way I’d put it is female.” He continued by noting the male leaders – so called “big names” in animal welfare – and closed by noting women’s role at the lower level. “Maybe the Wayne Pacelle’s and Nathan and Rich Avanzino and folks like that are people that you identify with humane stuff. But the real operations and the real lifework and the real motivation in the humane movement it strikes me comes mostly from women.” “A male volunteer, August, noted that he was only one of two male volunteers in his breed rescue organization.

Yeah, so there's one other guy that shows up to a lot of the events, and we've formed a relationship sort of as the minority there. From where I am in my

position in the rescue right now, I don't have a lot of administrative responsibility or authority. I'm not included in a lot of the conversations, so at this point I'm really happy with just being the minority, everybody's nice, it's great, I can just participate in the best capacity that I can, and it's well received and appreciated, and it's nice. I tend to be, yeah, I don't know. I just enjoy it.

Ethic of Care and Change in Attitude toward Animals Over Time

Finding nine continued to explore the research question, “How has the change in attitudes over time towards companion animals in society altered or impacted animal sheltering organizational leadership and policies?” but analyzed participant answers through an ethic of care versus ethic of justice framework. Seventy-five percent of females (30 out of 40) framed the change in attitudes toward animals over time in terms of issues of care, while 73% of males (8 out of 11) framed the change in attitudes towards animals over time in terms of justice. Interview participants were asked to describe the changes they had seen (if any) over the past decade in attitudes towards animals. A clear gender difference emerged as females described the change in terms of society’s or sheltering’s care for animals, while males framed the change in terms of an ethical or justice change.

Isabelle, the director of a private sheltering organization, stated that she has seen changes in organizations but not people. “It isn’t the org that is the problem, it is the people who choose to take one a pet and decide to give it up. There would be no organizations if everyone kept their animals and were responsible pet owners, I mean I am keeping that crazy chihuahua over there and my husband hates that dog and I still have it here. So that is the problem.” Brenda, a volunteer at a private shelter, spoke about the focus placed on adoption and how attitudes about adoption have changed. “We are starting to see that adoption has moved from thinking about families as being good

because they have money. Now, shelters are starting to adopt to families of all income levels because money doesn't equate love." Jenna, a director at a public/private collaborative shelter stated "I think there's more understanding now, of the needs of animals. They need support while they are in shelters. I think that's changing. There's more of an emphasis on behavior and enrichment for shelter animals. And training, for shelter animals." Cara, an employee at a public shelter, explained the change using a media example. "Petco has changed its name, or its slogan, from 'Where the pets go' to 'Where the healthy pets go.' This has really been a change in the ideology. I think also, I think there's been some negative stuff that's happened because of it because we are much more ... we are much less likely as a culture now to treat our animals like animals. And I mean that in a sense of, we baby our pets."

August, a male volunteer at a breed rescue organization, situated the change in terms of rights and ethics.

An example of a pattern, I suppose ... I don't know if this necessarily works as a pattern, but we'll see. I've noticed that there are among a little bit more conservative, older, Christian, so anywhere from sixty-five on-wards, there wasn't necessarily the attention paid to the rights of the animals, or the having of animals as a valued member of the household. At least where, in upstate New York, where I'm from originally. In the past ten years, I've noticed that has changed quite a bit. People like my grandmother now have a dog, and are more attentive to issues around animal abuse, and maybe somewhat factory farming.

Continuing in the vein of religiosity, a former director of both public and private sheltering described the impact of no-kill theory as a religion. "Well I think they have gotten the no-kill religion. They don't always call it that. But even the humane society is just signed on to it as a principle. So, I think there is a much greater sense of hope, and can-do attitude at least outside of the South East." The director of a spay and neuter clinic identified the change in terms of a social movement. "I look at animal welfare and

the changes of the law much like I look at women in getting the right to vote in civil rights. I see that as a continuity. I see the very same things that you had all these suffragettes in the late 19th century and early 20th century and then finally women get the right to vote. You had all of these freedom writers and you had all these other things going on and then the civil rights happened. I see the same thing now starting to happen with animal welfare.” Bill, a volunteer for a private shelter, described the role of responsibility in the change of attitudes towards animals. “People are becoming more responsible for their pets. They are aware of the role that spay and neuter plays in reducing pet overpopulation. They are even doing school programs on spay and neuter which helps educate the children about how important it is.”

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter explored ethics of care, issues of identity, and changes in animal sheltering and attitudes towards animals, focusing especially on gender differences. Although females and males scored similarly on a quantitative analysis of a measure of ethic of care and ethic of justice, qualitative analysis suggested that female leaders, workers and volunteers viewed relationships with animals and the work of sheltering through a lens of care. Men viewed these through a lens of justice. Descriptions of animal care and euthanasia provided by participants during the in-depth interview indicated that a moral decision-making framework of care or justice possibly impacts policy setting and best practices in the organization. Furthermore, interview participants differed by gender regarding changes they viewed taking place in attitudes about animals and animal sheltering in general. These gender differences were identified through an ethic of care or ethic of justice framework.

Finally, a significant difference existed on a quantitative test of ethic of care scores between current and former shelter leaders, workers and volunteers. Many survey respondents indicated work stress and problems with euthanasia as reasons for leaving employment.

CHAPTER FIVE

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

While the previous chapter focused on gender differences among animal sheltering leaders, workers and volunteers through the lens of identity and ethic of care, chapter five focuses on gender differences in animal sheltering leadership and organizations through the lens of altruistic leadership and organizational learning. Additionally, this chapter explores differences between types of sheltering organizations based on altruistic leadership and organizational learning. As in the previous chapter, the findings discussed in this chapter may cross research questions, contributing to multiple questions. This chapter contains the key findings from the 343 survey respondents and 49 in-depth interviews of current and former shelter leaders, workers and volunteers.

In addition to the Measure of Moral Orientation (Liddell 2006) addressed in chapter four, each survey respondent answered questions on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning (Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra 2007; F. Malien 2008). Sheltering organizational leaders and directors answered a version of the measure designed for self-assessment of leadership styles while workers and volunteers answered a version of the measure designed for individuals to rate their organization's director or leader. Workers and volunteers also identified the gender of their organization's leader. The MMO (Liddell 2006) was designed to be used for issues of personal identity while the Altruistic Leadership Scale (Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra 2007; F. Malien 2008) was designed to be used for issues of leadership style and organizational style. While the

measures are different, ethic of care and altruism are closely linked. The concept of altruistic leadership closely matched the moral orientation of ethic of care by the connection to a relational and egoless desire to care. Altruistic leaders cared for the needs of the organizational employees above their own personal needs or desire for attention. Altruistic leadership in turn generated an organization with a positive emotional environment that promoted trust, cooperation, risk taking, employee participation in decision-making and continued learning (F. Malien 2008). So while the MMO did not capture statistically significant differences between genders, the measure of altruistic leadership provided another opportunity to explore gender differences that focused specifically on leadership styles and how those styles might impact an organization. The MMO tested respondents using artificial moral dilemmas that might not have resonated with each respondent. In contrast, the measure of altruistic leadership utilized questions based on the respondent's current working experience which might then connect more directly with leaders, workers and volunteers in animal sheltering organizations.

The findings presented in this chapter highlight gender and organizational differences based on altruistic leadership. First, high scores on a measure of altruism for shelter directors and leaders was positively associated with scores on the measures of organization learning (experimentation, risk, external, dialog, and decision-making) for animal sheltering organizations. Second, females scored higher on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning than males. Third, females began work in animal sheltering in entry level positions and viewed their work as "a calling" while men entered sheltering from other careers and desired to make a big impact in their field. Finally on

issues of leadership, female leaders and workers who spoke about female leaders with high scores on a measure of altruism identified their leadership style as a democratic approach (12/20), while male leaders and workers/volunteers who spoke about male leaders with high altruism scores explained that they approached leadership in a one on one fashion (6/8).

On organizational level issues, findings discussed in this chapter show several differences by both gender and organization type. As a gender difference, female directors took part in collaborative efforts with outside organizations significantly more than male directors. Another difference found between high and low altruism groups stated that high altruism directors and workers identified that the organization as focused on both people and animals versus low altruism directors and workers that identified as having problems with people (females 17/20 males 6/8). Two organizational differences between public and private type organizations are also presented. First, the mean score on a measure of altruism significantly differed between types of sheltering organizations and second, in-depth interview participants identified public, government or municipal run shelters as “bureaucratic” and “rule-driven” while private shelters were described as being more flexible.

ALTRUISTIC LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING

All leaders, workers and volunteer survey participants completed a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning developed by Mallén, Chiva, Alegre and Guinot (2015). The measurement of altruistic leadership was completed by directors and leaders on their own leadership style and by workers and volunteers on their current leader’s style of leadership. Additionally, workers and volunteers identified whether their

leader was a male or female. Four questions measured on a Likert scale included (1) The leaders of this organization put the interests of the animals above their own, (2) The leaders of this organization do all they can to help animals, (3) The leaders of this organization sacrifice their own interests to meet the needs of others, and (4) The leaders of this organization go beyond the call of duty to help others. These questions were totaled to provide a one-variable altruism score. Likewise, a score was totaled for each of the series of questions on organizational learning providing a score for participation in decision-making, interaction with the external environment and experimentation. Experimentation included two questions: (1) People are supported when they put forward new ideas and (2) Initiatives frequently meet with a favorable response, and people therefore feel encouraged to put forward new ideas. External interaction with the environment included three questions: (1) Gathering information on what is happening outside the firm forms part of the job, (2) We have systems and procedures in place to receive, collate and share information from outside the firm, and (3) Interaction with the environment is encouraged. Decision-making included three questions: (1) Managers frequently involve employees in important decision, (2) the firm, and (3) Interaction with the environment is encouraged. Decision-making included three questions: (1) Managers frequently involve employees in important decision, (2) employees opinions are taken into account when firm policy is being decided, and (3) People feel involved in the main decisions of the firm. Table 5 shows results from a statistical analysis – a Manova – to determine the differences in high and low altruism across the measure of the scores of organizational learning (experimentation, risk, external, dialog, and decision-making). This test was run to determine if this sample of animal sheltering organizations

would follow Mallén, et al's (2015) hypothesis that high altruism levels in leadership would be positively associated with high scores on measures of organizational learning. The chapter's first finding shows that high scores on a measure of altruism for shelter directors and leaders were positively associated with scores on the five measures of organization learning (experimentation, risk, external, dialog, and decision-making) for animal sheltering organizations.

Table 5. Leadership Styles – Quantitative – analysis organizational learning scores by altruism split Differences by altruism split – Manova

Dependent Variable	Df	Sig.	F	Partial η^2	Altruism split	Means	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower	Upper
Org Learning Capacity Measures	1	.001	114.44	.33	Low	4.32	4.01	4.63
					High	6.49	6.24	6.75
Risk	1	.001	32.07	.12	Low	4.41	4.16	4.66
					High	5.36	5.14	5.57
External	1	.001	81.09	.25	Low	6.90	6.49	7.31
					High	9.37	9.02	9.72
Dialog	1	.001	60.69	.20	Low	9.37	8.81	9.94
					High	12.29	11.82	12.77
Decision-making	1	.001	109.23	.32	Low	5.62	5.15	6.09
					High	8.91	8.51	9.31

The Manova reveals significant differences across high and low altruism and the measures of organizational learning, Hotelling's Trace = .59, $F(5, 234) = 27.68$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .37$. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. Significant univariate main effects were found for Risk, Decision-making, External, Dialog, and Experimentation. Low Altruism leaders scored significantly lower on Risk ($M=4.41$, $SD=1.20$), Decision-making ($M=5.62$, $SD=3.30$), External ($M=6.90$, $SD=2.25$), Dialog ($M=9.37$, $SD=3.30$) and Experimentation ($M=4.32$, $SD=1.82$) then

high altruism leaders ($M=5.36$, $SD=1.33$; $M=8.90$, $SD=2.43$; $M=9.37$, $SD=1.98$; $M=12.29$, $SD=2.51$; $M=6.49$, $SD=1.33$).

The assumption of homogeneity of covariance was met, $Box\ M\ F(15, 181917.39)=2.67$, $p<.05$. As the assumption was violated for two of the measures of organizational learning, I proceeded with the ANOVA using the more conservative Hotelling's Trace. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was checked with the Levene's test and met with: Risk, $F(1, 238)=.89$, $p>.05$, External, $F(1, 238)=1.28$, $p>.05$, and Decision-making, $F(1, 238)=.064$, $p>.05$. The homogeneity of variance assumption was violated for Experimentation, $F(1, 238)=22$, $p<.05$ Dialog, $F(1, 238)=15.41$, $p<.05$. Due to the size of the sample, I proceeded with the interpretation of the test despite the violation.

The data analysis reported above provides support for Mallén et al. (2015) hypothesis that leaders who utilize a highly altruistic leadership style will lead an organization that is open to change, supportive of employee initiatives, open to relationships with other organizations and communicative with those internal to the organization, as well as those external to the organization.

Differences in Gender on a Measure of Altruistic Leadership and Organizational

Learning

Quantitative analysis

Chapter four discussed gender differences in the Ethic of Care decision-making style based on qualitative interviews, but that gender difference was not significantly different in the quantitative analysis. Despite those inconsistent findings, it is important to further analyze gender differences in leadership style. Unlike the MMO test which all

leaders, workers and volunteers took individually as part of the survey, the altruistic leadership and organization learning measure allowed workers and volunteers to base their answers on their perceptions of the organizational leader. This provided me with an opportunity to capture leadership data on a larger number of leaders than the MMO measure. Workers and volunteers also stated whether their leaders were male or female. The second finding presented in Chapter five discussed here examines gender differences on the altruism and organizational leadership scores. Finding number two shows that female leaders scored higher on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning than did male leaders. A Manova analysis of gender differences in altruistic leadership score and organizational learning capacity scores including decision-making, external and experimentation was completed and the results follow in Table 6..

Table 6. Analysis of leadership scale scores – Altruistic Leadership Score, Organization Learning Capacity Score Differences by gender Significant Univariate Effects for Gender (at $p < .001$ level)

Dependent Variable	Df	Sig.	F	Partial η^2	Gender	Means	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower	Upper
Leadership Styles								
Altruism	1	.001	11.14	.044	Female	12.98	12.50	13.47
					Male	11.34	10.50	12.18
Experimentation	1	.016	5.85	.024	Female	5.80	5.53	6.07
					Male	5.15	4.69	6.50
External	1	.019	5.58	.022	Female	8.63	8.28	8.98
					Male	7.80	7.21	8.40
Decision-making	1	.033	4.60	.019	Female	7.82	7.40	8.24
					Male	6.92	6.21	7.63

A Manova was run to determine the gender differences across the measure of altruism of leader and the scores of organizational learning (Decision-making, Experimentation, External and Altruism). The Manova revealed significant difference across gender and the measures of organizational learning and altruism of leader, Wilks'

$\lambda = .96$, $F(4, 240) = 2.83$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$. Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effects were examined. There were significant univariate main effects for altruism, $F(1, 243) = 11.14$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$, decision-making, $F(1, 243) = 4.60$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$ external, $F(1, 243) = 5.58$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$ and experimentation, $F(1, 243) = 5.58$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$.

Females scored significantly higher than males on the measure of altruism of the leader and organizational learning scores: altruism ($M = 12.98$, $SD = 3.17$), experimentation, ($M = 5.80$, $SD = 1.79$) external ($M = 8.62$, $SD = 2.33$) and decision-making ($M = 7.82$, $SD = 2.88$).

The assumption of homogeneity of covariance was met, BoxM $F(10, 60894.61) = 1.39$, $p > .05$. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was checked with the Levene's test and met with: decision-making, $F(1, 243) = .33$, $p > .05$, external, $F(1, 243) = .12$, $p > .05$, and experimentation, $F(1, 243) = 3.289$, $p > .05$. The homogeneity of variance assumption was violated for altruism, $F(1, 243) = 4.97$, $p < .05$. Due to the large sample size, I proceeded with the test and interpreted the results with caution.

Differences in Gender on a Measure of Altruistic Leadership and Organizational Learning

Qualitative analysis

Finding three further examines the gender differences in leadership style, specifically exploring how female and male leaders came to their employment within the sheltering organization. My interviews found that females began their work in animal sheltering organization at the entry level position and claimed to view their work as “a

calling,” while males entered sheltering from other careers and spoke about their desire to make a big impact in the field.

Qualitative data obtained from the interview participants indicated that the differences in leadership style began with entry into the field. Men and women entered the field of animal sheltering in very different ways. All of the female directors and workers (37) said that they began their work in sheltering by either volunteering or taking an entry level position and then working their way up through the organization. Although the women might have changed organizations as they moved, they all indicated a career trajectory from entry level to upper level.

Barbara, a director in a private shelter, provided an example of this type of entry and job trajectory.

Yeah, I’ve been at this shelter a long time. I started entry-level part-time vet assistant, moved to adoption counseling, admissions counseling. I worked in cruelty investigations for a time and a different management structure. I was assistant shelter manager, and then I managed those operations, and now I manage the vet services department. I’m shortly moving on to a senior operations manager position as soon as we find a better medical director.

April, a director at a public/private collaboration, entered the field as a volunteer. “I started as a volunteer and was hired after a few months to work in customer service. Then I became a humane officer, animal control officer and then I was customer service supervisor. Then field services supervisor and then director of operations.” Grace, a public shelter director, explained, “At the end of 2002 I started here. But, I’ve been in the business for 38 years.” Although technically a volunteer, Lisa serves on the Board of Directors for her rural private shelter and has literally done every job available within the organization.

I started volunteering in the early 1980s at the Humane Society and Welfare shelter. I kind of started off working in the office and doing almost everything there, including admissions, adoptions, check-ins, pretty much everything, answering the phone, the whole thing. Then, as the organizations grew, I kind of grew with it. I got on the Board in '84 and I've been on and off the Board since then. I've probably been on ... I think I'm in my 18th year now.

Men, on the other hand, approached sheltering via a different path and later in life than women. All but one of the men (6/7) entered after a career in other areas such as business, law or sales. A former director at a large urban public shelter, Bob, explained that:

I was then chosen by National Search to be the associate director at **** Humane Society in **** which is, you probably know one of the great no-kill shelters in the country. There was nothing going on in my primary occupation as the legal recruiter at that time. So, I decided to see if I could change careers because this is, I liked placing stray lawyers, but if I can place stray dogs so I get a much bigger kick out of it and they are probably more appreciative too.

Isaac was retired military and an academic prior to his tenure at a nonprofit, large suburban shelter. He recalled how he became interested in sheltering. "We started in 1995 because I made a mistake and told my wife that she really ought not work so hard and so she ought to volunteer for an animal organization because that's what she loved. Boy was that a ... probably one of the dumbest things I've ever done." Warren differed from the other male interview participants as his position was obtained on a similar pattern as those of the women. "I've worked here for ten years, and I started as a kennel tech when I was 18-years-old."

Among the female directors and workers interviewed, most clearly articulated that their work was more than just a job, rather they referred to it in terms of a calling. Grace, a director at a rural public shelter, described her early days in the field:

Going to a shelter to work was not just a job for me. I really wanted to do this. And then, when I became an animal control officer, same thing. I was so enthusiastic, and I thought "Oh, my God, this is the best job anyone could have!".

Just think about what I am doing every day. This is the best. I am doing law enforcement, I'm doing investigations, I'm helping people keep their animals, I'm saving animals. But, I'm also picking up strays up and taking them into the shelter."

A public shelter worker, Cassidy, explained in a very succinct fashion, "working at the shelter is more than just a job, it's what I am."

April, a former director at a public/private collaboration, detailed the problematic part of "work as a calling" stating "I'd say my biggest folly is that I would rather give away all of my skills and talents just to get them where they need to be. That's probably my worst ethical construct because I screw myself in the end. But if I'm looking at applying to dogs, it's worth it."

The majority of the male directors and workers spoke more in terms of their desire to make a large impact in their field or position. For example, Bob, a former director at a private shelter described wanting to make an impact using Nathan Winograd's No-kill theory. "So, I was fascinated by the no-kill I'll call it technology and its ability to make a difference, and in getting to know Nathan a bit and I wanted to do that. I wanted that kind of impact. So, I think that was probably it more than anything."

Another public shelter director, Douglas, explained "I feel like the most important part of my job is putting all those pieces together to make sure that we're all functioning in as efficient way as possible as well as making sure the animals are getting the best care possible and not just getting stuck in the rat race of the day. Finally a former director, Ned, referred to his previous career of sheltering in a pessimistic manner "It was just this is when we open. Yeah, the cages have to be cleaned. We have to get volunteers in there to get them locked and then carry it through and just get people in and out of the door

until we close.” Ned, instead of seeing sheltering as something he could always strive to make better, referred to it as manipulative, marketing strategy.

I think they're in a state of constant flux. I don't see it for the good or for the bad. My experience has always been, it's like marketing. You're trying to target this audience, you're trying to target that audience and then you change your message. It was like that at both humane societies I was at. You're trying to target people to pluck on their sympathies or at least ... It sounds awful when I say it, but you're trying to get money to keep open to help the animals. You have to constantly evolve and change your marketing and what you are, at least on the outside to the public to keep the donations coming in.

In comparison, Bob referred to marketing in a much more positive, strategic manner. “The board has to be a fund-raising mechanism and a weaving into the community mechanism, the context and all of that, everybody loves animals. So, it was important to, upgrade is a pejorative term, I suppose. But really we needed their money more than we needed their sympathy.

While the in-depth interviews found gender differences on the path to employment for leaders of animal sheltering organizations, further analysis of interview data specifically from leaders who obtained a high altruism score provided more differences between genders. Female leaders and workers who speak about female leaders with high scores on a measure of altruism identified their leadership style as a democratic approach (12/19), while male leaders and workers/volunteers who speak about male leaders with high altruism scores explained that they approach leadership in a one on one fashion (6/8).

Altruistic leaders voluntarily seek to increase the welfare of both people and animals and does not seek reward or recognition for helping others (F. Malien 2008). Analysis of the in-depth interviews revealed themes of altruism regarding both welfare of animals and organizational participants. Of the director, worker and volunteer interview

participants, 19 females and 8 males scored high on the measure of altruism, 11 females and two males scored in the mid-level and five females and five males scored in the low level.

Barbara, a current director of a private shelter, who received a high score on the measure of altruism, highlighted how she led her organization to go beyond the requirements for both the welfare of animals and people. “The last three or four years on Christmas day, we put together Christmas packages and delivered them to families in need in the community. As opposed to being that law enforcement, bring the hammer down kind of department, we’re much more caring and really try to make a difference to people and animals.” Barbara also described her process of leadership as a more democratic style: “Yeah, we talk it out as a team. It really comes to a majority vote, but that’s kind of similar on how we operate.” Cara, a shelter worker, talked about how her female director highlighted animal care: “But the objective is always about the animal. Animal first, animal first, animal first. That involves training. That involves being open to new ideas. I walked into this thinking I knew about ownership of dogs because I had one and I learned a thousand different things, but I had to be open to it..” Donna, a private shelter director, also identified her process of leadership as democratic “So generally, like I said, we work really well as a team and it’s a very healthy communication around that. We take everybody’s opinion into consideration and so it’s a mostly democratic process with a veto power, if you will. I work very hard to be open, honest and forthcoming to avoid misunderstanding from mishaps and then give people the choice, if they want to be involved.”

Males said that they valued their one on one relationship with the employees of the organization. Douglas, who scored high on a measure of altruism and is a director at a public shelter, explained his connection to employees.

I believe it is kind of my job to set the tone. My personal philosophy is I make sure that from the highest employee, maybe my peers or up, down to the front line staff person that they all know that I care about them personally and not just from an employer-to-employee or boss-to-employee role and I feel like that really makes a huge difference in people's attitude with work.

Another high altruism, public shelter director, Warren highlighted his efforts working one on one with staff:

I love being a cheerleader and resource for the team, so my favorite thing is when they come to me with a challenge and I'm able to offer them guidance on how they can actually solve their own problem. A lot of people are like, "Don't get all Oprah-y on me," but I'm very much into what can you do about this and you have to surrender to the situation and what are you.

Altruistic leadership and organizational learning – altruistic differences in experimentation

The previous section analyzes the responses from descriptions of leadership style from the in-depth interviews of leaders who held high scores on the measure of altruism. This section analyzed the same leader's responses to the interview questions about supporting employees in the area of experimentation. In the measure of organizational learning, experimentation referred to how a leader reacted to innovative ideas suggested by their employees. Mallén et al (2015) described altruistic leaders as supportive and encouraging of employee and volunteer initiatives to try new options to solve organizational problems. In my research, in-depth interview participants were asked about their support of employee and volunteer efforts to increase animal welfare in the shelter environment. Excerpts from the interview transcripts from leaders with high altruism scores expressed support and acceptance for employee initiatives, while excerpts

from low altruism scored leaders indicated that they reacted negatively towards employee initiatives. Warren, a public shelter director with a high altruism score, detailed how his organization supported innovative suggestions from employees:

I would say this is your idea and this is incredible, and always give credit where it's due, especially to the people who aren't in senior leadership. They actually make the biggest difference. Our kennel techs and the people like our volunteers are the most important people here. I could go away, and this place will operate. If all the techs weren't here, we would crumble. Making sure that they know how important they are helps.

Grace, a public shelter director, spoke about her early years in sheltering. She described how her efforts to make the shelter a better environment for the animals in their care was not supported by the male shelter director:

There was another woman who came through, and she became an animal control officer, and no one took her seriously because she was a female. Then, when I started moving up out of volunteering and then into a job there, again, nobody took me seriously because I was a woman. And, you would not believe, I could tell you stories. You'd not believe the stories. You've probably heard a lot about it, but it was bad. When I was in California, the men that I worked with, every single one was retired Navy, they were doing it as a second job and very few of them had respect for me and my position, and what I wanted to do.

Grace noted that she made sure not to repeat what those leaders did to her and supports her staff and volunteers, always encouraging them to try new things.

Our individual supervisors for each unit really work on getting those people (like if there is a person who really doesn't seem to care), we try to find out what they really like. Like we have one guy in the kennels which took us awhile to find out what he really likes. Then we found out he really likes CATS! O.K., so let him be our cat guy. He's our cat whisperer now! And, he has really found his niche in life. That only came through lots of encouragement for him and giving him an avenue to go to work with the cats. We started out by just making him our cat adoption counselor. So, every time someone wanted to look at a cat, we said you need to talk to our cat expert. We kept on calling him that until he became our cat expert. It kind of worked out that way.

On the opposing side, several shelter directors talked about previous employers and current workers talked about their director as being very closed off and at times

argumentative when approached with new ideas. Hera, a female shelter worker described the daily struggle over using new adoption techniques she encounters with her male shelter director in a rural county public shelter. “I mean there's days we've gotten eight dogs out in one day. Like I said, it's a constant fight to do that. I think it's because he don't know what he's doing. We're showing him how to do it and he doesn't like that. As far as finding homes for them, that's not been the problem. The problem comes from inside the shelter.” Another worker, Wilma, described her female director with a low score on the altruism scale as “dishonest” and “repeatedly ignored my attempts to implement a program that would be more upfront with adopters about the breed and temperament of the dogs they were considering adopting” She explained that the director’s dishonesty caused “high, failed adoption rates.”

Altruistic leadership and organizational learning – altruistic differences in external

The second area of organization learning measured was identified as external. Altruistic leaders supported open communication with outside organizations as well as sharing information with outsiders. They also remained up to date on new procedures and protocols for animal sheltering and supported their employees in obtaining professional development opportunities. Connections with other organizations also provided the leader with opportunities to collaborate. In the survey, respondents were asked if their organization took part in collaborative efforts with outside organization. Finding five found that Female directors took part in collaborative efforts with outside organizations significantly more than male directors. Using the variables Leader Gender and Collaborative, a Chi-square test of association was performed. All expected cell

frequencies were greater than five. There was a statistically significant association between leader gender and collaboration, $\chi^2(1) = 18.83, p = .005$. See Table 7 below.

Table 7

Crosstabulation of Leader Gender and Collaborations

Collaboration	Leader Gender		χ^2
	Female	Male	
Yes 184 (62.3%)	149 (70%)	36 (42.9%)	.005*
No 112 (37.7%)	64 (30%)	48 (57.1%)	

Interview participants described collaborative efforts in which they or their organization had been involved. A director at a public/private collaboration with a high score on the measure of altruism identified how important it was to work with others outside of the organization.

The most important part, I guess I'm just trying to get everybody to work together and to keep carrying down what opportunities there are for our people to work together. Like what other groups are around and what they're doing, because that's very important for our mission. To let people know we are there to give them resources, and for them to try to help each other with resources.

Donna, a private shelter director with a medium altruism score, stated simply, "I can play well with anybody in the sandbox. I don't have to like everybody in the sandbox, but I know how to get along." She also commented how important it was to be able to use outside-of-the-organization contacts when she needed answers to questions. "I will spend many hours researching things if I don't know, reaching out to others in my field for information. I don't live in a bubble."

Shelter workers (six of nine) who participated in the in-depth interview whose directors were scored with low altruism on the measure of altruistic leadership identified power as being problematic in collaborative ventures. Alma, a worker at a public shelter talked about her male director who scored low on the measure of altruism. When asked

about working with external organizations, Alma mentioned problems: “Not good at all! He's got an attitude. He always brings up he's losing power. He has a thing about having power. We argue quite a bit. We've had a few behind-the-door closed meetings with the Judge Executive and another magistrate. Yeah. Not good at all.” Marie, a volunteer coordinator in a breed rescue organization, stated, “Sometimes there's too many cooks in the kitchen. It gets really stressful.” A high altruism director of a private shelter, Carol, clearly pointed out how ego interferes with the collaborative effort:

Yeah, if you've got a big ego and it's all about you and your organization it's not going to work. You got to, and we did, we have a coalition in St. Louis metropolitan area that we've had for about five or six years and it doesn't work well because there're too many people not willing to share information and there's too many egos at the bigger organizations.

Altruistic leadership and organizational learning – altruistic differences in decision-making

A third area of organizational learning measured in the scale of altruistic leadership and organization learning was decision-making. Mallén et al (2015) identified that altruistic leaders encouraged participatory decision-making within the organizations and worked to include all employees in the decision-making process. They also strived to make all members of the organization feel as if they are making a difference in the organization. Both female and male shelter directors with high altruism scores identified this as part of their leadership style during the in-depth interviews.

Gwen, a director with a high altruism score at a private shelter, described how the decision-making process worked at her organization. “So, any time we're looking to make a change in whether it's an animal care decision or whether it's using this room over that room, or whatever that is. Everyone comes to the table and shares their opinion, and we work through that as a team to make the best call.” Also citing a group decision-

making process, Grace, a public shelter director with a high altruism score, stated “the advantage to having a smaller group is that you can one on one get to know each other and share information, just by talking and communicating with them. We do have weekly meetings, where we talk about issues that come up.”

Esther, a worker at a private shelter, stated that she felt supported by her female director, whom she rated as high altruism. “Yes, I felt supported, I think I got a lot of support. When I was first there it was the executive director who moved me to positions that she thought would be beneficial. I was very grateful when she let me manage the volunteer program.” Tina, a worker at a public shelter with a female director whom she scored as having a mid-altruism score, explained, “I felt so replaceable there. No one cared what I thought, and she didn’t want me to make suggestions on how to make it a better place for the animals.” Finally, underscoring the extreme problems that may come when a leader doesn’t include employees in the decision-making process, Bob, a former shelter director, related the story of another director:

Yeah, the guy in **** who is now in *****. The guy I got to know competing with him for the *** job and the union. Now he tried to go too fast the wrong ways, he didn’t have strong backup within the city government, and he got canned within 3 or 4 months I think, because the union set him up. So, you’ve got to be mindful of that stuff, too. I know I’m no opponent of unions, but you also got to respect the power, and figure out how to work it.

Differences in Organizational Type on a Measure of Altruistic Leadership and Organizational Learning

The previous section explored the differences that animal sheltering leaders expressed both on scores on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning and during in-depth interviews. This section moves the focus to differences between organizational types. The survey instrument asked leaders, workers and volunteers to

identify the type of organization for which they worked. Options included public animal sheltering organizations, private animal sheltering organization, breed rescue organizations, public private collaboration sheltering organizations and other sheltering organizations. Public shelters are operated by local city, county or state organizations and workers are paid by the corresponding government and are public employees. Private shelters are operated by non-profit organizations and employees are employed by the non-profit organization. Breed rescue organizations focused solely on one type of dog breed and are operated by a non-profit breed rescue organization. Finally, a public/private collaboration exists when a county government contracts with a private organization to operate the sheltering process. The building may be owned by the government or vice versa and most often the employees are paid by the non-profit organization.

Differences between organizational type on the measure of altruistic leadership

In quantitative analysis, finding six showed that the mean score on a measure of altruism significantly differed between types of sheltering organizations. An ANOVA was used to examine the question of whether public animal sheltering organizations, private animal sheltering organization, breed rescue organizations, public private collaboration sheltering organizations and other sheltering organizations differed with respect to their altruism score. The independent variable represented the different animal sheltering organizations with five groups being represented: 1) public; 2) private; 3) breed rescues, 4) public/private collaboration; and 5) other. The dependent variable was the score that leaders made on a measure of altruism with a range of 4 (low level of altruism) to 16 (high level of altruism) and workers and volunteers scored their leader

using the same measure. Due to problems with normality and skew, the dependent variable was transformed using a log10 referred procedure. As the outcome remained the same before and after the variable transformation, Table eight provided below reports the means and standard deviations for each of the five groups prior to the log10 transformation for ease of understanding.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Altruism by Organizational Type

Organizational Type	N	Mean	SD
Breed Rescue.	15	13.20	3.03
Private	115	13.12	2.97
Other	15	13.07	3.95
Public/Private Collab.	61	12.77	2.96
Public Shelter	81	11.33	4.00

Data is presented as mean \pm standard deviation. The measure of altruistic leadership in types of animal shelter organization from public shelter ($n=81$, 11.33 ± 4), to public/private ($n=61$, 12.77 ± 2.96), to Other ($n=15$, 13.07 ± 3.95), to Private ($n=115$, 13.1 ± 2.97), to Breed Rescue ($n=15$, 13.20 ± 3.03) in that order. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ($p = .403$). The measure of altruistic leadership was statistically significantly different for types of animal sheltering organizations, $F(4, 287) = 3.68$, $p < .05$.

Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that the decrease from private to public (-1.74 , 95% CI (-3.05 to $-.43$)) was statistically significant ($p = .003$), but no other group differences were statistically significant indicating that private shelters were associated with a significantly higher score on a measure of altruistic leadership than public shelters.

In qualitative analysis, the in-depth interview participants often described their own experience working in both types of organizations. In finding seven, they often identified public, government or municipal run shelters as “bureaucratic” and “rule-driven” while private shelters were perceived as being more flexible.

David, a director of a large urban spay and neuter clinic, clearly described his experience with a publicly operated shelter.

I went to Animal Control and it was being run by a brother retired officer, but it's a bureaucracy. It's a bureaucracy of paramilitary people. Again, when I was in the army fortunately or unfortunately, I had 700 badged and 200 military policemen working for me. I got into the Animal Control environment and I'm going, “This looks awful familiar.” I'm very comfortable in this environment. I understand how they think, but they don't think like animal welfare people, very different

A former director at a non-profit shelter, Bob, described the difference between public and non-profit sheltering.

The strength and the conversion of the *****shelter, to me, to non-profit was that there is the governmental role in keeping the community safe and gathering the strays. But there's a less of a governmental role in their disposition. So, when you put the police department in charge of the disposition, which it usually is, you don't get as good an outcome as if you put the true believers in charge of the disposition, and those are the non-profit people.

Warren explained the difference between the two types of sheltering organizations by focusing on the flexibility that non-profits are afforded.

I think collaboration is really important. I also don't see a lot of it with municipal shelters, but I also think that's why a lot of municipal shelters don't save the amount of animals we save. Your budget will never be enough. You'll never have enough staff, so you have to get buy-in from the community if you're going to run a successful organization. Non-profits are a lot better at it because they're used to cultivating relationships for a donor perspective to engage them in that way.

He added that “people get really complacent with the status quo, especially in the government.” Grace, a female director at a public shelter, stated about her organization: “Now, we have different people running our administration. I do not feel that they are not on the same page as I am, but I do feel the pain of having to just deal with a county government with conflicting responsibilities. You know, they have jails to run and they have social services and health departments, and it is sometimes very difficult to get the resources that I would like to have. But, having said that, it can be difficult and it can be an arduous process, but I think that they want our shelter to be the best shelter it can be.” Finally, a director of an urban high volume spay and neuter clinic described different types of organizations has have differing “world views.” David explained the differences in these world views:

. . . . not only Animal Control but also both the adoption groups and the Humane Society you see you really got a bunch of different people all involved in animal welfare. You’ve got the vets who have their own worldview and I’m citing myself there but I really like that term because they do. They think very differently about animal welfare than we do. Then you’ve got Animal Control which is a government agency and they have a completely different view of the world and they’re all about order. They are all about . . . up until recently, up until probably five to 10 years ago they’re really . . . And their idea of animal welfare is very different than the rest of us.

Differences in organizational focus by high and low altruism scores

In-depth interview participants who were leaders were given a high or low altruism designation based on their survey score on a measure of altruistic leadership. Workers and volunteers scored their organizational leader on a measure of altruistic leadership and were assigned a high or low altruism score for their leader. After analysis of interview transcripts, a difference was identified between high and low altruism leaders on the focus of the organization. Finding eight indicated that High Altruism directors and workers identified that the organization is focused on both people and

animals versus low altruism directors and workers that identified as having problems with people (females 17/19 males 6/8) .

Shelter directors, male and female, with high scores on a measure of altruism and workers that identified their director has having a high score on a measure of altruism described their organization as being focused on both people and animals, (24/27). Those with lower altruism scores described their organization as focused on the animals and identified as having problematic relationships with the people involved (3/4).

Grace, a director at a rural, public shelter with a high score on altruism, explained that education people was as important as caring for the animals. “We encourage people to think about animals first, and educating people first, because we try to reinforce that in our daily operations.” Another director of a suburban public shelter with a high altruism score, Warren, claimed that his ideology had changed over time. “What's interesting, as I got into this field very animal-focused, but now what has happened is I'm very people-focused. I feel like my purpose is to help people save more animals because I'm much better at developing people than I ever would be being a veterinarian, you know?” A private shelter director in the suburbs, Gwen, stated “people are very important to our work. They are equally important as our animals. I think that's something that often gets missed in our industry.” Cara, a public shelter director, similarly explained:

It's hard work. It's not just because you like animals that you do this. I think it's really important to create the connection between the people and the pets because we interact, we have the animals, but it all starts with the people. And we are youth focused. We have kids, teenagers that choose to spend their time with us. Like their entire day. And they're not doing it for school.”

She compared her organization to another she had recently visited “I went to a bird rescue once and they had like birds everywhere and all they did was complain. And sure we could complain if we wanted to but you sit in that negativity and it just becomes

negative. And some people do want that. Some people want like 5000 cats in their house and complain about people all day.” April, a former director at a public/private collaborative sheltering organization, focused on the role of communication in the organization.

A lot of people have the erroneous view that if you work with animals, you don’t work with people. I think everybody has heard that at least 100 times. I don’t really get along with people. I’m going to work with animals. Well, all these animals are attached to people. So, it doesn’t actually work that way. You have to have some level of communication skill to be effective, whether you’re doing rescue or a veterinarian or whatever capacity it is. You still have to engage people on certain levels.

Esther, a former employee at a private animal sheltering organization whose former director was given a low altruism score stated “People that work with animals are definitely unique, kind of quirky, don’t always like people, tend to like animals better.”

A current worker at a breed rescue organization whose male director was given a low altruism score stated that “he tell us to focus on the animals – it’s our job to make sure they are given the best home we can and that for him means a yard with a fence and no military families.” Finally, despite his high altruism score, Bob, a former shelter director at a large private urban shelter, connected an animal centered organization to problems with disagreements throughout the industry.

I think the people again there is a population statistic. But people who are drawn to animal welfare work are usually disappointed with people as a species and they like the genuineness and predictability of animals. I think that has to do with their disinclination to be able to settle disagreements. So, the animal groups are forever breaking apart and dissipating their energies, fighting each other. I mean I’ve lived with the whole Nathan versus the humane society thing and it was ridiculous.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter explored the differences between both leaders and organizational type on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning. The first finding

showed that animal sheltering leaders (and those workers and volunteers that scored their leader) who scored high on a measure of altruism also scored high on measures of organizational learning. This finding supports the initial research and development of the measurement tool (Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra 2007) and subsequent testing by other researchers (Escrig et al. 2016; F. Malien 2008; Mallén et al. 2015) that indicated highly altruistic leaders provided an open and supportive environment for innovation both internally and externally. The second finding discussed in this chapter explored the gender differences on the measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning. After quantitative analysis, female leaders scored significantly higher than males in altruistic leadership and three areas of organizational learning including external, decision-making and experimentation. Further qualitative analysis delved deeper into gender differences first exploring how leaders came to their positions, and next through the three areas of organizational learning. Finding three showed that women referred to the leadership position as a “calling” while males more often mentioned their desire to be successful and leave their mark on the organization. Finding four presented statistical analysis utilizing survey data asking whether the organization took part in externally collaborative ventures. The analysis suggested that female directors took part in collaborative efforts with outside organizations significantly more than male directors. Other themes relating to organizational learning were highlighted from the in-depth interview participants and also explored both gender and high/low altruistic leadership differences.

This chapter concluded with a focus on organizational differences on a measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning. Finding five showed that the mean

score on a measure of altruism significantly differed between types of sheltering organizations. Public shelters had a lower score than private shelters on a measure of altruism. The differences in organizational type were also supported by the qualitative analysis. Finding six showed that shelter directors, male and female, with high scores on a measure of altruism and workers that identified their director has having a high score on a measure of altruism described their organization as being focused on both people and animals, (24/27). Those with low altruism scores described their organization as focused on the animals and identified as having problematic relationships with the people involved (3/4).

As indicated by quantitative and qualitative analysis in this chapter five, it is suggested that the measure of altruistic leadership and organizational learning with its strong connections to an ethic of care was a more useful measure to identify and explore gender differences in animal sheltering leadership and the resulting working environment for workers and volunteers.

CHAPTER SIX

IDENTITY ISSUES AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES COMPARED

The purpose of this mixed methods research utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews is to explore the impact of gender and animal sheltering leadership on organizational policies and workers' and volunteers' attitudes towards reducing companion animal euthanasia in the sheltering organization. This chapter contains the key findings from the 343 survey respondents and 49 in-depth interviews of current and former shelter leaders, workers and volunteers. It explores how gender, identity, and leadership affect sheltering policies, procedures, and outcomes. The research studied both quantitatively and qualitatively how gender, ethic of care, altruistic leadership, and organizational sensemaking shaped animal sheltering organizations, contributing to rate of euthanasia and adoption, and either a healthy or toxic work environment. Research questions addressed in this chapter include: How does gendered leadership impact adoption of evidence-based best practice strategies to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia in animal sheltering organizations?, How does ethical decision-making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?, How does gendered leadership impact sensemaking surrounding issues of companion animal care in the shelter organization?, and How do the narratives created by organizational leaders impact workers and volunteers?

ALTRUISM, GENDER AND EUTHANASIA RATES

In chapter four, my findings suggested that while significant differences between gender scores on the MMO were not found, the qualitative research revealed differences between females and males in philosophy of animal care and euthanasia, as well as importance of animals to oneself. Findings discussed in chapter five showed that a significant difference between genders existed on a measure of altruistic leadership. In this chapter, we explore the impact that both gender and altruism have on euthanasia rates in animal sheltering organizations. Current and former shelter leaders, workers, and volunteers at animal sheltering organizations were asked on the survey instrument to provide rates of euthanasia on dogs and cats at the sheltering organization. As not all sheltering organizations accept felines, I decided to use the rate of euthanasia of canines for purposes of analysis. The variable leader gender was used for gender which was provided by leaders themselves, as well as workers and volunteers about their organizational leader. In finding one, quantitative analysis shows a statistically significant difference between low and high altruism scores and leader gender on rates of euthanasia of dogs in animal sheltering organizations. The altruism measure was provided by leaders on themselves, while workers and volunteers provided the score for their shelter's leader. High altruism and female directors were associated with lower euthanasia rates.

The results of the independent samples t-test and descriptive statistics are reported in table nine below.

Table 9

Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for High/Low Altruism score and Leader Gender by Leader Gender

	Altruism Split & Leader Gender						95% CI for Mean Difference	t	df
	Low			High					
	Male			Female					
	M	SD	n	M	SD	n			
Altruism Split	16.07	17.85	83	8.84	12.13	137	2.84, 11.62	3.26	128.28
Leader Gender	18.07	17.41	64	8.96	12.92	157	-13.88, -4.32	-3.8	92.6

* $p < .05$.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare canine euthanasia rates between low altruism leaders and high altruism leaders. There was a statistically significant difference between Low Altruism ($M = 16.07$, $SD = 17.85$) and High Altruism ($M = 8.84$, $SD = 12.13$) leaders on the rate of euthanasia of dogs $t(128.28) = 3.26$, $p < .05$.

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare canine euthanasia rates between male leaders and female leaders. There was a statistically significant difference between male and female leaders on the rate of euthanasia of dogs, $p < .05$.

Euthanasia and Organizational Sensemaking

As the analysis above showed, statistically significant differences in euthanasia rates were found between low and high levels of altruism in the shelter leader and between male and female leaders. In this section, I examine the philosophy of euthanasia provided by shelter leaders and workers in the in-depth interviews. As volunteers are often not included on organizational decision-making regarding euthanasia, they were not included in this analysis. All of the animal sheltering organizations stated they euthanized companion animals but the reasons for the euthanasia varied widely by organizational type and philosophy of the organization. On one end, some organizations only

euthanized critically ill or severely behaviorally challenged animals. On the opposing end of the spectrum, some organizations euthanized healthy, adoptable animals for considerations of time and space. Furthermore, all of the interviewees (workers and directors) acknowledged that euthanasia was the least favorite part of the job. Each interviewee was asked about their philosophy regarding animal euthanasia and five themes emerged.

It is my responsibility to protect the public from dangerous dogs.

Ten interviewees (Leader Gender-females=9 (24%) males=1 (7%)) mentioned that euthanasia was an important tool to use to protect the public from dangerous dogs. They believed that canines that had behavioral problems and posed a potential risk to people must be humanely euthanized. Grace, director of a rural public shelter with a high altruism score, provided a very clear example of this responsibility.

We have to protect the community, we have to protect children. I've seen too, too many children with mauled and mangled bodies because of what dogs have done to them. I never want to see those things, again. I continue to see them every year, more and more. So, euthanasia is something that has to be done, should be done, and in many cases. But, it needs to be done in the most responsible way possible.

Grace continued, "So those animals that I deem are unfit for the community, that are going to be a problem or a safety risk to the humans in my community, I feel very strongly that it is my responsibility to make sure that that animal does not go back out into the community." A male director at a public/private collaborative shelter with a mid-altruism score, Ned, discussed the problems that dogs who were used in dogfighting rings presented. "There were a lot of fighting dogs. There were a lot of dogs that could've never gone to a new home, that were unsafe to be around people. In that respect, yes, euthanasia is good." Jenna, a female director at a suburban, public shelter with a high

altruism score explained the role that the no-kill equation played in her philosophy regarding euthanasia.

I'm kind of a terrorist about that stuff, I learned really earlier on about no-kill and I believe that you need to protect other animals, you need to protect society. So, the things that you that you euthanize would be animals that are dangerous, are a danger to themselves and animals that are sick, or dying.

A former director at an urban, public shelter expressed how placing a dangerous or vicious dog in a home could damage the organization's reputation and trustworthiness in the public eye. "But for the most part there were 5% perhaps of animals that for one reason or another should not be put back in the community. Giving up on those was hard but necessary, it's a balance. We can't be putting dangerous animals out into the field, or we'll kill a lot more then because we'll lose credibility."

There are worse things out there than a "good death."

Six interviewees (Leader Gender – Female=4 (11%) Male=2 (13%)) said there are many things that could happen to animals that would cause suffering and pain. By providing these animals with a "good death," they could avoid being abused, tortured, abandoned or starved. Gwen, a director with a high altruism score that worked at a private shelter, directly and clearly stated this theme. "So, I would never say that euthanasia is the worst thing that can happen, because it's not. I've seen a lot of animal sufferings that euthanasia is truly the best outcome for them." Another director with a high altruism score, April, provided a second example.

In an ideal world, it wouldn't be an option. We don't live in that world and as long as we are producing animals at the rate with which we're producing them and then neglecting their needs at the rate that we're neglecting them. The end result is that it is a necessary blessing that we have the ability to give peace to animals that are constantly suffering.

April, a public/private shelter director, connected our treatment of dying humans to our treatment of dying animals. “I think giving an animal a gentle death is far superior to a prolonged life of either physical or mental torture. That I think humane euthanasia, which is redundant, is the one place where we are actually kinder to our animals than we are to our human companions.” Finally, a male director at a high volume spay and neuter clinic in an urban environment with a high altruism score, pointed out the cognitive dissonance encountered in this philosophical view of euthanasia. “Then you go back to what Phyllis Wright said back in the 70s and Ingrid Newkirk still says that is I kill them because I’m kind to them. That’s a very strange sensemaking, but it’s how you can live with the cognitive dissonance. I see great things going on here in our county but it is really all about getting to that 90%.”

It’s a very emotional process – as it should be.

The intense emotion work that goes on for personnel involved in euthanizing companion animals was highlighted in this theme. Six directors and workers (Leader Gender – female=6 (15%) talked about the role that emotions play in this required duty of their job. “Yes, it is very emotional to do – we get attached to every animal that comes through the door. Whether they are vicious or not because we try to turn them around and we get attached to them. And we do, we cry while we do it,” explained Hera, a public shelter director. Ned, a director at a public/private collaborative shelter, painfully explained how difficult it was to discuss euthanasia cases with his volunteer staff.

Then turning around and then having to tell the volunteers. It’s like you lose a family member and you’re the one that has to go okay, yeah, where’s this dog. What happened to this dog? Then you have to explain to them well, it had to go down and then they go through the whole cycle of grieving right in front of you and you just feel so helpless so yeah.

Karla, a director at a private shelter, relayed that their organization always notifies all employees before euthanizing an animal. This allows the group to have a more formal grieving practice. “No, we didn’t euthanize animals without people knowing it was going to happen, so they would have a chance to say goodbye to the animal. And, then, you know, we all grieved for the animal. We allowed time to grieve together.” Cara said that euthanasia was an emotional process but that it was a required part of her job and to avoid this because it causes emotional turmoil is selfish. “Yeah, we do this because love the animals so much that we can let them go or we can give them what they need even if it's not what we want. We're in this unselfishly--even if it hurts. I don't know how many times I've cried making a decision I didn't want to do but I knew that it was the best thing for the animal and that's hard.” Finally, Grace expressed her philosophy from which one could hear the emotion in her voice. “I personally think that death is not the worst thing you can do for an animal, and it’s going to a better place. I honestly believe that. I **have to** believe that. And, that’s how we approach it here.”

Euthanasia because the dog shouldn’t have to live such an unhappy life.

This theme highlights quality of life for animals, especially those that have behavioral problems. Dogs that experience severe anxiety, fear, and aggressive tendencies are living a very uncomfortable and unhappy life. These traits may put them at risk for even more abuse. Therefore, euthanasia is a better option for these animals rather than living a life based on fear, anxiety and abuse. Twelve directors and employees (Leader Gender-female=7 (18%) male=5 (33%)) made comments related to this theme in the discussion of philosophy of euthanasia during the in-depth interview. April explained

that those in animal sheltering have the responsibility of looking beyond their personal needs to provide for the animal, which in some cases is euthanasia.

To take an animal who lived in constant fear or constant anxiety and then further isolate them just so that what? I mean to what end is that exactly? So, I don't like euthanasia, but I'm grateful that we have this tool in our toolbox, in order to relieve the suffering that we have imposed upon these animals. I think that we have an obligation to look at it in a different perspective than just our own needs.

Douglas, a director at a public shelter in an urban area, centered his philosophy on euthanasia as a responsibility as well.

Having had many senior hospice animals, obviously if these are happy and healthy animals, I do not want to see them euthanized but I feel like there are animals and in shelters we end up with a self-selected group of maybe animals that are behaviorally a little bit more challenging as well as animals that medically may have some problems that someone ran out of money to work with. If they are beyond the care of the facility and there is nowhere else for them to go, you have to have euthanasia on the table because otherwise you are neglecting that animal and to me, that is not okay

Cara noted that it is a "hard decision and some people will keep a dangerous dog forever because they can't bare to lose it. Whereas I might say, "You know, this is an unhappy dog. This is a dog that is hurting, you know? And this is not a dog that will be happy in its life." And that's a hard thing to do."

Euthanasia causes compassion fatigue and undue stress on myself and fellow workers.

Directors and workers focused on the emotional toll and mental stress that euthanizing companion animals caused animal shelter workers. Nine interviewees (Leader Gender female=5 (13%) male=4 (27%)) talked about these problematic effects they and others experienced due to the experience of euthanizing animals regularly.

Donna, a director at an urban, public shelter with a mid-altruism score, stated, "It creates compassion fatigue and things like that. Those cases definitely where we can't fix it and if it ever gets easy to make a choice for a dog to leave us, then that is when I cease to do

what I do, because that's also a form of PTSD.” Ned, a director at a public/private collaborative shelter in an urban area, described how the routine nature of euthanasia becomes overwhelming. “The animals come in. You still have to adopt them. There's still the euthanasias. They're still ... The below-the-surface stuff that a lot of people don't see, never changes. It's a façade, they say here we are changing things to make it better but it's just . . . We want all the volunteers in bright colors instead of ... Instead of purple, we want them in light pink.” A former employee at a public shelter in a suburban area described how working in a shelter that euthanized healthy, adoptable companion animals for time and space changed her outlook on animals and society. “I experienced complete burnout and disillusionment with the way we look at and treat animals in our culture. I just couldn't face another day where I had to euthanize another dog or cat.”

It's the fault of the public.

Five interviewees (Leader Gender-Female =4 (11%) male=1 (7%)) discussed the role that owners of companion animals play in the euthanasia of healthy, adoptable animals. Directors and workers claimed that people don't care or take responsibility for companion animals and then turn them into animal sheltering organizations without care or concern for the animal. Donna provided a very clear narrative of this theme in her interview.

In an ideal world, it wouldn't be an option. We don't live in that world and as long as we are producing animals at the rate with which we're producing them and then neglecting their needs at the rate that we're neglecting them. The end result is that it is a necessary blessing that we have the ability to give peace to animals that are constantly suffering.

Vicky, a former employee at a public shelter, explained that she was fired for making a comment to the owner of a healthy, four-year-old dog who was turning him into the shelter because “he couldn't keep him any longer.” “I was fired after a customer

overheard me (trying to make it okay to myself) say, 'At least he's old' about a four-year-old happy, friendly, neutered Great Dane. We were out of space, and all dogs that had any type of vice at all had already been euthanized, it was pretty much down to 'enie-meanie-minie-moe' at that point.” A director at an urban, private shelter described how owners refused to take the time to train the animals appropriately so that the dog or cat wouldn't cause problems living in the home. “On a big level, it's the clients just not doing the work and me seeing that the dog responds really well. If they would only do the work, we could stop the cycle of suffering, but for whatever mere reasons why they can't, but that's probably some of the worst.”

Inter- and Extra-Organizational Conflict and Euthanasia

The six sensemaking themes on euthanasia identified in the in-depth interviews and the quotes used for each theme highlight the emotional distress that the many of the leaders and workers experienced. Given this distress, almost all of the leaders, workers, and volunteers also mentioned that conflict within the organization and between other organizations caused the most problems for the sheltering industry as a whole. In this qualitative analysis, volunteers were included as many of the volunteers identified that their decision to volunteer at the organization was premised on low or no euthanasia rates. Finding two in this chapter focuses on this problematic interaction. Conflicts regarding ideological positions on euthanasia between organizations and within organizations were most often said by sheltering leaders, workers, and volunteers.

Almost all leaders, workers, and volunteers interviewed mentioned the ideological divide between and amongst the shelter community as a whole. No-kill philosophy, originated by author Nathan Winograd, was mentioned 253 times throughout the entirety

of the interviews, both in support of or against the philosophy. In fact, many of the interviewees identified the philosophical differences in organizational euthanasia policy was the most divisive issue in the animal sheltering world.

Speaking directly to the issue of No-Kill philosophy and divisiveness, the former director of a large, private shelter in an urban area, Bob, stated, “So, the animal groups are forever breaking apart and dissipating their energies, fighting each other. I mean I’ve lived with the whole Nathan versus the humane society thing and it was ridiculous.” Bob continued saying, “I am a firm believer in Nathan Winograd. I think that the 11 steps that he has outlined work. I’ve seen them work. I know that some people in animal welfare get really upset when I say things like that.” Marcia, the volunteer leader for her all volunteer rescue organization, narrated the history of the start of her organization that followed the tenets of the no-kill equation. They foster, adopt and transport homeless companion animals from the local public shelter, as well as offer pet food to poor families and free spay and neuter and vaccine service.

Our daughter died in 2005 and we had two cats that she had given them to us. In 2012 the last cat died and we had moved to NC after he died unexpectedly. He had an aneurysm and I was kind of distraught, it was my last connection to Anna. I called my friend and asked where the animal shelter was. She said “you don’t want to go there” and I was like yes I want to get another cat, a rescue. We don’t have an animal shelter, we have an animal control facility. I drove over there on Thursday and they were closed because its “kill day.” All there was were garbage bags filled with dead animals getting ready to go to the city dump, which is next door to the animal control facility. I just burst out in tears and said this is not acceptable.

This one event triggered Marcia to apply for grants to improve the public facility and begin the process of convincing the male animal control officer to begin to implement the no-kill philosophy.

April, a former director at a public/private collaborative sheltering organization, felt just as strongly on the opposing side.

Well, Nathan Winograd hates me. But I think the position that gee, if shelters worked harder, if shelters try, there are really are enough homes for all of those dogs if shelters just tried harder. Shelters don't care, they are just not trying hard enough. It's not true. There aren't enough homes for all of them. The proliferation of hoarders, the proliferation of rescue groups, of hoarders masquerading as rescue groups to the rise of No-Kill Movement to me is just appalling. The whole idea that the No-Kill Movement has reduced the euthanasia numbers, those numbers were well on their way to reducing with this spay/neuter push, with the humane education push that was going on long before the No-Kill Movement took hold. The other thing that I think is deceptive about no kill is the general public doesn't understand that no-kill doesn't mean the shelter doesn't euthanize animals, a shelter can use a self no-kill and still euthanize animals and the public doesn't understand that at all.

Donna held the position of director at a private urban shelter and provided an example of what she described as the unintended consequences of the no-kill philosophy.

There was also another smaller rescue. Eventually they were found out as basically they were just overloaded. The animals were being abused and the animals were being neglected. This is the unintended consequence of No-Kill where we have this notion of never being able to euthanize and then not being qualified to recognize the parameters that are allowable within No-Kill, mental illness, physical illness.

Furthermore, she implied that No-Kill had adversely impacted the sheltering industry. "I think that the greater No-Kill Movement needs to step up their responsibility, because No-Kill is beautiful and it's a grandiose idea, but the implementation has had some very serious unintended consequences. That particular movement had been pretty unwilling to take that seriously and that's unfortunate."

Even within the organization, board members, directors, workers and volunteers often disagreed about euthanasia policy. April, a former shelter director herself and married to a former shelter worker, explained the results of one such disagreement. "My husband used to be the executive director of the shelter here. When his board let him go

because he wouldn't do the No-Kill game, they hired a guy who promised to be no-kill."

These disagreements are stressful and cause strife between organization members.

Donna explained how trying to increase adoptions and move animals out to fosters wears on her over time. "It's different. I've got too big a fight - just too big a fight from the director to the magistrate. Every move, every day, is a battle with one of them. Especially the director." Barbara, a shelter manager explained how disagreements between members of a management team impact the group. "I mean we do euthanize at the shelter where I work at, and it's the situation which not everybody is on the same page. There are differing opinions, and on both sides some not wanting it. It's just hard. We work really well together as a management team, as a group of people, but we're not always all on the same page and that's really tough to not agree on those things." Ned, a former director at a shelter reflected on his experience dealing with the pressure to alter or change the organizational euthanasia policy.

When we were low, we had so many dogs. When we were high, we had fewer dogs that got better care. I don't know. They kept changing, though, between you have to euthanize this much. We're not going to euthanize at all. Now we're going to euthanize maybe a little bit and then we want your committee. Then the shelter manager just chose. There was no ...Yeah, because we kept changing. We kept being in flux. Even though we were interim directors, the board was no, we need to be no kill. You need to not euthanize, and it was just like . . . We had such a weird . . . I was in a very weird situation in the humane society for those years.

Volunteers are impacted by the disagreements regarding euthanasia policies and often made their decision on where to spend the time spent volunteering based on the organizational euthanasia policy. Ned, a former director at a private/public sheltering organization spoke poignantly about emotional attachments of volunteers to animals that were euthanized. "The hardest part is when you couldn't save a dog. I had double duty. It's like when . . . When a dog has been there for a really, long time, the volunteers

become so attached to them, they just love these animals and the staff . . . The volunteers would you know we say have to save this dog, we have to put the dog down.” Ned felt it was his job to “protect” the volunteers from the stressful work at the shelter. “It's their off time. They don't want me . . . You need to do this or you need to do that. That's not what they're there for. They're there to get the good feels about what they're doing, to know they're making a difference and then not get a lot of someone breathing down their throat and barking orders at them. Then they want to smile when they walk out.” A volunteer at a public shelter, Davina, explained the process for euthanasia at the shelter for which she volunteers.

I think there are a couple of volunteers in certain positions that are told, so that if it's a healthy animal, we have an option of trying to figure something out. We have been able to argue in a couple of cases to give us more time, and we've actually had ... The actual staff has actually changed their mind at the last minute about animals, but ultimately, they are under no obligation to tell them. When we want to know, what we usually do is we usually ask a board member, and they can politely ask the superintendent, and she'll give them an honest answer. I think most people when it happens would prefer that we just assume the animal's been adopted. Most of us when it happens, we know. Like I said, we're a very small shelter, and that's a good thing and a bad thing. It's good because we know all the animals. It's a bad thing because when an animal is not there, it's glaringly obvious.

Another volunteer explained the secrecy of the process as being cloaked from the volunteers.

They have to deal with the necessity of it, though. At our shelter, not only do the volunteers have absolutely nothing to do with that side of things, but we're not even supposed to talk to the staff at all at the shelter about it. If we have conversations, we talk about it amongst ourselves, because the people who have to perform make the decisions. They love the animals. They don't want to have to do it. I think their philosophy's the same. I think we just get to live in a little bit more of an idealized role behind it.

Francis, volunteer at a private shelter, reflected on the reason why she preferred working at a shelter that does not euthanize for time and space. “I prefer no kill. I think one of my

biggest things was . . . especially when I was so much work in the kittens, I didn't want to have them when they're old enough for adoption, take it to the shelter only to find out later that they were euthanized and they can't be adopted. That just really deflects the whole purpose of what I was doing.” Finally, a director of a private shelter explained that volunteers chose to work at her shelter because of their no-kill status. “They know when they come in that we don’t euthanize. A lot of time when they come for positions or to volunteer that is why they come here because we don’t euthanize. Yes, they say I couldn’t deal with Humane Society or Animal Services, I couldn’t handle it.”

While both male and female leaders, workers and volunteers judged the conflict over euthanasia as problematic, only females identified the second most often mentioned conflict in the sheltering industry. Finding three focuses on conflicts about methodology of animal training. The second most often conflict mentioned by only female leaders, workers, and volunteers during the in-depth interviews was that of dominance training theory versus positive training theory. No males mentioned this conflict over training methodology.

The second most often mentioned conflict was that of the dominance theory versus positive training methods. As Donna, a director at a private shelter, argued, the results of unresolved conflicts in the sheltering community come with a high price. “They’re allowing the industry to fight it out, whether it’s No-Kill, dominance theory, all of these and not harmed, because we’re killing millions of animals for no reason as a result of us not being able to just get it together.” This conflict breaks down on several different borders. First, the most well-known proponents of dominance theory have been male. For example, Caesar Milan and the Monks of New Skete Monastery are

dominance style trainers. The conflict is bordered by gender. Second, as we have seen the rise of animal behaviorism as a field, we have seen scientific research supporting the positive reinforcement theory of dog training. So the second border is on the science of behaviorism. It is no surprise that the majority of veterinary behaviorists are female, as the field of veterinary science has seen a dramatic increase of women in the field (Smith 2002; Irvine and Vermilya 2010). These boundary infractions are clearly seen in narratives of the female leaders, workers, and volunteers interviewed.

A public shelter employee, Cara, explained how she has seen the progression of change from dominance theory to positive training. “That education level, it's just been really, really interesting to see because I've almost been in it for like a decade and to see that transition, I mean not everybody, but overall that expectation of how to get this dog to positive . . . we had people that in the beginning for house training would do like the rub their nose in it thing. And then we'd be like, "No, you can't do that." Now people are like, "What? People actually did that?" Another shelter worker explained that history of the conflict. “At that time it was almost all what we now call dominance theory, pack theory. There was very little science-based information at this point in time, you know, the late ‘80s, early ‘90s.” Grace explained how she had changed her training methods over time. “Years ago when I first went into dog training there was really only one kind of thing. And that’s what I did. You walk the dog around with a choke-chain and give it corrections when it doesn’t do something you want it to do.” Grace continued:

So, over the years I read every single book you could possibly imagine on animal behavior and over the years things started to change. You know, people started to look at behavior differently and training differently. So, I changed with the times as far as my methods of training, realizing well it’s not always the best thing to be dragging a dog around by a choke chain and correcting it every time it does something. So, I started doing more positive reinforcement training

The director of a public/private collaborative shelter, April, explained her position on the problematic use of dominance-based training methods connecting it to using violence to teach children. “I think that we now have enough information to stop utilizing fear and violence as a method of engaging our animals. We’ve shown it very clearly in human children and other mammals are not unlike us.”

Jenna, a director at a public/private collaborative shelter highlighted that positive methods using clicker training was supported by research. “I believe in clicker training, and not just a belief. There’s science behind it. I believe in science, let’s put it that way. And, there’s a lot of misinformation out there about training animals out there that we try to counter, with some new information based on science.” Jenna explained that her shelter supported this positive method and had paid to send her to Karen Pryor’s Clicker training seminar and that people who didn’t want to change methods were removed from the organization. “We had an old tiny vet, a man, who didn’t believe in clicker training, and just believed in getting the procedure done as fast possible, no matter what the effect on the animal. Just grab them, whatever, and this did not support what we were trying to do.” Finally, Donna described the impact that the conflict over utilizing either positive or dominance-based training methods had on the sheltering industry. “So, one of the biggest struggles is getting through the cognitive dissonance and the attachment to belief systems. We see it in social media where it’s ripping apart this entire industry, where people are spending more time in social media, arguing than teaching dogs or learning. That’s definitely a huge obstacle.”

Grace, a shelter director, reflected on both divisions in the animal sheltering industry as a whole, concluding that a lack of education overall plays into the deep divisions in guiding principles for sheltering organizations.

But because we don't have any level of education that's required to do any of this, we have a vast array of different approaches, different belief systems, different applications. I think that the lack of evidence-based education, the lack of standardization and the No-Kill nation, unintended consequences of adopting out dangerous and marginal animals is the problem. I think that we have a very serious problem in our sheltering system in this country, probably worldwide but I can only speak from experience here.

GENDER, ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE, AND SHELTER PROGRAMMING ON EUTHANASIA RATES

While previous analysis in this research explored gender, ethic of care, altruistic leadership and organizational type, the analysis here includes the various types of programming at shelters. The survey asked respondents whether their shelter offered adoption, fostering, transportation, low-cost spay and neuter, trap and release, humane education and volunteers. While survey respondents provided euthanasia rates broken down by canine and feline, this research utilized the canine euthanasia rate. Several organizations reported that they did not taken in felines. Additionally, due to the implementation of trap and release programs for felines, cats are not kept at some shelters. They are brought into the shelter, given spay or neuters, then finally released back into the area that they were picked up. Many organizations such as Alley Cat Advocates work to maintain these community cats by feeding and providing veterinary care. After a multiple regression quantitative analysis, finding three shows that female leaders, private organizations, and employing three or more programs including fostering, low cost spay and neuter, and humane education significantly reduced euthanasia rates of canines.

A multiple regression was run to predict euthanasia rates of canines from leader gender, altruism, orgpubpri (whether an organization was public or private), collaboration (whether the organization collaborated with outside organizations), adoption, fostering, transport, low cost spay/neuter, humane education, volunteers. Leader Gender was measured using 1 for female and 2 for male. Altruism was the total for the measure of altruism from a series of four questions about the altruistic leadership of the organizational leader provided by either the leader themselves or by the workers and volunteers of the organization Orgpubpri was measured using 1 for public organization or 2 for private organization. Collaboration was measured with 1 for yes or 0 for no. The programs offered by the organization were measured as 0 for no and 1 for yes

There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 1.98. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values.

There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. There were no studentized deleted residuals greater than ± 3 standard deviations, no leverage values greater than 0.2, and values for Cook's distance above 1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by Q-Q Plot. R^2 for the overall model was 37% with an adjusted R^2 of 32%, a middle size effect according to Cohen (1988).

Leader gender, altruism, orgpubpri, collaboration, adoption, fostering, transport, low cost spay/neuter, humane education, and volunteers statistically significantly predicted euthanasia percentage of dogs $F(10, 206) = 8.04, p < .005$. Only Leader Gender, Altruism, Orgpubpri, adoption, fostering, and transport, low cost spay and neuter

were significant predictors of euthanasia, $p < .05$. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 10 (below).

Table 10 Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	Mean	B	SE _B	B	Sig
Constant		21.91	7.52		.01
Leader Gender	1.28	6.72	2.04	.22	.01
Altruism	12.56	-.91	.27	-.22	.01
Orgpubpri	1.72	-6.51	1.98	-.21	.01
Collaboration	.62	1.12	1.88	.04	.55
Adoption	.97	-5.90	5.15	-.03	.69
Fostering	.87	-5.60	2.91	-.13	.05
Transporting	.45	-5.83	1.73	-.21	.01
Low cost spay	.65	3.35	1.99	.12	.08
Humane Education	.63	-2.52	1.99	-.09	.21
Volunteers	.91	2.39	3.17	.75	.45

Participants predicted the euthanasia rate is equal to $21.91 + 6.72 (\text{Leader Gender}) - .91 (\text{Altruism}) - 6.51 (\text{OrgPubPri}) - 5.60 (\text{Fostering}) - 5.83 (\text{Transportation})$. Moving from female to male adds 6.72 points to the euthanasia rates of canines. A private sheltering organization designation reduces euthanasia rate by 6.51. Offering a fostering program reduced euthanasia rates by 5.60, while offering a transportation program reduced the rate by 5.83.

Organizational Change – Reducing Euthanasia

Given the significance of programming like fostering, low-cost spay and neuter and humane education which often requires collaboration with organizations outside of the sheltering organization, and healthy and happy relationships with co-workers to the reduction of euthanasia rates, it is necessary to examine successful efforts to implement this type of change. During the in-depth interviews, participants were asked whether they had experienced or led organizational change recently in their organization. Ten of the

leaders interviewed had personally experienced the process of organizational change specifically geared towards reducing euthanasia rates in the sheltering organization. Four female leaders and three male leaders provided detailed narratives of the progression of change within their organization. Other directors, workers, and volunteers spoke to the process of organizational change on a smaller level. One of the female directors and two of the male directors discussed how change had failed in their organization or organizations with which they had a close relationship. After reading both the positive and negative detailed narratives which were also supported by similar smaller narratives provided by many of the other leaders, workers and volunteers, two themes became clear. The first theme described how toxic organizations made organizational change problematic and the second theme described positive change as a perfect storm. As two leaders of organizations provided clear and detailed narratives, one of difficult change and one of positive change, they are being treated as a comparative case study. In each thematic section, quotations from leaders, workers and volunteers are presented prior to the in-depth narrative to triangulate support for the case study. This section addressed the research question How do the narratives created by organizational leaders impact workers and volunteers?

Toxic organizations make change difficult.

A former director at a private shelter, Bob, explained that despite the desire to reduce euthanasia, it takes more than just a desire to do so. “I don’t think anybody goes to work at the animal shelter, because they want to kill the animals and there is tremendous compassion fatigue that sets in the shelter that is killing several thousand animals a year. So, to some extent it gets welcomed but there are also shelters that are

unionized where the shelter director has a very difficult time changing the organization.” Jenna, a current director at a public shelter, identified board make up as a barrier to organizational change. “Yeah I mean in the local areas I know that all the boards are still and the big groups are still overwhelmingly old men with lots of money and a lot of them, and then you can tell by which groups those are because those are the ones that are very slow to embrace change, and to embrace life enhancing activity. They tend to stick with the old stuff.” April, a former director of a public/private collaborative sheltering organization, identified lack of guidance from an over-arching sheltering organization. “I think a large part of the problem is that our larger entities within our industry refuse to step up and speak out. The ASPCA, PETA, all of these different huge HSUS organizations that do influence opinion, aren’t stepping up and backing the science.” Another former shelter director at a public/private shelter, Laura, agreed with April and stated succinctly “Animal sheltering is nuts when there's no government oversight.”

Other directors, workers, and volunteers spoke to the role that leadership, both directors and boards of directors, played in preventing change and creating a toxic environment for both employees and the animals sheltered within the organization. Marcia, the leader of a volunteer organization that pulls animals from their county’s animal control office, described the difficulties groups like hers have had over the past few years trying to get a new animal shelter built.

We have had two or three groups that have tried to build shelters here they even raised \$100,000 once but because they had an election that had new county commissioners who decided that bullets are cheap we don’t need a shelter and they struck it from the agenda and everything else. Because of that and we didn’t break ground in a certain period of time \$50,000 of that had to be returned to Maddy’s Fund had given to us that to build.

Veronica, a former employee at a public shelter, explained the impact that an uncaring and unsupportive administration had on workers at the organization. “I was burned out. The administration didn’t care about us or about the animals. I saw so much abuse while I worked there and so much killing. I now have PTSD from all the euthanasia.” A director, Grace, spoke about her experience working in the male-dominated animal control world.

When I started moving up out of volunteering and then into a job there, again, nobody took me seriously because I was a woman. Very few of them had respect for me and my position, and what I wanted to do. And, you would not believe, I could tell you stories. You’d not believe the stories. You’ve probably heard a lot about it, but it was bad. So much sexual harassment.

A narrative of a toxic shelter

Ned, a former assistant director at a private sheltering organization, now works as a radiographer after a career change forced by his “toxic” organization. He loves his companion animals, three, stating “My dogs are like ... We don't have any children right now so they're like our kids.” He even explained how he and his wife gave up their honeymoon in order to pay for medical care for their beagle pup. Despite his love for animals and desire to make a difference in their lives, he stated “This is ... I guess it says a lot, the fact that I'm in a different field now because I truly couldn't ... I couldn't do it anymore.” The private organization had contracted with the local government to provide shelter for the animals that animal control picked up. He explained that “***** Humane Society served as both animal control and the humane society so they did both. There was no separate facilities. They were bunched in the one.” He felt that this arrangement provided a mixed message for the community.

We couldn't turn away for surrenders and then people were also ... They would come in, they would want to leave their dogs there. We're humane society. They think they'd be protected. We had a high a number of dogs. We usually ran right

at our limit. Throughout the year, we were just at about the number. There were days when we would have to euthanize to get under the number just because it couldn't physically hold that many animals in the facility anymore.

Ned poignantly described how important the relationship was with his coworkers to help mediate the weight of the emotional stress of working in an organization that euthanizes healthy, adoptable companion animals.

Despite being in a situation we were in, one of my fellow managers, were an amazing group of people that came together. They loved what they do. The same thing with the volunteers. To hear all the different stories and all the different stories with the animals and all the experiences and this is what happened here. There's scales. That's how I always thought of it when I was there. At least in your heart. You hear these stories. These awful things happened and you have to ... You weigh that on the scale of your heart. Then they double as a positive to undo the bad that happened at the humane society

Ned continued to explain how co-workers helped him through his time at the sheltering organization. “For lack of a better word, it was an AA group. You have to share. Everyone has to carry that burden amongst themselves so you can get through to the next day because it is a very emotionally draining job. You know what I mean?” Ned felt that the most important part of his job was “getting the animals out – either by adoption or fostering or anything I could” because the organization had very high rates of euthanasia. He also explained that in his position of volunteer coordinator it was his job to protect the volunteers from dealing with the loss of the animals from euthanasia. “It was my job to be a buffer between the volunteers and the administration. They don't want to go home depressed, they want to feel good about what they did.” When asked about how the administration shared the organizational mission with employees, he gave a brief laugh and then related that “Yeah, no staff meetings. It was just this is when we open. Yeah, the cages have to be cleaned. We have to get volunteers in there to get them

locked and then carry it through and just get people in and out of the door until we close.”

Ned also related an event where euthanasia was used as a “weapon.”

There were periods in my time of employment there that euthanasia was used sometimes as a weapon for owners who didn't want their dog anymore or couldn't care for their dog anymore. We had one incident where the executive director had told the person if you surrender this dog, we're going to euthanize it. He says I can't. I have nobody to take this dog. and he said We'll go around the back and he drew up the blue juice and was at the back door and had syringe there while he surrenders his dog.”

Furthermore, he discussed how the high turnover leadership caused intense turmoil as the organization made rapid cycles of changes to euthanasia policy.

At first, they would euthanize with no rhyme or reason. It was more the executive director said Ned, walk through twice a week and they would just pick. They would not hold the dog or even look at them and they would euthanize the dog. We went from very high euthanasia to very low ... I don't want to say low, but we were running at full capacity and trying to adopt animals. Well, we had this full house of dogs. It'd be awful because we didn't have the staff to give them the services they needed. We're no kill now and it's like well, we're under the 25 or 35 percent, to be considered no kill. That was just ... We were euthanizing as many dogs. They were just ... It was just how the paperwork was done. The public sees it as you euthanize, do you not euthanize and having to respond to ... Being in the volunteer position, being in with the public so much ... Yeah, because we kept changing. We kept being in flux. We had such a weird ... I was in a very weird situation at the humane society for those years.

When asked whether he felt supported by the community during his work at the sheltering organization, he answered “yes and no.” Because his organization was associated with both a private sheltering organization and a public animal control organization, the community responded in a mixed way. “You had to wear a lot of hats at that humane society. I'd be at the front desk. Somebody'd come in. Why did you steal my dog? They would look at us as a villain at the same time as looking at us with ... Some people'd look at us as a helping force. That meshing of humane society and animal control was awful.” When asked about the support from his family, he responded that they did support him but the work itself was detrimental to his family life. “We were

salaried for \$10 an hour but we were working 60 hour weeks.” He continued saying “It was awful. They called us in. We didn't have a lot of staff. They didn't want to pay everyone so that's why put us on salary so we never got overtime.” He also explained to make matters worse, the organization required all salaried employees to volunteer time for which they could call them in at any time. “It was hard because we all wanted to do a good job and we wanted to save lives, but at the same time, it puts a strain on your personal life when you're working 60 hours a week and you're only bringing home ... But yes, the family did support me. It was very difficult, though. It definitely put a strain on my relationship.”

Overall, Ned felt that the “change” in his organization was not for the good of the animals but rather for the good of the donations. “It's a donation grab. All I saw was the grind of animals coming in, all the abuse, all of the surrenders, people not caring about their animals. Under that, it doesn't ... Nothing changes.” He detailed further that the community surrounding the shelter was a relatively poor community and yet many members of the surrounding community would donate to the shelter. “There was a lot of money that was coming into the shelter, but because it was so poorly run, it would hemorrhage money. Well, we need this or we need to get ... A lot of the animal care was neglected because of mismanagement of the money. Let's dump all of our money into this special event and then the volunteers would have to bring in ... I'd ask them hey, can you bring in food, food for the dogs.” Ned ended the interview with a final summation. “Yeah, I would never give my money to a humane society and it sounds awful having worked at them because I know that a portion of that does go ... It does go to helping the animals, but it never gets there because it goes into other stuff, wasted stuff.”

Organizational change comes as a perfect storm.

As Bob, a former public shelter director, stated, “Yeah I mean we hear the story of a guy walking in and saying okay the killing stops today. But I don’t know that that is possible in a shelter with a throughput of 12,000 animals.” Interviewees discussed how changes happened in their successful low – or no-kill shelters across the country but as Bob intimated, more goes into change than simply stating that now we are no-kill or low-kill. Ned’s story indicated the many problems that come along with making organizational change. But several directors and workers served in organizations that have successfully instituted change that significantly reduced euthanasia rates and increased live release rates of companion animals.

Bob, a former public shelter director, has worked to instigate change at several organizations. He suggested a number of ways to reduce the need for euthanasia in animal sheltering organizations.

So, you certainly say every killing is signed off on by me and here is the form, and then you start working it that way, but you’ve got to develop a whole range of alternatives including community outreach, energizing the fostering community and preaching to the community and just developing a better fostering program, the rescue community I’m in, developing an internal fostering program.

There are all bunch of things that need to be done to take the pressure off, to increase the speed of the throughput at the shelter so that you don’t run into capacity problems.

Barbara, a current director at a private shelter, said that an experienced change agent needed to lead the organization. “Change is never easy, although I had as I said the privilege working for a leader who was very well-versed in change management and leads the team really well.” Barbara added that the experienced leader must include all the employees in the process of planning for the change and all details must be addressed ahead of time. “Yeah, everybody was involved kind of from the get go. They might not

have been involved as directly in the kind of big picture decisions, but as it came down to how we were actually going to implement the decisions, we definitely involved as many team members as possible and that's where I am. So that's really important to ensure everybody kind of understands the process and buys into it." Warren, a director at a public sheltering organization, reflected on how important gaining support from the staff for the change was.

Especially the people who worked here many, many years, sometimes, for instance, our ACOs have been here 20 years. Many of them are not as open to change, but because I've known them and they've known me for ten years, it's a lot easier for them to accept change than when we've had our previous director come in. She's an amazing person, wanted to do a lot of the same things, but by virtue of we don't know you, we don't trust you, we're going to be resistant and we're going to make change hard. I'm implementing her ideas, and it's a lot easier to have them be implemented just because they are familiar with me.

Douglas, a public shelter director, claimed that being open and honest with the community garnered support from outside forces.

Transparency I think is one of the big ones so if people call to check on an animal that they brought here, regardless of the outcome, obviously if we send it to rescue or something or it was adopted, we can't release who got it or if we euthanized it, at least owning that decision and I feel like when you are not transparent and you are not open and honest, you are really cutting off your nose in spite of your face. You might not have one bad interaction but people know. When you are not upfront, they are suspicious and when they are suspicious, they are left to make up their own answers.

Barbara added that programming shifts within the organization can work to increase live release rates. She explained how changing the admission policy at their public shelter altered the live release rate. "So, if we can help the animals stay in that home by providing training and educational services, we're going to do that, instead of just taking them in those shelters and potentially making the decision a couple of days later. So, that was a really huge shift for us as an organization, but I think it was successful, just for records, our place prior to THAT was at 31% and now we're at a 74% to date."

The perfect storm – a successful change narrative

Lisa explained that she started volunteering for the local private humane society in the early 1980s and has worked almost all the jobs at the shelter. She is currently on her 18th year serving on the board of directors for the organization. “It's been a long time. I've been active in almost all the committees that we have. I'm active in fundraising, particularly. I do bylaws, personnel, just about everything. It's been all over the place and I foster dogs usually.” When asked why she started volunteering at the shelter, Lisa expressed her deep love for animals. “Just a love for animals. We've always had them. I lived out in the country so it wasn't like I had a lot of neighbors or anything to play with. There was really nobody my age so animals were my friends. Also, growing up, I saw a lot of neglect and abuse of animals and I was too little to do anything about it at the time. Plus, it was just something that kind of always haunted me. I guess it was just a way to try to give back to them.” She described her relationship with her current companion animals as like family. “They're my kids. They are just kind of spoiled rotten. Everything kind of revolves around them. I take in foster animals but I never take in one unless it works with the others. When we do get another animal in the others have to approve of it first. I've got one right now. He's going to be sixteen now in November. He's been a shadow like I've never had a shadow dog in my whole life. I can't go anywhere and he's right behind me or looking for me and it's kind of breaking my heart now because his vision is going. You have to scream at him for him to hear.”

When asked about her organization, Lisa explained that they have gone through major changes over the last decade.

I guess it's not as recently. In about 2008, we started making the transition to being a no-kill shelter. That's something we've been very, very successful about

and even recognized on a national and statewide basis with what we've accomplished there and the programs we've instituted and so on. It's very important for me to continue that, but never at the cost of an animal, like keeping it because it's super ill. Some places will never, ever put them down no matter how sick they are. We won't warehouse them.

When asked what prompted the change to no-kill, Lisa described it as “a perfect storm” with many things coming together at the same time. One of the things that Lisa felt was important to understand was the shelter’s history of financial instability. Lisa described the event in an emotion-filled “In fact, in the mid-90s we actually had to close the shelter because we ran out of money. I was around at that time and I will never, ever, ever forget that they put down all the animals in the shelter except for one stray that was still being held on impound. That was the most God-awful thing you'd ever have to live through.”

The executive director and the board members also contributed to resistance to change prior to this time. She described the director as “rigid” and that many of the board members completely supported the executive director.

I mean, at that time, our ED was very rigid and didn't want to bend with anything. When anything happened, like let's say an animal got returned because it was adopted out around Christmas and something would be instituted that no animal gets adopted around Christmas. No animal gets adopted to a college student. There was so many rules and people, when they came in, it ended up they were being interrogated, and having a discussion on, "Oh, gosh. You live in an apartment and you're looking at this Border Collie that needs a whole lot of exercise." Just doing in more in a discussion, like, how is that going to affect your life? He's going to need a lot of exercise and stimulation and everything. Instead it would have been, "Nope. You live in an apartment.

Lisa felt that the board members were “very, very loyal to our ED, who did not want change” and the staff followed the lead of the executive director and were “really very rude to volunteers and clients.” The organization was so resistant to change at that time that when an outside person pushed to have the shelter make significant changes

regarding to euthanasia policy, the board, director and employees immediately circled their wagons. Lisa narrated the event.

We had someone in the community who came before the Board and was advocating a no-kill shelter. We never thought way back then that we could be no-kill because basically we had been brought up with all the old ideology and everything that you used to hear like from HSUS and stuff, that there are too many animals. You can't find home for all of them. That's all we had ever heard. For many, many years, and you didn't have the internet, you didn't have anything like that to fall back on. We're kind of isolated out here so there's nobody close that maybe has been no-kill or close to no-kill or had ever implemented any of the . . . like the no-kill equation.

When you've got all these big organizations telling you that this is the way you . . . This is the best way to do things to be the most successful in saving the animals, that's what you believe. She must have read Redemption because a lot of the things that she was doing now were actually parts of the no-kill equation. She never gave him credit for it or anything. The way she went about everything was so devious and underhanded that it kind of turned everybody against her. It was like nobody even wanted to listen to her because she kind of ... I don't know if she thought was sort of PETA or what, but she sort of came to the shelter to volunteer and then she's documenting everything and then comes. First, she does this big media thing and the news media about everything that we're doing wrong and blah, blah, blah. Then she comes to a Board meeting with all these supporters and stuff. Instead of saying, okay, these are some of the things. Have you thought about maybe implementing them? It was a very frontal attack kind of thing. I think at that time, her doing it the way she did just put everybody's feet in cement and nobody even wanted to listen to her because for one thing, nobody trusted her. Everything she was saying was under false pretenses, that's one of the worst ways to go about it. I think had she done that whole thing differently, more people would have been open to listen to her.

The way she did it, it was like, I don't know, just very accusatory. She was right on a lot of it, but the way she did it, it was just ..

After the near shut down of the shelter and the release of the previous director, the board members and staff brainstormed together, Lisa explained. Also during this time, the staff had recently attended an in-service program that highlighted matching adopters to shelter pets and several board members were reading the book 'Redemption' (Nathan Winograd) which lays out the steps to become a no-kill shelter.

Following the financial shut down of the shelter, the board of directors membership changed and this time the board was able to let the current director go.

This time, we just happened to have a Board that when she turned in her resignation they just said, "Thank you very much. We hate to see you go, but thanks." Then, we hired a manager after that who was almost too far the other end of the spectrum. We ended up in good place. We kind of needed to swing far in the other direction because that mended so much with our community who really didn't like us very much.

At this same time, the entire board of directors shared the book "Redemption" and decided that it was worthwhile to take a chance and implement the suggested changes. "We thought, "Well, what have we got to lose?" We took one of those at a time and just plugged away at it. The things that ... We dropped some money at the time and we thought, "Okay, if we lower adoption fees, that's going to decrease our income. Are we going to end up closing because we're doing," Lisa then described the resulting change as very positive for their organization.

As it ended up, a lot of the things that we did ... We were charging less for it, but people were coming back, animals were moving faster. They weren't as crowded. They weren't getting as sick so we were saving money at that end. People were liking us so they started donating more. We started implementing all kinds of programs. At the time, we couldn't afford to do feline leukemia testing. We just set up a separate fund that people could earmark their donations for that. Before too long it just turned into a regular line item in our budget, and a lot of things like that. It turned everything around which made us very financial sound. We've been in really good shape ever since then.

Despite the fact that Lisa described the idea of change as "scary," the organization benefited from the changes. The only thing that Lisa regretted was that they missed out on the earlier opportunity to begin changes and provided this suggestion for outside organizations trying to implement change in their local shelter.

That was one of the first things I told them. Don't just go in there and attack. Go in and talk to people first. Talk to the ED. Talk to Board members. Be up front about what you're thinking, how you think they should change. Yeah, you've got

to ... If they continue to be resistant, but don't blindsides. See if it can work the nice way before you start getting hard-nosed about anything.

Otherwise, what you've done then is you've drawn a line in the sand and it's us or them. It wasn't even about the animals even more at that point. It's about egos. It's about just being right or wrong. People just start trying to justify their side of things. It's really sad because I think probably, at least five years earlier, we might have started change

Lisa's story of institutional change was very similar to others who took part in the in-depth interview process. Common among them was several failed attempts, employee turnover and some level of shock to the organization. As Lisa described it, "a perfect storm" scenario. Key among these are some type of a leader that is supportive of change and brings the rest of the organization's workers and volunteers into the process.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter examined how issues of identity, leadership, programming, and organizational type impacted euthanasia rates within the organization. The first section of chapter six presented statistical analysis that found leaders with high altruism scores had a lower organizational euthanasia rate than leaders with low altruism scores. Furthermore, female leaders had a lower organizational euthanasia rate than male leaders in this research. The qualitative analysis that followed in the next section examined the in-depth interviews of shelter leaders' answers explaining their philosophy of euthanasia and attitude toward euthanasia. Five sensemaking themes were presented and gender and altruism scores evaluated. One of the five themes was discussed only by female leaders and focused on the difficult emotions that a leader experienced when euthanizing a companion animal. More women (24%) than men (7%) said that it was my responsibility to protect the public from dangerous dogs, and that it is the fault of the public (13% of women compared to 7% of men). More men (27%) than women (13%) suggested that

euthanasia causes PTSD and compassion fatigue and a dog should not have to live such an unhappy life with men (33%) and women (18%). Both men (13%) and women (11%) described euthanasia as a “good death” in comparison to the many horrible things that could happen to the animals.

The majority of leaders, workers, and volunteers mentioned that euthanasia was often the point of conflict within the organization and with other organizations. This conflict centered on the concept of the No-kill philosophy. Both men and women identified this conflict as distressing and disrupting for the sheltering industry as a whole. The second most often discussed conflict was mentioned by women only and focused on the divide between dominance-based training theory and positive training theory.

As a final quantitative analysis of all the components discussed to this point, a multiple regression was run testing the impact of care, altruism, gender, organizational type, a supportive work environment, shelter programming and collaborative ventures on the rate of euthanasia of canines. This quantitative analysis found significant relationship between euthanasia rates and female leaders, private organizations, employing three or more programs, fostering, low cost spay and neuter, transportation, humane education and feeling supported by co-workers.

The final qualitative analysis studied the responses of leaders, workers, and volunteers to a question regarding instituting change in the organization that would reduce euthanasia rates. Two in-depth cases were used to illustrate the overall findings from the interview participants. The first was that change was difficult in a “toxic” organization and the second theme found was that successful change was a process of a

“perfect storm” that combined a jolt to the organization, a leader that was supportive of change and a board willing to support the organizational change

CHAPTER SEVEN

ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION & SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this mixed methods research utilizing an online survey and in-depth interviews was to explore the impact of gender and animal sheltering leadership on organizational policies and workers' and volunteers' attitudes towards reducing companion animal euthanasia in the sheltering organization. It was hoped that the results of this study would provide animal sheltering organizations with a better understanding of the role that gender plays in leadership including the impact on organizational programming, euthanasia rates and worker support of these programs. While the three findings chapters were separated by identity issues, leadership issues, and the combination of the two within the organization, this chapter reorganizes the findings into their associated research questions. Findings may cross research questions as was pointed out in the prior chapters. This chapter contains the analysis, interpretation and synthesis of the prior three chapters and is structured in order of the research questions addressed to present a full overview.

The following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. How does ethical decision making (ethic of care vs. ethic of justice) orientation impact leadership and policy setting in animal sheltering organizations?
2. How does gendered leadership impact adoption of evidence-based best practice strategies to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia in animal sheltering organization

3. How does gendered leadership impact sensemaking surrounding issues of companion animal care in the shelter organization?
4. How has the increasing need of collaborative efforts within and between organizations changed leadership?
5. How does the work of sheltering impact identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers?
6. How do the narratives created by organizational leaders impact workers?

The chapter concludes with a summary, limitations of my research, and considerations for future research in this area.

HOW DOES ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING (ETHIC OF CARE VS. ETHIC OF JUSTICE) ORIENTATION IMPACT LEADERSHIP AND POLICY SETTING IN ANIMAL SHELTERING ORGANIZATIONS?

Despite previous research supporting gender differences on the MMO (Liddell 2006), this research did not find significant differences between females' and males' scores on both ethic of justice and care scores. In contrast to the quantitative analysis, the qualitative analysis provided almost "textbook" examples of female use of ethic of care and male use of ethic of justice when describing self, philosophy of animal care and entrance to the field of sheltering. Two other quantitative analyses linked to ethic of care and ethic of justice suggested significant differences between the genders. The first focused on the role that animals play to one's identity. The second was on a measure of knowledge of issues facing animal welfare and actions taken by the respondent regarding these issues, a significant difference was found between men and women. Overall this

research found that females' use of ethic of care moral decision making and males' use of ethic of justice moral decision making influenced their entrance to the field, the impact that animals have on their identity and their philosophy of care and euthanasia of the animals in their care.

Gender Differences on the MMO

No significant quantitative support was found for gender differences on the scores of leaders, workers, and volunteers on the Measure of Moral Orientation developed by Liddell (1998) in either ethic of care or ethic of justice score. While Liddell designed the instrument for testing of undergraduate college students, the measure has been used in testing adults successfully (1998) The measure was not effective in measuring gender differences for this sample of animal sheltering leaders, workers and volunteers. The 22 question series did have an acceptable Chronbach's alpha score of .78 for the care score and a.70 for the justice score but is limited due to the high number of questions used in the MMO. In Liddell's development and testing of the measurement of care and justice, she compared the written instrument to an interview which included the question "describe yourself to yourself." Those participants with high care scores on the MMO also received high care scores on the interview and high justice scores received high justice scores on the interview thus correlating positively on a significant basis. It is important to note that Gilligan and other ethic of care researchers have stated that the difference between genders on the score is not biologically based, rather it is a result of socialization. Several studies using the MMO have found significant gender differences with females scoring higher on care than males and one study finding differences between a group of Turkish graduate students and U.S. graduate students (Kuyel and

Glover 2010). Other self-administered measures of moral orientation and the care ethic have been developed and tested but provided mixed results in support for a gendered difference in moral orientation (Skoe 2014; Yacker and Weinberg 1990). While some studies support Gilligan's assertion that women most often use ethic of care and men ethic of justice (Gilligan and Attanucci 1988; Johnston 1988; Yacker and Weinberg 1990), other studies found only gender differences in ethic of care and not in justice (Galotti, Kozberg, and Farmer 1991; Garmon, Basinger, Gregg, and Gibbs 1996; Gibbs, Arnold, and Burkhart 1984; Liddell, Halpin, and Halpin 1993; Wark and Krebs 1996). Finally, some researchers suggested that gendered differences in moral orientation may be impacted by the dilemma content in the testing measure or that moral orientation may change several times over a person's life time. (Walker et al. 1987; Wark and Krebs 1996,1997).

It is possible that the dilemma content in Liddell's MMO contributed to the disparate findings between the survey results and the interview results. The dilemmas used in her measure did not mention animals or management/leadership issues. Had the dilemmas contained problems or cases based on animal care or sheltering, perhaps the results would have been more relevant to the leaders, workers and volunteers.

In this line of consideration, significant quantitative findings on gender differences appeared on the survey of animal welfare issues. While both females and males scored about equally on a measure identifying how knowledgeable you are about animal welfare issues, females scored significantly higher on How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making personal choices. The differences between the two questions can be situated within the framework of justice and care. The

first question required respondents to identify their level of knowledge regarding animal welfare issues. This allows a respondent to maintain distance from the problem, framing them as problems of justice and rights. The second question required the individual to closing this distance and situated the problem within the context of relationship. Now, not only does an individual have knowledge of the issue of animals farmed for fur and leather, but that same individual must acknowledge a personal contribution to the problem by wearing clothes made from animal bodies. Josephine Donovan (1995) connected the concepts of ethic of care, feminism and animal ethics in her description of a feminist ethic of care. “A feminist ethic of care is a women’s relational culture of caring and attentive love – we should not kill, eat, torture, and exploit animals because they do not want to be so treated and we know that. If we listen, we can hear them” (109).

The other argument researchers found impacted a measurement of moral orientation is that an individual’s moral orientation may change over a lifetime (Jaffee and Hyde 2000). So while this research did not find a significant gender difference in use of ethic of care or ethic of justice moral orientation in animal sheltering leaders, workers and volunteers, previous leaders, workers and volunteers held significantly lower ethic of care scores than those currently employed.

Past research has focused on the damaging psychological impact animal workers that must euthanize animals on a regular basis experience (Arluke 1991, Arluke 2003, Frommer and Arluke 1999, Rohlf and Bennett 2005). Workers are at risk for PTSD, sleep disruption, chronic illness, high blood pressure, depression and anxiety (Rohlf and Bennett 2005). Similarly to past research, my research found much the same. In the findings from the survey instrument, former shelter leaders self-reported compassion

fatigue and PTSD as reasons for leaving the field. Many of the past shelter directors, and workers expressed similar self-reported psychological problems from long term exposure to their job stressors during the in-depth interviews for this research. Upton Sinclair (1946) identified the slaughterhouse effect, whereby slaughterhouse workers become immune to the violence of the slaughterhouse work and become more violent themselves from the long-term exposure. Other research has confirmed the slaughterhouse effect (Fitzgerald, Kalof and Dietz 2009). It is possible that a similar impact on animal shelter workers who euthanize healthy, adoptable animals as part of their regular work duties could be identified in a reduction of score on the measure of ethic of care. This is an area that has not been explored in depth within the framework of ethic of care and for which further exploration could benefit leaders, workers and volunteers in the field of sheltering.

Although the quantitative analysis of MMO scores didn't find gender differences, the qualitative findings from the in-depth interviews found clear patterns of gendered difference in the use of an ethic of care moral orientation that closely replicated prior research done by feminist care theorists. During the in-depth interviews, leaders, workers and volunteers were asked specifically to describe themselves to themselves and asked about their philosophy of animal care and euthanasia. Females more often answered with an ethic of care framework, while males more often answered with an ethic of justice framework.

Differences in gender and ethic of care in describe yourself responses

The gender differences in ethic of care versus ethic of justice were clearly articulated in the responses to the interview question "Describe yourself to yourself."

The majority of women in this study described themselves in terms of relations to others – both people and animals – and as caring for others. Nel Noddings (2012) described care ethic as a relational ethic, for which “we are less interested in the moral credit due to the carer and more deeply interested in the strength of the caring relation” (53). To push back against the connotation of care as a “warm, fuzzy feeling” that has little application as a moral ethic, Noddings developed six language areas - care, attention, empathy, response, reciprocity, and receptivity - that define care ethic as a moral ethic for use in the workplace. Using Nodding’s framework, a gender difference was identified between relational caring used by women and virtue caring used by men. In relational caring, the carer does not require public accolades or praise for her work. Unlike relational care, virtue caring whereby the carer may be rewarded or praised.

The attention, empathy, response, reciprocity, and receptivity in Noddings’ language model meld together to create an ethic of care. A carer must pay attention to the cared for in order to truly respond to the cared for in ways that are needed. This requires empathy on the part of the carer, especially in the case when the cared for has limited communication abilities such as handicapped adults or infant children. This perspective works well to address animals. This empathetic attention and response may require the carer to experience some level of pain when sharing the experience of the cared for. This framework is in opposition to the idea of critical thinking which also requires an attentive response but with no empathetic attention. Critical thinking requires one to carefully evaluate the argument in preparation of a rebuttal. This type of responsive attention does not require empathy on the part of the individual. Of the women that mentioned companion animals in their self-descriptions, many used the

language of care to describe their relationship with animals. In comparison to the women's mention of animals in their self-descriptions, men's responses focused on the attention within the critical thinking framework.

Ethic of care and philosophies of animal care and euthanasia

This research also found gendered differences in the qualitative in-depth interviews of leaders, workers and volunteers, both present and past, regarding their philosophies of animal care and euthanasia as they related to ethic of care or ethic of justice. Female leaders utilized the framework of an ethic of care as the basis of their philosophy of animal care and euthanasia, while male leaders utilized an ethic of justice framework. These philosophies, especially those held by leaders, when in agreement with the mission of the organization guide the programming and policy setting employed at the sheltering organization. Of these interviews, no women referred to the business of sheltering and the majority of the men used business terms and an ethic of justice to describe animal care. Nel Noddings (1984), in her book focusing on ethic of care and education, described a teacher carer as one who must be “totally and non-selectively present to the student—to each student—as he addresses me. The time interval may be brief but the encounter is total.” This same ethic of care is applied in the animal sheltering organization by leaders and workers. The males interviewed for this research described their philosophy of animal care in business related language and focused on equality of care for the large group of animals.

Leaders and workers also responded to the interview question about their individual philosophy of euthanasia. Again, similar gender differences appeared, situated in ethic of care or ethic of justice. Men tended to focus on their responsibility for making

the decision while women more often described their efforts to ensure the animal is well cared for during the procedure. Women highlighted both the relationship with that animal, the process of meeting the individual animal's needs at that point in time and the actual tactile experience of euthanasia. The majority of men spoke about their responsibility of either making the decision for euthanasia or ensuring that the appropriate channels had been followed prior to euthanizing the animal.

During the process of euthanasia, carers must participate in an act of caring that does not reciprocate. Both Noddings (1984, 2012) and Gilligan (1993) described this particular type of relationship as problematic for an ethic of care.

The issue is complicated, however, in unequal relationships such as parent-young child, teacher student, and nurse-patient. In all of these relations, only one person can really serve as carer. Reciprocity is then almost entirely defined by the cared-for's response of recognition. When, for whatever reason (severe illness or handicap, for example), the cared-for is unable to respond in a way that completes the relation, the work of the carer becomes more and more difficult.

When the carer does not receive feedback from the cared for, it is important for the carer to receive support from the community. This support may be from co-workers, family members or friends and the carer needs to make time for herself. Gilligan (1993) identified that without self-care, individuals may experience compassion fatigue. Mentioned earlier in this chapter, compassion fatigue appears a second time here. While Gilligan and Noddings both problematized the "big heart", neither explored the direct impact compassion fatigue might have on one's score on the MMO (Liddell 2006).

This research identified that females with high care scores recognized the problem of compassion fatigue and developed strategies to avoid the impact. During the in-depth interviews, women with high care ethic scores on the MMO (Liddell 2006) identified the

importance of taking time out for one's self. No men identified the need or desire to take time out.

Virginia Held (2006) described the need for the carer to recharge and center herself in order to continue providing care in a healthy manner.

An ethic of caring strives to maintain the caring attitude. That means that the one-caring must be maintained, for she is the immediate source of caring. The one-caring, then, properly pays head to her own condition. She does not need to hatch out elaborate excuses to give herself rest, or to seek congenial companionship, or to find joy in personal work. Everything depends on the strength and beauty of her ideal, and it is an integral part of her. To go on sacrificing bitterly, grudgingly, is not to be one-caring and, when she finds this happening, she properly but considerately withdraws for repairs.

Those females who scored high on the MMO (Liddell 2006) understood the necessity for taking time out for self and caring for self. In contrast, no males who took part in the in-depth interviews mentioned self care or taking time out for self. Those women in the mid-care level mentioned their difficulties with becoming overwhelmed by caring for others but did not mention taking time for self. Noddings (1984) identified that women may recognize that they have crossed the breaking point but heroically attempt to continue caring (105). Previous research has indicated that leaders, workers and volunteers in the animal sheltering industry suffer from compassion fatigue (Arluke 1991, Frommer 1999, Rohlf and Bennett 2005). Many people indicated on both the survey and in-depth interviews from this research that compassion fatigue was a major problem in the industry.

Entering the field of animal sheltering

Differences between men and women regarding their use of ethic of care in decision-making began at the entrance into the field. Asked during the in-depth interviews, female current and past leaders and workers and male current and past leaders and workers described two very different paths to entrance into the sheltering workplace.

Women entered the field of animal sheltering in entry-level or volunteer positions and worked their way up to management level positions. They also described their job as a “calling.” Men more often entered the field in a leadership position, after a career in sales, law or business and described their motivation as wanting to do the best job possible.

Previous research has examined the concept of work as a “calling” (Bellah et al. 1993, Weber 2002). Dik and Duffy (2013) identified three components to work as a calling. First, the person must feel that they are “called” by either a higher power, or a societal need. Second, the work must align the individual’s feeling of purpose in life. The final component is that the work allows the individual to help others or benefit society in a caring manner. In a study of zookeepers, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) extended the three components to add a sense of an ethic of justice based moral duty to society as a whole. In their study, the zookeepers identified their calling implied “a moral duty to leverage one’s unique gifts and passions to help humankind ‘save the planet,’ specifically by helping to preserve and care for captive animals” (2009:41). All of the women interviewed for this research indicated all three components of calling as identified by Dik & Duffy in their responses but rather than seeing animal care as a moral obligation to society as Bunderson and Thompson situated the zookeepers, these women described their work as focused on providing the best care to meet the needs of each individual animal in need.

Men interviewed for this research described a very different experience when entering the field. All but one of the men indicated that they entered sheltering with no experience after working in the business or legal fields and were often interviewed as part

of a organization search process. Expression of a “calling” was absent from the male experience. Men instead explained how they hoped to further their career by doing an efficient, and effective job in managing the organization. Furthermore, animal care or interaction with the animals was not mentioned as a driving reason for men to enter the field.

An examination of pay difference between men and women was not included in this research but as noted by several of the leaders interviewed, the majority of the large non-profit animal welfare organizations are led by men. According to Forbes (2017), Wayne Pacelle made almost \$300,000 in salary as leader of the Humane Society of the United States and Edwin Sayres received \$540,000 in salary as leader of the ASPCA. The largest animal sheltering non-profit is the North Shore Animal League, whose president is J. John Stevenson. Despite the fact that women far outnumber men in the field of animal sheltering, there still remains a disparity between men and women in the top, high paying leadership positions. Furthermore, given women’s career trajectory moving from entry level positions into management versus male recruitment via national or local searches, salaries for female leaders and managers are likely to be significantly lower than men. The only organization that studies compensation in the field of animal sheltering is the Society of Animal Welfare Administrators (SAWA) and the organization does not differentiate compensation by gender. As a final point, given women’s focus on their work as a calling, they are more likely to remain in a low paying position for a longer period than men who view their work differently. The differences between men and women and their use of ethic of care or justice continued after their entrance into the field of sheltering.

While the survey results from the MMO scores did not show significant differences between females and males in their use of ethic of care or ethic of justice, the qualitative findings from in-depth interviews suggested that females used ethic of care more often than males in their description of self, in their philosophy of care and euthanasia and in their use of self-care. These findings suggested that women come to the work of sheltering from an ethic of care and defined their philosophies of care and euthanasia from an ethic of care more often than males do. So how do these gendered differences in moral orientation impact leadership beyond development of the personal identity issues of entering the field, philosophy of care and euthanasia? The next research question discussion deals with how an animal sheltering leadership based in an ethic of care impacts the adoption of strategies that reduce euthanasia and increase live release rates in animal sheltering organizations.

HOW DOES GENDERED LEADERSHIP IMPACT ADOPTION OF EVIDENCE-BASED BEST PRACTICE STRATEGIES TO REDUCE OR REMOVE THE USE OF EUTHANASIA IN ANIMAL SHELTERING ORGANIZATIONS?

To answer this question, I moved from a measure of ethic of care to a measure of altruistic leadership which incorporated the major tenets of care. The altruistic leadership was paired with a measure of organizational learning, and quantitative analysis indicated that higher altruistic leadership scores were associated with higher organizational learning scores. This quantitative research found a gender difference in altruistic leadership scores, as well as gender differences in organizational learning scores. Female leaders also took part in collaborative ventures more than male leaders, and qualitative findings suggested that female leaders utilized a more democratic-style leadership while

males used a more hierarchical leadership style. Furthermore, qualitative analysis found that a more positive organizational culture existed in organizations with leaders with high altruism scores. Finally, gender was found to significantly impact euthanasia rates with organizations with female leaders having lower euthanasia rates of canines than organizations with male leaders. Higher altruism scores and a combination of programming contributed to lower euthanasia rates of canines in the organization.

Altruistic Leadership and Ethic of Care

This section focused on altruistic leadership and organizational learning (Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra 2007, Mallén et al. 2015), a measurement for a level of altruistic Simmons (1991) defined altruism in four parts “(1) seeks to increase another's welfare, not one's own; (2) is voluntary; (3) is intentional, meant to someone else; and (4) expects no external reward” (3) which closely matches the foundation of ethic of care. Altruistic leadership in turn generates an organization with a positive emotional environment that promotes trust, cooperation, risk taking, employee participation in decision-making and continued learning (F. Malien 2008). This research corroborated (F. Malien 2008) that highly altruistic leaders were significantly associated with these positive organizational outcomes. Past research has suggested that altruistic leadership closely aligned with transformational and spiritual leadership (F. Malien 2008) and Simola et al (2010) found that Gilligan’s Ethic of Care was similar to transformational leadership framework. Bass & Avolio (2000) found that gender – after controlling for age and propensity for justice and care – was associated with transformational leadership.

Gender Differences in Altruistic Leadership and Organizational Learning

Gender differences in leadership style have been documented in many past research studies (A.H. Eagly 1992, A.Statham 1987, Helgesen 1995, Rosser 2010) with women utilizing more participative leadership styles, more relational interactions, and rated as more effective leaders. The analysis suggested that men received more support for traditional, autocratic behavior while women leaders were supported for a more participative leadership style.

Given that past research made connections between the framework of altruistic leadership and ethic of care and that no leadership framework existed specifically for ethic of care, the test of altruistic leadership and organizational learning was utilized for this research. All survey respondents were tested using the measure developed by Malien (2008) as described in the methods section. A score was totaled from each area of the measure.

Organizational learning capacity refers to the “the organizational and managerial characteristics or factors that facilitate the organizational learning process or allow an organization to learn” (Escrig et al. 2016)(1061). Chiva et al (2007) developed a five factor scale to measure organizational learning capacity that included both internal and external factors. For this research, the measures of both altruism and organizational learning were entered by survey respondents. In addition to the significant gender difference with females scoring significantly higher on altruistic leadership, they also scored significantly higher than men on experimentation, external and decision-making which are measures of organizational learning. High scores in the area of experimentation indicated that an organization is open to trying out new ideas and implementing changes. External refers to the openness of an organization to outside relationships and

collaborations. Finally, decision-making ranks an organization's openness to participative style decision-making. As women scored significantly higher in all the above measures, this research supports previous studies that found that women leaders were rated higher than men on transformational styles of leadership and management styles (Helgesen 1995, Rosser 2010, Schueller-Weidekamm and Kautzky-Willer 2012)

Survey participants were also asked whether the organization took part in collaborative ventures or partnerships with external organizations. Given the previous finding that female led organizations scored higher on a measure of external connections to groups or organizations outside the organization, it is not surprising that female leaders and workers/volunteers of female led organizations also scored significantly higher on collaborations than male led organizations. An in-depth discussion of collaboration will be addressed under the research question dealing with collaboration later in this chapter.

Gender differences regarding leadership styles were also identified during the in-depth interviews. Interview participants were asked to describe a "normal" day, as well as how policies and decisions were transmitted within the organization. Of those leaders and workers/volunteers who responded about their leaders, females with high altruism scores described a democratic style policy transmission and decision-making. In contrast, male leaders with high altruism scores and workers/volunteers with male leaders with high altruism scores responded to the same questions by focusing on the leader's role within the organization. Leadership was then situated in a more hierarchical fashion rather than a democratic one.

Overall, this research suggested via quantitative and qualitative analysis that females had higher scores on altruistic leadership and organizational learning than males.

Given the overlapping frameworks of care ethic and altruistic leadership, females use a relational and supportive leadership style that in turn creates a positive climate for organizational learning. The positive climate provides employees the opportunity to share creative solutions to organizational problems and collaborate with outside organizations to provide the community with more and better options for homeless companion animals.

Gendered Leadership and Adoption of Best Practice Strategies to Reduce Euthanasia

This next section explored the impact of gendered leadership on the adoption of best practice strategies to reduce the high numbers of animals euthanized in shelters across the United States. The estimated numbers of companion animals euthanized in animal shelters in the United States vary widely from four million to 20 million (Bartlett et al. 2005, Manning and Rowan 1992, Rowan 2007, Scarlett 2008). More recently, several studies have identified rates of euthanasia in statewide populations of animal sheltering organizations ranging from 15% to 100% (Balcom 2000, Bartlett et al. 2005, Sinski, Carini and Weber 2016, Sinski and Gagné 2016, Weiss et al. 2014). Furthermore, entering an animal shelter puts canines at the highest risk of death. Yet, no known research to date has explored the impact of leader gender or leadership styles on euthanasia rates in shelters.

In this research study, quantitative analysis indicated that female-led organizations had a significantly lower euthanasia rate than male-led organizations. Higher altruistic leadership scores were also associated with lower rates of companion dog euthanasia rates and lower altruistic leadership scores with higher rates of companion dog euthanasia rates. Given that both gender and high altruism scores were associated with lower euthanasia rates and women had higher altruism scores than men, it appeared

that altruistic leadership contributed to an environment that supported lowered euthanasia rates.

In addition to the finding in this research that female led organizations have lower euthanasia rates, it was also found that organizations with leaders who have higher altruism rates also have lower euthanasia rates. In research on the connection between altruistic leadership and innovation, Escrig et al (2016:1061) claimed that “the levels of integration and interdependence required in the new working environments demand leadership styles such as transformational, authentic, spiritual, servant or ethical leadership, which go beyond classic transactional styles which all coincide in altruism.” Previous research indicated altruistic type leadership style supports an environment that makes workers feel safe enough to propose innovative programming ideas (Axelsson and Axelsson 2009, Chiva, Alegre and Lapiedra 2007, S.E Simola 2010). Altruistic leadership and high levels of organizational learning are also associated with a positive emotional culture within the organization, and an capacity to promote radical innovation (Escrig et al. 2016).

Supporting the previous research and my current quantitative findings, the qualitative analysis in this research found evidence of a connection between positive emotional culture within the organization and high altruism. During in-depth interviews in this research, leaders with high altruism scores and workers and volunteers who scored their leaders with high altruism scores identified that animal shelters must be both people and animal centric rather than solely animal focused. Both females and males, all with high altruism scores, mentioned that to be effective as an organization, shelters must not limit their focus only to the animals. Lower and mid-altruism leaders and workers or

volunteers who scored their leader as such did not mention the issue or spoke only of maintaining focus on the animals in the shelter. Those in the high altruism group spoke of the absolute necessity of both good communication and interpersonal relationship skills to reduce euthanasia rates.

Several research studies have explored the impact that various shelter programs have on euthanasia rates in animal shelters, both public and private. Low cost spay and neuter programs reduce population with estimates of up to 33% and help to control some common behavioral problems related to sexually mature pets reducing shelter intake (Frank 2004, Frank and Carlisle-Frank 2007, Zanowski 2012). Adoption and fostering programs have also been connected to lowered euthanasia rates but also depend upon the shelter's specific policies regarding adoption which can reduce the effectiveness (Irvine 2003, Sinski 2016, Taylor 2004, Weiss and Gramann 2009, Williams 2012) Nathan Winograd authored the controversial text "The Myth of Pet Overpopulation and the No Kill Revolution in America" which detailed the "no-kill" solution combining a number of shelter programs, when employed, worked to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals. (Responses from in-depth interviews regarding Winograd will be discussed in a later section of this chapter). Programs like adoption, fostering, transporting animals to locales that have low numbers of adoptable animals, humane education and behavior training all require collaborations with people and other organizations external to the animal shelter (Hamilton 2010, Marsh 2009). Hamilton (2010) in his study of a community wide collaborative venture involving numerous stakeholders, described the imperative for organizational leaders to practice adaptive leadership.

“Each stakeholder in any collaboration holds a different world-view based on background, training, and experience. What is truth in one particular world-view may not be a universal truth. Leadership that connects worldviews must recognize the differences among world-views while holding each one as worthy, true, and real. A single world-view is unlikely to solve a dynamically complex problem such as companion animal overpopulation. Thus, adaptive leadership, which includes perspective taking, reframing and suspending assumptions affects collective performance and ensures that all stakeholders have a voice. The goal is to invent, construct, and create new ways of thinking and talking to develop a shared understanding in which everyone is a partner” (2010:289)

Hamilton’s (2010) adaptive leadership is comparable to the model of altruistic leadership in an organizational learning environment with high scores on external relationships, participative decision-making and an openness to trying out new ideas and programs. Overlapping, these aspects of organizational leadership and learning with an ethic of care expands a leader’s “world-view” in contextual and relational aspects. Using a relationship model, Gilligan argued that women cared more about connecting with others and building relationships, while men are focused on a more hierarchical pecking order. Therefore, women make decisions based on the idea of our human interrelatedness and connectedness and how decision-making will impact self and others.

In this research, quantitative analysis using a multiple regression model found that the variables Leader Gender, Orgpubpri, Altruism, fostering, and transport, added statistically significantly to the prediction of euthanasia rates of canines. So, for example, a female leader of a private organization that offered fostering and transported animals to other shelters in need of adoptable animals had a significantly lower euthanasia rate of canines than a male leader of a public organization and offered only adoption. Given that programs like fostering, low-cost spay and neuter and humane education requires collaborative relationships with organizations external to the organization, the leadership and organization must be open to external, collaborative ventures. Moreover,

relationships between and among coworkers evolve in an organization that supports workers and is open to their influence on organizational programming. While gender – being female – reduces euthanasia rates, and females leaders test higher in altruistic leadership, it is important to acknowledge that Gilligan and other feminist ethic of care researchers noted in their research, both females and males can be high in ethic of care based moral orientation, but it is likely a product of socialization rather than biologically based (Adams 2007, Donovan and Adams 1995, Gilligan 1993, Noddings 2012, Skoe 2014).

A discussion of collaborative efforts and the impact of public and private organizations will continue under the collaboration research question later in this chapter.

HOW DOES GENDERED LEADERSHIP IMPACT SENSEMAKING SURROUNDING ISSUES OF COMPANION ANIMAL CARE IN THE SHELTER ORGANIZATION

As discussed in the previous research questions, this study has identified several gender differences regarding philosophies of both animal care and euthanasia. Research over the last decade has clearly indicated that changing societal attitudes about companion animals are pushing animal shelters to move towards a low-kill or no-kill solution to dealing with the problem of pet overpopulation (Arluke, 2006; Irvine, 2002; Cherry, 2010; DeMello, 2012). One of the most vocal advocates for no-kill shelter policy outlines the “no-kill solution” as utilizing adoption, fostering, transportation, low-cost spay & neutering and behavioral training (Winograd 2007). The language used to describe euthanasia has changed from euphemisms like “putting to sleep” to “killing.” The ways in which people described their relationships to companion animals have

changed from “pets” to “family.” We are experiencing a paradigm shift (Kuhn 1970) with a radical shift from viewing animals as object in society to animals as subject in society.

Applying the idea of a paradigm shift to organizational change in a university setting, researchers described the background assumptions used by organizations as a framework for viewing the world (Simsek and Louis 1994). This “organizational paradigm” was referred to as myths because these “long-lasting beliefs generally turn into a mythical phenomenon which later becomes quite resistant to change” (1994:672). Weick et al (2005) described sensemaking as going on behind the scenes in a swift, ongoing process which makes meanings that inform and constrain identity and action. “When we state that meanings materialize, we mean that sensemaking is, importantly, an issue of language, talk and communication. Situations, environments and organizations are talked into existence” (2005:409). Language plays the integral part in sharing organizational myths and leaders, workers and volunteers used the organizational myths to make sense of their work.

Many members of sheltering organizations obtained positions within the organization to “make a difference” in the lives of the animals they care for. Earlier in the chapter, I discussed how females entered the field as a “calling.” Furthermore, although female leaders scored higher on a question asking whether they agreed with the statement “Animals are central to my identity,” none of the survey respondents strongly disagreed with that statement. This indicates that leaders, workers and volunteers agreed that animals were central to one’s identity. Arluke (2003) in his research on the division over euthanasia in the animal shelter field, stated:

Provocative language is a symptom and not a cause of the problem; its social and psychological roots are concealed and complex. To explain the persistence and fervor of the strife, it is necessary to analyze the unexpressed, complicated, and recalcitrant issues that underlie manifest tensions. No-kill and open-admission followers cling to and defend their vested interests, including their collective identities, occupational lifestyles, and world views. These vested interests underlie any debate about the merits of different policies for controlling and managing pet overpopulation or dealing “humanely” with its victims.

Much of the time, Weick explained, sensemaking occurs in a swift, subtle and ongoing way and is often simply taken for granted as happening behind the scenes.

When sensemaking is made explicit, actors perceived something in the world as out of the ordinary, outside of the expected state of the world. Here in order to make sense, actors look to pull from the framework of the organization so that they may swiftly resume activity and continue action. The framework included organizational policies, plans, accepted justifications, expectations and previous leadership. Given that killing healthy companion animals is viewed by many as morally reprehensible and that many of the employees working in shelters hold caring for animals as a central tenet to their own identity, the framework used to justify the action becomes very important to the organization. As the organization is exposed to no-kill and low-kill policy used effectively in other organizations, it becomes much more difficult to “make sense” of traditional euthanasia policy. The continued action without reflective interruption becomes necessary in order to “ignore” the conflicting data sources. The organizational narratives facilitated the ongoing action and are used to deflect outside data

Given the importance of this paradigm shift on the meaning of the work done in animal sheltering, it is not a surprise that euthanasia was at the center of the most often mentioned conflict in animal sheltering. In this research during the in-depth interviews, the conflict regarding ideological positions on euthanasia between organizations and

within organizations was most often mentioned by both female and male directors, workers and volunteers. The conflict centers on the language and policies associated with the “no-kill” movement most often linked to Nathan Winograd (2007).

Many leaders, workers and volunteers mentioned the emotional divineness of the conflict which is often triggered by the language used in the argument itself. Essentially when one acknowledges that by following Winograd’s plan, the need for euthanasia is significantly reduced or even removed that is challenging an essential myth of animal sheltering organizations which for the past three decades has determinedly situated euthanasia as a required tool to combat overpopulation. The arguments against Winograd’s policies are often maintained that without euthanasia, the animal population will continue to grow and cause hoarding situations. Both sides of the argument suggest that the opposing side contributed to animal abuse.

All of the animal sheltering organizations admitted to euthanizing companion animals but the reasons for euthanasia varied widely by type and philosophy of the organization. On one end of the spectrum, some organizations only euthanized critically ill or severely behaviorally challenged animals. On the opposing end of the spectrum, some organizations euthanized healthy, adoptable animals for considerations of time and space. Furthermore, all of the interviewees (workers and directors) acknowledged that euthanasia was the least favorite part of the job. Each interviewee was asked about their philosophy regarding animal euthanasia and five themes were presented. These themes were as follows: Euthanasia because the dog shouldn’t have to live such an unhappy life, It is my responsibility to protect the public from dangerous dogs , Euthanasia causes compassion fatigue and undo stress on myself and fellow workers, There are worse things

out there than a “good death,” It’s a very emotional process – and it should be, and It’s the fault of the public. After analysis of these six, individuals either blamed the public (fault of the public and worse things out there), blamed the shelter animals themselves (dangerous dogs and unhappy dogs) or blamed the procedure of euthanasia (compassion fatigue and emotional process). Previous research identified similar blame displacing strategies (blamed the public or blamed the dog) by animal care workers and those owners relinquishing pets to the animal shelter (Arluke 2003, Frommer 1999, Irvine 2002) They did not identify the blaming the process as a strategy. Arluke (2003) did discuss ways that the field of animal sheltering might work together to reduce the hostility and divisiveness of the “no-kill” debate.

Identifying and acknowledging mutual identification can help to lessen the present polarization that leads to overgeneralization and blanket assumptions about those in the opposite camp. In such a hostile environment, people are likely to feel unfairly and negatively judged by others, and certainly unappreciated for their emotional and ethical labors. Sympathy can be the starting point that opens lines of communication and support for different, but not necessarily antagonistic, ways of managing shelter animals (81)

The third blame displacing strategy of blaming the process of euthanasia -newly identified here - may be evidence of the impact of the wide-spread paradigm shift as more people in the field acknowledge the emotion work and distress they experience when a leader or worker must euthanize companion animals. This strategy most likely is evidence that the Paradigm Shift of animal as object to animal as subject has caused the majority of the industry to begin questioning the legitimacy of the organizational myth declaring euthanasia as a required tool to combat companion animal overpopulation.

In this research, these themes were also analyzed by gender and were reported above. Leaders and workers/volunteers in female led organizations most often mentioned that it was their responsibility to protect the public from dangerous dogs while male

leaders and workers/volunteers in male led organizations most often mentioned euthanasia because the dog should not have to live an unhappy life. Both reasonings are placing the blame for euthanasia on the dog itself, whether it is dangerous to the public or not adoptable due emotional distress, illness or age.

Conflicts regarding philosophy of animal training was the second most often mentioned by female directors, workers and volunteers of female led organizations. No male leaders or workers/volunteers in a male led organization mentioned this. This conflict centers on dominance-based theories of canine training (large number of male trainers or positive methods of canine training (large number of female trainers). Over the past decade, much research has focused on whether dominance-based training methods versus positive based training methods elicited better results in training domestic dogs. Dominance-based training methods are situated in the framework of wolfpack hierarchy and position the owner as the alpha of the pack. Trainers like Caesar Milan have taught training methods that included the alpha roll and other punishment-based training techniques to reduce the status of the canine in the pack. Positive-based training methods are situated in the framework of pseudo-parental framework where dogs and puppies are socialized within the family. Here positive training methods utilized reward-based methods, either treat, toy or other reward, directed by learning theory (Bradshaw 2011, Chiandetti et al. 2016, Herron, Shofer and Reisner 2009) and Karen Pryor's clicker training is well known amongst positive trainers. This issue aligned with care ethic and justice ethic clearly as dominance is hierarchal based and positive reinforcement is relationship based.

Powers (2012) research focused on the concept of gendered pet keeping. She argued that women are responsible for the domain of “the home” and this included the training of the companion animal to fit comfortably within the confines of acceptable behavior with the house. Within this concept of gendered pet-keeping (Power, 2012), women are applying their “everyday” knowledge garnered from child-rearing and educating children to their capacity as companion animal caregiver. In this research, qualitative analysis found that female directors spoke about their own experiences of training companion animals, often comparing this training to their experience raising children. Female directors also spoke about animal science and the support for positive-training methods.

Given that most of the scientific and veterinary community now supports positive training methods as being more beneficial to the human/animal bond and that dominance methods may actually exacerbate problems of aggression (Chiandetti et al. 2016), the absence of male voices in this support of positive training in this research speaks in and of itself.

HOW HAS THE INCREASING NEED OF COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS WITH AND BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS CHANGED LEADERSHIP

The current research supports previous studies done on leadership and organizational barriers to collaborative programming in organizations. Quantitative analysis identified a gender difference in leadership of programming that required collaborations with outside organizations with females significantly more likely to do so than males. Secondly, the mean score on a measure of altruism significantly differed by organization type with private, non-profit organizations holding a significantly higher

score on a measure of altruism than public organizations. Thirdly, qualitative analysis found that in-depth interview participants identified public, government or municipal run shelters as “bureaucratic” and “rule-driven” while private shelters were afforded more flexibility. Finally, in quantitative analysis, female leaders, private organizations, and employing three or more programs including fostering, low cost spay and neuter, and humane education significantly reduced euthanasia rates. These findings combined to create an organization that is led by an altruistic leader who is open to sharing power with employees and held a positive organizational culture with open boundaries.

The recent economic recession contributed to shrinking access to an increased expectation that both public and private organizations look to collaborative efforts. Collaboration can either be seen as an antidote to government bureaucracy or a creative solution to draw on multiple sectors to benefit communities. (Snively and Tracy 2000). As discussed in a previous section of this chapter, collaborations are considered vital for animal sheltering organizations to reduce or remove the use of euthanasia of healthy, adoptable companion animals (Hamilton 2010, Marsh 2009)

Leadership is an important component of collaborations with external organizations (Axelsson and Axelsson 2009, Hamilton 2010, Huxham and Vangen 2000) with female led organizations showing higher levels of altruism and were less territorial (Helgesen 1995). Trust was the focus of a study of a cross-sectoral interorganizational network (Lee et al, 2012). They found that trust building wasn't a simple process but that participants would have higher levels of trust for collaborative partners who share a similar mission to their own organization.

In this research, all survey participants were asked whether their organization took part in collaborations with those external to the organization. Female led organizations took part in collaborative ventures more than male led organizations. The collaboration variable was also used in a multiple regression to predict euthanasia rates and while it did not contribute significantly to the analysis, fostering, transport, low cost spay and neuter, humane education and three programs added statistically significantly to the prediction. All of these programs listed required organizations to collaborate with both the community and other sheltering organizations, suggesting that collaboration is crucial to reducing euthanasia rates.

Previous research has also explored the role that the type of organization, whether public or private, plays in contributing to collaborative ventures (Axxelsson 2009, Gazley 2010, Helgesen 1995, Huss 2006, Powell 2006, Snavelly and Tracy 2000, Vangen 2000). In this research, quantitative analysis using the variable Orgpubpri found that private organizations reduced euthanasia rates significantly over public organizations.

Collaboration can either be seen as an antidote to government bureaucracy or a creative solution to draw on multiple sectors to benefit communities. Organizational leaders often express difficulties communicating within the group because of differences in purpose, procedures, accountabilities and power (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). Much research has been done on the barriers to doing collaborative work and one area of focus has been on territorial behaviors (Axelsson & Axelsson, 2009). Many leaders within organizations view their work responsibility as their territory. In order to effectively operate collaborative efforts, members must see beyond their own interests and relinquish control of territories if necessary (Axelsson & Axelsson, 2009, p.324).

This research found similar barriers to performing collaborations in public organizations. The first barrier to collaboration was leadership with statistical analysis finding private organizations had a significantly higher score on the measure of altruistic leadership than did public organizations. The second barrier to collaboration was organizational culture. Leaders, workers and volunteers mentioned perceptions about differences between public and private animal sheltering organizations. In-depth interview participants identified public, government or municipal run shelters as “bureaucratic” and “rule-driven” while private shelters were afforded more flexibility. The third barrier to collaboration identified power-centric leadership. Shelter workers who participated in the in-depth interview whose directors were scored with low altruism on the measure of altruistic leadership identified power as being problematic in collaborative ventures.

Overall, both previous research and this research found that collaboration played an important role in reducing euthanasia rates in animal sheltering organizations. Both public and private animal sheltering organizations need to be aware of the connection between gender, altruistic leadership and collaboration.

HOW DOES THE WORK OF SHELTERING IMPACT THE IDENTITY OF LEADERS WORKERS AND VOLUNTEERS?

It would be difficult to find an example of work that impacted the identity of leaders, workers, and volunteers more than animal sheltering. This research supports and adds to the current body of sociological literature on stigma, identity and work. While all the survey respondents reported that they identified animals as being either somewhat or strongly associated with identity, females strongly agreed significantly more often than

males. Females also identified their work as “a calling” and entered the field as volunteers or lower-level employees. Males entered the field as a second career coming from fields like business or sales and wanted to make an impact on the field. All agreed with the fact that sheltering extended beyond a 40-hour week but females more often mention interruptions in their work-life balance. Females scored significantly higher than males on a measure of “How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making personal choices” indicating their actions are guided by issues facing animal welfare. Finally, as discussed earlier a new blame displacing strategy regarding euthanasia appeared in this research “blaming the process” whereby many leaders, workers and volunteers acknowledged strong stress responses, even PTSD, resulting from euthanizing healthy, adoptable companion animals.

Stigma & Identity in Animal Sheltering

Occupations can be considered stigmatized in three ways: by either being physically tainted, socially tainted or morally tainted with associated criteria for each (Ashforth and Kreiner 1999, Ashforth and Kreiner 2014, Goffman 1963, Hughes 1951)). Animal Shelter Directors work is associated with all three. Physical taint is associated with occupations that must deal physically or tangibly with “dirty” or “offensive” items or may be performed under “noxious” or “dangerous” conditions (Ashfort & Kreiner, 1999). During the in-depth interviews for this research, all of the leaders interviewed stated that the least favorite part of their work was euthanizing animals and many past leaders, workers and volunteers reported that they left their position due to the task. Furthermore, several of those interviewed mentioned long hours and low paid positions

with high stress and even experiences of sexual harassment that was endemic to the organization. These descriptions match those identified by Ashfort & Kreiner (1999).

The second area of taint associated with stigma is the social taint. This area focuses on occupations that have direct contact with stigmatized populations in society. Shelter dogs and cats are socially stigmatized simply by being nonhuman and second by being unwanted (DeMello 2012). Also, the public doesn't want to know that even though the animals are unwanted they are killed. Several of those interviewed described the community as unsupportive and critical of their work at the shelter.

The third and final area of stigma deals with moral taint. Clinton Sanders (1996) claims that more people than ever suffer from conflict regarding the use of animals in our society. Changes in state law regarding shelter policies and the current public pressure on animal sheltering organizations to move towards a low-kill or no-kill policy reflect the moral taint that society associates with euthanizing healthy and adoptable companion animals (Veterinarians 2010). A public shelter director explained the impact of the moral taint as even spreading to her family by word of mouth from her childrens' peers.

Previous research suggests that relationships with and care for companion animals is often cited as central to an individual's expression of identity (Arluke, 2006; Belk, 1996; P. S. Burke, JE, 2009; Lovett & Jordan, 2010). Human and companion animal relationships are experienced as embodied, relational and kin-like through the "intimacy of their everyday relations, revealing the importance of animals in every-day human social interactions" now embedded in our conceptions of family, kinship and domesticity (Sanders, 2003). In fact the care for companion animals is so strong, that Arluke (1994) developed the term the "caring-killing paradox" to explain the extreme trauma that

animal care workers experience when they must euthanize the animals they have sworn to care for. This research supports previous findings regarding the care for animals as central to worker's identity. All directors indicated on the survey device that they strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement "I see animals as central to my identity." Female leaders acknowledged that they strongly agreed with the statement while significantly fewer males did so. The in-depth interviews for this research also indicated that females are driven to the field of animal sheltering by their desire to work with and care for animals, viewing their work as a calling (see previous section for more information about this finding). Females also make personal decisions based on issues of animal welfare more often than men. They choose to avoid purchasing leather, do not attend circuses or dog races, and make food choices based on welfare issues. So while men may be knowledgeable about welfare issues, animal welfare is so central to female identity that they make life choices based on the issues.

Sociologists in the field of identity theory examined the relationship between an individual's self-concept and the individual identities, positional component of self, which combined together comprise self-concept (Brenner, Serpe and Stryker 2017, Burke 2009, Stets 2005). Identity theorists defined identities as "the set of possible meanings of roles in the form of expectations of others for one or more of these possible meanings. They require that the meanings be internalized by actors" (2017:232). These identities are categorized as belonging to either personal, role or group (Brenner, Serpe and Stryker 2017, Burke 2009). Whether any one identity is used at that moment in time, depends upon either a salience hierarchy (Stryker and Serpe 1982) or a prominence hierarchy (McCall and Simmons 1978). The salience hierarchy determined the likelihood that that

particular identity will be invoked based on frequency of use and the network of others to which that particular identity is attached, while a prominence hierarchy, determines the identity use by the level of importance attached to that particular identity in one's ideal self. More recent research has focused on combining the concepts to explain the likelihood that any one identity will be used (Brenner, Serpe and Stryker 2014, Stets 2005). A hierarchy of control, per social identity theory, situated some identities as higher ordered than others. The higher ordered identities serve to regulate or guide lower level identities. Furthermore, either positive or negative emotions are experienced when the identity verification process is engaged. Positive emotions are experienced when the role is adequately played out, and negative emotions are experiences when the role is inadequately played out. The self-verification process provides the basis for self-esteem and its components worth, efficacy and authenticity. Higher ordered identity self-verification problems result in higher levels of distress than lower level ones (Burke 2009).

Animal shelter leaders, workers and volunteers reported that animals were central to their identity and entered the field as a calling in this research. The majority of the leaders, workers and volunteers also had companion animals of their own to care for and talked about their role that their companion animals played in their early social development. My research suggested that for the majority of leaders, workers and volunteers, the animal identity has been life long, extended across networks of families, friends and co-workers connecting to identity theory as an upper level identity with both high salience and prominence.

There are few, if any, direct comparisons to other occupations or fields where identity is wrapped so closely with the work and where the meaning of the work has experienced such a drastic paradigm shift. As previous research has explored, animal shelter workers have, up until the last five years, been able to do the “dirty work” by employing strategies that enable them to maintain self-esteem and avoid the negative emotions from a faulty verification process. Animal shelter leaders, workers and volunteers utilized ideologies or belief systems to reframe, refocus and recalibrate the meaning of their work (Kreiner, 2006). This research found evidence of similar strategies used regarding philosophies of euthanasia reframed as a “good death” in the face of treatment that might have ended in a painful or tortuous death supporting the research of Arluke (1991) and Irvine (2004a). Another theme identified in this research was “blaming the public” for abandoning animals in the shelter to be ultimately euthanized which Arluke (2006) and Irvine (2004) also found in their research.

Amongst the themes of euthanasia philosophy identified in this research was the third one “blaming the process.” In this theme, findings from in-depth interviews suggested that leaders, workers and volunteers experienced compassion fatigue, traumatic stress and post-traumatic stress disorder. “Blaming the process” has not been identified by previous researchers as a stigmatized worker strategy. Situated here, it is possible that we see the direct impact of the paradigm shift, the pressure to move from higher euthanasia rates to much lower rates because views of animals have shifted from an object, to a subject, becomes evident. The blames displacing strategies that researchers identified over a decade ago appeared about the same time as, or shortly after, the no-kill movement became widely acknowledged. The majority of these interviews were completed in late

2015 and early 2016. Many sheltering organizations have adopted the programming necessary to significantly reduce euthanasia rates and as identified in this research has become a central conflict across the industry with over 253 mentions throughout the in-depth interviews (see previous discussion in this chapter).

Burke and Stets (2009) in their book on identity theory, described the results of emotional results of identity verification disruptions on highly salient and prominent “person” identities. When identity nonverification happens at this level, individuals experience moral emotions including anger, empathy, shame and guilt which over the long term may contribute to depression. Furthermore, identity change takes place slowly over an extended exposure to repeated negative identity verification cycles (Burke 2006).

The results of this exposure are explained by Burke (2006)

the presence of such elements that have meanings discrepant with our identities, some self-meanings change in a way that reduces the dissonance or discrepancy. We change the importance or prominence of certain elements, and we shift our self-conceptions on dimensions of meaning so as to reduce the dissonance. The changes in identities resulting from most decisions would be quite small; for very important or large decisions ,however fairly large changes can ensue. (94)

Furthermore, to avoid coming into direct confrontations to discrepant feedback, individuals try to interact with others that will confirm the meanings that are in contest, using strategies like selective interaction (Burke 2006). Here individuals avoid people who might call this meaning into question. On the organizational level, occupations that are classified as having “pervasive stigma” tend to experience the strengthening of entitativity – a perception among individuals that they are group like. This produces a boundary between “us” and “them” and in turn “us” begins to question the legitimacy of the stigma espoused by “them.” In essence, the organization circles the wagons and responds to the threat as a collective (Kreiner 2006)

This cycle of negative identification, the resultant social relationship reduction and ensuing negative emotions like anger, shame and depression fit cleanly into the framework described by trauma theorists. Judith Herman (1998, 1997) described trauma as situated in extreme disconnection from both society and self. Trauma is conceptualized as breaking one's understanding of the world around them. It casts the victim into an existential crisis, breaking relationships with friends and family. Trauma shatters an individual's self concept, undermining their belief system. According to Herman, trauma alienates individuals from their social surroundings. Trauma causes the victim to feel shame, anger and depression from the disconnection experienced.

Applying both lenses of identity theory and trauma theory to that of euthanasia in animal sheltering organizations, the connection to exposure to euthanasia and what is referred to as compassion fatigue in the field or traumatic stress disorder by psychologists becomes clear. Early in the "no-kill" movement and societal paradigm shift of attitudes about companion animals, it was much easier to utilize blame displacing strategies and organizational entitativity to reinforce the narrative that euthanasia was an important, though unpleasant, duty. As the meaning of animal care and the use of euthanasia has dramatically shifted and become much more widespread, leaders and workers with salient and prominent "person" identity of an animal person and the moral identity of ethic of care or altruism, the traumatic impact of the act of euthanasia cannot be avoided. This connects directly to the strategy of "blaming the process" of euthanasia. In order to continue euthanizing animals, an individual's identity must change and this change is compassion fatigue.

HOW DO THE NARRATIVES CREATED BY ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS IMPACT WORKERS AND VOLUNTEERS?

The pressure to make organizational change regarding euthanasia rates in animal sheltering was evident during the in-depth interviews throughout this research. In fact, the majority of the leaders, workers and volunteers mentioned change during the interviews and in the open response question of the survey instrument asking for the reasons for leaving. Four female directors and three male directors provided detailed narration of the progression of change in their organization. Two themes regarding change became clear. One theme focused on “toxic change” where organizational leaders created a climate of constant change without clear goals or support and employees continued to experience negative emotions as described above. The other theme focused on successful change or “the perfect storm” where leaders implemented successful change in response to a number of changing conditions and employees felt positive emotions and enhanced self-esteem.

Previous research has explored the emotion work required for animal shelter leaders, workers and volunteers while dealing with issues of animal care, euthanasia, and interacting with the public (Arluke 2006, Irvine 2002, Irvine 2003, Sanders 1995, Sanders 2010, White and Shawhan 1996). Hochschild (1983) identified surface acting and deep acting as emotional regulation tools to modify or regulate emotional reactions. These emotion-altering or reducing strategies may cause extreme distress for both the mental, physical and social health of the individual when they are reproduced over long periods of time (Cote 2002, Lawrence 2008). Given that the work of animal sheltering has been associated with the negative physical, mental and social impacts, leaders must be very

aware of creating a culture that acknowledges these negative emotions and works to provide support and protection for the employees. The addition of outside pressure to create change makes the field of animal sheltering a very unique environment unlike any other.

Research regarding change in organizations has documented a link between negative emotions and change (Dutton and Jackson 1987, Frost 2004, Gallos 2008, Kiefer 2005). Identity theory, as discussed above, supports a negative emotion and change connection, especially when change involves a difference between strongly held and often used person and moral identities. Often during periods of change, moral ambiguity exists about what is right or wrong and can work to sustain a toxic environment in the workplace, especially when negative internal emotions like guilt, shame or embarrassment are collectively held (Smith-Crowe and Warren 2014). Given the paradigm shift regarding animals in society and the expansion of the no-kill movement, many animal sheltering organizations are feeling immense pressure to change, are attempting to make this change or have successfully implemented change. Speaking about the general ambiguity that exists in today's sheltering environment, many shelter leaders mentioned during the in-depth interviews that lack of guidance from an overarching organization exacerbated the dilemma. Problematic organizational barriers like push back against change from unionized workers or the role of power and money that work to maintain the status quo were also mentioned frequently.

Several directors, workers and volunteers spoke to their own experience of dealing with boards of directors and leaders that worked to create a toxic environment and prevented permanent change within the organization. Some employees and

volunteers mentioned unsupportive administration that did not encourage self-care or allowed a culture of sexual harassment to exist. Others mentioned that administration encouraged an attitude of apathetic treatment or abuse to the animals in their care.

While several current and former leaders provided similar examples and change narratives, a former assistant director at a public/private sheltering organization, provided an in-depth narrative of his experience in a toxic organization where change was never fully implemented. As the organization served in both a public and private way, the moral ambiguity regarding euthanasia stemmed from both inside the organization and outside the organization. One arm of the organization provided animal control services per a contract with the local government and the second arm sheltered and cared for the animals as the humane society. Furthermore, the two arms were housed together in one building. Albert and Adams (2002) referred to hybrid organizational identities where the two are perceived as incompatible and indispensable and contributed to conflicts in identity roles. This in turn is associated with strongly held negative emotions (Wang and Pratt 2009). The narrative of the toxic organization described the experience of a push and pull between a humane society and a public shelter that must take all surrenders despite lack of space which directly increased euthanasia numbers. The community expected surrenders to be rehomed per the non-profit mission but the public shelter mission directly clashed causing distress for both employees and community members.

Another example that the narrative provided of the experience of moral ambiguity was the constantly changing animal euthanasia policies. The organizational euthanasia policy changed with “no rhyme or reason” and the goals assigned for the change kept shifting. In his research on toxic emotions in organizations, Frost (2004) identified seven

sources of toxicity in organizations. One of these was the corporate agenda where “toxins flow from company practices that create pain in those who must carry them out. The equation that generates the policy or practice frequently is inherently toxic. Unethical behavior that is systemic in organizations is also unhealthy. Impossible stretch goals and constant cuts to budgets and to staff and endless changes in direction all contribute to the toxicity in many organizations” (114). The narrative of the toxic organization highlighted the pain and distress felt by the employees when faced with the unclear, often changing policy towards euthanasia of healthy, companion animals for reasons of time and space.

Another of the seven sources of toxicity identified by Frost (2004) was intrusion where the agenda of the leader intruded into the lives of employees by requiring unreasonable workloads and work schedules. In the toxic narrative, the employee spoke at length about the impact that low wages and long hours had on his home life. Furthermore, the organization required all salaried employees donate unpaid work time which allowed the toxic organization to avoid paying any overtime or avoid adding additional employees.

Toxic leader are individual that use their power to manipulate and control followers for immoral or narcissistic purposes (Frost 2004; Gallos 2008). The toxic narrative described several incidents which served as an example of a leader’s action that was both damaging and emotionally destructive to the employees and volunteers, one time even using euthanasia as a weapon against them.

The director in the toxic narrative described how he often played the role of the “toxic handler” which served as a buffer between toxic leadership and other employees.

He also relayed the psychological distress that juggling the needs of his employees and volunteers and his upper management caused him long-term.

Using the emotion-evoked collective corruption model, Smith-Crowe and Warren (2017) described how corruption is diffused across organizations. When strong internalized negative emotions exist like shame and guilt in organizations that experience moral ambiguity, corruption is easily spread throughout the organization. The toxic narrative provided a description of the private public collaboration style animal shelter which fits within this framework. The corruption in the toxic organization extended to the monetary funds solicited as donations from the community surrounding the organization. These funds were used by upper management to benefit themselves rather than the animals held there.

This toxic environment contributed to an organization which discouraged connections to the external environment. Relationships within the organization became most important and encouraged secrecy from those outside of the toxic stew; in fact he described them as an AA group. Here the toxic organization can be viewed through the framework of trauma, where trauma serves to disconnect an individual from one's relationships with others, even family and community (Herman 1997).

Overall, the narrative of a toxic organization mirrored the experience of many leaders, workers and volunteers. Several of those interviewed experienced corruptive practices in leadership and five women directly mentioned sexual harassment. While the toxic narrative provided a detailed description of an organization that failed to introduce successful change, other leaders, workers and volunteers described more positive experiences of change.

The last detailed narrative centered on change as a “perfect storm” or change that occurred through a series of events, actions and people that came together to successfully implement change. The perfect storm narrative described that initially her organization struggled with many problems that were similar to the “toxic” environment described above. The organization had a history of financial problems and leadership that was “rule-driven” and held an us against them mentality. In fact, the leader described a situation where an outside individual who volunteered at the organization secretly gathered information on euthanasia rates and practices and shared it with the press. Rather than encourage change, it worked to entitativity – a perception among individuals that they are group like (Kreiner 2006) This served to encourage social weighting - the feelings of us against those uneducated outsiders and the current leader maintained the position that there was no other option than euthanasia to deal with the unwanted animals (Arluke 1991).

It was the financial instability that caused the final “shock” to the system. The narrative provided a description of the painful experience of temporarily closing the shelter and euthanizing all the animals in the shelter at the time. Weick’s sensemaking model (2005) explained that sensemaking is not necessarily accurate but required a continued redrafting of a narrative that makes it comprehensible to the actors involved. A disruption or shock to the narrative caused the actors to reevaluate the sensemaking. In this case, the shock of financial insolvency and euthanasia of all the animals was so painful that the board decided to reevaluate their organizational mission, policies and leadership.

Here critical sensemaking (Helms Mills, Thurlow and Mills 2010; Thurlow and Helms Mills 2015) explained that organizational rules and policies restrict the legitimacy of plausible narratives. The perfect storm described how animal sheltering had no overarching organization that could provide alternative frameworks for developing euthanasia policies but that someone happened to share Nathan Winograd's book that provided a step-by-step plan for instituting an effective, financial stable organization that would significantly reduce euthanasia. The entire board read the book and decided to try his plan and then redesigned a more flexible adoption policy with reduced fees allowing more of the community to adopt.

Furthermore, the board decided to hire a (F. Malien 2008) shelter director that was open to change and was supportive of Winograd's policy. The implementation of the policies would require an altruistic leader (Axelsson and Axelsson 2009; Escrig et al. 2016) that could encourage employees to take chances on new programming, encouraged collaborations with other organizations and included the community on decision-making, all elements of a high score on organizational learning.

This organization is now used as a model for implementing no-kill policy in a private, non-profit organization. She explained that they continue to be financial stable despite the fact that they reduced adoption fees and that the community is now very supportive of them. The perfect storm story of institutional change was very similar to others who took part in the in-depth interview process. Common among them was several failed attempts, employee turnover and some level of shock to the organization providing "a perfect storm" scenario. Key among these are an altruistic leader that is

supportive of change and brings the rest of the organization's workers and volunteers into the process creating an organization that is open and flexible to learning.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

Participants for the survey were solicited from both The Bark magazine and an Humane Society of the United States conference on animal sheltering as the link to the online survey was shared at both. Snowballing occurred as survey respondents shared with others in the organization or other organizations. The findings from the survey and resultant in-depth interviews may not generalize to the animal sheltering community nationally.

The majority of the respondents were women, with very few males taking part in the research. While previous research has suggested that animal protection and welfare occupations are filled by the majority of women, this sample may not generalize to population of animal sheltering leaders, workers and volunteers.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Given the recent suicide of Sophia Yin, a veterinary behaviorist and animal welfare author, much more attention must be given to the concept of compassion fatigue. It was widely reported that Yin experienced depression and PTSD from compassion fatigue (Lizak 2015). Furthermore, the experience of sexual harassment appears to be problematic in the world of animal sheltering as well, as exemplified by the charges against HSUS president Wayne Pacell. My research supported evidence of both compassion fatigue and sexual harassment in "toxic organizations."

More research needs to focus on the role of leadership in creating organizational culture in animal sheltering organizations as my research suggested that female leaders

with high altruism scores created a positive and supportive culture that dealt with change. In this case change resulted in significantly lower euthanasia rates. Given the high risk of companion animals death resulting from entering into animal shelters, more research needs to be done in an accessible fashion for the industry to implement leadership change.

Finally, animal sheltering work appeared to be very central to an individual's identity and given the level of distress that the "caring/killing paradox" (Arluke 1991) presents for leaders, workers and volunteers in the field more research must be done. Given the societal changes in attitudes towards animals, and the stigma associated with animal euthanasia, this relationship between identity and work is very different than any other field.

REFERENCES

- Accords, Asilomar. 2004. "The Guiding Principals of the Asilomar Accords." *Asilomar Accords*. (<https://www.shelteranimalscount.org/docs/default-source/DataResources/2004aaccords5.pdf?sfvrsn=0>).
- Adams, J. Donovan & C.J. 2007. *The Feminist Care Tradition in Animal Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Adrian, Luiz, Julie A. Deliramich, Aimee N. Frueh and B. Christopher. 2009. "Complicated Grief and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Humans' Response to the Death of Pets/Animals." *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 73(3):176-87.
- Arluke, Arnold. 1991. "Coping with Euthanasia: A Case Study of Shelter Culture." *Journal of The American Veterinary Medicine Association* 198(7):1176-80.
- Arluke, Arnold. 2002. "A Sociology of Sociological Animal Studies." *Society & Animals* 10(4):369-74.
- Arluke, Arnold. 2003. The no-kill controversy: Manifest and latent sources of tension. Pp. 67-83 in *The state of the animals II: 2003*, edited by D.J. Salem and A.N. Rowan, Washington, DC: Humane Society Press.
- Arluke, Arnold. 2006. *Just a Dog*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ashforth, B. E. and G. E. Kreiner. 1999. "How Can You Do It?: Dirty Work and the Challenge of Constructing a Positive Identity." *Academy of Management Review* 24(3):413-34. doi: 10.2307/259134.

- Ashforth, B. E. and G. E. Kreiner. 2014. "Dirty Work and Dirtier Work: Differences in Countering Physical, Social, and Moral Stigma." *Management and Organization Review* 10(1):81-108. doi: 10.1111/more.12044.
- Association, American Pet Products. 2011. "Industry Statistics and Trends." American Pet Products Association. Retrieved 11/2015. (www.americanpetproducts.org).
- Axelsson, Susanna Bihari and Runo Axelsson. 2009. "From Territoriality to Altruism in Interprofessional Collaboration and Leadership." *Journal of Interprofessional Care* 23(4):320-30. doi: 10.1080/13561820902921811.
- Balcom, Sarah A. 2000. "Legislating a Solution to Animal Shelter Euthanasia: A Case Study of California's Controversial Sb 1785." *Society & Animals* 8(2):1-23.
- Baran, B.E. 2012. "Shouldering a Silent Burden: The Toll of Dirty Tasks." *Human Resource* 65(5):597-626.
- Bartlett, P. C., A. Bartlett, S. Walshaw and S. Halstead. 2005. "Rates of Euthanasia and Adoption for Dogs and Cats in Michigan Animal Shelters." *J Appl Anim Welf Sci* 8(2):97-104. doi: 10.1207/s15327604jaws0802_2.
- Baruch, Y. and B. Holtom. 2008. "Survey Response Rate Levels and Trends in Organizational Research." *Human Relations* 61(8):1139-60.
- Beck, A. M. and A. H. Katcher. 2003. "Future Directions in Human-Animal Bond Research." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1):79-93.
- Beers, D.L. 2006. *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*. Athens, OH: Swallow Press.

- Bekoff, Marc. 2001. "The Evolution of Animal Play, Emotions, and Social Morality: On Science, Theology, Spirituality, Personhood, and Love." *ZYGO Zygon*® 36(4):615-55.
- Bekoff, Marc. 2006. "Animal Passions and Bestly Virtues: Cognitive Ethology as the Unifying Science for Understanding the Subjective, Emotional, Empathic, and Moral Lives of Animals." *ZYGO Zygon*® 41(1):71-104.
- Bellah, Robert N, Richard Madsen, William M Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steven M Tipton. 1993. "Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life." *Journal of Leisure Research* 25(1):100.
- Blouin, D. D. 2013. "Are Dogs Children, Companions, or Just Animals? Understanding Variations in People's Orientations toward Animals." *Anthrozoos* 26(2):279-94.
- Bradshaw, J. W. S. 2011. "Conceptualizing the Domestic Dog – Should We Start Again?". *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 6(1):95-96. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2010.08.014>.
- Brenner, Philip S., Richard T. Serpe and Sheldon Stryker. 2014. "The Causal Ordering of Prominence and Salience in Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77(3):231-52. doi: 10.1177/0190272513518337.
- Brenner, Philip S., Richard T. Serpe and Sheldon Stryker. 2017. "Role-Specific Self-Efficacy as Precedent and Product of the Identity Model." *Sociological Perspectives*. doi: 10.1177/0731121417697306.
- Brown, S. E. and A. H. Katcher. 2001. "Pet Attachment and Dissociation." *Society & Animals* 9(1):25-41. doi: 10.1163/156853001300108973.

- Brown, S. E. 2002. "Ethnic Variations in Pet Attachment among Students at an American School of Veterinary Medicine." *Society & Animals* 10(3):249-66.
- Bryant, C.D. 1979. "The Zoological Connection: Animal-Related Human Behavior." *Social Forces* 58(2):399-421.
- Bunderson, J Stuart and Jeffery A Thompson. 2009. "The Call of the Wild: Zookeepers, Callings, and the Double-Edged Sword of Deeply Meaningful Work." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 54(1):32-57.
- Burke, P.J. and J.E. Stets. 2009. *Identity Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, Peter J. 2006. "Identity Change." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 69(1):81-96. doi: 10.1177/019027250606900106.
- Campbell, M. O. 2013. "The Relevance of Age and Gender for Public Attitudes to Brown Bears (*Ursus Arctos*), Black Bears (*Ursus Americanus*), and Cougars (*Puma Concolor*) in Kamloops, British Columbia." *Society & Animals* 21(4):341-59.
- Carter, Bob and Nickie Charles. 2013. "Animals, Agency and Resistance." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43(3):322-40. doi: 10.1111/jtsb.12019.
- Cherry, E. 2010. "Shifting Symbolic Boundaries: Cultural Strategies of the Animal Rights Movement." *Sociological Forum* 25(3):450-63.
- Chiandetti, Cinzia, Silvia Avella, Erica Fongaro and Francesco Cerri. 2016. "Can Clicker Training Facilitate Conditioning in Dogs?". *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 184(Supplement C):109-16. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2016.08.006>.
- Chiva, Ricardo, Joaquin Alegre and Rafael Lapiedra. 2007. "Measuring Organisational Learning Capability among the Workforce." *International Journal of Manpower* 28(3-4):224-42.

- Christian, L.M., N.L. Parsons and D.L. Dillman. 2009. "Designing Scalar Questions for Web Surveys." *Sociological Methods & Research* 37(3):393-420.
- Coleman, Sydney H. 1924. *Humane Society Leaders in America, with a Sketch of the Early History of the Humane Movement in England*. Albany, N.Y.: American Humane Association.
- Council, Faunalytics Humane Research. 2016. "Animal Tracker Survey."
- Dalla Villa, P., S. Barnard, E. Di Fede, M. Podaliri, L. Candeloro, A. Di Nardo, C. Siracusa and J. A. Serpell. 2013. "Behavioural and Physiological Responses of Shelter Dogs to Long-Term Confinement." *Veterinaria Italiana* 49(2):231-41.
doi: 10.12834/VetIt.2013.492.231.241.
- DeMello, Margo. 2012. *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Development, Chaddick Institute for Metropolitan. 2010. "Companion Animals and Chicago Communities: A Strategic Assessment for the City of Chicago." Vol. Chicago: Depaul University.
- Diverio, S. and G. Tami. 2014. "Effect of Owner Experience, Living Environment, and Dog Characteristics on Owner Reports of Behavior of Argentine Dogos in Italy." *Journal of Veterinary Behavior-Clinical Applications and Research* 9(4):151-57.
doi: 10.1016/j.jveb.2014.02.007.
- Donovan, Josephine. 1993. "Animal Rights and Feminist Theory." *Ecofeminism: Women, animals, nature*:167-94.
- Donovan, Josephine and Carol J Adams. 1995. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*: Duke University Press.

- Duffy, Ryan D and Bryan J Dik. 2013. "Research on Calling: What Have We Learned and Where Are We Going?". *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 83(3):428-36.
- Dutton, J. E. and S. E. Jackson. 1987. "Categorizing Strategic Issues - Links to Organizational Action." *Academy of Management Review* 12(1):76-90. doi: 10.2307/257995.
- Eagly, A.H., S.J.Karau, & B.T. Johnson. 1992. "Gender and Leadership Style among School Principals: A Metaanalysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 28(1):3-22.
- Eaton, Heather, Carol J Adams and Josephine Donovan. 1996. "Animals & Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations." *Resources for Feminist Research* 25(1/2):23.
- Escrig, Emilio Domínguez , Francisco Fermín Mallén Broch, Ricardo Chiva Gómez and Rafael Lapiedra Alcamí. 2016. "How Does Altruistic Leader Behavior Foster Radical Innovation? The Mediating Effect of Organizational Learning Capability." *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 37(8):1056-82.
- Fitzgerald, Amy J., Linda Kalof and Thomas Dietz. 2009. "Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates." *Organization & Environment* 22(2):158-84. doi: 10.1177/1086026609338164.
- Frank, J. 2004. "An Interactive Model of Human and Companion Animal Dynamics: The Ecology and Economics of Dog Overpopulation and the Human Costs of Addressing the Problem." *Human Ecology* 32(1):107-30.
- Frank, J. 2007. "A Interactive Model of Human and Companion Animal Dynamics: The Ecology and Economics of Dog Overpopulation and the Human Costs of Addressing the Problem." *FirePaw Website*. (firepaw@earthlink.net).

- Frank, J. M. and P. L. Carlisle-Frank. 2007. "Analysis of Programs to Reduce Overpopulation of Companion Animals: Do Adoption and Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Programs Merely Cause Substitution of Sources?". *Ecological Economics* 62(3-4):740-46.
- Frommer, S. S. and A. Arluke. 1999. "Loving Them to Death: Blame-Displacing Strategies of Animal Shelter Workers and Surrenderers." *Society & Animals* 7(1):1-16.
- Frost, Peter J. 2004. "Handling Toxic Emotions:: New Challenges for Leaders and Their Organization." *Organizational Dynamics* 33(2):111-27. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.01.001>.
- Fund, Animal Legal Defense. 2010. "Aldf Takes Kentucky Counties to Task for Failing to Protect Homeless Dogs and Cats." *Animal Legal Defense Fund*. Retrieved 11/2015 (www.aldf.org).
- Gardner, Emily. 2008. "Risk & Reward: The Impact of Animal Rights Activism on Women." *Society and Animals* 16(1):1-22.
- Gallos, Joan V. 2008. "Learning from the Toxic Trenches." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 17(4):354-67. doi: 10.1177/1056492608320580.
- Gardner, William L, Bruce J Avolio, Fred Luthans, Douglas R May and Fred Walumbwa. 2005. "'Can You See the Real Me?' a Self-Based Model of Authentic Leader and Follower Development." *The Leadership Quarterly* 16(3):343-72.
- Garner, R. 1995. "The Politics of Animal Protection: A Research Agenda." *Society and Animals* 3(1):43-60.

- Gazley, B. 2010. "Why Not Partner with Local Government?: Nonprofit Managerial Perceptions of Collaborative Disadvantage." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39(1):51-76.
- Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a Different Voice*. New York: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., 1995. Hearing the difference: Theorizing connection. *Hypatia*, 10(2), pp.120-127
- Goffman, E. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon & Simon.
- Goodstein, J. D. 2007. "Institutional Pressures and Strategic Responsiveness." in *The Sociology of Organizations*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Greenebaum, J. 2004. "It's a Dog's Life: Elevating Status from Pet to "Fur Baby" at Yappy Hour." *Society & Animals* 12(2):117-35. doi: 10.1163/1568530041446544.
- Greenebaum, Jessica. 2009. "'I'm Not an Activist!': Animal Rights Vs. Animal Welfare in the Purebred Dog Rescue Movement." *Society & Animals* 17:289-304.
- Hageby, L. L., and L. K. Schartau. 1903. *The Shambles of Science*. 19-25.
- Hamilton, F. E. 2010. "Leading and Organizing Social Change for Companion Animals." *Anthrozoos* 23(3):277-92.
- Hanrahan, R. 2007. "Dog Duty." *Society & Animals* 15(4):379-99.
- Haraway, Donna Jeanne. 2003. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*: Prickly Paradigm Press Chicago.
- Haraway, Donna Jeanne. 2008. *When Species Meet*, Vol. 3: University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis.

- Hecht, J., A. Miklosi and M. Gacsi. 2012. "Behavioral Assessment and Owner Perceptions of Behaviors Associated with Guilt in Dogs." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 139(1-2):134-42.
- Held, Virginia. 2006. *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Helgesen, S. 1995. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Helms Mills, Jean, Amy Thurlow and Albert J Mills. 2010. "Making Sense of Sensemaking: The Critical Sensemaking Approach." *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 5(2):182-95.
- Hens, K. 2009. "Ethical Responsibilities Towards Dogs: An Inquiry into the Dog-Human Relationship." *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics* 22(1):3-14.
- Herman, Judith L. 1998. "Recovery from Psychological Trauma." *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences* 52(S1):S98-S103. doi: 10.1046/j.1440-1819.1998.0520s5S145.x.
- Herman, Judith Lewis. 1997. "Trauma and Recovery (Rev. Ed.)." New York: Basic Books.
- Herron, Meghan E., Frances S. Shofer and Ilana R. Reisner. 2009. "Survey of the Use and Outcome of Confrontational and Non-Confrontational Training Methods in Client-Owned Dogs Showing Undesired Behaviors." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 117(1):47-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2008.12.011>.

- Herzog, Harold A. 2007. "Gender Differences in Human-animal Interactions: A Review." *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of The Interactions of People & Animals* 20(1):7-21.
- Holak, S. L. 2008. "Ritual Blessings with Companion Animals." *Journal of Business Research* 61(5):534-41.
- Hughes, E.C. 1951. "Work and the Self." Pp. 313-23 in *Social Psychology at the Crossroads*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Huss, Rebecca J. 2006. "Rescue Me: Legislating Cooperation between Animal Control Authorities and Rescue Organizations." *Conn. L. Rev.* 2006;39:2059..
- Huxham, Chris and Siv Vangen. 2000. "Special Research Forum on Managing in the New Millennium - Articles - Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-up World." *Academy of Management journal*. 43(6):1159.
- Ingold, Tim. 1980. *Hunters, Pastoralists, and Ranchers: Reindeer Economies and Their Transformations*: Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Irvine, L. 2002. "Animal Problems/People Skills: Emotional and Interactional Strategies in Humane Education." *Society & Animals* 10(1):63-91.
- Irvine, L. 2003. "The Problem of Unwanted Pets: A Case Study in How Institutions "Think" About Clients' Needs." *Social Problems* 50(4):550-66.
- Irvine, L. 2004. "A Model of Animal Selfhood: Expanding Interactionist Possibilities." *Symbolic Interaction* 27(1):3-21.
- Irvine, L. 2012. "Sociology and Anthrozoology: Symbolic Interactionist Contributions." *Anthrozoos* 25:S123-S37.

- Irvine, Leslie and Jenny R. Vermilya. 2010. "Gender Work in a Feminized Profession: The Case of Veterinary Medicine." *Gender and Society* 24(1):56-82.
- Jaffee, Sara and Janet Shibley Hyde. 2000. "Gender Differences in Moral Orientation: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):703.
- Kass, Philip H, John C New Jr, Janet M Scarlett and Mo D Salman. 2001. "Understanding Animal Companion Surplus in the United States: Relinquishment of Nonadoptables to Animal Shelters for Euthanasia." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 4(4):237-48.
- Kiefer, Tina. 2005. "Feeling Bad: Antecedents and Consequences of Negative Emotions in Ongoing Change." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26(8):875-97. doi: 10.1002/job.339.
- Kentucky Humane Society. 2011. "Kentucky Humane Society S.N.I.P. Clinic Performs 40,000th Surgery." Retrieved: February 28, 2015.
- Kreiner, G.E., Ashforth, B.E. & Sluss, D.M. 2006. "Identity Dynamics in Occupational Dirty Work: Integrating Social Identity and System Justification Perspectives." *Organization Science* 17(5):619-36.
- Kruse, Corwin. 2002. "Social Animals: Animal Studies and Sociology." *Society of Animals Forum*. Retrieved 11/2016 (<http://www.societyandanimalsforum.org/sa/sa10.4/kruse.shtml>).
- Kruse, Corwin R. 1999. "Gender, Views of Nature, and Support for Animal Rights." *Society and Animals* 7(3):179-98.

- Kuyel, Nilay and Rebecca J. Glover. 2010. "Moral Reasoning and Moral Orientation of U.S. And Turkish University Students." *Psychological Reports* 107(2):463-79.
doi: 10.2466/08.09.17.PR0.107.5.463-479.
- Larson, B. R., S. Looker, D. M. Herrera, E. T. Creagan, S. R. Hayman, J. S. Kaur and A. Jatoi. 2010. "Cancer Patients and Their Companion Animals: Results from a 309-Patient Survey on Pet-Related Concerns and Anxieties During Chemotherapy." *Journal of Cancer Education* 25(3):396-400.
- Liddell, D. 1998. "Comparison of Semistructured Interviews with a Quantitative Measure of Moral Orientation." *Journal of College Student Development* 39(2):159-77.
- Liddell, D. 2006. "The Measure of Moral Orientation: A Testing Manual." Iowa City:University of Iowa.
- Mallén, Fermín, Ricardo Chiva, Joaquín Vidal and Jacob Guinot. 2015. *Are Altruistic Leaders Worthy? The Role of Organizational Learning Capability*, Vol. 36.
- Manning, A. M. and A. N. Rowan. 1992. "Companion Animal Demographics and Sterilization Status - Results from a Survey in 4 Massachusetts Towns." *Anthrozoos* 5(3):192-201.
- Marsh, Peter. 2009. *Replacing Myth with Math: Using Evidence-Based Programs to Eradicate Shelter Overpopulation*. Concord: Town & Country Reprographics.
- Martin, F. and S. Glover. 2008. "Veterinary Students' Views Regarding the Legal Status of Companion Animals." *Anthrozoos* 21(2):163-79.
- Miller, L. 2007. "Animal Sheltering in the United States: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow." *Veterinary Medicine* 102(10):656-63.

- Mornement, K. M., G. J. Coleman, S. Toukhsati and P. C. Bennett. "A Review of Behavioral Assessment Protocols Used by Australian Animal Shelters to Determine the Adoption Suitability of Dogs." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 13(4):314-29.
- Morris, J. and S. Zawistowski. 2004. "The Evolving Animal Shelter." Pp. 3-10 in *Shelter Medicine for Veterinarians and Staff*. Ames: Blackwell Publishing.
- Munro, L. 2001. "Caring About Blood, Flesh, and Pain: Women's Standing in the Animal Protection Movement." *Society & Animals* 9(1):43-61.
- National Council on Pet Population and Study. (2001) *Shelter Statistics Survey*. Retrieved 11/2015 (<http://www.petpopulation.org/statsurvey.html>).
- New, J.C., Salman, M.D., King, M.Scarlett, J.M. 2000. "Characteristics of Shelter Relinquished Animals and Their Owners." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 3(3):179-201.
- Newbury, Sandra, Mary K. Blinn, Philip A. Bushby, Cynthia Barker Cox, Julie D. Dinnage, Brenda Griffin, Kate F. Hurley, Natalie Isaza, Wes Jones, Lila Miller, Jeanette O'Quin, Gary J. Patronek, Martha Smith-Blackmore, Miranda Spindel. 2010. *Guidelines for Standard of Care in Animal Shelters* .Retrieved in 11/2015. (<http://shelternet.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Shelter-Standards-Oct2011-wForward.pdf>).
- Nicoll, K., C. Trifone and W. E. Samuels. 2008. "An in-Class, Humane Education Program Can Improve Young Students' Attitudes toward Animals." *Society & Animals* 16(1):45-60.

- Noddings, N. 1984. *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*.
 Berkley: University of California Press.
- Noddings, Nel. 2012. "The Language of Care Ethics." *Knowledge Quest* 40(5):52-56.
- Podberscek, A. L. 1997. "Illuminating Issues of Companion Animal Welfare through
 Research into Human-Animal Interactions." *Animal Welfare* 6(4):365-72.
- Powell, Walter W. Steinberg Richard. 2006. "The Nonprofit Sector a Research
 Handbook."
- Reeve, Charlie L. Rogelberg Steven G. Spitzmüller Christiane Digiacoimo Natalie. 2005.
 "The Caring-Killing Paradox: Euthanasia-Related Strain among Animal-Shelter
 Workers¹." *JASP Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 35(1):119-43.
- Ritvo, Harriet. 1987. "The Emergence of Modern Pet-Keeping." *Anthrozoos* 1(3):158-60.
- Rogelberg, S. G., C. L. Reeve, C. Spitzmuller, N. DiGiacomo, O. L. Clark, L. Teeter, A.
 G. Walker, P. G. Starling and N. T. Carter. 2007. "Impact of Euthanasia Rates,
 Euthanasia Practices, and Human Resource Practices on Employee Turnover in
 Animal Shelters." *Javma-Journal of the American Veterinary Medical
 Association* 230(5):713-19.
- Rohlf, V. and P. Bennett. 2005. "Perpetration-Induced Traumatic Stress in Persons Who
 Euthanize Nonhuman Animals in Surgeries, Animal Shelters, and Laboratories."
Society & Animals 13(3):201-19.
- Rollin, B. E. 2011. "Euthanasia, Moral Stress, and Chronic Illness in Veterinary
 Medicine." *Veterinary Clinics of North America-Small Animal Practice*
 41(3):651-+. doi: 10.1016/j.cvsm.2011.03.005.

- Rosser, V.J. 2010. "Faculty and Staff Members' Perceptions of Effective Leadership: Are There Differences between Women and Men Leaders." *Equity & Excellence in Education*:71-81.
- Rowan, Andrew. 2006. "Counting the Contributions: Benchmarking for Your Organization and Your State." *Animal Sheltering Magazine*, November, pp. 35-43.
- S.E Simola, J. Barling, and N. Turner. 2010. "Transformational Leadership and Leader Moral Orientation: Contrasting an Ethic of Justice and an Ethic of Care." *The Leadership Quarterly* 21:179-99.
- Salman, MD, Jr , New, John G, Janet M Scarlett, Philip H Kass, Rebecca Ruch-Gallie and Suzanne Hetts. 1998. "Human and Animal Factors Related to Relinquishment of Dogs and Cats in 12 Selected Animal Shelters in the United States." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 1(3):207-26.
- Salman, Mo D, Jennifer Hutchison, Rebecca Ruch-Gallie, Lori Kogan, John C New Jr, Phillip H Kass and Janet M Scarlett. 2000. "Behavioral Reasons for Relinquishment of Dogs and Cats to 12 Shelters." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 3(2):93-106.
- Sanders, C. R. 1990. "The Animal Other - Self Definition, Social Identity and Companion Animals." *Advances in Consumer Research* 17:662-68.
- Sanders, C. R. 1995. "Killing with Kindness - Veterinary Euthanasia and the Social Construction of Personhood." *Sociological Forum* 10(2):195-214.

- Sanders, C. R. 2003. "Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Close Relationships between Humans and Nonhuman Animals." *Symbolic Interaction* 26(3):405-26. doi: 10.1525/si.2003.26.3.405.
- Sanders, Clinton. 2010. "Working out Back: The Veterinary Technician and "Dirty Work"." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 39(3):243-72.
- Sanders, Clinton R. 1996. *Regarding Animals*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sandra Newbury, Mary K. Blinn, Philip A. Bushby, Cynthia Barker Cox, , Brenda Griffin Julie D. Dinnage, Kate F. Hurley, Natalie Isaza, Wes Jones, Lila Miller, and Gary J. Patronek Jeanette O'Quin, Martha Smith-Blackmore, Miranda Spindel 2010. "Guidelines for Standard of Care in Animal Shelters." Vol.: Association of Shelter Veterinarians.
- Scarlett, J. 2004. "Pet Population Dynamics and Animal Shelter Issues." Pp. 11-17 in *Shelter Medicine for Veterinarians and Staff*.
- Scarlett, J. M., M. D. Salman, J. G. New and P. H. Kass. 2002. "The Role of Veterinary Practitioners in Reducing Dog and Cat Relinquishments and Euthanasias." *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 220(3):306-11.
- Scarlett, J.M. 2008. "Interface of Epidemiology, Pet Population Issues and Policy." *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 86:188-97.
- Schueller-Weidekamm, Claudia and Alexandra Kautzky-Willer. 2012. "Challenges of Work-Life Balance for Women Physicians/Mothers Working in Leadership Positions." *Gender Medicine* 9(4):244-50. doi: 10.1016/j.genm.2012.04.002.

- Serpell, J. A. 1987. "Pet-Keeping in Non-Western Societies: Some Popular Misconceptions." *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of The Interactions of People & Animals* 1(3):166-74.
- Serpell, J. A. 2002. "Anthropomorphism and Anthropomorphic Selection - Beyond the "Cute Response"." *Society & Animals* 10(4):437-54.
- Serpell, J. A. 2009. "Having Our Dogs and Eating Them Too: Why Animals Are a Social Issue." *JOSI Journal of Social Issues* 65(3):633-44.
- Serpell, J.A. 1986. *In the Company of Animals*. New York, New York: Pitt Publishing.
- Serpell, James A. 2000. "9 Domestication and History of the Cat." *The domestic cat: The biology of its behaviour*:179.
- Simmons, Roberta G. 1991. "Presidential Address on Altruism and Sociology." *The Sociological Quarterly* 32(1):1-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1991.tb00342.x.
- Simola, Sheldene K, Julian Barling and Nick Turner. 2010. "Transformational Leadership and Leader Moral Orientation: Contrasting an Ethic of Justice and an Ethic of Care." *The Leadership Quarterly* 21(1):179-88.
- Simsek, Hasan and Karen Seashore Louis. 1994. "Organizational Change as Paradigm Shift: Analysis of the Change Process in a Large, Public University." *The Journal of Higher Education* 65(6):670-95.
- Sinski, Jennifer. 2016. "'A Cat-Sized Hole in My Heart': Public Perceptions of Companion Animal Adoption in the USA." Pp. 73-89 in *Companion Animals in Everyday Life : Situating Human-Animal Engagement within Cultures*: New York : Palgrave Macmillan US : Palgrave Macmillan.

- Sinski, Jennifer, Robert M. Carini and Jonetta D. Weber. 2016. "Putting (Big) Black Dog Syndrome to the Test: Evidence from a Large Metropolitan Shelter." *Anthrozoös* 29(4):639-52.
- Sinski, Jennifer B. and Patricia Gagné. 2016. "Give Me Shelter: The State of Animal Sheltering in Kentucky's County Shelter System." *Contemporary Justice Review* 19(2):250-66.
- Skoe, Eva E. A. 2014. "Measuring Care-Based Moral Development: The Ethic of Care Interview." *Behavioral Development Bulletin* 19(3):95-104.
- Smith-Crowe, Kristin and Danielle E. Warren. 2014. "The Emotion-Evoked Collective Corruption Model: The Role of Emotion in the Spread of Corruption within Organizations." *Organization Science* 25(4):1154-71.
- Smith, Carin A. 2002. "Gender and Work: What Veterinarians Can Learn from Research About Women, Men, and Work." *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 220(9):1304-11. doi: 10.2460/javma.2002.220.1304.
- Smith, D.E., 1987. *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. University of Toronto Press.
- Snavely, Keith and Martin B. Tracy. 2000. "Collaboration among Rural Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management Leadership* 11(2):145.
- Statham, A.. 1987. "The Gender Model Revisited: Differences in the Management Style of Men and Women." *Sex Roles*:409-29.
- Stets, Jan E. 2005. "Examining Emotions in Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1):39-56. doi: 10.1177/019027250506800104.

- Taylor, N. 2004. "In It for the Nonhuman Animals: Animal Welfare, Moral Certainty, and Disagreements." *Society & Animals* 12(4):317-39.
- Taylor, Nik. 2012. "Animals, Mess, Method: Post-Humanism, Sociology and Animal Studies." *Crossing Boundaries: Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*. Leiden: Brill:37-50.
- Thurlow, Amy and Jean Helms Mills. 2015. "Telling Tales out of School: Sensemaking and Narratives of Legitimacy in an Organizational Change Process." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 31(2):246-54. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2014.10.002>.
- Udell, Monique AR, Nicole R Dorey and Clive DL Wynne. 2010. "What Did Domestication Do to Dogs? A New Account of Dogs' Sensitivity to Human Actions." *Biological Reviews* 85(2):327-45.
- Unti, B. & Rowan R.N. 2001. "A Social History of Postwar Animal Protection." in *Animal Protection* Pp 21-37 edited by D.J. Salem and R.N. Rowan Washington D.C.:Humane Society Press
- Urbanski, B. L. and M. Lazenby. 2012. "Distress among Hospitalized Pediatric Cancer Patients Modified by Pet-Therapy Intervention to Improve Quality of Life." *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing* 29(5):272-82.
- Vangen, s. and C. Huxham. 2000. "Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a (Not Quite) Joined-up World." *The Academy of Management Journal* 43(6):1159-75.
- Veterinarians, The Association of Shelter. 2010. "Guidelines for Standards of Care in Animal Shelters." Corning, NY, USA: The Association of Shelter Veterinarians.

- Voith, Victoria L. 2009. "The Impact of Companion Animal Problems on Society and the Role of Veterinarians." *Veterinary Clinics of North America-Small Animal Practice* 39(2):327-+.
- Walsh, F. 2009. "Human-Animal Bonds I: The Relational Significance of Companion Animals." *Family Process* 48(4):462-80.
- Weber, Max. 2002. *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and Other Writings*: Penguin.
- Weick, Karl E., Kathleen M. Sutcliffe and David Obstfeld. 2005. "Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking." *Organization Science* 16(4):409-21. doi: 10.2307/25145979.
- Weiss, E. and S. Gramann. 2009. "A Comparison of Attachment Levels of Adopters of Cats: Fee-Based Adoptions Versus Free Adoptions." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 12(4):360-70. doi: 10.1080/10888700903163674.
- Weiss, E., G. Patronek, M. Slater, L. Garrison and K. Medicus. 2013. "Community Partnering as a Tool for Improving Live Release Rate in Animal Shelters in the United States." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 16(3):221-38. doi: 10.1080/10888705.2013.803816.
- Weiss, Emily, Margaret Slater, Laurie Garrison, Natasha Drain, Emily Dolan, Janet M. Scarlett and Stephen L. Zawistowski. 2014. "Large Dog Relinquishment to Two Municipal Facilities in New York City and Washington, D.C.: Identifying Targets for Intervention." *Animals (2076-2615)* 4(3):409-33. doi: 10.3390/ani4030409.
- Wells, D. L. 2009. "The Effects of Animals on Human Health and Well-Being." *Journal of Social Issues* 65(3):523-43.

- White, D. J. and R. Shawhan. 1996. "Emotional Responses of Animal Shelter Workers to Euthanasia." *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 208(6):846-49.
- Williams, C. 2012, "Pet Adoption Events at Shopping Centers: Everybody Wins": Maddies Fund. Retrieved November 1, 2013 (http://www.maddiesfund.org/Maddies_Institute/Articles/Pet_Adoption_Events_at_Shopping_Centers.html).
- Winefield, H. R., A. Black and A. Chur-Hansen. 2008. "Health Effects of Ownership of and Attachment to Companion Animals in an Older Population." *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 15(4):303-10.
- Winograd, N.J. 2007. *The Myth of Pet Overpopulation and the No Kill Revolution in America*: Almaden Books.
- Wrye, J. 2009. "Beyond Pets: Exploring Relational Perspectives of Petness." *Canadian Journal of Sociology-Cahiers Canadiens De Sociologie* 34(4):1033-63.
- Yacker, Nancy and Sharon L. Weinberg. 1990. "Care and Justice Moral Orientation: A Scale for Its Assessment." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 55(1-2):18-27. doi: 10.1080/00223891.1990.9674043.
- Yen, Hsiuju Rebecca and Brian P Niehoff. 2004. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Organizational Effectiveness: Examining Relationships in Taiwanese Banks." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 34(8):1617-37.
- Zanowski, G. N. 2012. "A Fresh Look at Spay/Neuter Legislation: The Journey to a Middle Ground." *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 18(3):E24-E33. doi: 10.1097/PHH.0b013e318222a7f5.

Zawistowski, Stephen, Julie Morris, MD Salman and Rebecca Ruch-Gallie. 1998.

"Population Dynamics, Overpopulation, and the Welfare of Companion Animals:
New Insights on Old and New Data." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*
1(3):193-206.

APPENDIX ONE

Shelter Director Questionnaire

This study of Animal Sheltering Organizations is to understand the role that shelter directors, employees, volunteers and adopters play in meeting the mission of the organization. We are looking for who are leaders, workers, and volunteers in animal sheltering organizations including both public and private non-profit organizations. The study consists of a demographic questionnaire and a survey which will take about 30 minutes. Potential benefits are indirect in that the results will contribute to advancing knowledge in the field of animal sheltering organizations.

Participation is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and you can withdraw at any time without penalty. There is no compensation provided for participation in this study. The information obtained during this research will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. No identifying data is obtained in the questionnaire. If you agree to a follow-up interview, only the interviewer and principal investigator will know your identity. Once the data is coded, your identity will be kept confidential and reported in a way to ensure confidentiality. Your participation will remain confidential in any publication of the results of this study. The data will be maintained for up to 7 years. Any new information that develops during this study, which might affect your decision to participate, will be given to you immediately.

This Consent Form contains a click through button that will forward you to a secure web-based survey program (www.surveymonkey.com) which encrypts all data transmission. Although the risk is small, no guarantee can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by any third parties. You will be able to print out a signed copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions, at any time, about this research, or want to discuss any possible study-related injuries, please contact Jennifer Blevins Sinski, at telephone number 502-852-8046 or email her at jbsins01@louisville.edu .

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Louisville Institutional Review Board (the committee that oversees all research in human subjects at University of Louisville), and may also be reviewed by individuals who are authorized to monitor or audit the research, or the IRB if required by applicable laws or regulations. If you have any questions, concerns or comments, please contact*

1. With the information provided above,

- With the information provided above, Yes, I agree with the information and give my consent to participate in this study. By completing the survey, I am agreeing to participate in the research.
- No, I do not agree with the information and do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Type of Organization: Public _____ Non-Profit _____ Public/Private Partner _____

Shelter Director _____ Shelter Employee _____ Shelter Volunteer _____ Adopter _____

Is the shelter located in an area that is Urban _____ Suburban _____ Rural _____

Approx. Shelter Budget _____ (Categories)

Annual # of dogs entering shelter _____ Annual # of cats entering shelter _____

Dogs % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Dogs % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Cats % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Cats % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Programs offered: Adoption _____ Foster _____ Transport _____ Spay/Neuter _____

Trap/Neuter/Release Cats _____ Humane Education _____ Volunteers _____

Other _____

Number of Full Time Employees _____ Part-time employees _____

Volunteers _____ Court ordered volunteers _____

Does your organization partner with outside organizations to offer programming ___Y
___N

Age _____ Sex _____ # of years in animal sheltering _____

Education: High School ___ Some college _____ Bachelors Degree _____ Graduate
School _____ Vet _____

Would you be interested in taking part in a confidential in-depth interview? _____

Please provide name and contact information

How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals in the following circumstances?

- Animals in circuses and rodeos
- Animals in laboratories
- Animals in pounds and shelters
- Animals in zoos and aquariums
- Animals kept as companions/pets
- Animals raised for food
- Endangered species
- Horses and dogs used in racing
- Wildlife on public lands

Very Somewhat Not Very Not at All Do Not Know

How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making the following personal choices?

- Attending circuses or rodeos
- Buying clothing
- Buying food (i.e., meat, eggs, dairy)
- Buying consumer products
- Getting a new pet
- Going hunting or fishing
- Going to dog or horse races
- Voting for a political candidate

Very Somewhat Not Very Not at All Do Not Know

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- Some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions
- Buying clothes made of real animal fur is ethically acceptable
- Dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy
- Farm animals deserve the same consideration as pets and other animals
- People have an obligation to avoid harming all animals
- Protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority
- Research on animals is necessary for medical advancement
- Using animals for food is necessary for human survival

Agree Disagree No Opinion Do Not Know

Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Somewhat Oppose
- Strongly Oppose
- Do Not Know

I would describe my desire to care for animals as central to my personal identity.

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

I feel supported by my local community in the important work that I do within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

I feel supported by my co-workers in the important work that I do within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

I often discuss difficult parts of my work with my co-workers as they understand my concerns.

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

I often discuss difficult parts of my work with family and friends as they understand my concerns.

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Altruistic Leadership (for directors)

Strongly Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Somewhat Agree 3	Strongly Agree 4
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

1. As a leader of this organization, I put the interests of the animals above my own _____
2. As a leader of this organization, I do all I can do to help the animals in my care _____

3. As a leader of this organization, I sacrifice my own interests to meet the needs of the animals. _____
4. As a leader of this organization, I go beyond the call of duty to help the animals. _____
5. I support employees and volunteers when they put forward new ideas _____
6. I believe my employees and volunteers feel that initiatives are met with a favorable response and they feel encouraged to put forward new ideas.
7. I feel that I encourage my employees and volunteers to take risks.
8. I feel that people often throw themselves into topics they are unfamiliar with
9. Part of my job requires that I gather information on what is happening outside the organization.
10. I have systems in place to share information with employees and volunteers received from outside the organization.
11. I encourage interaction with others outside the organization.
12. I encourage employees to communicate with each other.
13. I encourage open communication in work groups.
14. Team working among people from different departments is common practice
15. I frequently involve employees in important decisions within the organization
16. I take employees opinions into account when organizational policy is being decided.

Appendix 2

Former (no longer working in the field) Shelter Director Questionnaire

This study of Animal Sheltering Organizations is to understand the role that shelter directors, employees, volunteers and adopters play in meeting the mission of the organization. We are looking for who are leaders, workers, and volunteers in animal sheltering organizations including both public and private non-profit organizations. The study consists of a demographic questionnaire and a survey which will take about 30 minutes. Potential benefits are indirect in that the results will contribute to advancing knowledge in the field of animal sheltering organizations.

Participation is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and you can withdraw at any time without penalty. There is no compensation provided for participation in this study. The information obtained during this research will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. No identifying data is obtained in the questionnaire. If you agree to a follow-up interview, only the interviewer and principal investigator will know your identity. Once the data is coded, your identity will be kept confidential and reported in a way to ensure confidentiality. Your participation will remain confidential in any publication of the results of this study. The data will be maintained for up to 7 years. Any new information that develops during this study, which might affect your decision to participate, will be given to you immediately.

This Consent Form contains a click through button that will forward you to a secure web-based survey program (www.surveymonkey.com) which encrypts all data transmission. Although the risk is small, no guarantee can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by any third parties. You will be able to print out a signed copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions, at any time, about this research, or want to discuss any possible study-related injuries, please contact Jennifer Blevins Sinski, at telephone number 502-852-8046 or email her at jbsins01@louisville.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Louisville Institutional Review Board (the committee that oversees all research in human subjects at University of Louisville), and may also be reviewed by individuals who are authorized to monitor or audit the research, or the IRB if required by applicable laws or regulations. If you have any questions, concerns or comments, please contact*

1. With the information provided above,

- With the information provided above, Yes, I agree with the information and give my consent to participate in this study. By completing the survey, I am agreeing to participate in the research.
- No, I do not agree with the information and do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Type of Organization: Public _____ Non-Profit _____ Public/Private Partner _____

Shelter Director _____ Shelter Employee _____ Shelter Volunteer _____ Adopter _____

Is the shelter located in an area that is Urban _____ Suburban _____ Rural _____

Approx. Shelter Budget _____ (Categories)

Annual # of dogs entering shelter _____ Annual # of cats entering shelter _____

Dogs % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Dogs % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Cats % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Cats % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Programs offered: Adoption _____ Foster _____ Transport _____ Spay/Neuter _____

Trap/Neuter/Release Cats _____ Humane Education _____ Volunteers _____

Other _____

Number of Full Time Employees _____ Part-time employees _____

Volunteers _____ Court ordered volunteers _____

Does your organization partner with outside organizations to offer programming ___Y
___N

Age _____ Sex _____ # of years in animal sheltering _____

Education: High School ___ Some college ___ Bachelors Degree ___ Graduate
School _____ Vet _____

Would you be interested in taking part in a confidential in-depth interview? _____

Please provide name and contact information _____

How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals in the following circumstances?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
--	------	----------	----------	------------	-------------

- Animals in circuses and rodeos
- Animals in laboratories
- Animals in pounds and shelters
- Animals in zoos and aquariums
- Animals kept as companions/pets
- Animals raised for food
- Endangered species
- Horses and dogs used in racing
- Wildlife on public lands

How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making the following personal choices?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
Attending circuses or rodeos					
Buying clothing					
Buying food (i.e., meat, eggs, dairy)					
Buying consumer products					
Getting a new pet					
Going hunting or fishing					
Going to dog or horse races					
Voting for a political candidate					

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Do Not Know
Some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions				
Buying clothes made of real animal fur is ethically acceptable				
Dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy				
Farm animals deserve the same consideration as pets and other animals				
People have an obligation to avoid harming all animals				
Protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority				
Research on animals is necessary for medical advancement				
Using animals for food is necessary for human survival				

Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Somewhat Oppose
- Strongly Oppose
- Do Not Know

I would describe my desire to care for animals as central to my personal identity.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I felt supported by my local community in the important work that I did within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I felt supported by my co-workers in the important work that I did within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I often discussed difficult parts of my work with my co-workers as they understood my concerns.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I often discussed difficult parts of my work with family and friends as they understood my concerns.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

Altruistic Leadership (for directors)

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

1. As a former leader of this organization, I put the interests of the animals above my own

2. As a former leader of this organization, I did all I could do to help the animals in my care _____
3. As a former leader of this organization, I sacrificed my own interests to meet the needs of the animals. _____
4. As a former leader of this organization, I went beyond the call of duty to help the animals. _____
5. I supported employees and volunteers when they put forward new ideas _____
6. I believed my employees and volunteers felt that initiatives were met with a favorable response and they felt encouraged to put forward new ideas.
7. I feel that I encouraged my employees and volunteers to take risks.
8. I feel that people often threw themselves into topics they were unfamiliar with
9. Part of my job required that I gather information on what was happening outside the organization.
10. I had systems in place to share information with employees and volunteers received from outside the organization.
11. I encouraged interaction with others outside the organization.
12. I encouraged employees to communicate with each other.
13. I encouraged open communication in work groups.
14. Team working among people from different departments was common practice
15. I frequently involved employees in important decisions within the organization
16. I took employees opinions into account when organizational policy was being decided.

Appendix 3

Shelter Employees & Volunteers Questionnaire

This study of Animal Sheltering Organizations is to understand the role that shelter directors, employees, volunteers and adopters play in meeting the mission of the organization. We are looking for who are leaders, workers, and volunteers in animal sheltering organizations including both public and private non-profit organizations. The study consists of a demographic questionnaire and a survey which will take about 30 minutes. Potential benefits are indirect in that the results will contribute to advancing knowledge in the field of animal sheltering organizations.

Participation is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and you can withdraw at any time without penalty. There is no compensation provided for participation in this study. The information obtained during this research will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. No identifying data is obtained in the questionnaire. If you agree to a follow-up interview, only the interviewer and principal investigator will know your identity. Once the data is coded, your identity will be kept confidential and reported in a way to ensure confidentiality. Your participation will remain confidential in any publication of the results of this study. The data will be maintained for up to 7 years. Any new information that develops during this study, which might affect your decision to participate, will be given to you immediately.

This Consent Form contains a click through button that will forward you to a secure web-based survey program (www.surveymonkey.com) which encrypts all data transmission. Although the risk is small, no guarantee can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by any third parties. You will be able to print out a signed copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions, at any time, about this research, or want to discuss any possible study-related injuries, please contact Jennifer Blevins Sinski, at telephone number 502-852-8046 or email her at jbsins01@louisville.edu .

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Louisville Institutional Review Board (the committee that oversees all research in human subjects at University of Louisville), and may also be reviewed by individuals who are authorized to monitor or audit the research, or the IRB if required by applicable laws or regulations. If you have any questions, concerns or comments, please contact*

1. With the information provided above,

- With the information provided above, Yes, I agree with the information and give my consent to participate in this study. By completing the survey, I am agreeing to participate in the research.
- No, I do not agree with the information and do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Type of Organization: Public _____ Non-Profit _____ Public/Private Partner _____

Shelter Director _____ Shelter Employee _____ Shelter Volunteer _____ Adopter _____

Is the shelter located in an area that is Urban _____ Suburban _____ Rural _____

Approx. Shelter Budget _____ (Categories)

Annual # of dogs entering shelter _____ Annual # of cats entering shelter _____

Dogs % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Dogs % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Cats % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Cats % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Programs offered: Adoption _____ Foster _____ Transport _____ Spay/Neuter _____

Trap/Neuter/Release Cats _____ Humane Education _____ Volunteers _____

Other _____

Number of Full Time Employees _____ Part-time employees _____

Volunteers _____ Court ordered volunteers _____

Does your organization partner with outside organizations to offer programming ___Y
___N

Age _____ Sex _____ # of years in animal sheltering _____

Education: High School _____ Some college _____ Bachelors Degree _____ Graduate
School _____ Vet _____

Would you be interested in taking part in a confidential in-depth interview? _____

Please provide name and contact information _____

How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals in the following circumstances?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
--	------	----------	----------	------------	-------------

- Animals in circuses and rodeos
- Animals in laboratories
- Animals in pounds and shelters
- Animals in zoos and aquariums
- Animals kept as companions/pets
- Animals raised for food
- Endangered species
- Horses and dogs used in racing
- Wildlife on public lands

How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making the following personal choices?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
Attending circuses or rodeos					
Buying clothing					
Buying food (i.e., meat, eggs, dairy)					
Buying consumer products					
Getting a new pet					
Going hunting or fishing					
Going to dog or horse races					
Voting for a political candidate					

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Do Not Know
Some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions				
Buying clothes made of real animal fur is ethically acceptable				
Dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy				
Farm animals deserve the same consideration as pets and other animals				
People have an obligation to avoid harming all animals				
Protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority				
Research on animals is necessary for medical advancement				
Using animals for food is necessary for human survival				

Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Somewhat Oppose
- Strongly Oppose
- Do Not Know

Altruistic Leadership (for employees and volunteers)

1. Please answer the following questions ABOUT THE LEADERS OF YOUR FIRM OR ORGANIZATION. Respond by marking the number corresponding to the response that most reflects your opinion, where 1 represents total disagreement and 5, total agreement.

Totally disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5

On altruism

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. The leaders of this organization put the interests of the animals above their own | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 2. The leaders of this organization do all they can to help animals | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 3. The leaders of this organization sacrifice their own interests to meet the needs of others | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 4. The leaders of this organization go beyond the call of duty to help others | 1-2-3-4-5 |

2. Please answer the following questions ABOUT YOUR FIRM OR ORGANIZATION. Respond marking the number corresponding to the response that most reflects your opinion, where 1 represents total disagreement and 5 total agreement.

On experimentation:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 5. People are supported when they put forward new ideas | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 6. Initiatives frequently meet with a favorable response, and people therefore feel encouraged to put forward new ideas | 1-2-3-4-5 |

On risk acceptance:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 7. Employees are encouraged to take risks | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 8. People often 'throw themselves' into topics they are unfamiliar with | 1-2-3-4-5 |

On interaction with the external environment:

9. Gathering information on what is happening outside the firm forms part of the job 1-2-3-4-5
10. We have systems and procedures in place to receive, collate and share information from outside the firm 1-2-3-4-5
11. Interaction with the environment is encouraged 1-2-3-4-5

On dialogue

12. Employees are encouraged to communicate with each other 1-2-3-4-5
13. There is open communication in work groups 1-2-3-4-5
14. Managers facilitate communication 1-2-3-4-5
15. Team working among people from different departments is common practice 1-2-3-4-5

On participative decision making

16. Managers frequently involve employees in important decisions 1-2-3-4-5
17. Employees' opinions are taken into account when firm policy is being decided 1-2-3-4-5
18. People feel involved in the main decisions of the firm 1-2-3-4-5

I would describe my desire to care for animals as central to my personal identity.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I feel supported by my local community in the important work that I do within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I feel supported by my co-workers in the important work that I do within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I often discuss difficult parts of my work with my co-workers as they understand my concerns.

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

I often discuss difficult parts of my work with family and friends as they understand my concerns.

Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly
-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Disagree
1

Disagree
2

Agree
3

Agree
4

Appendix 4

Former (no longer working in the field) Shelter Employees & Volunteers Questionnaire

This study of Animal Sheltering Organizations is to understand the role that both current and former shelter directors, employees, volunteers and adopters play in meeting the mission of the organization. We are looking for who are leaders, workers, and volunteers in animal sheltering organizations including both public and private non-profit organizations. The study consists of a demographic questionnaire and a survey which will take about 30 minutes. Potential benefits are indirect in that the results will contribute to advancing knowledge in the field of animal sheltering organizations.

Participation is entirely voluntary, anonymous, and you can withdraw at any time without penalty. There is no compensation provided for participation in this study. The information obtained during this research will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. No identifying data is obtained in the questionnaire. If you agree to a follow-up interview, only the interviewer and principal investigator will know your identity. Once the data is coded, your identity will be kept confidential and reported in a way to ensure confidentiality. Your participation will remain confidential in any publication of the results of this study. The data will be maintained for up to 7 years. Any new information that develops during this study, which might affect your decision to participate, will be given to you immediately.

This Consent Form contains a click through button that will forward you to a secure web-based survey program (www.surveymonkey.com) which encrypts all data transmission. Although the risk is small, no guarantee can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the internet by any third parties. You will be able to print out a signed copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions, at any time, about this research, or want to discuss any possible study-related injuries, please contact Jennifer Blevins Sinski, at telephone number 502-852-8046 or email her at jbsins01@louisville.edu .

This research has been reviewed and approved by the University of Louisville Institutional Review Board (the committee that oversees all research in human subjects at University of Louisville), and may also be reviewed by individuals who are authorized to monitor or audit the research, or the IRB if required by applicable laws or regulations. If you have any questions, concerns or comments, please contact*

1. With the information provided above,

- With the information provided above, Yes, I agree with the information and give my consent to participate in this study. By completing the survey, I am agreeing to participate in the research.
- No, I do not agree with the information and do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Type of Former Organization: Public _____ Non-Profit _____ Public/Private Partner _____

Former position: Shelter Director _____ Shelter Employee _____ Shelter Volunteer _____ Adopter _____

Was the shelter located in an area that was Urban _____ Suburban _____ Rural _____

Approx. Shelter Budget _____ (Categories)

Annual # of dogs entering shelter _____ Annual # of cats entering shelter _____

Dogs % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Dogs % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Cats % adopted or fostered (LRR) _____ Cats % euthanized _____ (Annual)

Programs offered: Adoption _____ Foster _____ Transport _____ Spay/Neuter _____

Trap/Neuter/Release Cats _____ Humane Education _____ Volunteers _____

Other _____

Number of Full Time Employees _____ Part-time employees _____

Volunteers _____ Court ordered volunteers _____

Did your organization partner with outside organizations to offer programming ___Y
___N

Age _____ Sex _____ # of years in animal sheltering _____

Education: High School ___ Some college ___ Bachelors Degree ___ Graduate School ___ Vet _____

Would you be interested in taking part in a confidential in-depth interview? _____

Please provide name and contact information _____

How knowledgeable do you feel about issues that affect the welfare of animals in the following circumstances?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
--	------	----------	----------	------------	-------------

- Animals in circuses and rodeos
- Animals in laboratories
- Animals in pounds and shelters
- Animals in zoos and aquariums
- Animals kept as companions/pets
- Animals raised for food
- Endangered species
- Horses and dogs used in racing
- Wildlife on public lands

How important to you is the protection of animals when it comes to making the following personal choices?

	Very	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All	Do Not Know
Attending circuses or rodeos					
Buying clothing					
Buying food (i.e., meat, eggs, dairy)					
Buying consumer products					
Getting a new pet					
Going hunting or fishing					
Going to dog or horse races					
Voting for a political candidate					

Do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Do Not Know
Some animals are capable of thinking and feeling emotions				
Buying clothes made of real animal fur is ethically acceptable				
Dissecting animals is a vital way for students to learn about anatomy				
Farm animals deserve the same consideration as pets and other animals				
People have an obligation to avoid harming all animals				
Protecting endangered or threatened species should be a global priority				
Research on animals is necessary for medical advancement				
Using animals for food is necessary for human survival				

Do you personally support or oppose the animal protection movement's goal to minimize and eventually eliminate all forms of animal cruelty and suffering?

- Strongly Support
- Somewhat Support
- Somewhat Oppose
- Strongly Oppose
- Do Not Know

Altruistic Leadership (for employees and volunteers)

1. Please answer the following questions ABOUT THE LEADERS OF YOUR FIRM OR ORGANIZATION. Respond by marking the number corresponding to the response that most reflects your opinion, where 1 represents total disagreement and 5, total agreement.

Totally disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Totally agree
1	2	3	4	5

On altruism

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. The leaders of this organization put the interests of the animals above their own | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 2. The leaders of this organization did all they could to help animals | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 3. The leaders of this organization sacrificed their own interests to meet the needs of others | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 4. The leaders of this organization went beyond the call of duty to help others | 1-2-3-4-5 |

2. Please answer the following questions ABOUT YOUR FIRM OR ORGANIZATION. Respond marking the number corresponding to the response that most reflects your opinion, where 1 represents total disagreement and 5 total agreement.

On experimentation:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 5. People were supported when they put forward new ideas | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 6. Initiatives frequently met with a favorable response, and people therefore felt encouraged to put forward new ideas | 1-2-3-4-5 |

On risk acceptance:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 7. Employees were encouraged to take risks | 1-2-3-4-5 |
| 8. People often 'threw themselves' into topics they were unfamiliar with | 1-2-3-4-5 |

On interaction with the external environment:

9. Gathering information on what was happening outside the firm formed part of the job1-2-3-4-5

10. We had systems and procedures in place to receive, collate and share information from outside the firm

1-2-3-4-5

11. Interaction with the environment was encouraged 1-2-3-4-5

On dialogue

12. Employees were encouraged to communicate with each other 1-2-3-4-5

13. There was open communication in work groups 1-2-3-4-5

14. Managers facilitated communication 1-2-3-4-5

15. Team working among people from different departments is common practice 1-2-3-4-5

On participative decision making

16. Managers frequently involved employees in important decisions 1-2-3-4-5

17. Employees' opinions were taken into account when firm policy was being decided 1-2-3-4-5

18. People felt involved in the main decisions of the firm 1-2-3-4-5

I would describe my desire to care for animals as central to my personal identity.

Strongly Disagree
1

Somewhat Disagree
2

Somewhat Agree
3

Strongly Agree
4

I felt supported by my local community in the important work that I did within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree
1

Somewhat Disagree
2

Somewhat Agree
3

Strongly Agree
4

I felt supported by my co-workers in the important work that I did within the shelter.

Strongly Disagree
1

Somewhat Disagree
2

Somewhat Agree
3

Strongly Agree
4

I often discussed difficult parts of my work with my co-workers as they understood my concerns.

Strongly Disagree
1

Somewhat Disagree
2

Somewhat Agree
3

Strongly Agree
4

I often discussed difficult parts of my work with family and friends as they understood my concerns.

**Strongly
Disagree**
1

**Somewhat
Disagree**
2

**Somewhat
Agree**
3

**Strongly
Agree**
4

Appendix 6

Shelter Director Interview Questionnaire

Interview Question Form

Can you describe a typical work day?

What do you feel is the most important part of your job?

To Whom do you report?

What positions did you hold prior to your current one?

What was the process for obtaining your position as shelter director?

Why did you decide to enter the field of animal sheltering?

What are your philosophies regarding work ethic?

What are your philosophies regarding animal care?

What are your philosophies regarding euthanasia?

Do you feel that all your employees share the same work ethic, animal care and euthanasia philosophies that you hold? How do you know this?

What ways or methods do you use to maintain up-to-date on industry standards or methods within the field of animal control, care, sheltering and euthanasia?

How do you transmit this information to your staff? Volunteers? The public?

How is your organization's mission expressed to the employees and/or volunteers that work at your shelter?

How are shelter statistics shared within your organization?

How would you describe the general working atmosphere for your organization?

What role do you play in guiding or leading employees in general attitudes about their position within the shelter organization?

What is your organization's mission with regard to the animals in your care?

Do you work directly with volunteers within your community and if so how are they incorporated into the day-to-day operations of the shelter?

Do you feel supported in the important role that you serve within your community and in what ways is this support expressed?

Do you take an active role within the planning process for all areas of service offered by your organization to the community?

What is your favorite part of your job?

What is the least favorite part of your job?

Describe yourself to yourself?

Think of a time at work when something you usually do resulted in an unexpected outcome. Can you describe the “thinking” process prior to taking action and what that final action was?

Did the unexpected response result in changing any policy regarding to future action?

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Former Shelter Director Interview Questionnaire

Interview Question Form

Can you describe your former typical work day?

What do you feel was the most important part of your job?

To Whom did you report?

What positions did you hold prior to the director position?

What was the process for obtaining your position as shelter director?

What were your philosophies regarding work ethic?

What were your philosophies regarding animal care?

What were your philosophies regarding euthanasia?

Did you feel that all your employees shared the same work ethic, animal care and euthanasia philosophies that you held? How did you know this?

What ways or methods did you use to maintain up-to-date on industry standards or methods within the field of animal control, care, sheltering and euthanasia?

How did you transmit this information to your staff? Volunteers? The public?

How was your organization's mission expressed to the employees and/or volunteers that work at your shelter?

How were shelter statistics shared within your organization?

How would you describe the general working atmosphere for your former organization?

What role did you play in guiding or leading employees in general attitudes about their position within the shelter organization?

What was your organization's mission with regard to the animals in your care?

Did you work directly with volunteers within your community and if so how were they incorporated into the day-to-day operations of the shelter?

Did you feel supported in the important role that you served within your community and in what ways was this support expressed?

Did you take an active role within the planning process for all areas of service offered by your former organization to the community?

What was your favorite part of your job?

What was the least favorite part of your job?

Why did you leave the position?

What field are you currently employed in?

Describe yourself to yourself?

Think of a time at work when something you usually do resulted in an unexpected outcome. Can you describe the "thinking" process prior to taking action and what that final action was?

Did the unexpected response result in changing any policy regarding to future action?

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Animal Shelter Employee Interview Questions

Why did you decide to enter the field of animal sheltering?

What positions did you hold prior to the current position?

What was the process for obtaining your current position?

Is the work the same or different than what you expected it to be?

How would you describe your relationship with your co-workers?

How would you describe your relationship with the director?

How would you describe your relationship with the animals?

What is your favorite part of your job?

What is your least favorite part of your job?

Are there breeds of dogs that you prefer to work with and if so which? Are there breeds you would rather not work with and if so which?

Do you feel supported by the community for the important work that you do?

Do you feel supported by your family for the important work that you do?

Do you feel supported by your coworkers and/or director for the important work that you do?

Describe a routine event at work that resulted in an unexpected outcome and then describe the “thinking” process that went on when coming up with an action.

Did that “new action” result in any policy changes or organizational changes in your organization?

How would you describe the leadership style of your director or organizational leader?

How do you remain up-to-date on changes going on in the animal sheltering industry?

Do you feel included in policy changing decision making process?

What is your organization’s mission with regard to the animals in your care?

Can you provide an example of how your work at the shelter helps to solve the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you provide an example of how your work at the shelter might not be an effective method for solving the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you give an example of a change or pattern of change in the last 10 years about how people view their pets?

What about an example of a change or pattern of change within animal welfare organizations towards companion animals?

Describe yourself to yourself.

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Former Animal Shelter Employee Interview Questions

Why did you decide to enter the field of animal sheltering?

What positions did you hold prior to the former position?

What was the process for obtaining your former position?

Was the work the same or different than what you expected it to be?

How would you describe your former relationship with your co-workers?

How would you describe your former relationship with the director?

How would you describe your former relationship with the animals?

What was your favorite part of your job?

What was your least favorite part of your job?

Are there breeds of dogs that you preferred to work with and if so which? Are there breeds you would rather not work with and if so which?

Did you feel supported by the community for the important work that you did?

Did you feel supported by your family for the important work that you did?

Did you feel supported by your coworkers and/or director for the important work that you did?

Describe a routine event at work that resulted in an unexpected outcome and then describe the “thinking” process that went on when coming up with an action.

Did that “new action” result in any policy changes or organizational changes in your organization?

How would you describe the leadership style of your former director or organizational leader?

How did you remain up-to-date on changes going on in the animal sheltering industry?

Did you feel included in policy changing decision making process?

What was your organization’s mission with regard to the animals in your care?

Can you provide an example of how your work at the shelter helped to solve the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you provide an example of how your work at the shelter might not have been an effective method for solving the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you give an example of a change or pattern of change in the last 10 years about how people view their pets?

What about an example of a change or pattern of change within animal welfare organizations towards companion animals?

Describe yourself to yourself.

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Volunteer Interview Guide

What kinds of tasks do you perform while volunteering?

Who directs your volunteer activities while at the organization?

How would you describe the interactions between volunteers and shelter staff?

Tell me about some ways or examples of how your organization works with volunteers?

Now, tell me about some ways or examples of how your organization partners with other organizations.

Can you relate a recent experience of working with the Shelter Director during your volunteering experience?

What types of training were you provided before beginning to volunteer at this organization?

Can you tell me about the process you went through when deciding to become a volunteer at an animal sheltering organization?

What made you pick this specific organization?

Can you describe an event at the shelter when you were volunteering that happened differently than what you expected to happen? Describe the “thinking” process that happened before you took the action you decided upon.

Can you describe any experiences you have had with your friends or family in response to your volunteering work?

How would you describe the general public’s response to the work your organization does?

Can you relate an experience that you really enjoyed while volunteering at the shelter?

Now what about an experience that you disliked or did not enjoy.

Are there breeds of dogs that you prefer to work with and if so which? Are there breeds you would rather not work with and if so which?

Can you provide an example of how your work as a volunteer works to solve the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you provide an example of how your work as a volunteer might not be an effective method for solving the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you give an example of a change or pattern of change in the last 10 years about how people view their pets?

What about an example of a change or pattern of change within animal welfare organizations towards companion animals?

Describe yourself to yourself.

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Former Volunteer Interview Guide

What kinds of tasks did you perform while volunteering?

Who directed your volunteer activities while at the organization?

How would you describe the interactions between volunteers and shelter staff?

Tell me about some ways or examples of how your organization worked with volunteers?

Now, tell me about some ways or examples of how your organization partnered with other organizations.

Can you relate an experience of working with the Shelter Director during your volunteering experience?

What types of training were you provided before beginning to volunteer at this organization?

Can you tell me about the process you went through when deciding to become a volunteer at an animal sheltering organization?

Can you tell me about why you decided to leave the volunteering experience?

What made you pick this specific organization?

Can you describe an event at the shelter when you were volunteering that happened differently than what you expected to happen? Describe the “thinking” process that happened before you took the action you decided upon.

Can you describe any experiences you have had with your friends or family in response to your volunteering work?

How would you describe the general public’s response to the work your organization did?

Can you relate an experience that you really enjoyed while volunteering at the shelter?

Now what about an experience that you disliked or did not enjoy.

Are there breeds of dogs that you preferred to work with and if so which? Are there breeds you would rather not work with and if so which?

Can you provide an example of how your work as a volunteer worked to solve the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you provide an example of how your work as a volunteer might not be an effective method for solving the problem of pet overpopulation?

Can you give an example of a change or pattern of change in the last 10 years about how people view their pets?

What about an example of a change or pattern of change within animal welfare organizations towards companion animals?

Describe yourself to yourself.

Is there anything else that I might have missed that you feel is important to discuss?

May I contact you to follow up with you in the future?

Facebook Bark Magazine

Leadership in Animal Sheltering Organizations

Be part of an important animal sheltering research study

- *Are you older than 18?*
- *Are you a current or former animal shelter director, current or former animal shelter employee or volunteer or have you adopted an animal from an animal sheltering organization?*

If you answered YES to these questions, you may be eligible to participate in an online survey on animal sheltering research study. You may also consent to take part in an in-depth interview beyond the survey if you so decide.

The URL for the survey is XXXXXXXXXX. Click on the link to transfer to the survey instrument. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. No names or organizational names are requested unless you wish to be contacted for an individual telephone or internet interview.

The purpose of this research study is to examine leadership in animal sheltering organizations and the impact on policies in the sheltering organizations.

This study is being conducted at University of Louisville, Department of Sociology, Louisville, KY 40299.

Please call Jennifer Blevins Sinski at 1-502-852-8046 for further information or email jbsins01@louisville.edu

Blog on The Bark Magazine

Leadership in Animal Sheltering Organizations

Be part of an important animal sheltering research study

- *Are you older than 18?*
- *Are you a current or former animal shelter director, current or former animal shelter employee or volunteer or have you adopted an animal from an animal sheltering organization?*

If you answered YES to these questions, you may be eligible to participate in an online survey on animal sheltering research study. You may also consent to take part in an in-depth interview beyond the survey if you so decide.

The URL for the survey is XXXXXXXXXX. Click on the link to transfer to the survey instrument. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. No names or organizational names are requested unless you wish to be contacted for an individual telephone or internet interview.

The purpose of this research study is to examine leadership in animal sheltering organizations and the impact on policies in the sheltering organizations.

This study is being conducted at University of Louisville, Department of Sociology, Louisville, KY 40299.

Please call Jennifer Blevins Sinski at 1-502-852-8046 for further information or email jbsins01@louisville.edu

Flyer at “No More Homeless Pets” Conference

Leadership in Animal Sheltering Organizations Research Study

NEEDED

***Animal Shelter Directors, Employees, Volunteers
(both current & Former)***

Adopters of Shelter Pets

Be part of an important animal sheltering research study

- *Are you older than 18?*
- *Are you a current or former animal shelter director, current or former animal shelter employee or volunteer or have you adopted an animal from an animal sheltering organization?*

If you answered YES to these questions, you may be eligible to participate in an online survey on animal sheltering research study. You may also consent to take part in an in-depth interview beyond the survey if you so decide.

The URL for the survey is XXXXXXXXXXX. Click on the link to transfer to the survey instrument. The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. No names or organizational names are requested unless you wish to be contacted for an individual telephone or internet interview.

The purpose of this research study is to examine leadership in animal sheltering organizations and the impact on policies in the sheltering organizations.

This study is being conducted at University of Louisville, Department of Sociology, Louisville, KY 40299.

Please call Jennifer Blevins Sinski at 1-502-852-8046 for further information or email jbsins01@louisville.edu

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jennifer Blevins Sinski

April 2018

Address (Home):

1508 Cadet Court
Louisville, KY 40222

Contact:

(502) 339-9110 home
(502) 338-5077 cell

E-Mail:

jbsins01@louisville.edu
Jsinski2@bellarmine.edu

EDUCATION:

- **University of Louisville, PhD Applied Sociology** graduated May 2018
- **Murray State University, Masters of Arts in English Literature** December 2009 4.0 GPA
- **Bellarmino University, Master of Arts in Teaching, K-5** December 2002
+18 hours toward Rank I certification in Learning and Behavior Disorders K-12
Finished Spring 2003. 4.0 GPA
- **Bellarmino University, Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies**, May 2000;
emphasis in Psychology & Sociology. Graduated Cum Laude, with a 3.65 GPA.
- **Sullivan Junior College of Business**, 1982; Diploma Program
Legal Secretarial. 4.0 GPA

TEACHING/EDUCATION EXPERIENCE:

Bellarmino University, Adjunct Faculty, Sociology, IDC & English Department

Currently teaching

Introduction to Sociology (Fall 2015 & Spring 2016, Fall 2017, Spring 2018)
Social Problems (Spring 2016, Fall 2017)
Impact of Trauma on Development, IDC 200 (Fall 2015 & Spring 2016, Fall 2017)
Honors English 101 (Fall 2015)
Animals and Society (Spring 2016, Spring 2017)

University of Louisville, Adjunct Faculty, Sociology Department

Diversity & Inequality (Fall 2015)
Introduction to Sociology (Spring 2016)

University of Louisville, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Sociology Department

Teach Self & Society (Spring 2013)
Teach Sociological Theory (Fall 2013; Fall 2014; Spring 2015)
Teach Sociology 323 – Diversity and Inequality (Fall 2012; Summer 2013)
Teach Introduction to Sociology (Fall 2014)

Dissertation Research – Gender, Leadership & Ethic of Care in Animal Sheltering Organizations

Internship: Required component of sociology PhD program

The Bark Magazine is a national magazine focusing on companion canines. Duties include writing articles on companion animals and human interaction. Research includes collecting data via social media, website and blogs operated by The Bark Magazine. Reported from the “No More Homeless Pets” Conference held in Jacksonville, Florida for the magazine.

Awards: Graduate Teaching Award - 2015, Service Award - 2014

University of Louisville, Adjunct Lecturer, English Department (Fall 2011)

Teach three sections of English 102. Currently taking part in a teaching cohort group funded by a grant received by the English Department led by Dr. Michael Sobiech.

Elizabethtown Community & Technical College, Instructor Tenure Track, English Department (Spring 2010 – August 2011)

- Instructor, English Department
Teach English 101, 102 & 161 in both face-to-face format and online. Course load is 5 courses per semester. In addition to teaching responsibilities, I serve as Secretary to the Faculty & serve on the Faculty Executive Committee. Begin serving as the advisor for the campus newspaper, *The Street*, January 1st. Also meet expectations for community service through a variety of volunteer opportunities throughout the semester.

Lead two presentations for the local community through the Morrison Gallery Literary Reading group – A focus on Child Soldiers featuring books by ex-child soldiers Ishmeal

Beah and Emmanuel Jal – A Beat Poetry Performance Art presentation by my English 161 students presenting their projects.

Bellarmino University, Coordinator, Freshman IDC Program & Adjunct Faculty IDC and English Department (Fall 2009 & Spring 2010)

- Coordinator, IDC 101 – Oversee Freshman IDC 101 Program and classes

My responsibilities included recruiting, recommending, and working with faculty interested in teaching in the IDC at a particular IDC level. Additionally, I peer reviewed the faculty (23) in their IDC level. This involved in-class review, follow-up feedback and recommendation sessions with individual faculty members. I also served as a mentor for faculty, especially faculty new to the program or to the IDC level. This involved meeting with the faculty on a regular basis (e.g., orientations, open houses, workshops, etc.) individually and in a group setting to provide assistance and advise to the faculty. I assisted the IDC director with assessment of the IDC program including collection of and evaluation of collected data. Each semester I planned regular faculty development opportunities, in addition to assisting the IDC Director in planning the annual May IDC workshop.

- IDC. 200 “Effects of Trauma on Development” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic.

Course Description: *The Effects of Trauma on Development will examine specific incidences of trauma and the impact trauma has on the learning process. Students will explore current research on trauma and its effect on brain development as well as applications in the learning setting. Many scientific studies have indicated that trauma causes long term damage to portions of the brain that control learning and behavior, causing both learning and emotional disabilities. Parents and educators must find the key to address individual children’s needs, and when many of these children have experienced both large and small scale traumas, a special understanding must help guide the curriculum. “No Child Left Behind” mandates achievement goals for all children regardless of a parent’s death, long term illness, physical/sexual abuse or other trauma that occurred in that child’s life.*

- IDC. 101 “Young Adults in Literature” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic for freshmen.

Course Description: *A Study of Young Adults in Literature will explore the real world difficulties and issues as represented in young adult fiction and nonfiction. The class will read paperback novels such as "perks of being a wallflower" and autobiographies including "A Long Way Gone" that deal with tough, real world issues that teens and twenty- somethings must face as they come of age in a modern society. Book discussions, text analysis and writer’s workshops will form an integral part in the learning process. Projects/Writing Assignments/Exams will be used as student assessment.*

- English 101 – required freshman English course.
Course Description: I have tailored my English 101 Composition course to utilize a full suite of modern software technology. Entitled, “*Exploring Writing through Social Action*” students produce a series of essays that combine to create an individually designed hypertext document, as well as a separate series of essays to be published on campus as an electronic magazine or “E-zine”. This labor intensive process requires the full spectrum of available software including student proficiency in Blackboard, Inspiration, Microsoft Word and Microsoft Expressions Web I believe my course is unique in the fact that all of the above must be seamlessly integrated by the student to plan writing, write essays, edit & review essays, design electronic documents and create an electronic magazine. In the process the computer lab becomes the classroom, and students engage more fully in the writing process.

Jefferson Community & Technical College Southwest English Department (Fall 2009 & Spring 2010)

- English 101 – required freshman English course.
See above for course description.

Bellarmino University, Full-time Instructor IDC and English Department & Coordinator for the Freshman IDC Program. (Fall 2008 & Spring 2009)

- Coordinator, IDC 101 – Oversee Freshman IDC 101 Program and classes
- IDC. 200 “Effects of Trauma on Development” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic.
- IDC. 101 “Young Adults in Literature” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic for freshmen.
- Professor English 101 – required freshman English course.

Bellarmino University Adjunct Faculty Teaching Load (Spring 2008 & Summer 2008) (ongoing)

- IDC. 200 “Effects of Trauma on Development” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic.
- IDC. 101 “Young Adults in Literature” as part of the interdisciplinary core curriculum. This course focuses on writing development through the exploration of a topic for freshmen.
- Teach English 101 – required freshman English course. (Summer 2008)

Past Courses Offered at Bellarmino

- IDC. 200 “Effects of Trauma on Development” Normally Each Semester and Summer for 8 Years

- IDC. 101 “Young Adults in Literature” Offered in 3 Previous Semesters in the Past 2 Years.
- IDC. 100 “Freshman Focus” Fall 2007

Jeffersonville High School, Jeffersonville, IN

Lead Teacher, Alternative GED Program

August 2003 – May 2008

Greater Clark County Schools

- Designated as Highly Qualified by the State of Indiana in the areas of English, Math, Science and Social Studies at the High School level. Licensed to teach K-12 special education all subjects.
- Design and Implement Curriculum for Alternative GED Program for high school students who have been unsuccessful in the traditional diploma tract. These students have been removed from all possible programs for various reasons including incarceration.
- Caseload of 25 students for which I am responsible for writing and administering Individual Education Plans which address the accommodations that are required by federal law for their individual disabilities. I collaborate with school psychologists to administer testing and evaluation for these disabilities.
- Teach young adult special education students in preparation for taking GED test covering all subjects required for the test – English Reading, Writing, Math, Science & Social Studies.
- Created programming to supplement academic work including life skills counseling, community based service learning program, introduction to area Technical schools and Community Colleges, job placement and job skills training.
- Responsible for program retention.
- CoChair – PL221 Committee. Responsible for leading faculty in curriculum change focused on school goals in line with federally mandated school progress. The committee was charged with addressing achievement levels focusing on a goal of Writing and Math with Benchmarks of over 86% passing the ISTEP Math and 91% passing the ISTEP Writing portion of the tests. All teaching areas were required to incorporate writing & math into their specific content areas. The committee developed common assessments to be used in each class, and strategies with which teachers could incorporate their content with the writing/math goals in mind. We then developed professional development and provided the tools necessary for each teacher to incorporate into their specific content area.
- CoChair – North Central Accreditation Committee.
- Webmaster – responsible for designing and updating school website.

Indiana University Southeast, Clarksville, Indiana

Adjunct Faculty

Summer 2007

- Teach both undergraduate and graduate education course in the Education Department EDUC K352 Education of Students with Learning Disorders and EDUC K590 Special Topics: Methods for High Incidence

Decker College, Louisville, KY

Adjunct Faculty

Fall 2005

- Teach “Designing Websites with Microsoft FrontPage”, “Typing” and “Internet” to adult students in the associate degree IT program.

South Oldham High School, Oldham County, KY

Special Education Teacher

Spring 2003

SCHOLARSHIP:

Sinski, Jennifer, Carini, Robert & Weber, Jonetta: “Give a Schipp A Chance :Challenging The Big Black Dog Syndrome.” *Anthrozoos*. Spring 2017.

Williams, Brittany, Sinski, Jennifer & Ashlock, M: “They are Normal and We aren’t”: The Impact of Celebrity Mom Body Narratives on Non-Celebrity Moms.” *Women’s Studies in Communications*. Accepted for Publication.

Williams, Brittany, Christopher, Karen & Sinski, Jennifer. “Who doesn’t want to be this hot mom?”: Celebrity mom profiles and mothers’ accounts of their post-partum bodies. Accepted for Publication.

Sinski, Jennifer. “A Cat-sized Hole in My Heart: Perceptions of the Adoptions Process in the United States.” Book Chapter in “*Companion Animals Across Cultures*” Michel Pergowski, Ed.

Sinski, Jennifer & Gagne, Patricia “Give Me Shelter: The State of Animal Sheltering in Kentucky’s County Shelter System,” *Contemporary Justice Review Special Issue: Animals, Justice & the Law*. Spring 2016

Sinski, J.: “The State of Sheltering in the United States” September 2013

Bark Magazine

Sinski, J.: “Teaching & Learning Strategies to Address Short Term Memory Problems Caused by PTSD & TBI in the Classroom” March 2012. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*

Bergstrand, C & Sinski, J: "Swinging in America: Sex, Love & Marriage in the 21st Century" ISBN: 0-313-37966-1 ISBN-13: 978-0-313-37966-6 192 pages

Praeger Publishers Publication: 11/30/2009

Bergstrand, C.; Schrepf, N.; Williams-Sinski, J.; "Civilization and Sexual Discontent: Monogamy and the Problem of Surplus Repression", *Psychodynamic Perspectives*, 12/01/2003

Bergstrand, C.; Williams-Sinski, J.; "Today's Alternative Marriage Style". *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, Volume 3, Oct. 10, 2000.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS:

"A Cat-sized Hole in My Heart" (August 2015)
American Sociological Association

Gender and Animal Sheltering (August 2015)
American Sociological Association

"Teaching Students with Disabilities" March 2013
North Central Sociological Association

"Women's Choice: Entering Swinging" March 2013
Anthropologist and Sociologists of Kentucky Conference

"Barriers to research in animal sheltering organizations" November 2012
Minding Animals conference at Eastern Kentucky University

"Population of Canine and Feline Companion Animals in Publicly Funded Kentucky Shelters" Mid-South Sociological Association." November 2012

"Give Me Shelter: The State of Kentucky's Publicly Funded Animal Shelters" April 2012. NCSA Conference. North Central Sociological Association.

"Common Sense for the Common Man: From Thomas Paine and Ben Franklin to November 2012." Sinski, J. 2011 ASK Conference. Northern Kentucky University.

"Wounded Warriors in the Classroom." Sinski, J. & Caheney, B. 2010 Faculty Fall Convocation. Elizabethtown Community & Technical College

"Using a suite of software programs to engage the Millennial in the writing process." Sinski, J. Kentucky Convergence 2008. Summerset, Kentucky

"Alternative Sexualities and Human Relationships". Bergstrand, C., Williams-Sinski, J. Session Chairs. North Central Sociological Association 2002 Conference. Windsor, Canada.

"Sexual Habituation and the Problem of Monogamy: An Examination of the Views of a National Sample of 1,100 Swingers." Bergstrand, C., Williams-Sinski, J. North Central Sociological Association 2001 Conference. Louisville, Kentucky.

SERVICE

Interviewed by WKYT Lexington News about animal sheltering in Kentucky, July 2 2015

Council member. Animals and Society Chapter of American Sociological Association. Three year term. Beginning August 2013

Volunteer IRB member. Bellarmine University Beginning August 2013

Secretary. Sociology Graduate Student Association. Department of Sociology, University of Louisville.

Critical Thinking Skills in the Sociology Classroom. A presentation provided for the Faculty, Graduate Teaching Assistants and Graduate Students in Sociology. University of Louisville. September 2012.

Child Soldiers: Featuring readings from Emmanuel Jal's *War Child* and Ishmael Beah's *A Long Way Gone*. A presentation provided for the students of Elizabethtown Community College and the general public. November 11, 2010

Beat Poet's Coffee House – Readings and artistic interpretations of poems from the Beat Generation from my English 161 students. Provided for the ECTC community. February 10, 2011.

Interviewed by Kim Iverson on her nationally syndicated radio program "Your Time with Kim" – Served as the expert on the topic of swingers and spoke about the research on swinging in the United States. January 19, 2011

Interviewed by Rachel Platt of WHAS news on the topic of marriage and monogamy. "The State of Marriage: Is Traditional Marriage Working?" November 10, 2010.

Hosted at Bellarmine University a Screening of *I.O.U.S.A* and arranged a panel discussion featuring a member of the Concord Coalition. September 2008.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Sociological Association. ASA

Animals and Society Chapter

Animal Behavioral Society. ABS

Animals & Society Institute, ASI

Anthropologists and Sociologists of Kentucky. ASK

North Central Sociological Association. NCSA

Mid-south Sociological Association, MSSA

CURRENT RESEARCH

Gender and Leadership in Animal Sheltering Organizations - Dissertation – Defended 4/10/2018

Intersection of Race and Class in Mothers' Perceptions of their Post-Partum Bodies with
Brittany Williams.

Black Cats. Analysis of two years of an urban, animal shelter's data with Dr. Robert
Carini

REFERENCES:

Dr. Cynthia Negrey
Dissertation Chair
Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Cynthia.negrey@louisville.edu

Dr. Graham Ellis
Assistant Vice President
Academic Affairs

Bellarmino University
502-452-8000

gellis@bellarmine.edu

Dr. Patricia Gagne
Director, Graduate Studies Sociology
Member of Dissertation Committee
Associate Professor, Sociology
University of Louisville

Patricia.gagne@louisville.edu

MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE:

Bellarmino University, Louisville, KY

Director, Printing and Mail Services & Advisor for Student Publications: (Lance &
Concord)

Spring 1986 – Spring 2003

- Supervise four full-time workers, two part-time workers, and eighteen work-study students in two departments.
- Provide design and layout services for University materials on P.C. based desktop publishing system using Pagemaker 7, CorelDraw 10, Photoshop 5.5, and Adobe

Illustrator 9.0. Used Microsoft Office tools (Word, Excel, Access, Outlook, Publisher, and Powerpoint) extensively.

- Design and maintain departmental web pages with FrontPage 2000.
- Manage printing and mail services for all departments on campus from editing and design through bindery and mail assembly.
- Produce interdepartmental billings for both departments.
- Interact with supply vendors to purchase all supplies and equipment.
- Maintain personnel staffing levels.
- Oversee purchasing, service and maintenance of all University copiers.
- Schedule, estimate and bill all printing and mailing jobs.
- Provide customer service and sales of printing to all departments.
- Responsible for yearly departmental fiscal budgeting and day-to-day maintenance of same.
- Advisor for student publications, *The Concord*, *The Lance* and *The Ariel*.
- Worked with Jeffersontown High School FMD and LD students and teacher in work skills training as volunteer workers in the bindery department.

Continuing Education Classes Taught While At Bellarmine

Adobe Pagemaker, Adobe Photoshop, Desktop Publishing for Communications Major, Web Design, and Using the Internet as a research tool. In my capacity as Advisor, I provide technical education and support on desktop publishing tools.

PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS:

- Certified Graphic Communications Manager - Became certified through IPMA (In-Plant Managers Association) by passing a five-hour test on Management, Personnel Management, Technical, Theory, and Scheduling. This is a respected designation throughout the in-plant field.
- President - Kentuckiana In Plant Printers Association 1988-1993
- Top 10 Managers award in 1988 from In-plant Reproductions and Electronic Publishing Magazine.
- Teacher in Continuing Studies at Bellarmine College taught several adult education classes including "Managing a Small Print or In-plant Shop."

VOLUNTEER & LEISURE ACTIVITIES:

- Canine Agility at Competitive Edge Agility & Dog Sports, LLC
- Treasurer, Women of Reformed Judaism, The Temple, Louisville, KY