THE RESCUERS: INTERSECTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP ACTIVISM AND THE
RECOGNITION OF THE HUMAN-ANIMAL "LINK"

by

ANDREA BUTTON

B.S., Stephen F. Austin State University, 2003
M.A., Kansas State University, 2007

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2015

Abstract

Academics, victims, and advocates have increasingly brought attention to the need for programs and policies to protect and shelter nonhuman victims of domestic violence. Research focused on the "Link" between human-based violence and violence against animals has played a significant role in the creation of these programs, and has prompted a more holistic approach to providing services to all victimized family members. In this dissertation, I focus on the unique origin points of several animal-friendly domestic violence organizations and the models used to serve both human and nonhuman victims, as well as on the individual advocacy and activism of animal-friendly domestic violence organization workers. Data collection from semi-structured interviews with thirty domestic violence workers and advocates provides the foundation for my investigation of the importance of community networks and individual identity as a source of professional navigation of the connected spheres of domestic violence and animal abuse. This study extends the ever-growing collection of research on the "Link" and on the broader discipline of human-animal studies. Finally, this research provides an additional perspective on the use of personal and collective identity to engage in advocacy on behalf of nonhuman victims of domestic violence.

THE RESCUERS: INTERSECTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP ACTIVISM AND THE
RECOGNITION OF THE HUMAN-ANIMAL "LINK"

by

ANDREA BUTTON

B.S., Stephen F. Austin State University, 2003
M.A., Kansas State University, 2007

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2015

Approved by:

Major Professor
Gerad Middendorf

Copyright

ANDREA BUTTON

2015

Abstract

Academics, victims, and advocates have increasingly brought attention to the need for programs and policies to protect and shelter nonhuman victims of domestic violence. Research focused on the "Link" between human-based violence and violence against animals has played a significant role in the creation of these programs, and has prompted a more holistic approach to providing services to all victimized family members. In this dissertation, I focus on the unique origin points of several animal-friendly domestic violence organizations and the models used to serve both human and nonhuman victims, as well as on the individual advocacy and activism of animal-friendly domestic violence organization workers. Data collection from semi-structured interviews with thirty domestic violence workers and advocates provides the foundation for my investigation of the importance of community networks and individual identity as a source of professional navigation of the connected spheres of domestic violence and animal abuse. This study extends the ever-growing collection of research on the "Link" and on the broader discipline of human-animal studies. Finally, this research provides an additional perspective on the use of personal and collective identity to engage in advocacy on behalf of nonhuman victims of domestic violence.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

This dissertation, both as a product and as a process, is the result of years of dedication by a number of individuals. As a process, I am thankful to Robert Schaeffer, my initial chair, for his dedication to the fostering of the conception of the project, and the defense of the proposal. The solid foundation he provided enabled this project to take off in the right direction. I am also thankful to my final dissertation chair, Gerad Middendorf. His willingness to continue the process with me, and his encouragement of my research on the topic, made the completion of this project possible. I am also grateful to my committee members, Nadia Shapkina, Don Kurtz, Torry Dickinson, and Charlotte Olsen, for their support, suggestions, and dedication to fostering the learning process.

I have been blessed with a welcoming Sociology Department, and an amazing College of Arts and Sciences at my own institution, Midwestern State University. The support and encouragement of Beverly Stiles, Emily LaBeff, Aisha Siddiqui, Leland Turner, Tiffany Ziegler, and so many other amazing colleagues has made the completion of this dissertation an event to be celebrated.

I started this long journey due to the dedication of the Sociology faculty at Stephen F. Austin State University. Because of their collective belief in my own potential, I started my graduate school career – and it was with their continued support that I have now finished that path. Jerry Williams, Tom Segady, and Robert Szafran – thank you for believing in my potential.

I have met so many amazing and wonderful people along this journey. My friends, both in graduate school and in the Manhattan, KS community, kept me grounded and provided

laughter and support during the most difficult of times. My work for my Master's thesis, fostered through the guidance of Dana Britton, enabled my later non-profit work with former inmates – an experience that I will always be grateful for. My Austin, Texas friends and colleagues provided a break from the graduate school routine, while each encouraging me to finish this task in order to continue to help those in need. Lani Hartnett, Jenna Gallagher, Nathan Langfitt, and Ellen Bettis – you are each phenomenally talented and inspiring. I cannot tell you enough how loved you always made me feel.

My family has provided unwavering support for my passion for learning. My parents and siblings have never doubted my ability to become a professor. Though our relationship has changed over the years, I am thankful to Ryan Button for being one of my loudest cheerleaders in this process – he knows my dedication to my work better than any other. He walked the path of graduate school with me, and he continues to be my teaching and life experience buddy. Kim and Zac Ralston – there are not enough words to thank you for your support. I have cried with you two, laughed with you, and have shared more life defining moments with you than I can count. I found it fitting that you both spent the morning of my defense encouraging me, and celebrated with me after I successfully passed. You are friends, and you are family – and Linc is lucky to have such awesome parents.

Finally, I want to recognize and thank the women and men who participated in this study. Their experiences, passionate advocacy, and humor made this research possible. I am forever grateful, and they served to inspire my own professional passion even more.

Dedication

As I write this, I can hear my daughter talking in her sleep. I dedicate this project, this process, and this product, to her. Ronin, you are the reason that I completed this journey. For all the support and encouragement from the people in my life, it is your welcomed presence in my life that made this all worth it.

A few months ago, the sound of my daughter stirring in her sleep would have been followed by the soft sound of my dog, Yukon, slowly crawling onto her bed to check on her and give her comfort and warmth. Yukon, my gentle giant, was the protector of our small family – but he was also the reason for why I could understand the perspectives expressed by my respondents. Yukon was Ronin's companion, protector, friend, and teacher. He was also by my side through many of the tough, life-changing moments in my path to completing both of my graduate degrees. Despite the abuses suffered before he came into my life, he was always calm, and always kind. And when his cancer became too painful to endure, we said goodbye. Now, the sound of her stirring is often met with the sound of Marx and Burden, our cats, meowing in response. Thus, I also dedicate this dissertation to Yukon, Marx, and Burden – for showing me how important animals can be in the lives of the humans they share space and companionship with.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Statement of Topic

September 24, 2013 – A 25-year old Illinois man is charged with killing a stray cat his female housemate had been feeding following a dispute with her. He beat the cat with a metal bed frame and intentionally left the body in the house for her to find.

September 13, 2013 – a 29-year-old Nebraska man is charged with killing a family dog following a fight with his girlfriend. He threw the dog against a wall and broke its neck in front of his girlfriend's children.

September 11, 2013 – a 20-year-old Oregon man plead guilty to charges of animal cruelty after repeatedly punching his girlfriend's cat following an argument. The tabby cat was unable to eat due to fractures to the face, jaw, and neck.

August 2013 – a 45-year-old man, believing that his wife had "put the devil in" the family dog, placed an explosive device around the dog's neck and blew the dog up. Police arrived on scene to find body parts scattered across the yard.

June 14, 2013 – a 59-year-old man is arrested for domestic violence and animal cruelty following a fight with his wife. He confessed to choking his wife's dog to death.

March 27, 2013 – a 28-year-old man is accused of assault and animal cruelty when he knocks his girlfriend's dog unconscious following an argument.

I want to open this topic with a sample of some of the more recent news-worthy cases involving animals as victims of domestic violence. The hundreds of stories that I have uncovered in the course of this project have been the most difficult part of my research. I have, on more than one occasion, been forced to distance myself from this topic simply to recover mentally from the stories of horrific violence that both humans and animals have experienced. In

truth, I chose to use recent stories in my introduction rather than the most sensational ones, as I am not interested in exposing others to these stories unnecessarily.

This project evolved from research that I thought, at the time, was unrelated. While conducting interviews in Kansas prisons for my thesis, I spoke with men and women that were involved in dog-training programs within the prison. During an interview with a female inmate, I was told the story of a puppy that had been abused and thrown in a dumpster as punishment during a domestic violence dispute. The inmate requested that I look into the connection between animal and human violence, as she had numerous stories from fellow inmates that had experienced similar events. I agreed, initially as a way to honor her request. The past few years of research are the result of that request, and I am eternally thankful to the inmate that pointed me in this direction.

The "discovery" of the connection between animal abuse and other criminal behaviors is commonly credited to MacDonald (1961) for what is known (and continues as a popular, yet controversial concept) as the "triad of sociopathy": bed –wetting, animal abuse, and fire setting (Lea 2007). During what appears to be the same time frame, the FBI was making connections between violence against animals and violence against humans (U.S. Department of Justice 1998). On the ground, individuals began addressing the joint issues of violence against women, children, and animals through shelters, courts, social workers, policing, and veterinarians (Ascione 1999). As a sign of the interest and influence of academics and professionals, animal cruelty was listed in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV)* in 1987, in part due to the research done within the FBI regarding patterns of abuse and violence associated with serial killers (U.S. Department of Justice 1998).

This early emphasis was also founded in an assumption of individual pathology being the primary cause for violence against animals – Arkow argues that the motivations of animal abusers are similar to those of child abusers, primarily issues of control and anger (1999). The findings by researchers investigating the connection between child abuse and animal abuse was not unexpected, considering the fact that the first child abuse case of "Little Mary Ellen" was brought forth by the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (APSCA) in 1874 (Beers 2006). The arguments regarding violence against children and violence against animals as patterns of cruelty have been clear in the eyes of advocates for quite some time.

By contrast, domestic violence has long been a well-known, though often overlooked or ignored, issue with regard to the dangers of intimate relations (Hensley and Tallichet 2005). Connections between violence against women and violence against animals are not new. Leslie Irvine (2004) reveals a clear relationship between the treatment of women and their animals with regard to violence. Women accused of witchcraft were burned or drown along with their cats and any strays found in the area. Males often killed or maimed women's horses due to spurned love or disobedience. Ascione's (1998) modern focus on women that face violence against their animals presents a broad continuum from simple threats to the killing and dismembering of pets at the hands of abusers. Since the early 1980's, research connecting animal abuse and domestic violence has been steadily increasing. Keeping true to the initial disciplinary foci, studies have been primarily founded in behavioral and psychological frameworks, consistently finding links between interpersonal violence (IPV) and violence against animals, as well as other forms of antisocial behavior (Arkow 1996; Arkow & Ascione 1999; Arluke et. al 1999; Ascione et. al. 2007; Boat 1995; Fitzgerald 2001; Flynn 2000). Arluke (1999), for example, found that 37% of animal abusers also committed other violent crimes; and 44% committed property crimes. In

addition, Simmons and Lehmann (2007) note that these trends have a pattern of "distant" to "intimate" victims: earlier property crimes evolve into crimes against animals, and finally escalate to crimes against humans. In particular, Arluke highlights evidence that violence against women and children often included acts of violence against their companion animals (Arluke et. al. 1999).

Domestic violence and abuse is a form of oppression – control over women's daily actions and interactions. Adams (1994) provides extensive detail to Ascione's abuse continuum, and has argued that the abuse that women and their pets suffer is vast, and includes the abuse and killing of pet animals – battering, marital rape (often utilizing family pets), pornography, child sexual abuse, ritual abuse, serial killing, and sexual harassment. O'Toole et. al. (2007) updated the continuum even more, presenting the broad spectrum of behaviors that includes "slapping, biting, kicking, punching, throwing objects, confining, denying care (food or medication), abuse of pets and property destruction, sexual abuse, stabbing, shooting, choking, threatening, insulting, and degrading" (2007: 252). Often, the presence of one form of abuse is connected to other forms. Women, and the children and pets in their care, find it difficult to escape. Browne (2004) argues that women face many obstacles if they try to leave their battering partner: financial insecurity, limited educational background and work experience, lack of childcare, legal sanctions, and escalating abuse before and after flight make it extremely difficult for women to leave. Finally, victims of domestic violence who choose to use violence to defend themselves and their families are often prosecuted by the legal system. In particular, Browne's discussion of the legal barriers (loss of custody, desertion, not granting divorces) faced by women attempting to escape their abusers demonstrates how male authority and power is reinforced by the justice system (Browne 2004). To make matters worse for battered women

4

with pets, healthcare, police, and judicial authorities are reluctant to intervene on behalf of animals in abusive situations due to a "moral schizophrenia" regarding the legal status of animals as property (Franscione 1995). Mandatory reporting of animal abuse by veterinarians, vet techs, and animal control workers exists only in four states (California, Colorado, Ohio, and Virginia) and the complex legal status of pets as *property* makes it difficult to remove animals from abusive situations (Fox 1999).

When women successfully leave their abusers, the results may not be beneficial for their animals. Flynn (2000) clearly addresses how the experiences of shelter residents resonates with studies done in the initial phase of studies investigating the Link – the relationship between human violence and violence against non-human animals (Ascione 1998; Ascione, Weber, & Wood 1997). Whereas these initial studies note the similarities in types of crimes committed and the findings that human and animal abuse were connected, Flynn argues correctly that the effect on battered women is more complex. In addition to the emotional trauma faced by both the women and their children through the abuse of their animals, women sometimes postponed their flight from abusive homes because they were concerned about the welfare of their pets (Flynn 2000). Many women recount experiences in which the abuse intensified once they were no longer with their abusers, often leading to the death of a companion animal. Grant (1999) also provides evidence that there exists a reluctance to take on the complexity of human-animal violence in women's shelters due to the fact that volunteers, organizers, and advocates tend to have limited resources, experience, and energy. Women who are in the position of seeking shelter for both themselves and their animals are often faced with a difficult choice – them, or their pet? When it comes to domestic violence it is clear that the welfare of both humans and animals is at stake.

In recent years, the focus on violence against animals in the context of domestic abuse has prompted cooperation between animal and women's shelters, and attracted the attention of police, activists, scholars, and policy makers (Kogan et. al. 2004). These information campaigns are similar to the successful consciousness-raising initiatives that Kravetz (2004) discusses, although the comparison is limited due to the diversity of individuals and organizations that are not all necessarily "feminist" in perspective or structure, although feminists and women's rights advocates do fill ranks in all three campaigns (animal rights, women's rights, and children's rights). In response to this public awareness, there have been recent changes in state-level legal policies and practices in many states; to date, thirty states have provisions that protect animals in protective orders (Wisch 2011; www.animallaw.info). Several states have also initiated limited programs in which the animal victims of domestic abuse are housed temporarily in animal shelters, though these programs have problems. Kogan et. al. (2004) found that these temporary shelters, often located at veterinary offices, were understaffed, inexperienced, and could only house the animals for a short period of time (usually the same six to seven weeks of housing offered by the women's shelter). Although the women who use the shelters are grateful for it, they also fear that some harm may come to the animal if the abuser finds the pet shelter (Kogan, et. al. 2004). To highlight the institutional recognition of the Link, Krienert et. al. (2012) surveyed 767 domestic violence shelters in the United States regarding their awareness of the connections between animal and human violence. Of these shelters, the authors note that 95% recognized the issue, and more than half (57%) provided some form of animal-friendly program. However, only a small number (*n=48*) provided on-site assistance, and were limited in terms of the number of animals permitted as well as the length of their stay (Krienert et al. 2012).

The initial phase of the development of connected shelter programs, and of policies that recognize the connections of violence, is not clearly mapped, although the Safe Haven programs are often seen as the most well-known practical response by shelter staff at both animal shelters and domestic violence shelters (Arkow and Coppola 2007; Kogan et. al. 2004). The Safe Havens for Pets provides the network connections between shelter staff, veterinarians, and domestic violence victims, and appears to be more popular than the on-site shelter programs (Krienert et al. 2012). When I first started this project, the central questions I wanted to ask in this research were: how these varied programs and policies got started, how do these individuals negotiate individual and collective identities, and how the experiences of these men and women provide insight into the larger dynamics of interpersonal violence and animal abuse? While these questions remained part of the focus of this project, I quickly found that my own assumptions about how knowledge regarding the connections of violence was produced and applied were not entirely accurate, as I will detail in later chapters.

Outline of Chapters

My review of relevant literature is provided in chapter two. I address the recent histories of the domestic violence movement and the animal welfare movement, as well as the specific topic of "The Link" between human-animal violence, and the larger body of scientific interest in human-animal studies. In chapter three, I detail the methods I used, my analytical approach, and my own positionality as it relates to the research. My findings in chapter four are organized into two sections: why did the shelter decide to include animals, and what types of programs did those decisions result in? Additional findings in chapter five address the community connections and advocacy of the shelter workers that enables these animal-friendly programs, as well as the importance of the personal and client-focused framing and collective identity that informs the

perspectives of these shelter workers. In the final chapter I discuss the major findings and the theoretical contribution to resource mobilization, identity negotiation, the implications of how the framing of human and nonhuman victims of domestic violence influences the experiences of both victims and advocates, the production of knowledge, as well as implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

Human-Animal Interactions

The field of human-animal interaction (HAI) first began to gain international recognition in the early 1980s, pushed into the academic spotlight with the establishment of the concept of the human-animal bond (HAB) (Hines 2003). An international and interdisciplinary goal was espoused by early supporters of the HAB, though until recently most contributions have come from the field of veterinary medicine; scholarly attention regarding the HAB has begun to include the fields of psychology, sociology, social work, public health, and the broad field of medicine (Hines 2003). It has only been over the past twenty-five years that research has begun to confirm the value of animals in our everyday lives. Interaction with animals has been shown to improve survival rates among cardiac patients (Friedman, et al. 1980; Friedman and Thomas 1995; National Institutes of Health 1988), decrease blood pressure and cholesterol (Anderson, Reid and Jennings 1992), lower stress (Eddy, Hart and Boltz 1988; Serpell 1993), increase mental activity and prevention of dementia among Alzheimer's patients (Batson et al. 1998; Baun and McCabe 2003; Edwards and Beck 2002), detection of cancerous cells (Catanzaro 2003), improve survival rates among patients receiving animal therapy visits (Johnson et al. 2003), and play a beneficial role in child development (Filiatre, Millot and Montanger 1983; Melson 2003). The result of this research has been the implementation of animal-assisted therapy (AAT) and pet therapy programs (PTPs) in institutional settings as diverse as hospitals, nursing homes, juvenile detention centers, mental hospitals, schools, individual homes, and prisons (Lai 1998; Furst 2006).

In addition to the discoveries of the physical benefits regarding interaction with animals, psychological benefits of animal interaction were discovered to exist where animals provided

social support to their owners, caregivers, emotionally- and behaviorally-challenged individuals, and individuals that suffered from anxiety (Beck and Katcher 2003; Flynn 2000). This early research did not remain obscured in academic circles, however. Public spheres were involved in the media attention surrounding the HAB throughout the 1970s and 1980s-*Newsweek* and *McCalls* both ran articles highlighting the human-animal connection as early as 1974 and 1978 (Hines 2003). Print media and radio spots soon followed. This attention, however, was focused on the therapeutic research noted earlier, not on the darker associations of humans and animals with regard to abuse and violence. Following this groundbreaking research, people have increasingly relied on dogs and cats (and even birds, rabbits, llamas, miniature horses, and fish) to serve as therapy animals in institutional settings as diverse as hospitals, nursing homes, juvenile detention centers, mental hospitals, schools, individual homes, and prisons. This initial focus on the physical and psychological effects of human-animal interactions enabled a more dedicated research agenda directed toward the negative effects of human-animal interactions.

At first, research centered on the variables that impact human-animal interactions; such as class, gender, age, and economic status. As early as the 1980's, studies on the role of animals within the human-centric spheres began to highlight the complexity of our relationships with nonhuman animals. The manner in which we relate to pets within and around the home environment varies by gender (Kellert & Berry, 1987; Wells and Hepper, 1997); age (Kellert 1980; Driscoll 1992); and childhood experience with pets (Paul and Serpell 1993). The "utilitarian" view of animals is distinctly different from a perspective that embraces animal companionship, though as Kellert and Berry note, this distinction is complicated by individual's views on hunting, farming, and pet ownership (1987). These studies address the relational context of nonhuman animals, and provide a background for how our society has evolved its

laws and customs to accommodate the increasing cohabitation with nonhuman animals. Related research, unfortunately, has found increasing evidence linking the incidents of animal abuse and cruelty with domestic violence and child abuse. Specifically, scholars have evidence of a relationship between human and animal violence, increasing awareness in the public while furthering academic attention (Arkow 1999).

The Link Between Human-Animal Violence

The connections between human violence and animal violence, though acknowledged by the criminal justice field, were initially of limited interest to academics. This "ignored link" created a significant gap in both the research agendas on human-animal interactions, and in the ability of professionals within the public sphere to argue for animal-friendly policies and programs within their various service sectors (Boat 1995). Flynn (2012) notes that the problem was not a lack of research, but rather a lack of theoretical connections between the various disciplines in which studies were being conducted. Eventually, the interests of activists, advocates, and academics sparked a theoretical shift in how human-animal interactions are viewed by both the research and the public spheres. It is within this theoretical evolution that the most important epistemological concerns have become apparent – concerns that challenge the very manner in which our society defines the existence of animals within our world.

Research regarding the Link is founded in the early arguments of the graduation hypothesis (Arluke et. al. 1999). These perspectives placed the human-animal violence connection within the context of animal abuse as proxy for human violence, and relied on research that reflected the self-reporting of the abuse and killing of animals by criminals that escalated in the violent nature of their crimes, and often targeted humans in later crimes (Lockwood and Church 1998; Tingle et. al. 1986; Wright and Tinsley 2003; Merz-Perez et. al.

2001; 2004; Arluke et. al. 1999; Alys et. al. 2009). The work of Arluke and Ascione is of particular importance – their research significantly contributed to the early production of knowledge about the context in which animal abuse occurs, and paved the way for additional studies to address the various social settings in which human-animal violence was connected. Ascione's (2000) survey on 41 "Safe Haven" programs highlighted some of the experiences from 21 domestic violence shelters and 20 humane societies. The resulting report reflected the desire by participants for an increased awareness of the need in these programs, as well as the common challenges faced. Ascione noted in his initial study that awareness of LINK-based knowledge was present, but limited – only 38% of the domestic violence shelters surveyed incorporated cross-training on the LINK, with active participation by both domestic violence and animal welfare programs in early phases of incorporating animal-friendly programs being a trial-and-error learning process. Sheltering models primarily relied on animal welfare facilities and fosters – often utilizing a combination of these two – with kennels only used by 4.8% of the programs. In addition, a few programs studied by Ascione had been shuttered due to a loss of program initiators, and had limited access to portable kennels or on-site housing options. At the time of publication, Ascione's Safe Haven research demonstrated an initial attempt to bridge the gap between academic interest and practical application.

As awareness and academic interest increased, so did the data that challenged the initial foundation for the Link – the perspective that animal abuse during adolescence was a marker for future violence against humans. These challenges were part of a larger crisis being reflected within the public sphere as animal rights activists and advocates gained ground in their campaigns for animal welfare issues and started to change the manner in which the lives of animals were defined by the state. Questions regarding the status of animals in relation to

humans, in particular regarding the rights of animals-as-animals and animals-as-property, were not simply a challenge to the legal definition of animals; instead, this was a direct assault on the supremacy of humans over non-human animals. For this reason, the topic of animal abuse is rife with controversy and disagreement. Abuse and neglect have conflicting meanings depending on the context and the audience. The status of animals varies according to how we, as individuals, are associated with them. The manner in which our society uses animals impacts the rights we have assigned to them. Are animals property? Companions? Loved ones? Family members? Tools? Food?

Shifts in the perspective of how animals are assigned real and theoretical place within our society have demonstrated the extent to which the awareness of the evolution of human-animal interactions have fundamentally changed our social world. As a subfield of the legal profession, "animal law" reflects much of the ongoing discussion within the larger movement. Debates between rightists and welfarists are at the foundational basis for most of these laws – the limitation of animal suffering versus the recognition of animals as having intrinsic rights as nonhumans (Tauber 2010). Internal divisions aside, the importance of the legal battles that have been waged in the name of nonhuman animals is a testament to the influence and commitment of activists within the larger movement. In a more specific context, these legal battles have also furthered the ability of social services and policing to protect the nonhuman victims of domestic violence by establishing legal precedents to include them in protective orders and safety plans. Although Tauber's quantitative study on the effectiveness of litigation by animal advocacy groups demonstrates a general positive impact, it is important to note that local cases are often the ones that are more "newsworthy" to the community, and thus result in increased funding for animal protection (2010).

As noted earlier, the research, and thus the dialogue that has evolved from this is also marked by disagreement. Though the correlation between animal abuse and human violence is real – it is still *only* a correlation. A great deal of discussion by academics in this field is spent on the "potential" of connected human-animal victims. Flynn (2012) provides an excellent example of this focus on the "potential" for violence – he dedicates several sections within his first chapter to how this inherent threat to both humans and animals exists. Unfortunately, this has the tendency to overlook the context within which violence occurs. Rather than seeing the violence as a predetermined event, it must be placed within the social relations that make violence more or less likely. This is a decidedly difficult process, as intimate partner violence is highly contextual. Not all females are victims and males perpetrators, though the context of their roles is related to the intensity and systemic or episodic nature of their violence (Kelly and Johnson 2008). The most extreme forms of violence within the IPV spectrum are overwhelmingly committed by males against their female partners – this is the category of intimate terrorism (Johnson and Leone 2005). Indeed, how we address batterers in intervention programs is contextual – although there is a focus on human interactions, I know of no trainings that include a clear focus on human-animal interactions as well. Such a discussion is beyond the scope of my project, though, as the experiences of my respondents closely mirror the types of violence noted by Johnson and colleagues.

This research is founded primarily in the focus on intersecting social movements. The intellectual and policy developments that have accompanied the work of Link-based academics and activists have also influenced policies and practices associated with human and animal victims of violence. All social movements require a foundation built upon knowledge – in the form of real-world experience, education, and vision. For this topic, the foundations of

knowledge overlap within multiple spheres including the academic, social service profession, victim advocacy, and movement politics. It is within this intersection that I focus my project, and I therefore draw from these spheres for my theoretical application and contribution. Although academic attention has focused on the issue of the Link (Ascione 1999) for several decades, the everyday experiences of shelter workers and advocates does not always keep pace with the interests of researchers and theorists, nor are the works of academics always central to the policies and programs that emerge through a more organic process. The occasional disconnect between these two groups (academics and advocates) obscures the reality of how individuals from diverse backgrounds applied their spheres of knowledge to the issues of domestic violence and animal abuse. This is not to say that these groups have remained wholly separate, however. A key component of this project is to address how academics and advocates have contributed to the production of knowledge regarding the connections between human-animal violence, and have combined the passions of two social movement spheres – domestic violence and animal abuse – to bring about change in a specific manner.

Social Movements and Interest Groups

Granados and Knoke argue that an "organized interest group" is a "formally structured organization with a common goal of influencing the public policy-making by elected or appointed officials" (2005: 287). This would apply to child welfare and animal welfare groups such as the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA), Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), and American Humane Society (AHS), but not as clearly with the battered women's movement. Although a common interest is indeed associated with individuals that are concerned for the welfare of battered women, and the women's movement was a primary influence behind the initial establishment of the availability of women's shelters,

the contemporary organizations are not structured as a component of a unified "formal" organization – instead, many are funded through donations and marginal public funding, and many do not promote feminist or outspoken women's rights (Lehrner and Allen 2009). In addition, shelter workers and volunteers do not necessarily belong to an organization – ideologically there are similarities, but structurally there is more diversity and a new focus on shelters as places of professional services (2009). Therefore, the informal coalition component of the more fluid "interest group" classification would appear to apply more to the battered women's movement, but not necessarily to individual workers and volunteers at shelters. At the same time, the categorization of child welfare, animal welfare, and battered women's movements are also complicated as "interest organizations" (Granados and Knoke 2005: 288). The problem here is that the Link is not represented by a single movement. Instead, you find three separate, though connected, movements that each stress the Link in different contexts. Advocates of battered women highlight the importance of understanding shared victimhood in the context of abuse (Jorgensen and Maloney 1999). Child welfare advocates focus on the dangers of violence against animals in the home as a sign of future violence against children, and the possibility of the cycle of violence to become instilled within young minds (Grant 1999). As the voice for the "silent", animal advocates promote the Link as an indication of the extent of cruelty humans have become capable of (Ascione 1999). Thus, the Link – both in conception and in application – does not fit neatly into the traditional categories utilized by theorists of collective behavior and movements due to the fact that there is no single movement at the center of these issues.

I agree with Andrews and Edwards (2004), that the Link takes the closest form of an advocacy organization – though not in the traditional sense. A key problem in attempting to define a public collective is that not all categories fit all cases. Andrews and Edwards provide a

fair critique of the traditional manner of defining interest groups, social movements, and

nonprofit advocacy groups (2004). The enigma of the Link is that the origin is both old (the

history of the ASPCA and HSUS as examples), and yet new (the recent research interest in the

connections of violence). In addition, the politics of advocacy have not been the same for each

of the relevant groups – children, animals, and women – each have had their successes and

failures. Therefore, I utilize Andrews and Edwards approach regarding the defining element of

an advocacy group: the Link needs to be viewed from the standpoint of the emphasis on public

claims and demands for social change (2004: 486). In this application, however, I take the focus

deeper than the common perspective – as the authors argue, research on movements and interest

groups tends to focus on the public arguments of organized groups (ASPCA, HSUS, Department

of Justice, etc.) (Andrews and Edwards, 2004: 500). The problem with this is that it ignores the

everyday advocacy of individuals – such as shelter workers, animal control officers, politicians,

judges, veterinarians, court representatives, academics, and social workers.

Identity Politics, Social Movements, and Social Change

An important link clearly exists between the animal rights movement, and the women's

rights movement. Much like the initial foundations for the women's rights movement, the

modern animal rights movement has been led by a predominantly female, educated, middle class

group of activists (Einwohner 1999). Within this group, commonalities between women operate

as a source of resource mobilization and networking abilities; this common base of activists has

proven to aid the recruitment and mobilization of both the animal rights and women's social

movements. Peek et. al. (1996) highlight the importance of the influence of the feminist

perspective that many of these activists emphasize: the shared experiences by women and

animals as dominated, controlled populations with limited rights. Although identifying as

17

"feminist" is not universal among leaders and participants, the overlap between these groups has influenced how protests and movement activities and discourse are framed. In similar fashion, however, attacks on the feminist movement have influenced how the messages of these movements are received and have damaged the legitimacy of animal activists' protests – the women involved are often portrayed in public discourse as having "nothing better to do", overly nurturing and caring, and being "aging hippies" with feminist roots (Einwohner 1999). I am informed in my focus by the work of Kravetz (2004), but I am unable to apply the category of "feminist organization" to the coalitions and advocacy connections that I am researching due to the diversity in these community networks.

For the most part, the animal rights movement has been a public movement, with public protest, intensive lobbying campaigns, and mass media coverage (Beers 2006). By contrast, the campaign against domestic violence has not always been waged as a public issue, but instead initially as a "private matter" in which women's shelters were founded by concerned community members working within their neighborhoods (Murray 1988). This is not to say that the domestic violence movement has never been public, but rather that the origins of the movement were necessarily shrouded in quiet advocacy in order to protect the women and children that were in need of safe shelter. The intersection of the animal rights movement with the women's rights movements, specifically regarding domestic violence, has helped reframe the issue from the public to the private sphere in a manner that has expanded the potential audience (individuals promoting animal welfare now learn of the connection with domestic violence) and yet has increased the demands of shelters to again provide (hidden) safe haven for all victims. Thus, the resources available to the individuals promoting these issues (protection of women, children, and pets from domestic violence) is limited (Kogan et. al. 2004). Although animal welfare

organizations do indeed provide information about the connections of these spheres of violence, they are primarily in the context of animal-child victimization. Thus, while there is public acknowledgement, the issue is still shrouded in the privacy of the intimate home life.

The experiences of women and children who face domestic violence in the home are diverse. As Emma Williamson has argued: "It is only through our understanding of the experiences of abused women that we can adequately identify a model or definition of abuse that encompasses the range of tactics that men use and the range of harms women experience as a consequence" (2010:1413). I agree with Williamson that women and children experience physical and psychological "coercive control" both within the home and outside of it. I would further this argument, however, and note that the "cage" of coercive control transcends the physical and psychological – it is social as well. When a victim of abuse leaves the private sphere of the abuse – the home, for example – the effects of the abuse transcend this imagined barrier into the public sphere. Gender relations that reinforce dominance over women and children are not merely acted upon by deviant individuals; instead, they are the normative expectations of a society that engages in discourse and practice that promotes the superiority of males and masculine behavior. The "public/private" divide that we have engaged in academically and within the state through professional documentation is a false boundary that we have constructed through an inconsistent analysis of the multiple mechanisms of control that are not merely used on the body, but instead became internalized as well. By creating a context in which we imprison women within the public (dangers of leaving and public documentation and scrutiny of abuse) or private (dangers of staying and stigma associated with women that don't "choose" to leave), we contribute to the coercive control over their bodies in new ways – we limit their choices, their responses to domestic abuse, and create new bars to the "cage" that they

must negotiate. As a final insult, we engage in a public 'blindness' with regard to victims of abuse – actively removing or turning away from all signs of the reality of abuse by replacing the privacy of the home with the privacy of the shelter.

This "cage" becomes even more intricate when the issues of parenthood and pet ownership (companionship) are included. Women fleeing violence with their children are not the same as women fleeing with children *and* animals, because the challenges that they face are different. Fear for the welfare of pets if the woman is away from the home is akin to the fear associated with the welfare of children (Flynn 2012). Women that face abuse do not identify themselves only as victims or survivors; they also see themselves in relation to their pets, children, friends, family, and intimate partners. These shifting identities are a response to complex realities that include the intersection of mechanisms of control that affect the lives of women, children, and animals.

Feminist academics have failed to address many of these issues. Birke (2002) argues that feminist scholars have shied away from an in-depth analysis of human-animal relationships. Birke argues that Butler's framework of "gender-as-performance" helps evaluate the different meanings we assign academically and publicly to human-animal relationships (2002:430). Although I agree with Birke that women and animals are associated with "other"-ness, which is an inherent problem considering the need for a broader understanding of the fluidity of identity for both humans- and animals-in-context, I would also present two other layers of complexity. First, essentialist ideas as to the role of women-as-victims or women-as-protectors obscures the place of women in the context of violence. Women are capable of abuse of animals and humans. Women can facilitate the abuse of animals to spare themselves or their children. Women can be victims of abuse by animals. Women are victims, survivors, and perpetrators.

Second, although animals have clearly been at the center of the studies on human-animal relationships, the emphasis on the child-animal connection complicates the public/private divide that I mentioned earlier. Advocates of the Link have been the most vocal with the connection between child abuse and animal abuse. We have organized interest groups that draw specific attention to this link on websites, in media releases, and through cooperative efforts with national and local affiliates to spread information and influence policy regarding the link between children and animals. The focus on children and animals as potential ("essential") and actual victims is influenced by the discourse of abuse that is founded in social expectations of behavior and the powerlessness of these two groups. At the same time, we have dedicated a number of studies to the abuse of animals BY children as a sign of emotional distress (Flynn 2012). In contrast, we do not have that level of attention focused on the experiences of women other than their role as victims, and with animals as the stand-ins for children. These simple facts, if anything, demonstrate the level of complexity of this issue.

Ascione and Shapiro (2009) define animal abuse as "non-accidental, socially unacceptable behavior that causes pain, suffering, or distress to and/or death of an animal". But I agree with Serpell (2009) that "socially unacceptable" is a culturally defined concept. As noted earlier, the behavior of individuals – abusers, victims, and survivors – takes place in context. There are similarities between nations (particularly the US, England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia) regarding the academic and public support for the Link (Flynn 2012). Many of these nations have policies that mirror one another with regard to the need to address the dangers of human-animal violence connections. I will take Serpell's argument a step further, again, with relation to the experiences of battered women vs. abused animals (or abused children): although people object to animal cruelty – as they did in the case of

Michael Vick – they do not object to the same extent, publically, to the abuse of women. Consider the response to the incidents of abuse and misogyny by other public figures – Charlie Sheen and Ray Rice – as examples. On the one hand, we have imprisonment and public shaming; on the other we have a national "comedy" tour and record-breaking social media popularity. With regard to Ray Rice, despite video evidence, the national conversation focused not on the horrific crime, but instead became an example of public scorn directed at a woman that chose to stay with her husband.

In addition, this is a social and structural trap for women – society places them at fault for accepting, negotiating, or managing "socially unacceptable" behavior at the hands of an abuser; faults them for having anyone (anything) under their "care" experience unacceptable treatment; and then subjects women to a public discourse that allows for no alternative to the victim-survivor dichotomy. I turn here to the argument by Marcus (2010) regarding the framing of rape and sexual assault. At fault in this framing is the emphasis on women as victims, and men as actual or latent perpetrators. In similar fashion, as noted earlier, initial academic and anecdotal arguments espousing the Link have created a self-fulfilling prophecy: that human-animal violence is always connected, that men are violent in their dominion over all, and that violence against animals is a sign of deeper issues. Patterson-Kane and Piper's (2009) critique of the empirical research of the "link" is an excellent example of how a moral panic can obscure the reality of how power is used in everyday gendered interactions. By the very nature of the focus of psychology, the research questions informing this topic were centered on the potentially abnormal behavior of individuals, not on a social structure that promotes violence. In addition, publications of the incidence of animal abuse in veterinary medicine also appears to have stoked these fires even more – as animal welfare advocates became more mainstream in academia, so

did scholastic material dedicated to investigating the positive and negative effects of the human-animal bond. Although methodologically academics have noted that the relationship of the Link is not a causal one (Lea 2007; Flynn 2012; Arluke 2006), the professional push by these same academics and advocates has been to treat the Link as essential. Unfortunately, the related fund-raising campaigns that utilize this academic information, well-intentioned though they are, have also produced a wealth of everyday knowledge from victim testimonies and impassioned advocates that promote the Link as essential to understanding victimization. Socioeconomic factors associated with connected patterns of violence such as gender, race, poverty, and cultural factors such as ownership-as-right are all overlooked when incomplete empirical research is combined with passionate advocacy. Much like Marcus finds fault with the framing of rape and sexual assault as stripping agency and empowerment from women against potential assaults and attacks, I argue that the framing of the Link cannot be founded in an assumption of such simplistic dichotomies of "victim/abuser" or "public/private". Social relationships that include mechanisms of violence and control are simply not that scripted. While the patterns uncovered in the current literature do indeed highlight a higher propensity for abuse by men, it does not (and should not) indicate that we as researchers should promote correlation as causation. By framing women, children, and animals as "victims", we have validated the public control over their identities. When we group children and animals into categories of "innocent" victims, we perpetuate the placement of blame on women for not having the ability to shield those in their care – thus aligning them with the perpetrators of the abuse, and stripping them of our social empathy (Terrance et. al. 2008). In addition, we enable the assumption that only women are the natural caretakers of children and animals – a significant issue for many reasons, including the pressure placed on women and the inability to then recognize males as potential caregivers, or

victims, as well. Further, when we create a system of public responsibility on the mandatory reporting of animal abuse and child abuse, but do not argue for the public responsibility to intervene in the privacy of women's experiences of abuse, we are reifying the mechanisms of control that force a woman to choose between family ("private" - child, pet, partner or all) and self (public survivor). This is a false reality of choice – we are fluid identities within social relationships, not generic, static persons in a false dichotomy. Perhaps at issue here is the delicate balance needed to address violence-in-context without losing sight of the complexity of the issue. A moral panic that seeks to carve a new niche for criminality is not acceptable as a means for labeling individuals according to assumed, and often unfounded, pathology.

The history of the animal rights movement is long and complex. Jasper and Nelkin (1992) note that the current animal rights movement is less cohesive than it once was, due to the fact that it is a combination of various other movements such as the environmental, women's rights, and new religious movements (1992:15). As the agendas of these other movements change, their influence on the animal rights movement shifts. In addition, as I noted earlier, the public perceptions of other movements, and more importantly the assumptions of the identities of the individuals involved in these movements, has also had an effect. In particular, there exists a continuum of ideology in the current movement, from promoting animal "welfare" to animal "rights"; often these two social movement camps find themselves as odds with one another, as is the case of individuals participating in the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and individuals that are associated with local and national pet rescue organizations (Beers 2006). Within this complexity also exists the continuum of individual perspectives on animals – those that focus on the absolute right that animals should be granted with regard to self-hood, as well as individuals

24

and academics that argue for humane practices within the animal industry, such as Temple Grandin.

The movements associated with women's rights have also faced periods of transition. Of these movements, the battered women's movement (also called the domestic violence movement) is the most relevant regarding the Link. As with the passage of legislation aiding in the protection of children and animals, the battered women's movement has had a public spotlight as well. First passed in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) has consistently been attacked by a variety of anti-feminist women's organizations, marking a clear distinction from the histories of animal welfare (the exception being the antivivisectionist movement) and child welfare legislations (Beers 2006). Whereas advocates for child and animal victims have widespread support, as noted earlier, advocacy for women is considerably less ideologically organized at the national and state level, relying instead on a diverse base of volunteers and advocates dealing directly with victims and survivors in shelters. In addition, the complex needs of domestic violence victims forces a system of shelter and community services to rely on groups and individuals that do not always share a similar perspective of victimization (Allen et. al. 2004). Further, there has also been a bureaucratic shift in the approach to assisting victims and survivors. There is a divergence – a lingering social movement as well as an increasingly professional approach to providing social services and resources for "clients". This shift to the professionalization marks an additional change with regard to the ability to modify the dominant "frame" of the occurrence of IPV as victim-centered (Berns 2004).

As the central interest group promoting the Link, the animal rights movement has been tasked with mobilizing public support for the connections between animal abuse and child abuse. Paramount to any social movement, cultural context has aided the animal rights movement both

locally and globally, with common origins and constituents being found, for example, among the Humane Society for the United States (HSUS), American Humane Society (AHS), Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), and the mirror movement in America (ASPCA). In addition to the need for a relevant cultural framing, however, is the importance of the network mechanisms that enable social change to occur. It is within this intersection of the efforts of individuals, interest groups, and network connections that my research addresses an important missing component to the understanding of the Link between human-animal violence.

Rationale for Study

The research on human-animal interactions (HAI), and the larger body of knowledge know as human-animal studies (HAS) continues to contribute to a vibrant discussion about the role of animals in the lives of humans. Of particular importance, this research highlights the manner in which the lived experiences of humans and non-human animals intersect. As humans, we define ourselves in the context of our relationships with animals – the ones we share our living space with, the ones we chose to consume (or not), the ones we name, and the ones we identify as pests. We identify ourselves as "animal lovers", "dog lovers", "cat lovers", and as "animal advocates". In addition, we have formed organizations and engaged in social movements to enact political and social change to address the (in)correct manner in which we utilize non-human animals in our human-centric world. In the case of the initial animal rights movement, this awareness of the connection between human- and animal-based violence started a campaign that has now found a modern form in the attempts to address animal-related violence in the context of intimate-partner abuse.

This project addresses a missing aspect in the current literature – the experiences of the men and women that have enabled the animal-friendly programs, and fostered network

connections between women's shelters and animal's shelters. No systematic literature addresses the development of these connections, or the experiences of the individuals that initiated these network connections. Because of the lack of detail on this history, I argue that the first-hand accounts of these individuals is essential – why (and how) did they become involved, what challenges have their shelters, organizations, and programs faced, and how do these individuals perceive the current state of the profession and public awareness with regard to the human-animal violence cycle. Understanding the experiences and challenges faced by these individuals will uncover the evolution of the anecdotal and academic accounts of the Link as they were applied in policy, training, discourse, and practice. One aspect of this research focuses on the recognition of the Link by shelter workers. Specifically, this research helps to bridge the gap between Ascione's (2000) report on Safe Haven programs and the current state of animal-friendly programs. As academics debate over the reliability of research on the Link (Lea 2007; Arluke 2002; 2006; Arluke et. al. 1999), shelter workers still face the reality of victims needing animal-friendly policies (Krienert et. al. 2012). In addition, considering the combined difficulties faced with regard to the protection of human-animal social units (often including children), uncovering the tactics, networks, training, politics, and policy pathways to establishing supporting shelter programs is crucial to understanding *how* this evolving movement happened, while also providing an insight into which tactics worked (or didn't), and which components are still a work in process. Finally, by focusing on individuals that have contributed to the implementation of animal-friendly programs, this study uncovers the professional experiences of those that are associated with the protection of victims from a more complex standpoint.

The advocacy of individuals built the women's movements, the child welfare movement, and the animal welfare movement. Individual advocacy enabled the ASPCA, HSUS, NOW, and

AHS to shape public policy through these different groups. Indeed, Beers (2006) argues that the passion of the individuals within the animal rights movements, primarily of those within positions of power and leadership, helped to shape the connected social movements of feminism and child welfare rights. Therefore, I argue for a focus on the experiences of these individual advocates to address the origin of the shelter programs and network connections as well as the evolution of the professional awareness and framing of the Link.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

My primary focus for this project is to look at the process of applying animal-friendly programs and policies to family violence shelters. This approach requires an understanding of the structure of these organizations, the history of the academic and professional attention regarding the human-animal violence link, and the everyday experiences of individuals in positions of power and influence that have enabled these animal-friendly aspects of their services. Due to this broad focus, I considered several issues prior to my choice of methodology: the lack of previous studies on this process; the desire to gather in-depth information about respondents' experiences; and the difficulty of syncing multiple movement perspectives into a cohesive narrative. For these reasons, I chose to rely on qualitative methods to address the complexities that exist within these shelters. My primary source of data comes from in-depth interviews with individuals that have been part of the process of the inclusion of animal-friendly shelter programs and policies within women's and family violence shelters. Additional data includes program and policy guidelines that have been organized in information packets by the various animal welfare organizations that have contributed to the consciousness-raising campaigns regarding the Link. Finally, I include the perspective of one of the leading members of the campaign to increase awareness, funding, and resources for professionals within the related spheres of animal abuse and domestic violence.

Sampling Method and Study Locations

This research relies on the information from family violence shelters nationwide that have initiated or completed the process of including animal-friendly programs and policies. Unfortunately, these shelters increase and decrease in number on a monthly basis. To date,

shelters in 30 states have started to include these programs. The aim of my research was to uncover, if possible, the initial process through which these individual programs were implemented – a focus that required uncovering relationships between actors that often were no longer working within these locations. Producing a random sample of shelter workers was not practical for this study. Due to the focus on coalition relationships, I used purposive sampling (Babbie 2002) to reach the specific category of shelter workers that are integral to the narrative I intended to highlight in my research. I therefore excluded shelter staff members that have not been involved in the inclusion process; shelters not incorporating animal-friendly programs are also excluded. Using information gathered from the alliephillips.com website – one of the leading advocates of the movement to include animals programs in domestic violence shelters – I started my initial search with 89 shelters. I sent initial contact emails to each shelter, though seven of the organizations did not have correct contact information and I was unable to make consistent contact with staff – thus creating an initial contact sample of 82 shelters. From that sample, 37 shelters responded and were sent additional information regarding the study (including the IRB statement), and 23 shelters agreed to be interviewed. Of the organizations that participated, 21 accepted small animals, one specialized in horses and larger animals, and one shelter was only in the initial phase of incorporating animal-friendly programs. Additionally, one of the organizations serves both a large metropolitan homeless population as well as those fleeing domestic violence. In total, 31 individuals were interviewed. From the initial sample of 82 shelters, 4 of the shelters declined to participate in the research project. The primary reason for shelters not agreeing to be interviewed was due to discontinuing the animal program – often because the pioneering individual at that location had left, or because there was limited use of the resources.

Table 3.1 Employment Status

Professional Status	Frequency (Percent)		Total (n=31)
	Male (n=5)	Female (n=26)	
CEO/Founder	--	5 (19.2%)	5 (16.1%)
Management	2 (40%)	18 (69.2%)	20 (64.5%)
Non-Management	3 (60%)	3 (11.5%)	6 (19.3%)

For the purpose of this study, a larger sample size was not necessary. Data saturation occurred early on, in part due to the close connections between animal-friendly shelters. Word traveled quickly between the organizations, and my initial email request was being forwarded to additional organization by my tenth interview – as word grew, more shelters met my request with immediate agreement to be interviewed. In addition, my interviews with both Allie Phillips and Dr. Maya Gupta spread the word to other advocacy spheres and opened more doors due to the extensive professional networks which both individuals are associated with. Theoretical saturation, however, took longer to reach. Each interview, though providing consistent data, also brought new and original perspectives due to the length of time these individuals had been within the domestic violence field. The variety of professional backgrounds – drug dog trainers, social workers, lawyers, and academics to name a few – created the opportunity to have a broad understanding of the types of advocates that have helped to further this shift in practice and policy.

Table 3.2 Age Ranges of Respondents

Age group	Frequency (Percent)		
	Male (n=5)	Female (n=26)	Totals (n=31)
20-29	--	2 (7.7%)	2 (6.4%)
30-39	1 (20%)	8 (30.7%)	9 (29%)
40-49	4 (80%)	12 (46.2%)	16 (51.6%)
50-59	--	4 (15.4%)	4 (12.9%)

Interview Schedule, Interviewing, and Consent

Interviews covered baseline data regarding the establishment of programs that utilize the network connections between professionals associated with the shelters, as well as questions that deal with program-specific experiences. The purpose of targeted questions was to provide background information regarding previous experience with advocacy work, policy implementation, training, and general information about daily network-specific and shelter routines. Coalition-specific and knowledge-based questions were designed to uncover the transference of information and resources that respondents utilized in their establishment of animal-friendly programs. For this research study, I applied Arnold's (2011) approach to understanding coalition relationships within the domestic violence movement as a framework for uncovering the connections used by shelter staff to establish and maintain animal-friendly programs. As Arnold notes, the relationships between organization members and movement advocates are essential to understanding the structure of a social movement. To address this, I asked participants if they worked with police, animal shelters/rescues, and similar organizations. I also asked participants about the ways in which the collaborations have changed over the years, and how their programs have changed in response those changes.

I divided the interview schedule into general topic areas: work/educational background, shelter history, perspectives on human/animal victims, and coalition participation. In the first topic area, I asked questions regarding the individual's position within the shelter/organization, and background questions about education, training, or specific work history that would give depth to their professional experiences within the domestic violence field. Although I did request demographic information regarding race and age, I made the decision to utilize age ranges such as 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, etc. rather than requesting specific ages (see Table 3.1). In addition, although I requested racial identify as part of my demographic background, I made a clear note that the information was optional. This decision was purposeful, as early pilot interviews revealed the potential risk to respondents that may have been victims of intimate partner violence (IPV). Though speculation is problematic in this context, it would not be surprising that these professionals within the domestic violence field, particularly those that self-identified as survivors, were concerned with privacy.

Table 3.3 Experience with Organization

	Frequency (Percent)		
Years with Organization	Male (n=5)	Female (n=26)	Total (n=31)
Less than 2 years	--	1 (3.8%)	1 (3.2%)
2-4 years	4 (80%)	5 (19.2%)	9 (29%)
5-10 years	1 (20%)	6 (23%)	7 (22.6%)
11-14 years	--	5 (12.2%)	5 (16.1%)
15+ years	--	9 (34.6%)	9 (29%)

For my second general topic I addressed the demographics of the shelter/organization. In this section, I asked questions such as "What is the history of this shelter/organization? Who

started it? How big is it? Do you serve only women and families, or men and other unique populations (LGBTQ, teens, immigrants) as well?" in addition to asking background information about the use of animal-friendly programs and policies. My third topic area included questions that provided professional and personal reflections human/animal victims, the connections of violence, and memorable experiences by staff or survivors. I asked questions such as "What is it like working with human and animal victims/survivors of violence? Describe the skills needed to negotiate this type of interaction and environment" and "Can you walk me through a typical interaction with a woman/family?" The final section on coalitions drew from questions that addressed the relationships, either professional or personal, that the shelter/organization had with other organizations or public entities, such as police, animal welfare/shelter/rescue groups, and whether or not the shelter/organization was actively engaged in Link advocacy. (See Appendix A for interview schedule.)

Interviews occurred both in-person and via telephone. During initial contact, respondents were sent the research synopsis and consent form. Additional verbal confirmation of consent was granted at the start of each interview, and interviews ended with final confirmation that the topics discussed were in agreement with the respondent. Therefore, in-person interviews allowed for a copy of the consent form to be filed; telephone interviews relied on verbal consent at the beginning and end of the interview. Interviews lasted 26-120 minutes, with most lasting at least 50 minutes.

I should make an important comment regarding consent: for this research, the option was given to consent as an "on the record" source – in other words, some respondents chose to consent to having their name or organization identified in the final report. For some organizations, the request originated from the individual whom I spoke with – Allie Phillips,

Christie Kitchens, and Dr. Maya Gupta, for example, requested to be identified along with their respective organizations. For the other individuals and organizations, I clarified at the beginning and the end of the interview that they had to option to be on- or off-record. Most agreed to be on-record at the end of the interview, though I confirmed this agreement prior to presenting this final version of the research project write-up. I made the choice to only identify the lead advocates that have a public profile within the movement – all other respondents have been assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity, regardless of the on- or- off-record status of their organization.

Finally, I want to address my positionality with regard to this research. The path that led to this topic was influenced, equally, by previous research with inmates, and by my own past history of working with abused animals. I knew, anecdotally, of the connections of violence between humans and animals through the stories of my female inmates, and from witnessing it personally. I was capable of reaching out and making connections with the shelters that I spoke with because of personal contacts in the domestic violence field, and my own status as a pet owner helped me to understand and connect with my respondents. Thus, as Stacey (1988) argues, without doubt, my positionality influenced this research – but it also provided an understanding into the complexity of my respondents. My own relationships with animals are anything but simple: I share space with cats in my home, and once considered my dog, Yukon, to be an integral member of my family (the cats count, too). I support legislation aimed at protecting the welfare of animals, but I am neither vegan nor vegetarian. I consume meat, though I attempt to do so with consumer knowledge of the standards of care for the animals I consider edible. I spent years helping to run a farm where our primary income was from cattle and bee hives. And, when I believed the time was right, I made the choice to euthanize Yukon to

limit his suffering from cancer – this decision is a nearly perfect example of the power that I, as a human, have over the lives of the animals that share my space.

This research is meaningful in that it addresses gaps in the current knowledge base of the Link and human-animal studies. In addition, while my own status as a white female with a baseline of knowledge regarding domestic violence and animal welfare opened doors for access to respondents, I also found that status challenged due to the gaps in my own awareness. Many of my respondents are trained in the social work discipline, and while we shared some awareness of the context of each other's fields, I found that my lack of clinical or non-profit experience created a need for more direct questioning of procedures and funding issues. I was, in fact, challenged by a respondent in my own interpretation and lack of use of "person-first" language (Gilson & DePoy 2002). Though these differences required an adaptation on my part, they also drove part of this research – mid-way through my interviews I began working for a non-profit that served clients from nearly every background that I'd either had previous contact with (inmates, former inmates, juveniles in the legal system, and individuals experiencing homelessness), or that were similar to those my respondents had experience with (victims and perpetrators of violence). It is for these myriad reasons that I felt compelled, challenged, and rewarded by this research in the "mixed-species" field of human-animal studies (Wilkie 2015).

Analysis

Following transcription, all interviews and observation notes were entered into NVIVO 10, a software package designed for use with qualitative research. Initially, the interviews were analyzed with open coding – a process that allows for key themes to emerge independent of theoretical focus (see coding tree in Appendix C). The second stage of this analysis involves the recognition of patterns and themes that are significant within the interview narratives. This

process evolved as the data evolved in the sense that the relevant themes were marked for further analysis and theoretical investigation.

This research is exploratory in nature, and I therefore utilized the inductive process of grounded theory method (GTM) (Bryant and Charmaz 2007: 4). Arguably, all theory is "grounded", but I am specifically utilizing a reflexive process in which I engage, as a researcher, with the data in an active format. Rather than attempting to "fit" the data into preconceived notions of coalition participation and Link awareness, I must engage with "the specific and the general – and seeing what is new in them – then exploring their links to larger issues or creating larger unrecognized issues in entirety" (Charmaz 2006: 181). For this reason, my approach is indeed informed by, and thus "grounded", in theories of social movements, organizations, and criminology; however, I was also clear in my understanding that this research would likely evolve beyond those frameworks. I believe that this approach was necessary in order to understand the complexities of these coalitions; the process of categorizing the emergent themes needed to be flexible enough to respond to the quickly changing public and professional perspectives that relate to domestic violence and animal abuse. In addition, I allowed coding to reflect the organic themes noted by respondents; for example, coding for perspectives on "clients" expanded beyond the narratives of victimization and demographics to include aspects of control, children-specific perspectives, and narratives of success and horror.

At the heart of this research is an understanding that correlation does not equal causation. It is with this mental mantra that I have to question if the coalitions that are being formed are due to assumptions about the nature of the Link (including the variations of this perspective on violence and perhaps in the same realm of other moral panics in the past), or if there is a true need being expressed from victims to the shelter workers at the locations that are being included

in the study. It could also be the case that incorporating animal-friendly programs is simply the "trendy" thing to do in family violence shelters. As I will address in my findings – several of these issues are mentioned by the individuals I interviewed. Indeed, I find that my respondents do not all create the same model of animal-friendly program, despite sharing similarities in experience and knowledge.

Conclusion

The true test of a research model is the process of expressing the results in a manner that reflects the findings in the proper format. For this project, the words of my respondents – their challenges, moments of triumph, and heartbreaking stories – are the most important component. Given the complex academic and professional attention on the Link, this project provides a more in-depth approach to understanding how the informal social networks of people with diverse backgrounds can organize for change on related issues that impact shelter policies and programs for the benefit of both humans and companion animals. For my part, I chose to uncover how people make change, utilizing the resources that they have, in order to apply this research to expand the theoretical perspective of social movements, criminology, animals and society, and organizations. As an added benefit, this research has provided a wealth of information on practical policies and programs that have worked (or not), and addressed the issue of how the Link has challenged shelter workers "on the ground" rather than simply in their hearts. In the following chapter I present my findings, as well as highlight the manner in which these findings add depth to the current data regarding the coalitions, knowledge-base, and professional experiences that staff members have in relation to the Link.

Chapter 4 - Origins and Types of Animal Friendly Programs

I conducted interviews with twenty-nine individuals representing twenty-five organizations, and one interview with Allie Phillips, the founder of an online database of animal-friendly programs at domestic violence shelters, and a key leader in the movement to increase animal-friendly programs across the United States. I conducted one site visit, and was sent video tours of five additional sites. The length of time for these animal-friendly programs ranged from zero (currently building the kennel site) to thirty years. In addition, the years of experience with the respective organization of my respondents ranged from one to twenty years. Half of my respondents had been with their organization for at least a decade; of the remaining half, only 2 of the 15 had less than two years of experience with their organization. Of the organizations that I spoke with, only one was identified as one of the on-record organizations that was part of the original 1998 survey conducted by Ascione on "Safe Haven" programs (Ascione 2000); however, due to changes in staff and organizational names it is possible that there was additional overlap, though none identified as such when asked about relevant research studies. In addition, Ascione's research served as an important component in the awareness and education of some of the organizations that I spoke with.

My findings highlight the origins of the various types of animal-friendly programs and policies that are associated with the organizations that my respondents work for. The data reflect similarities in individual and collective agency with regard to how the programs were initiated, and the different formats in which animal-friendly programs and policies can be implemented. In addition, my findings indicate that the community networks used by these organizations, both officially and unofficially, are an important component in the sharing of information and resources. This finding reflects a common argument made by foundation literature on the Link;

however, the data also indicate that the awareness of the literature on the Link is not shared by all respondents – a surprising realization on my part. Relationships with law enforcement, animal control, other domestic violence shelters, legal services, and the animal welfare community are integral to the success of these organizations, though those relationships are presented as contentious at times. Finally, I highlight the commonalities of shared experiences by my respondents regarding their identities as human and nonhuman advocates, the benefits that they observe while including animal-friendly programs, and the challenges that they face. Results are organized into three major components: origins of animal-friendly programs, community networks; and human/nonhuman advocacy. The data from this study indicate that although the anecdotal and academic research on the Link is reflected in the experiences of some of my respondents, the diffusion of this body of knowledge is not as extensive as I expected. In addition, the ability of these individuals and organizations to navigate the often challenging relationships with the local community and human services fields is an integral aspect of their individual and collective advocacy and activism.

Origins of Animal-Friendly Programs

Although each of these organizations has a unique starting point, the inclusion of animal-friendly programs and policies often shared similar origin stories. Of the organizations that I spoke with, 18 of the 25 (72%) are pet-friendly due to the actions of the respondent. Three of my respondents are the founders of their organizations, and their decisions highlight a key element of their shared experiences:

> Horse people tend to be…you know, they are a different breed of people. Now, most of the time, if you've had any kind of relationship with a horse…it's next of kin. I've got one I've ridden for 20 years, I'm not kidding you that when I'm sitting on him I feel his heartbeat and I know he feels my breath. We are a different animal when we are united. It takes years to have that relationship with that horse…that is maybe even more intimate than what you have with a spouse, because that horse gets you. When you have a

creature like that in your life, I mean…they [survivors] are staying there with that horse, even if that man is going to shoot them. They will stay…There are about 2500 women's shelters in the US, and I'm going to take a guess that the number that take horses is 1 – I should say 0 because we are not actually a shelter. There's us. That's it. (Christie, 50s)

I went through a very tragic experience in losing my fiancé when I was 3 months pregnant with our son – my son is Noah, and I don't know if I would have gotten through my pregnancy because I was seriously considering suicide, had my dog not been right by my side. I refer to Tahoe, that was her name, she passed away earlier this year, as the 4-legged founder because I watched her therapy on me, as I went through the worst thing in my life, and that is what made me start asking questions because I could not have done that without Tahoe. So…why are we asking women and children to come to the shelter without their Tahoe, you know? (Staci, 40s)

I knew that if I left my dogs – that is part of the control, too. I stopped leaving and going to hotels because of the abuse that was happening to them. It was just another area to control me. So, basically, they took the brunt of the punishment more than I did because, especially my one dog – I had one, and they both just passed a few months ago so it can be hard to talk about, but I had one dog that in particular got in between he and I when we were fighting, and she was my protector. She even lay in bed between us, she just instinctually knew to protect me. We were very, very close. She took the brunt of it. When I would finally get out of the house, when I'd flee, she would still be there to take the punishment. So, obviously, that got me to where I wouldn't leave anymore, and so I'd stay and take the punishment. That was why when I was told, and they weren't trying to be callus when they told me to get out and leave the dogs, but that's why I couldn't just leave them. I was like "You don't understand, he will kill them. Either we all go or none of us do". (Angie, 30s)

For each of these respondents, the relationship that they had with their non-human companions was the driving force behind the creation of their own organization. These women note that these relationships are not unique – for Christie, this is about "horse people", while Staci and Angie highlight the importance of their canine companions being the reasons for surviving traumatic events in their lives. Each of these women present an individual experience that is also believed to be a common shared emotional attachment that their clients possess with their own pets and non-human companions. Although these accounts are reflective of the importance of our relationships with non-human companions, the experiences of the majority of

41

my respondents shared a similar element in that their individual advocacy on behalf of animal-

friendly policies and programs was central in the decision by the organization.

> So, we were getting "I can't leave my dog alone, because he has threatened to kill him", or "He'll kill my cat", or we've even had larger horses that people were afraid to leave. So, I asked myself…I started looking at different options, because a lot of women in abusive relationships are isolated from their families, they've burned a lot of bridges due to the leaving and going back, and a lot of times their families won't help them to take care of the animals, they felt too isolated from their families because of their abusive relationship. So, I started thinking "Why reinvent the wheel? Why not if we can just pop the animal into the ASPCA?" So, I called the SPCA…well, first I contacted the shelter in New York, I was wondering if they were having the same problem, and she said "yes" and asked if the two of us could go together and meet with the director of the SPCA here. I said "Yes", and she was very happy to work with us. (Anita, 50s)

> I also applied and got a PAWS grant in 2011, and that was with the American Humane Association. They gave us money and we then purchased stuff that we could use to assist our shelter clients with their pets. So, we purchased airline crates with it because we don't have many roads here and everybody flies in and out… (Lisa, 40s)

> When we were with the previous director, we were not animal-friendly. If you had a goldfish or something like that it wasn't a problem, but if you had birds, cats, dogs, anything else, they would try to help you locate a shelter for them, but they couldn't stay here.
> *And you started including animals how long ago?*
> We started including animals about a month after I became director, which was about 5 years ago.
> *So, what led to that decision?*
> It was the need – I had seen the need for it for a long time. We've had women who would say "Well, I can't come if I can't bring my dog – my dog is my best friend, and my dog is the only one that tried to comfort me for the past 6 years that I've been with the abusive person, and I just can't let it behind." Or "I need these cats, they are my family, I can't leave them." So, they will stay in the abusive situation instead of leaving because they won't leave their pets… (Jana, 30s)

> *How long has your organization had animal-friendly policies?*
> It has been a policy since…for about 5 years…but, and you may never hear this from anybody else, but I've never NOT allowed someone to come to shelter because they had a pet.
> *Can you walk me through how you came upon that decision?*
> Because I'm an animal lover [laughs]. Number 1. Number 2, if we had a puppy or something that needed training, we took them to work. So, it wasn't fair for us to have our animals, even my cat, not able to leave my dog at home, but then say "I'm sorry, but you can't bring your cat or dog in." So, I guess that I know that there are people – we started all the way back in 1997 we had our first animal murder. They killed the dog and

then they killed her…he killed her dog and then he killed his wife. So, that got me thinking that maybe this might be…I wouldn't leave my house without my animals. Especially if it was with an abusive man. So that was how it started. (Veronica, 40s)

In the case of Veronica, her position as Executive Director allowed her to make the decision to include animals in the shelter since 1995 – long before their policy became official. For each of the above respondents, their decisions were central to the process of becoming an animal-inclusive shelter. Applying for grant money, troubleshooting issues of transportation, acknowledging the connections of violence, and connecting with community partners were all steps that they took to enable survivors to maintain the companionship of their pet.

For some of the respondents, the decision to become animal-friendly originated from the leadership within the organization, or by the founder of the shelter. The following respondent is addressing the decision of her organization to include animal-friendly policies – they were in the process of drawing the initial building plans to have them finalized for approval from the city.

> *Can you tell me what the reason was behind the decision to build an animal-friendly program?*
> What has led us to that point is the fact that we were noticing, being that we are a domestic violence shelter, we noticed that the women calling in that were in a situation and were hesitant about coming in to the shelter because a lot of them did not want to leave their pets behind. Also, it is one of the, um, I guess the behaviors, if you will, that come with perpetrators, is a lot of times, maybe the perpetrator will not actually physically abuse the partner, but to get at the partner, will abuse the animal. So, based on those two indicators: one – seeing that a lot of women see their pet as part of the family, as when you are in that situation, a DV situation, you will see that it is a huge factor about whether a woman will stay or go. (Amber, 20s)

Amber is connecting the two most common anecdotal accounts in her response: victims being hesitant to come in without their pets, and the use of animal abuse to control the victims. The familiarity that the board of directors had with these issues, and the leadership by the shelter director to propose a solution, enabled the organization to move forward in requesting the

additional permits from the city. At times, having an animal-friendly policy is simply business-

as-usual:

> When our previous director had founded the project, she…it started out as her master's
> project, and she was doing DV advocacy out of a little office, and then decided that they
> needed a shelter. She was able to secure a grant to be in the process of buying a house –
> the house is still there….The new shelter was built in 1992, and I think from the time that
> the new shelter was built, that was when we officially started allowing pets, or calling it a
> pet-friendly shelter. But, that's how that all got started, and it was pretty much unofficial
> at first…To my knowledge, what I know about the history, and for as long as I've worked
> here, we've always had people bringing pets. There is no rule…I don't know that there is
> any designation about it…I'm not even sure if we are…everybody knows that we allow
> pets, so no one has ever said that we can't have them. (Tessie, 40s)

Tessie's tenure with the organization was well into her second decade, and so her

understanding of the "unofficial" policy to allow pets is significant – much as Veronica noted

early about never turning away a pet, Tessie highlights that this approach to having an open-door

policy for pets is both a process of "official" recognition, and the importance of community

knowledge.

> *So, when you started the programs, obviously before you consolidated – what was the*
> *reason behind why you did it? Was there a particular case, or just the clear need?*
> Carmen: I can't say that it was one particular case, I just think that there was
> this…vision, or a need for this to take place because a lot of calls that we would get…the
> victim would say that they didn't have any place for their pet to go – they didn't have
> family or friends to watch their pet. They weren't safe, that abuser was showing violent
> acts against their pet, so they knew they weren't safe and so something needed to happen
> in order to give these people an opportunity to leave the situation.
> Colleen: For MNAFAS, it really started out with the University of Minnesota domestic
> violence programs…and a congressman was involved in a conference that we held here
> in 2007 about the Link, and as a result of that conference, people came together and said
> "what can we do, on a broader level?"…and part of the work that…because we were
> hearing from domestic violence programs like Cornerstone and other advocates that there
> was truly a need to have some type of pet-safe housing. (Carmen, 40s & Colleen, 50s)

The situation for Carmen and Colleen was unique – both women work for organizations

that are a consolidated unit with regard to community coordinated response (CCR) programs.

Carmen's organization is a domestic violence shelter, while Colleen works for an alliance of

multiple organizations that trains, educates, and facilitates the fostering of animals for individuals and families that are fleeing domestic violence. The collaboration between these two organizations is a direct result of the limited space that was available at Carmen's on-site kennel facility, and the fact that domestic violence shelters without animal-friendly policies still had survivors with pets that needed assistance. Colleen also addresses an important aspect with regard to the academic and social awareness of the Link – the example here reflects a clear connection between the research that has been done on the connections of violence, and the direct application of that research into public and human services policy. I will return to the awareness of this body of knowledge on the Link at a later point in my findings. The importance of evidence-based practices was also noted by another respondent:

> We had, through the research [on the Link], and then with a group that had gone around the country and had interviewed and witnessed what about 80 different facilities were doing – he was trying to pull best-practices from each one and see what the research said. [The founder of organization] is an animal person and one of the things that he noticed is that most of the places they went to had nothing for the people that had animals, and a significant number had attachment to their animals. So, that became one of the focuses that they wanted to include, was an animal side to Haven. (Cheryl, 50s)

Cheryl is highlighting the rigorous process that her organization went through in order to create a multi-acre "campus" that would house individuals experiencing homelessness, and also permit their non-human animals, to remain in safety for temporary and extended stays. Although not specifically a domestic violence shelter, the Haven campus serves as a key facility in the metro area for individuals fleeing violent homes. As Cheryl notes, the founder of the organization had a clear vision for the type of programs that he wanted to include – but as I'll address in a later section, it was only with the help of "animal lovers" like Cheryl that the on-site kennel system flourished and became a larger part of the mission of the organization.

Finally, 2 of the 25 (8%) organizations had animal-friendly programs that are the result of a collaboration initiated by a humane society or animal control. These organizations have a unique origin point, but the results are similar to other organizations that were initiated with a focus on the human victims of violence.

> We cover 5 counties in our service area, and the animal control division of one of those counties got a hold of us, and said that they were interested in stepping up to the plate with the PET SAFE program. So, they really initiated that with us, and we utilized the program…then in 2008, I pursued a connection with one of the other counties that our safe home resides in, that humane society, and we joined and started a program in 2008. (June, 40s)

> So, I was approached by the head at the Humane Society, he isn't there anymore, but I was approached by him, and he wanted to do a shelter program thing between his shelter and our domestic violence shelter where he…women that came into the shelter and that had pets could be boarded at the humane society for up to 2 weeks. A lot of times, because the shelter program was 90 days, a lot of times he would extend the two weeks. So, that worked really well because he totally understood the whole dynamic of pets being abused as well in the household when domestic violence is going on. So, he had a soft spot for domestic violence and animal abuse in general. (Lilah, 30s)

In each of these cases, the original format of the animal-friendly program was later modified to either expand to another location, as is the case with June, or to include on-site kenneling and fostering, as is the case with Lilah. Therefore, although the initial process was external to the domestic violence shelter, it was the advocacy of these women on behalf of the animals and their human companions that helped to create more opportunities to assist survivors. Therefore, although the Link movements, and the push for the inclusion of animal-friendly programs did indeed have an effect on the creation of some of these programs, the Link movement cannot be used to explain the existence of all of these programs. The recognition that these origin stories include cases in which the animal-friendly programs have existed for longer than the dedicated Link movement implies that the academic and advocate-focused movement would be benefited by an inclusion of the accounts of long-term, organic programs that have

continued to thrive over the decades. This early reliance on loose networks of activists and

advocates by these separate shelters, often removed from one another by state boundaries,

initially appears to resemble more of a transnational movement (Porta and Tarrow, 2004) prior to

the creation of the Link movement.

Types of Animal-Friendly Programs

All of the animal-friendly programs except for one provide assistance for "household"

pets – i.e. dogs, cats, small mammals (hamsters, gerbils, ferrets, mice, rats, chinchillas, rabbits),

fish (including sharks – yes, you read that correctly), birds, reptiles/amphibians, and large insects

(tarantulas, primarily). Ten of the 25 organizations were specific in highlighting that small

animals were their only pet population. For the additional pet-friendly programs, only one –

Little Grass Ranch (LGR) – was specifically designed for horses and other large animals. I will

highlight the similarities to other organizations, and yet the unique challenges faced by LGR at

various points in this chapter. Although the majority of these organizations were initially

conceptualized as being designed for dogs and cats, it was a common occurrence to have

unexpected requests or arrivals with the women that were fleeing violent relationships.

> We've had birds – we had a huge macaw that this woman used to take a shower with
> [laughs] I mean, it was her companion, that got her through and she could not leave that
> bird behind. She said "I can't go anywhere, I'm not going to find anywhere that will take
> me and my bird". And that was a hard one for us…a giant bird, huh, well…okay. And it
> worked out just fine. She was able to eventually move out of the shelter and get her own
> place, and she is doing fantastic and still has her bird. (Tessie, 40s)

> We've mostly done dogs and cats, we've had birds, we had a shark at one point…it was
> during shark week and we got a request to relocate a shark… (Maya, 30s)

> And, we have housed, I don't know how many hundreds of animals – everything from
> tarantulas and ferrets, betas and hamsters, dogs, cats, horses, snakes…everything. (Matt,
> 30s)

I've also had calls from people that have exotics and…like one lady had 2 horses, 1 donkey, a camel, and a zebra…and I had no clue what to do about that! It was kind of overwhelming and we get that a lot. (Christie, 50)

We don't have any large livestock in the area…but they do have chickens and goats. Other animals like caged animals and exotics – birds, bunnies, ferrets, snakes, iguana. *Wow. Iguanas in Alaska?*
Right! Yeah, I had a cockatiel that lived in her cage in my office for a very long time because the bird was also a victim of DV, and had been attacked with scissors. So, the bird was living at my house for a bit. (Lisa, 40s)

All organizations had a system of combined programs that were either currently in use, or had been used prior to building on-site facilities. As I'll mention later in this chapter, the current version of animal-friendly program that each organization utilizes varies slightly in application, but most share similar formats. I found three primary types of programs in my research: on-site programs (kennels or in-room housing), boarding assistance with community partners, and fostering networks through volunteers and community partnerships. In addition, several organizations utilize a combination of programs in order to maximize their options, and often for special circumstances, such as large-animal rescue.

On-site Programs

On-site programs are common among the organizations that I spoke with. This format includes indoor and outdoor kennels and in-room housing. Some of these facilities are separated by species – dogs and cats are not often housed in the same area. Nineteen of the 25 (76%) organizations had on-site facilities, while 8 of the 19 (42%) allowed for in-room housing. In-room housing, however, is occasionally allowed only for service- and therapy-animals. Several of the organizations that I spoke with applied for, and received, the PAWS grant from the American Humane Society, often working with Allie Phillips (she has since left AHS), and were able to build their kennels using those funds.

So, we got a grant through the American Humane Society, it was called the PAWS program, and they would pay to build a small animal facility. So, we got that $5,000 grant, and we built it. It has been great ever since. We have an outside kennel which has basically a dog run area or a cat run area, and two large outside kennels, and we have a room that is air conditioned and heated for small animals, cats, or small dogs that might not be able to handle the temps outside. We've had gerbils and rabbits and birds and rats – we have fish out there right now, a huge aquarium. Any type of animal that can't handle it, except large animals because the city doesn't allow those, can be out there in that area, and the person whose pet it is can have access to it 24 hours a day. (Jana, 30s)

Now, with our on-site kennel, we have it designed so that our animals are not allowed in the shelter. So, it is an on-site kennel that is a separate building from our shelter that has access to the shelter through a certain door. It is completely contained, so if it is an animal that doesn't do well with other pets, then we have a policy that you keep the animals in the kennel, and you can have access to a different gate that doesn't lead into our courtyard where children might be playing and things like that. So, we are pretty concerned with that type of thing, and that is in our policy. (Sherrie, 40s)

So, we really struggled with – we couldn't have the animals in the buildings, and so while we would have really loved to have allowed people to have their animals in their rooms, it was just that the nature of having children and adults with asthma, we just couldn't do that. So, that is really where the kennel comes in. (Cindy, 50s)

Most of the organizations that I spoke with used a kennel system that is similar to the ones mentioned by Jana and Sherrie. These are small to moderate-sized buildings that have kennels and a small dog run or connected yard that allows for the pets (mostly dogs) to be exercised, played with, walked, and socialized with that is separate from the primary shelter buildings. When asked for the reasoning behind the kennels, most respondents noted similar concerns for the safety and health of the human clients that Cindy and Sherrie mention – fear of animals, potential harm to children, asthma, and pet allergies were all mentioned as being part of the concerns while implementing animal-friendly programs and policies. The perspective of these respondents provides some insight into the data collected by Kreinert et al. (2012) regarding the prevalence of the types of programs they surveyed nationwide. Kennels, while not always the preferred form of animal friendly program, provide a compromise for considering space restrictions, client needs, and animal advocacy.

We do only allow service animals at the shelter. But, it would still be nice for the service animals to have a kennel, or a walk and play outside area. But, we are exploring it to see how we can expand. (Patrice, 30s)

We underwent a full agency-wide study on how we responded to people with disabilities, and how accessible we really were for people with disabilities. We went through and made sure to increase our accessibility, and that was one of the pieces that we wanted – we found that we needed more structure around that, and so we started to allow service and therapy animals into the shelter. (Jessica, 20s)

For both Patrice and Jessica, the ability to provide an animal-friendly shelter to clients with service or therapy animals was a welcomed change, though both mention later in their interviews that the accessibility isn't utilized as often as they would like. For Patrice, including kennels and a play area would be welcomed additions, while Jessica highlighted the need for all clients to have the same close-comfort of their pets as those with service and therapy animals:

When we first started talking about allowing service pets and therapy pets into the shelter, I was thinking that this would open up a huge can or worms where we would have people with snakes as therapy pets and all that stuff. But, it is so rare – it doesn't happen that often, and it isn't taken advantage of at all. When people have a therapy pet, and it is a need for them, then it works out and all of that other worrisome stuff never happens. I thought that we would be overcome with animals…and we haven't been. I wish we could expand it more to regular clients. (Jessica, 20s)

For the shelters that allowed for in-room housing to all clients, the model varied slightly, but still held some similarities with regard to the use of designated animal spaces and rooms, and maintained policies that allowed for the relocation of a pet that was aggressive or in need of medical care to a community facility.

We were going to be a little different, and we were going to allow the dog right into the shelter with their human. We do have a kennel outside that they can put their dog in if they need to go run errands, or go to work, or some other appointment. They can be with their dog at night or while they are at home in the shelter, that was kind of how it was born. (Laura, 40s)

I think that we have long been the first shelter in Minnesota to accept animals, and probably are one of the very few – I think there are only 3 – that actually will shelter animals with a battered woman and her children rather than kenneling them or offering

programs to put them in rescue groups. All of the rooms allow pets except 3 that are designated pet-free – they have never had pets in them in case we have someone with allergies or a sensitivity to pets. We've dealt with that – where we've had someone with pets and then another person comes in near capacity and they are allergic to pets. But, we have it set up so that we have rooms that are completely pet-free. So, those rooms have never had pets, are not near the rooms with pets, the building is set up so that they are the farthest away so that people won't have issues. (Tessie, 40s)

We cohabitate, so it is internal, providing that everybody can play nicely together. Obviously, cats are – we have a cat room, so to speak, not that we don't have any kennels, but we have a room dedicated for those individuals that have cats, just because spraying can sometimes be a problem with them. But the only time that we ever require that they have to kennel their animal is if it is aggressive or is not playing nicely with the other animals or people. Otherwise, it is just like living in a normal house, and we are fairly small. I'm sure that we will talk about that in a minute, but however you would cohabitate or live in a family, that is how we prefer everyone to live and cohabitate here. (Angie, 30s)

We started to let them bring their dogs or their cats a long with them. And, it worked out just fine…I allow people to leave their pets in their rooms when they go to work or to school, because some of the staff were concerned, thinking that they would roam around all day with their pet in the car while they were out an about. We made the usual allowances that people would have at home, it was just in a shelter situation…I can't even imagine having just kennels. At the same time, we are trying to keep families together, and that includes men, women, their kids, and their pets. So, to me, the whole family structure is there – and that would be more disruptive, I can't even imagine if you take a dog that has been living inside a home and then take it outside and put it in a kennel. (Lilah, 30s)

Laura and Tessie both note that they see their model as unique, considering that most shelters have built kennels or created a foster network. They are correct in this assumption, according to the data, and their reasoning for using this model is also expressed by Angie and Lilah with regard to "cohabitating" as a family unit. This focus on keeping the family unit together within the shelter environment was a primary function of the in-room housing. For some of the shelters that decided to allow in-room housing, a modified application of the Pets and Women Shelters (PAWS) grant allowed them to renovate existing kennels space, or to apply funding that is traditionally used to build kennels for a more specialized use. Lisa's experience is unique in that her shelter is located in Alaska – the extreme cold during the winter months

made outdoor kennels suitable only for certain dogs. Therefore, allowing animals to stay in the

rooms with clients was a practical solution that enabled clients to continue to care for their pets

without exposing them to weather conditions that they were not accustomed too. Lisa also

applied for the PAWS grant, though her unique location, again, required a creative use of the

funds:

> I also applied and got a PAWS grant in 2011, and that was with the American Humane Association. They gave us money and we then purchased stuff that we could use to assist our shelter clients with their pets. So, we purchased airline crates with it because we don't have many roads here and everybody flies in and out, and often times people would end up owning an animal after they got here, and had no way of transporting that animal out when they got ready to leave. (Lisa, 40s)

Finally, there was one organization, called Noah's House, that I spoke with that had a

separate facility next to the domestic violence shelter that housed client's pets:

> We didn't really have a model in this country of a free-standing facility to understand how big to make it, so we went back to a back-of-a-napkin map scheme that we had that we had 320 client beds, and we wanted a ratio, so now we have 32 dogs and cat kennels and cat condos. We have a mixture of indoor and outdoor runs and kennels and then we built an intake room so that as pets entered, they could be kept separate from the other pets until they could be kept clean with the vaccinations and everything. (Staci, 40s)

Considering the financial capital needed to build and sustain such a facility, it isn't

surprising that there are no other models that operate the way that Noah's House does. The

facility was built, in part, due to a very generous offer:

> We were just…[the shelter] was blessed because the city had given us an acre of land for a dollar…so we had available land. So, I just went to the board and said that I wanted to build the first full-scale animal facility on the ground, we had enough room, and I offered to own it. So, there would be no additional work by anyone else (Staci, 40s)

For many of these organizations, the decision to build separate facilities, indoor/outdoor

kennels, and renovate rooms to accommodate non-human victims of violence required

significant planning and fundraising. For others, such as Laura, Tessie, Lilah, and Adela, the

decision was merely a case of rearranging rooms and maintain a model that is as close to "home-life" as possible within a shelter. The approaches used by these organizations reflect a larger perspective in our society about where nonhuman animals should exist and reside with relation to humans. Each kennel, building, and modified room is about an underlying assumption of the co-construction of human-animal environments – the placement of nonhuman animals as either external to the human realm, or as internal members of the "family".

Boarding Assistance

The use of boarding facilities to house pets was the least common model of animal program. Only 8 of the 25 (32%) used a community partner to temporarily board animals – these partners included humane societies, veterinary offices, and animal control shelters. Only one of the organizations that I spoke with used boarding as their primary model; all other shelters used boarding, instead, as an overflow or initial temporary measure for pets that were injured or too aggressive for on-site housing or fostering.

> The way that we set it up with both of these, animal control and the humane society – they are really needing a 48 hour notice in the best case scenario prior to the animal showing up there, and they also request a written referral from the women's resource center saying "Yes, this woman is staying at the [shelter] home and they need your services". So, we get that [pet] release signed, and then basically with both of these programs, they will board these animals for up to 14 days at no charge. (June, 40s)

Lilah's shelter initially used a system of boarding with the local humane society, but soon found that the need was often greater than the available kennels:

> Women that came into the shelter and that had pets could be boarded at the humane society for up to 2 weeks. A lot of times, because the shelter program was 90 days, a lot of times he would have to extend the two weeks, and that could be tough sometimes. (Lilah, 30s)

This disconnect between the perceived need of the clients – a two week boarding option – and the reality of the typical stay in a shelter for an individual, or family, fleeing violence, is not

the fault of either organization. In Lilah's case, the willingness of the humane society to accept

client's pets was the initial step to help her petition for the option of expanding the available

services to allow pets on-site. In addition, for some of the shelters, the use of temporary

boarding is done at a financial cost:

> We also have an informal contract with the only local boarding facility to board it there, too at a reduced rate. And that is all in addition to staff members taking these animals home temporarily. [laughs] Which is usually option #1, and option #2 is one of the care providers due to the cost to us and the client. (Lisa, 40s)

> The pet [if needed] will stay with the vet due to injury or temperament, and then the others will be moved to one of our locations in either a boarder facility or a foster home, depending on space and what would be the best fit for that animal…and also which foster home might need a break…or which boarding facility may have accidently gotten a Kujo [aggressive dog] the last time we boarded a dog [laughs]. Some of our boarding facilities will do it for free, and some of them it doesn't matter how many we send them it is free…some it is a free one per month – so it depends on all of that. (Maya, 30s)

Both Lisa and Maya work with organizations that have a system of networked boarding

facilities, and fostering. The financial challenge of boarding pets makes this option the least

likely to be used for each organization, and both noted that they will try to work with a facility

that will not charge a fee.

Fostering Networks

The most commonly used animal-friendly program is the use of fostering networks.

Twenty-two of the 25 organizations (88%) have a system of staff, volunteer, veterinary- or

humane society-assisted fostering. For many of these organizations, the fostering method was

the initial form of animal-friendly program – modified later to include on-site facilities or

additional boarding partnerships. As several of my respondents noted in the previous sections,

the fostering model is almost always used in conjunction with another program model – either

on-site housing, or boarding.

Several of my respondents noted that staff members are often the first option for fostering, and at times, adoption. Lacey, in the previous section, mentioned that staff fostering was their first choice due to the lack of financial cost, though her experience is not unique with regard to the willingness of staff to offer up their homes:

> So, that is something that I am not even tasked to do – to find homes for the ones that show up here. And we are very successful, and we have a lot of people here at Haven that have taken them home. (Cheryl, 50s)

> I would just send out emails to our volunteers and staff and see if any of them would be able to take animals…cats, dogs…and even horses, I'd ask vets to take them. (Patrice, 30s)

> And sometimes the resident will leave and can't take the animal, and we will help her find a home for the animal.
> *Does that seem to take pressure off of the survivors?*
> Yes. I think that it does, because she also knows that we will find a good home for the animal.
> *And obviously you have a staff full of animal lovers.*
> Yes, and that is usually where the animal ends up!
> *That is not surprising!*
> Seriously! I'm like "How many can we take!?" (Mandy, 40s)

Each of these respondents mentioned that although staff and client boundaries were clear with regard to interacting with animal survivors, in times of need and crisis with regard to rehoming pets or overflowing kennels (often the case with "accidental" litters of puppies and kittens), the support from staff was guaranteed. For another respondent, Lacey, the dedication to fostering and re-homing a client's animal became a personal quest:

> So, she surrendered the dog through the city, so then I tried to find a new home for the dog in the short time that the dog was allowed at the animal shelter, which was only 10 days…so I knew when the guy [the abuser] was going to get out of jail – I convinced the animal control officer to hang on to the dog for a bit longer, he got out of jail and we let him know where the was if he wanted his dog back…and he never showed up. So clearly he didn't want his dog. So, then me and another advocate fostered this dog from February to May until we found a new home for him. We took turns, he came in my dog pen during the day, and then my friend, he would stay at [friend's] during the night because I had 2 cats and I didn't want the excitement of introducing a 100lb dog to 3 cats.

So, [her friend] was great and he took the dog in at night, I took him during the day. We advertised, we did craigslist, we did background checks on everybody…we finally selected a family for the dog. I took him to get neutered when the vet came into town, and then he went with this new family – a family of 5 – and they totally doted on him. (Lisa, 40s)

Lisa had already mentioned during this interview that she had taken home a cockatiel for another client while the client stayed in shelter and searched for a job, but this story was important because of the character of this particular dog:

We did it for the dog specifically because of that dog's outstanding temperament. If that dog hadn't had that amazing of a temperament, it would have been a lot harder to do that. But, it seemed such a shame to lethally inject a dog who was such a gentle giant. He was so gentle. So some of it depends on the nature of the dog, too. This was a dog that had been abused, but had no barriers to anybody. So, this dog just overcame everything, all of his issues and he loved and trusted everyone. And when you have that kind of a dog, that's the kind of dog that you really want to find a good home for. (Lisa, 40s)

For the majority of the shelters that allowed staff to assist in fostering (officially or "unofficially"), this relationship between staff and animal survivors was important. Only staff that felt comfortable fostering a client's pet were allowed to do so, and only with the client's expressed permission. In one unique case, the use of staff to foster animal survivors was the only model being used:

We are fortunate in that we have a staff member that worked for the zoo who was very passionate and had a tremendous amount of knowledge about how to care for animals… *So, do you have on-site care or you foster out as well?* No, the employee that started the program actually cares for these animals at home. So, she has a ranch where she is set up to do a really tremendous job, so she does all of that from her ranch. She has some volunteers that come in and help her, and it is obviously part of our budget to support the ongoing care of those animals while clients are in the shelter. (Matt, 30s)

Matt's experience with having a member of his staff that was not only proficient at caring for animals, but was also paid to maintain the care of the animals (with the exception of

veterinary care), was not shared by any other organization. For the other respondents, staff were

used as temporary fosters, or as permanent adopters if the animal was relinquished by the client

and had developed a close bond with a particular staff member.

Most of the organizations that I spoke with use a network of community volunteers to

help foster client's animals. Several of these organization work with humane societies, vet

clinics, and animal defense leagues to find fosters:

> They [local SPCA] decided to get foster parents, volunteers, and foster them out, for up
> to 30 days. So, they tried to get a stable family who would be willing to do that, and they
> were able to help us and not just shelter the animals. (Anita, 50s)

> The animals are in foster-care homes that are all trained. As a matter of fact, we are all
> cross-trained in DV and animal care. During that 90 days, that gives the victim time to
> go into shelter if need be, or to find new housing. Basically, it is time to work through
> the crisis. The vet care is also mostly free, and we work with a vet to provide the more
> difficult stuff at a minimal cost for us. The humane society and the animal control people
> are the ones that take in the animals and then they train the foster homes and send them
> out to the right fosters. And that program, like I said, we've only been up and running for
> a couple of years, but so far we have served over 122 animals and 52 families. (Colleen,
> 50s)

> If it is on the weekend or during the evening, we can't utilize the rescue league unless it
> is during the business hours. So, we will try to safety plan with them around that and see
> if there is a safe place for the pet to go for at least a day or two until we can get them into
> foster care. If, not, then we know that a lot of people choose to stay in the abusive
> situation until we can get them into a foster for the pet. Once we go the foster route, we
> get the info about the pet and the vaccinations and whether or not it has been spayed or
> neutered, and we call over to the rescue league and we have a contact there and she sends
> us a form to fill out with all the pet's information. We send that back to her and usually
> within 24 hours she lets us know if she's found a place for the pet to go. Then we would
> do the intake with the woman…sometimes people come and we figure out a way to get
> the pet after, maybe with a police escort – it depends on whether or not they think that the
> abuser is going to hurt the pet or if they can have the pet with them. Once we get the
> animal into the foster program then the woman comes into the shelter. (Jessica, 20s)

> We called it SAFE PAWS, and really, it was a foster program, so people here take them
> in while the client was in shelter. I think our first animal was a hamster [sighs] it died
> while it was in foster care, so that was traumatic. But…it was one of those things that
> once we started doing it, we are able to foster – we started out with any companion
> animals, as we call them – we are located in a rural area and if there needed to be, like a

horse that needed to be fostered, we do have a rancher that we could call. But, in our community of foster folks they will foster dogs, cats, hamsters, and birds. (Sherrie, 40s)

For these respondents, the use of a fostering network was an excellent way to help gain access to a large number of temporary homes, often on a short notice. Although the initial fostering model mentioned by Sherrie ended up being "traumatic" for the client and the foster-family, no other organization mentioned having a similar negative experience.

By far, the most extensive fostering networks used by any of the organizations that I spoke with were the ones used by Ahimsa House and Littlegrass Ranch. Ahimsa House is not a domestic violence shelter – they are solely dedicated to the safety of the animals that are fleeing violence with their human companions. Although there are domestic violence shelters in Georgia that do accept animals, Ahimsa House's community connections allows them to access foster networks that are often outside the service areas of individual shelters, while maintaining many of the security measures used by domestic violence shelters.

> Because so much of DV services and the movement as a whole are still so clandestine, it is still possible for us to operate in tiny pockets of isolation from one another, and have no idea that even in an adjoining county, perhaps there is a program that is operating that is assisting with animals. When I first got into this, I perceived that and really thought that it was a disservices to the animals and the humans that were connected to violence because we couldn't effectively coordinate referrals, and so often they couldn't relocate across the city or across county lines for their own safety because we didn't know that there was a program that would exist in New Mexico, for example, where she could go and her dog could be placed safely while she was in shelter. So, one of the things that I became involved in really early on was trying to develop some better directories of these programs…
> *Can you walk me through a typical intake for you?*
> All communication goes through our organization, so the fosters never speak with the clients, and never know their names. So, we work to get them [the pet] back and sometimes the client picks them up directly from the foster or a boarding facility, because we do sometimes allow contact between boarding facilities and clients if both parties are okay with that, they will let clients come visit sometimes. Then, we like to reunite within 60 days if possible when we can, especially if they are still in shelter, we see ourselves as an initial emergency resource that someone can use when they are really facing a barrier to seeking safety, rather than a long-term option, especially if someone is going into more

of a transitional type of program for a year or two years…we usually try to help them figure out different options for placing the animals. (Maya, 30s)

As an organization, Ahimsa House is able to connect clients with shelter services, as well as provide the safe keeping of pets through fostering and boarding. Maya's personal task, to develop a database of shelters and organizations that also provided animal-friendly services, evolved from her own academic interests as well as her professional need to continue to help clients that contacted them. That database, in fact, was one of the many tools that I used to contact additional shelters that were not part of the original list provided by Allie Phillips. In addition, Maya provided assistance to my own research by posting a notice on the Ahimsa House listserve notifying domestic violence shelters of my research in case they wanted to spread the word through their own communities.

As I noted earlier, Littlegrass Ranch provides a specialized form of pet protection for horses and large animals. Due to the logistics of transporting and relocating large animals and survivors, the fostering network used by Littlegrass Ranch is of a national scale:

> Christie: The first client we ever worked with was out of Florida… I had a friend in the area that was a counselor and her parents were circus performers, so she had several connections and so we rang them up and asked them if they knew of any place in Florida where we could stash a few horses…We have had some that we need to send out to other states – I know of several places in Louisiana that will take women from other states, so I send people there. I know of a few specific clients, in fact.
> Wendy: Was that the NY one?
> Christie: Yeah, her, I sent her there.
> *So, on that point – do people call and ask for a referral? Or do shelters call you?*
> Wendy: Both.
> Christie: Somebody contacted us from Facebook. A shelter up in Wisconsin, a group that sheltered animals for the victims at the local shelter…I can talk to them and find out their programs, just spend an hour on the phone talking to people. I might be in S. Texas, but a few minutes later I got a phone call from someone that was only 15 minutes away from that organization in Wisconsin. It clicked…it was just like the thing in Florida. We try not to hang up or turn down anyone. (Wendy, 40s; Christie, 50s)

Littlegrass Ranch activates a cross-state network of volunteers with land and resources to help women, and occasionally men, to flee with their animals. As a common strategy in domestic violence advocacy, details about when and how to safely leave, where the safest locations to travel to and through, emergency contact lists, setting aside funding for the eventual leave – all known as safety planning – are encouraged with each client. These survivors often safety plan for weeks in advance, if possible, but on occasion, Christie noted that they have pulled contacts and safe locations together within a matter of hours. Both Ahimsa House and Littlegrass Ranch are unique in that their resources are concentrated in animal-friendly networks. The success of Littlegrass Ranch stems from the "different breed" of people that are involved in the horse world, while Ahimsa House focuses their efforts on recruiting fosters and boarding facilities that already cater to the animal welfare movement. I use these two organizations as a transition point to my discussion of the importance of community connections because of the vital importance that these networks of resources and activism demonstrate.

Summary

The organizations that are represented in this research share unique origin stories – often reflecting a clear connection between the individual experiences of the respondents and the decisions to create an animal-friendly policy. The models of animal-friendly programs – on-site, boarding, and fostering – used by these organizations matched the majority of models noted in the national survey data collected by Krienert et al. (2012). The primary reliance on fostering networks by most of the organizations that I spoke with provides an important insight into the reliance on individual and organizational advocacy as a method of assisting both human and nonhuman victims of interpersonal violence – a topic I turn to in the next chapter.

Chapter 5 - Community Connections and Advocacy

The origins of each of these animal-friendly programs, and the models that these shelters use, places significance on the connections that shelter workers had to their communities and professional networks. The reliance on the fostering networks, and the advocates that participate in them, mentioned in the previous chapter demonstrates the importance of community connections for the sustainability of these animal-friendly programs. In this chapter, I will address the types of community networks and advocacy that shelter workers emphasized as integral to their personal and professional experiences.

Clearly, the use of network connections, both personal and professional, is a key aspect in any human- or social-services organization. Legal advocacy and services, housing assistance, physical and mental health services, childcare, and employment assistance are all part of the needs that must be addressed by individuals and families that are fleeing violent relationships. For some of the organizations that I spoke with, the majority of these services could be obtained on-site, while others partnered with outside organizations and agencies to connect their clients to the assistance that they needed. The addition of animal-friendly programs and policies made these community connections even more valuable, as the care and safety for victims of violence extended from humans to nonhumans. In this chapter, I will present the community networks that respondents utilized the most, and I will highlight both the official and unofficial resource sharing that helped these organizations succeed.

Animal Welfare Community

The most important community network mentioned by all respondents was the reliance on the animal-welfare community to temporarily house animals, provide valuable services

(veterinary care, behavioral testing, therapy for abused animals), donate supplies, and fundraise.

As I noted in the previous chapter, the fostering model was often the first step in the decision by

the organization to develop an official policy on allowing animals to be included as victims. In

times of overflow crisis and emergency safety planning, the community of fosters can mean the

difference between life and death for both the human victims and their pets.

> But, the last time I was involved in SAFEPET was last year, and we had a woman who had 3 or 4 kids, and 2 dogs…and she had to leave because he was threatening the dogs, and she had to leave, and the shelter could not take the dogs. So, I called the SPCA, and I actually…I picked her up, got everything in the car, and got her, and her son took the dogs up to the SPCA, for an emergency foster, even for 30 days…because what they had been through…it was critical. (Anita, 50s)

> If we have a pet that we can't maintain, then we can jump through the wait list that is for fostering, because it isn't always easy to foster a pet, especially knowing that the person will be getting it back…we do have a thing with the local vet so that survivors will hopefully be able to have their pets checked up, and get some healthcare – animal care – but we haven't utilized that recently. (Verna, 40s)

> We were part of the PAWS program that had received funds…and so we would help women with their pets if they needed their shots updated or anything. We had one woman whose dog was very sick and riddled with cancer, and we worked with our local vet and we were able to raise the funds to put her dog down because her dog was so bad. (Tessie, 40s)

> PAWS has money to put forward for the SAFEPAWS program, so all of the animals go to a vet before they go to a foster family. If there are behavioral problems, they end up working with an animal trainer that is being funded through the program, that will help – that will help them be sociable. (Sherrie, 40s)

> We are all fosters, too, so we would be calling around to other pet stores to help get low-cost or free food for the animal if we needed it. Usually, the animal community here is very giving. (Clara, 30s)

These examples are only a small sample of the extent to which the organizations relied on

the local animal-friendly community to help in times of routine service and emergency response.

Anita, for example, not only demonstrates her own agency in personally assisting a client, she

also addresses the "critical" need that they have in terms of relying on emergency fosters. Both

Verna and Tessie mention the importance of veterinary care, though for different reasons. All of the organizations that I spoke with required up-to-date vaccinations (negative Coggins tests for horses, in the case of Littlegrass Ranch), and most of these exams and vaccinations were done for free, or at a reduced cost by community partners. In the example mentioned by Tessie, the reality of terminal cancer made affordable end-of-life care the most critical need for her client. Several respondents mentioned cases in which the pet was too old or sick to continue with a good quality of life, and the clients turned to the shelter's community partners to help them make the difficult decision to humanely euthanize their pet. In the rare cases in which an animal has become traumatized to the point of needing behavioral therapy or training, some of the organizations relied on partnered trainers to assist the family and help the pet adjust back to a "new" normal, much like the case mentioned by Sherrie. Most organizations noted that, much like their human families, these animals often faced an adjustment period when they transitioned out of the abusive home. Finally, Clara notes that the daily needs of the animals are often met by local pet stores and volunteers – an experience that most shelters also had with their local animal community.

Human Services Community

The importance of having a solid working relationship with other human service organizations (legal services, law enforcement, child protective services, and animal control units) was the second most important community network mentioned. For many of these organizations, clients are provided with access to necessary services such as legal advocacy, housing services, and child welfare services, as part of the process of being admitted to the shelter. One of the forms of community networks that exist is the coordinated community response (CCR) model. The standard practice of the CCR model is to promote the sharing of

information by various organizations regarding special populations. For example, a child

welfare advocate will contact the local domestic violence shelter to have a victim's advocate

available to coordinate or safety plan with the victimized parent, or an animal control officer will

report to police and the domestic violence shelter when an animal welfare call indicates signs of

family violence as well. The CCR model can be a fully recognized, extensive network of

organizations, or it can be an unofficial relationship between staff at various organizations.

Eighteen of the twenty-five (72%) organizations that I spoke with used the CCR model in some

fashion – in both official formats and as a network of "unofficial" points of contact:

> *Do you have law enforcement, animal services, or CPS automatically contacting you?*
> Yes, we all talk to each other – we serve Arlington County – but all the domestic violence
> shelters talk to one another. Since we are so few and far between, we share information
> and resources. We do a lot of outreach and work with our CCR teams to make sure that
> we are constantly training up on all the new first responders and who they can
> call…when they can call. (Clara, 30s)

> I am also the sexual assault team coordinator for Bristol Bay, so that means that I get key
> team players together every month and talking about how we respond to sexual assault
> and identifying anything that we need to so that we can provide a coordinated response –
> and that is one of my 3 primary jobs. (Lisa, 40s)

> Some of our intakes are done through our humane society…and now that their staff is
> very aware of domestic violence, we have had a number of cases where they have come
> in to them to surrender their pets…but their staff is now more trained in picking up on the
> signs of domestic violence that they are more comfortable in asking those questions…and
> we are finding that 5 out of the 10 surrender cases really are victims of domestic violence
> that aren't aware of our PetSafe program. So, that changes things – instead of just
> leaving their pet there, it is connected immediately to our domestic violence services and
> their pet is placed in one of our foster homes, and we get them help. (Colleen, 50s)

These examples are a sample of the official CCR programs that connected these domestic

violence organizations with the larger community network of the human services field. Clara

and Lisa are addressing the use of community coordinated response teams, occasionally referred

to as "task forces" in other interviews, as promoting the open dialogue needed to properly

address the needs of victims fleeing domestic violence. Communicating between domestic

violence shelters is critical when clients are calling from different parts of the state, and

maintaining updated training for first responders on the services available is an important step in

allowing these victims to access a safety network. Colleen highlights the importance of cross-

training at what might appear to be an unusual site – the humane society. What is important

about Colleen's experience, however, is that her organization was created in response to a joint

coalition of academic and public institutions that were educated in the awareness of the Link, and

clearly incorporated the recommendations by Ascione (2000) and others to cross-train as many

coalition partners as possible.

In addition to assembling "key players" in her official capacity as the sexual assault team

coordinator, Lisa also mentions that her friendship with the local animal control officer is part of

the toolkit she uses:

> Typically if we get calls it would be rare for a law enforcement officer to say "Oh yeah, there is a dog here" – that doesn't typically happen for whatever reason. So, I don't know if they call animal control prior to that or not, and then animal control may then contact me and say "hey, this is what I have, do you know anyone that might want it"? So, yeah – the animal control officer, within the limitations of his job, can be pretty flexible in how he interacts with us, so yeah. We probably have the least amount of interaction with regard to clients with animals with state troopers and local police.

> *Animal control seems to have a good relationship with you, but law enforcement can be a harder link?*

> Right. Yeah, I'd say that they don't always make the same connections that animal control might. That would be the case around here.

> *Okay. Do you have any examples, do you see that happening?*

> I see it happening because I talk with our animal control officer quite frequently, unfortunately because I use my bicycle to and from work, and it is 7.3 miles each way, and on any given day in or out, I will be accosted by any number of loose dogs along the way. So, then I call when I get home and say which house it seems to be coming from. And, there have been several times where I have noticed that the primary animal provider has left the home, and then the animal turns up loose. That is the information that I relay

to him. This is the classic case it happens all the time, and I may or may not know if there is domestic violence in the house, sometimes I do know because it is my job – and so I'll tell him "This dog was never loose before, something has changed in the household, so could you check it out?" And, oftentimes, dog ownership changes, and I'll recognize the dog somewhere that I'd never seen before, and so I'll say "Hey, something happened and maybe you should go check because it might not be a safe place". So, I have a lot of communication with him on those accounts. He responds to the animal control calls and goes to the same households where our clients live and he goes to the same houses that the police respond to, because usually there is something more going on – it is all linked there. (Lisa, 40s)

Because animal control officers are tasked with public safety as a primary duty, they are included in my category of human services. Here, Lisa uses both her professional knowledge of the connections of violence and her ongoing friendship with the local animal control officer to promote the awareness of the Link, and advocate for the safety of both humans and nonhumans. By tapping into the need for personal safety (not be accosted by loose dogs), Lisa is able to activate the involvement of the animal control officer in a manner that can then be used to potentially intervene in an act of abuse against the human or the animals.

Link Community

Perhaps the most unexpected finding was the discovery that, despite the past two decades worth of academic attention and an increased public and professional awareness campaign by those working within the field of the Link – many of my respondents did not know of the actual data collected, nor were they aware of the most well-known individuals in the field. Ten of my thirty respondents made no mention of any of the prominent names in the Link movement. Of those that did mention the work of advocates and scholars, Allie Phillips was the most common name mentioned, with several respondents having personal interactions with her. Six of my respondents mentioned Ascione's work and contribution to the movement, with two having personal interactions with him, and another that mentioned attending a speech that he gave.

Finally, three respondents mentioned a variation on the awareness of the National Link Coalition

(an organization that the majority of Link advocates are associated with).

For some of my respondents, the research conducted by Ascione on the Link was used to

help establish their animal-friendly programs:

> I started doing some research, and I found…which was tied to American Humane, who is who Allie was previously employed with. I found a lot of research by this professor, Frank Ascione, at the time he was a professor at the University of Utah…he is now in Colorado, as a professor in humane education about the Link. He wrote incredible research – papers and books – on the LINK. So, the more I dug in, the more I was like "We have to solve this"… We tried to start tracking the info…we changed the client intake forms to ask if there were any abuse on animals to follow-up on some of the research done by Frank, and he had started his First Strike program at that time. (Staci, 40s)

Another respondent, Cheryl, noted that the building of her organization's metro campus for

individuals experiencing homelessness was, in part, based on some of the research done by

Ascione. Staci's experience also reflects a practical application of Ascione's work – the shelter

had already encountered issues of victims leaving animals in their cars in an attempt to care for

them while fleeing violence, and the work done by Ascione allowed Staci to sway the board to

build the new animal-friendly facility, and incorporate several of the policies and documents that

he recommended.

Other respondents had already established animal-friendly programs, and used Ascione

as a mechanism to provided additional training and education:

> And, we have a lot of training, and the one training that will ring a bell if you've been doing research about the Link, and that is Frank Ascione – we had him come from Utah and talk about the link between the abuse of animals and human violence – behaviors in violent relationships. I think that he is probably one of the most studied – the one that has done the most research about the Link, well one of them, there are a lot of people that are doing research, and even more so now.
> *Was that talk with Dr. Ascione, was that early in this process, or was the program already in place?*

Ann: It was already in place, established, but we wanted to educate other people that may work with victims of DV, such as medical personnel. I don't know how much he charged, but we had to raise money to pay and get him over here (Anita, 50s)

For Anita, using Ascione as a community educator was an attempt to bring an expert to the table to help jump-start a coordinated community response program. Another respondent, Christie, was in the process of applying Ascione's research to her own organization, Littlegrass Ranch, and modifying his recommendations for large animal rescue. Of interest, however, was an additional perspective on Ascione's research – the awareness that although the research on the Link was important, it wasn't exactly "news" to some of the organizations:

When Frank Ascione came out with all of his research, he really makes it very clear that animals are part of the family, and they are part of our society – they are considered a family member. Which everybody knew, but it just hadn't been expressed…it was so obvious that you can't just ignore them, not only from a safety standpoint, but also from a healing standpoint. (Mandy, 40s)

I think that Frank Ascione had really started to do that [develop best practices] all the way back in…gosh when was that…back in the early 2000s when he did the survey of over 47 Safe Haven programs where he put together some summation of the different practices that they had and was able to identify how people tend to address legal challenges or big animals, or whatever it might be…So I really think that it is growing. At the same time, though, I think that we have discovered how many DV shelters had had some kind of accommodations for animals all this time, or just how many animal organizations had had, in working with the DV shelters….what I've seen a little bit of is that as suddenly there is all of this public attention, especially on DV shelters housing animals on site…suddenly people are like "Hey, this is a new idea, we should do this"…and I think that we are seeing a little bit of push back from some of the programs that had had some kind of a pet policy in place for some time, saying "You know what, this isn't a new idea, we didn't all just figure this out". (Maya, 30s)

Mandy is expressing a sentiment that was common among my respondents – they all "knew" that violence between animals and humans was connected, primarily due to their own direct experience with victims, but the additional validation by Ascione and other researchers on the Link helped to further the argument. Maya, however, brings an additional component to this perspective – shelters that had been incorporating animals for a much longer history than the

Link research was documenting. Although Ascione's Safe Haven report mentioned that several shelters had "unofficial" pet friendly programs, I have to question whether the pushback mentioned by Maya was, in part, due to the assumption that those very programs were "unofficial" simply due to a lack of formal documentation. In the increasing bureaucratization of these shelters, the new emphasis on "official" policies regarding animals might, in fact, have the effect of limiting the agency of those working directly with clients.

Despite the limited awareness by many of my respondents of the key players in the creation of Link scholarship and policy procedures, all of my respondents gave accounts of the connections of violence that they had experienced in their own tenure at their organizations. Interestingly, only ten of my thirty respondents utilized the official terminology of the "Link" in some variation or another. So, although the accounts of the connections were present, language was not. My findings on this were not as I anticipated; contrary to my initial assumption that the research and subsequent report by Ascione in 2000 would have enabled the diffusion of academic knowledge into the common usage of those in the domestic violence field, I was surprised to find, instead, that most of my respondents, while clearly aware of the connections of violence, were not necessarily basing that information from the academic realm. For their interests and narratives, the connections of violence were concrete rather than abstract – the power of their stories came from the emotional impact of working with individual human and nonhuman victims of violence.

> *Have you used any of the organizational material that other academics have supplied?*
> I've never actually used anything that anyone else has produced while I'm talking about it – I probably should, but I've never found the resources that are available and free, honestly. I haven't been to Allie's website since she left the American Humane – I'll have to go check it out, though. (Jana, 30s)

As I mentioned earlier, the data reflected a stronger association of Link resources with

Allie Phillips rather than Ascione, Arluke, or Arkow. Several respondents, like Jana, mentioned

working with other shelter or Link-based organizations, and Allie Phillips in particular, to secure

funding, share resources and policy guides, and brainstorm on challenges that they were facing.

Allie is indeed a key trainer, educator, and speaker on the Link, and runs the Sheltering Animals

& Families Together (SAF-T) website and program. Allie has helped to compile a database of

shelters that allow for animals, and her own activism stems from her years of experience within

the justice system advocating for victims of domestic violence. My own interview with Allie

reflected her awareness of the key role that she has played in this movement – her busy schedule

is due to the fact that she has on-the-ground experience working with victims directly as a legal

advocate and former lawyer, and might make her more approachable due to the shared

experiences that she has with shelter workers.

Although awareness of Link research and terminology varied among the individuals that I

interviewed, it is clear that the success of these organizations in meeting the needs of their clients

is a direct result of the community networks that have been fostered through both official and

"unofficial" channels. Whether anecdotal or research-based, the body of knowledge required to

navigate the complex world of domestic violence is integral to the role that these individuals play

as advocates, educators, and activists within their own communities. It is with this focus on

individual agency that I present the final section of my findings.

Human/Nonhuman Advocacy

The experiences of my respondents reflect an intersection of individual identities and

professional advocacy. Respondents labeled themselves and their fellow staff in animal-friendly

terms, and highlighted their sincere, shared beliefs in the importance of nonhuman animals in the

lives of themselves and those around them. Quite often, respondents shifted their own personal

identity from "I am" to "we are" – directly making the leap that they occupy a collective space

with other like-minded individuals within their own shelter, and the larger domestic violence and

animal welfare community. This awareness of the dual role of being a human and nonhuman

advocate created an important emphasis for many of my respondents on their need to engage

with others in a dynamic, at times challenging, manner in order to educate, train, and respond to

community needs.

Animal Lovers

All but one of my respondents identified as having a passion for animals, often self-

identifying as an "animal lover", and all 30 of the respondents highlighted the importance of

having animals in their own lives, or the lives of their children. For example, Scott, my lone

non- "animal lover" qualified his statement by talking about his son: "I'm not an animal lover, I

didn't even like cats, but I married into a cat, and when my son was born…and he finally caught

the cat and it was so cute…so, now we have Beni and BooBoo. I don't love them, but they come

around and I pet them. But my son – every morning BooBoo is on his lap and he is attached."

Even as a holdout, Scott brings to the table the important relationship his son has with the cat he

picked out at the humane society; this relationship is the basis for how Scott understands the

emotional attachment that his clients have with regard to their own pets and facilitates his

advocacy on their behalf. Respondents used this individual, and yet collective, identity as

"animal lovers" in a variety of ways:

> There are animal lovers in the world and there are not-animal lovers in the world, but
> when you've got your family with you…if someone were to leave their child at home,
> then that same level of relief when they got them back is what an animal lover feels.
> (Elisa, 40s)

Whatever we had to do to allow women fleeing DV relationships to get out and keep their cherished animals. I feel like we've come a long way, and it is important. I mean, I'm an animal lover anyway…so I totally get it. (Patrice, 30s)

Elisa's example is used to highlight the perspective that there is a shared emotional attachment that human and nonhuman "parents" have with regard to their desire to stay and protect their loved ones. Patrice takes this experience and makes it personal – as an animal lover, she understands why victims fleeing violence want to keep their animals safe. Both of these women are connecting a personal identity with a larger shared experience.

For others, the shared identity of being an "animal lover" is integral to the process of establishing and maintaining shelter staff relationships with one another and other community partners. Maya's experience doing community education with other professionals often relies on this shared identity to bridge the gap between organizations:

Doing outreach with human services professionals has been kind of a good tactic because you sometimes get these audiences that are very jaded, whether it is law enforcement or CPS, or even just DV shelter staff, and you go in and start with "How many of you are animal lovers?", and you kind of get their ear…Or, when we work with a DV shelter and they refer cases to us, it is always the one advocate that loves animals – either because that is the only one asking about animals on the crisis line, or because the other advocates aren't getting clients in that have animals…and they are sending them to this other person to "soothe" them. (Maya, 30s)

Sherrie notes that the "intense" passion that herself and fellow staff members have for animals has helped to further the animal programs that they have created, and is one of the reasons for why the program has been so successful:

I think that part of that, when you are focusing on the reasons behind why we developed the program, and why it worked, is that we happen to have intense animal lovers on-staff. One of the staff was an intense cat lover, and she was one of the ones that argued that we needed to build a facility that would primarily serve cats as well – so she personally helped with the development of the program. (Sherrie, 40s)

Finally, Veronica uses a direct approach to foster a community of staff that will share in the responsibilities associated with being an animal-friendly shelter:

> We all are animal lovers. As a matter of fact, when I interview people, one of the interview questions is "Are you allergic to cats or dogs?" [laughs] and "Do you mind cats? Do you mind cleaning a litter box?" because we take turns doing the litter box. That really is part of the interview process. (Veronica, 40s)

For Veronica, asking potential volunteers and employees if they are willing to work with cats and dogs goes beyond the potential that a staff member might have to help a client care for their animal during an emergency – the shelter has a resident cat that lives in the front office and regularly interacts with both clients and staff. Therefore, only non-allergic, animal friendly people are encouraged to apply.

Although this shared identity gave a sense of collective purpose to my respondents and their staff, it also presented a challenge within the larger field of domestic violence services. At times, respondents struggled with the state that clients' pets were in upon arrival. Most pets were not vaccinated or spayed/neutered, and this created a tension at times between staff and clients:

> Usually what we deal with is just neglect due to poverty, due to how they've been living prior to coming to our shelter. We have some local vets here within the city that will assist with basic grooming or basic care, or actually help get that animal up on its shots, or just basic stuff (Angie, 30s)

The "basic stuff" Angie is referring to is what is considered by pet owners to be a general standard of care: food, water, shelter, and safety. These standards, however, are contextual – class privilege enables certain pet owners to provide additional standards of care beyond the basics. Another respondent, Cindy, mentioned her surprise that these standards were not shared by clients:

> When we got into this because we thought that they were used to having children and vaccines that they would have vet records…and that is absolutely not the case. Of all the pets that we have brought in, only 2 dogs were up to date on their vaccines (Cindy, 50s).

For victims of domestic violence, the intersections of poverty and abuse make providing the "basics" for their companion animals difficult, if not impossible. As the CEO of her organization, Cindy knows the economic challenges that her clients face in their attempts to flee violent homes – but her confusion as to the lack of basic animal care given to clients' pets highlights a gap in her knowledge that existed prior to including animals in their shelter. Therefore, the privilege that was often shared by shelter workers created a blind spot with regard to the experiences of their clients: vaccinations, access to adequate food, water, and space, and even the ability to provide quality time with their pets was not attainable for most of the shelter clients.

The personal identity as an "animal lover" also informed the framing that my respondents used when discussing their passion for working with both human and nonhuman victims of violence. All of my respondents had companion animals, and several connected the emotional turmoil that they observed in their clients that had pets abused with their own sense of compassion for their personal animals. As noted earlier in my findings, several of my respondents started their respective organization as a direct result of their own relationship with their companion animals. This shared sense of collective identity helped them to connect with partners in the animal welfare community, and allowed them to incorporate animals into their professional sphere in ways that benefited both their human and nonhuman clients.

Advocating for the Human-Animal Bond

One of the findings from the data was the shared perspective by my respondents that the presence of animals in their shelter served as a calming effect. All of my respondents spoke of the ability of the animals in their lives and the lives of their clients to mediate the stressful world

of domestic violence. Angie's two dogs lived in the shelter homes with the residents, and she

described her reaction to watching her dogs interact with the other women:

> Like, I had one dog who literally gravitated toward the humans – the adult humans – and just knew…like "I know you are hurting and I am going to help you. I am going to love you"…I would watch her do miraculous things, for lack of a better word, with the clients that came and stayed with us: climbed up on the couch with them, snuggle up with them, and how that whole process would assist that individual with their healing. (Angie, 30s)

Angie's dogs sought out the attention and comfort of the shelter residents – engaging in agency

that Angie interpreted as helping the residents heal. This sentiment about non-human agency

was expressed by Jana, as well, in talking about the positive experience of having animals within

the kennels at her shelter:

> *Is there a change in the environment with the animals there?*
> Yes, absolutely. Most of the people – there are some people that just don't like animals – but most of the time everyone loves interacting with the pets. Everybody gets something out of it, and I think the pet does, too, you know. It likes the attention. But it seems to be good- it is something positive for everyone. (Jana, 30s)

These responses demonstrate what Wheeler and Faulkner (2015) call the "pet effect" – a

physiological response to companion animals that reduces stress and anxiety. Several

respondents mentioned observing both resident shelter animals (owned by staff or living at the

shelter in staff areas) and the pets of clients that were at on-site locations intentionally seeking

out human comfort, much like Angie's dogs did. Staff mentioned the sense of peace and calm

that victims felt when they were able to interact with the animals. In addition to the

physiological benefits of having pets in the shelter, several respondents highlighted the use of

pets by staff as "social facilitators" (Irvine 2004), where interactions with victims occurred

through the context of the pet – enabling traumatic experiences and difficult conversations to be

addressed with both the calming effect of the pet and providing a "safe" topic to start with before

transitioning into more challenging ones. Jessica provides an excellent example of this process when talking about a dog that was a client's therapy animal: "As staff – we all talked about the dog and petted it often…it was something to talk about if you didn't know what else to say to the resident." Jessica and other respondents are speaking to the importance of the human-animal bond (HAB), where the relationships that humans have with their nonhuman companions provide a sense of family, enable social interactions, and benefit both species in physical, emotional, and mental ways, as Lilah mentions:

> *Have you noticed a difference in the actual shelter in the areas where you have the pets? Are people more relaxed?*
>
> I think it helps, because a lot of times the animal is there as a sort of stress-reliever or to help with anxiety. Um…I say that pets can't be roaming in the hallways, but service animals can, and typically the people that are going through these high stress situations, or mental health situations, they are able to meet with people here and go about their day in the building more peacefully, I think, than if I told them that their therapy animal had to stay in their apartment – I think that would cause way more stress for them for them to get everyday things done, because it would interrupt their lifestyle and what they had become comfortable with. I've seen people with regular pets when I've been meeting with them and they are talking about something stressful, and they will reach down while they are talking and will start petting their dog. I will see them calm down and get more relaxed. So, yeah, totally, I think that being able to have their pets, or their therapy animals, with them helps them to get rid of their stress or anxiety and meet their emotional needs.

In some cases, however, this desire for using an animal as a stress reliever or as therapy occasionally complicated the staff/client boundary:

> I can definitely mention the impact on the survivors. In fact, there is probably not a day goes by that I don't see one of our therapy interns – they are out there doing therapy with people and their pets. The way that our kennel is set up, we have a cat porch, which is a screened-in porch with cat climbing things all over it and Adirondack chairs and Wi-Fi – you can sit out there and your cat can play. It overlooks the dog park – we have a full dog park with play toys and everything and two bog oak trees that you can sit under – and again you can work on your laptop or whatever the case may be. So, we really try to incorporate those opportunities for people to be with their pets in ways that are calming and facilitates that trauma recovery. Now, in terms of the staff, we have actually had to keep the staff out of the kennels – because if they…if it is the owner's dog or cat, they

don't want anyone messing with their animal. It was just too tempting…you walk by and suddenly the dog has 47 toys in its cage…it was too tempting for the staff, especially those that had worked around animals and with rescue groups, to want to take the animal out and play with it as a stress reliever. (Carol, 50s)

For Carol, the need to respect the ownership relationship of the client, and yet the reality of staff

working in a high-stress environment caused a conflict. She notes, however, that one of the

ways to satisfy both was for staff to watch the clients play with their animals and watch the

children interact with their pets in the dog park – therapy via pet voyeurism, if you will. Despite

these occasionally conflicting relationships, respondents were overwhelmingly supportive of

incorporating animals as both official, and "unofficial" therapy components.

> I know that there is another organization down the way where they have been going out and using a dog for child therapy, but no we haven't done that. I've always advocated for a house dog, but I haven't won that yet [laughs] (Elisa, 40s)

> *So, one of the things that you mentioned was that you have a staff member that brings their own dog – have you noticed an effect of having the animals in the shelter with the survivors, does it calm them…*
> [interrupts] They love it! They absolutely love it! We had a shelter cat for a long time, but he developed feline AIDS so now we have him as an office cat where there won't be any other cats around. We love it – we find that it is a great source of calm – they love the animals to death.
> *Can you give me an example of how you've seen this happen?*
> We had this one lady…and this was with our office cat, we had this one lady that, she fell in love with him and he slept with her at night. You know, she came in not knowing what to do and feeling scattered, and scared and worried and Sebastian was very much a calming effect on her. It was not long before she was ready to get on and do the things that she needed to do.
> *So is it like the pets help, almost like a therapy aspect?*
> Yes, and it is a calming effect, it is comforting, it is unconditional love – it is a friendly face when you don't feel like there are any more friendly faces. So, yes, it is very therapeutic for the people that are in shelter. (Veronica, 40s)

Elisa's ongoing campaign for a "house dog" is indicative of the shifting debate on the

public/private nature of nonhuman animals in our society. As Veronica mentions with her own

shelter/office cat, the effects are clear for these shelter workers, and their perspective is reflective

in the fact that more companies allow for pets in the workplace; in addition, we have an increasing number of citizens stepping out into public spaces with service and therapy animals. My own experience as a college instructor has been part of this phenomenon, as to date I've had three students with therapy animals that attended classes with them (one of which was a Great Dane that served as a PTSD dog for a veteran). Thus, the private lives of companion and therapy animals are increasingly becoming a part of daily interaction for all of us (DeMello, 2012).

Navigating the Field of Victimization

All of my respondents highlight the difficulty of navigating the human/nonhuman advocacy field with regard to how the general public ranks victims of violence. Shelter workers were aware of the stigma facing adult victims of violence – at the time of the interviews, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was stalled in Congress awaiting reauthorization. When asked about where the most support comes from the community, Amber stated: "Ohhh….on the behalf of pets. [BIG SIGH] That's what I see, yeah. But that makes total sense to me as an animal lover." Amber's identity as an "animal lover" allowed her the ability to recognize the shared sentiment of animals as an at-risk population, while she also recognized that stigma placed on adult victims of violence is not present with children and pets. This perspective was reflected by other respondents, and shelter workers are forced to apply their professional experiences in dynamic ways to advocate for the lives of both humans and nonhumans.

The most common ways that respondents navigated the field of victimization was through the process of community education and fundraising campaigns. All of my respondents recognized that how their audience framed the victims, similar to the arguments by Berns (2004), with regard to accountability and innocence often reflected the usual public scripts of victim-blaming assigned to adult female victims (rarely accounting for male victims), and the silent

agony of animals and children. For example, when asked about if the public perceives victims of

violence differently, Staci addressed the fact that although women are viewed as having a higher

level of agency and accountability, including pets and children in the discussion makes it harder

to stigmatize:

> I think it is harder when you bring in the bigger picture, when you bring in the children and the animals it becomes less about "Well, why didn't she just leave?", so I do think that there is a level of acceptance. I don't…it is really hard for me to see how domestic violence still needs the explanation and how it doesn't receive the funding and support that it deserves in comparison to others…it still feels like it is a behind-closed-doors conversation. I think that by putting examples of the pets at Noah's and their stories, showing the power of recovery and the day-to-day compassion and therapy between the children and the pets has been an easier message and accepted message…unfortunately more than we've seen in the past at Shade Tree all those years before. (Staci, 40s)

The disbelief Staci mentions at the fact that domestic violence still needed an "explanation" is a

common theme for my respondents. The fact remains that part of the national discussion on

issues of intimate partner violence has been relegated to precisely the public/private divide that

initiated the shelter movement (Murray 1988).   Staci's experience of public audiences being

more likely to blame the adult female victim was shared by other respondents as well. For

Veronica, the greatest challenge was in dealing with members of law enforcement.

> Law enforcement is usually more sympathetic to children and animals. Law enforcement, I think, still tends to blame victims… (Veronica, 50s)

Although several of my respondents noted a similar problem with law enforcement, Allie

Phillips suggested that using the right audience, and the right "tone", could help to bridge the

police/advocate wall; specifically, Allie suggested speaking with K-9 units to help capture the

"animal-friendly" group in a police audience, and allowing them to help spread that awareness to

other officers. This suggestion was, in fact, mentioned by another respondent who had spoken

with Allie – Angie stated that she "would LOVE to do just an event and get the K-9 units out and

talk about awareness." Respondents thus channeled the desire to help facilitate the advocacy for

all victims of domestic violence by accessing the significance of animals in the lives of the general public as well as the law enforcement community, bridging the two fields of animal welfare and domestic violence.

Participants were also aware that navigating the fields of domestic violence and animal abuse could be hard for the general public when faced with the narratives of abuse victims. Tessie spoke of how difficult it could be to attend the advocacy trainings and face the narratives of the clients they worked with, but then expanded that to the need for teachable moments:

> When you think about domestic violence, and you think about someone being abused – whether it be a woman or a cat – it is horrifying for people to wrap their minds around if they don't often think about it. If they do often think about it, I think that it is more of an expansion thing. Yeah, people are mortified that people are hurting animals, and they are mortified that people are hurting children, and they are mortified that people are hurting women, but I think it really depends on the case, on what is going on. It depends on how you frame the message. (Tessie, 40s)

For Tessie, the framing of the message meant that you brought topics into the discussion that the audience could handle. Being "horrified" was a necessary part of the reality of confronting animal abuse and domestic violence, and when audiences had to experience the two together, she recognized that it could be overwhelming – therefore, being an advocate meant that you spoke on these topics, but you also "framed" it in a way that didn't traumatize the audience.

Even for the respondents themselves, the effect of seeing animal abuse could, at times, be overwhelming. One respondent, Clara, referred to the ASPCA commercials featuring abused animals while Sarah McLaghlan's "Angel" plays in the background:

> I can't watch those ASPCA ads – I get so upset. I can sit and talk…it is so weird, we did this webinar and I had my staff sit in and people were having really visceral reactions to the stories about pet abuse, and I think it is because they don't speak. They can't express themselves the way that kids and adults can. And again, I'm not equating the two, but for some reason, I don't know what it is about animals, but it just hits such a nerve, even with me – I can't watch it. But, I can watch a documentary on the worst case of domestic

violence scenario with an adult all day long. It is very strange, and I don't understand that.
Well, it only takes one Sarah McLaghlan song to make you feel guilty.
I know, right! [both laugh]. I can't even listen to that song anymore. I always want to just turn it off and pick up the phone and ask "How much money do you need?"! It is so sad – the shaky dog, I don't like that poor dog.

Noting that at times you must be a "chameleon" to reach your audience for funding and education, Clara was clear on how the emotional response that she has to animal abuse has, at times, provided a clear connection to locking in a potential funding source. For some organizations, the availability of funding was indeed indicative of how the public views the victimization of animals and humans:

> Some people, the non-crazy pet people that aren't like you and I will go crazy over this response…but it is easier for us to raise money for the pets. Much easier. Donations right now for the regular family shelter are usually very, very hard…and yet I haven't had as much difficulty sustaining donations at our pet-friendly one. (Staci, 40s)

> When I advertise and I asked for sponsorship, I asked for prevention of violence against women and children – that's what I always say, because I think that people are more apt to help to fund something that is going to help children or animals. (Anita, 50s)

> We are starting to look at more local grants – in our community, potentially – um, it is kind of hard, because we need to find the right people who want to help animals as well as domestic violence… you see…you have on the one hand, one section of people that are all animal friendly, they foster, they volunteer at the humane society, they want to do stuff for the animals, but they don't really care about who actually owns the animals. [Laughs] And then you have the people who are really engaged and immersed in DV, and want to help out survivors, and the families – particularly the children – but then they are not animal-friendly. (Verna, 40s).

Staci, Verna, and Anita are all stating a common, challenging theme: individuals that shared a "pet-crazy" perspective (I admit, I fit the mold Staci placed me in) were not always in the same category as those that were not as enthusiastic about animals. Indeed, many respondents stated that they had an easier time accessing new funding sources once they included animal-friendly programs. Jana recounted a grant awarded to her organization "simply because we had the

animals and that funder wanted to take care of animals. In the long run, they are taking care of

people by wanting to help the animals."   While several noted the "warm fuzzy" feelings that

went with rescuing animals, it was also mentioned that the stigma of domestic violence might

stay with a victim beyond death:

> When people pass away, they want people to donate, in lieu of flowers, they want people
> to donate to either the animal shelter, the cancer society, or the local hospice. Without a
> doubt, those are the top three. Rarely do they want it to be bequeathed to our
> organization. And, I think that is a case because 1: this is a very private thing to
> experience, being a survivor. If you want to donate – a lot of people donate privately,
> anonymously. They don't want the world at large to know that they are connected,
> because there is still a big stigma attached to having been a domestic violence survivor.
> (Laura, 40s)

From Laura's perspective, this stigma was mitigated in community education and

fundraising by talking about animals. By talking about animals as co-victims, and by mentioning

that her shelter was animal-friendly, Laura was able to open up discussion and funding streams

that were now easier to navigate. Indeed, one of the most common ways that participants used

their professional and personal experience to bridge the knowledge gap between themselves and

their audience was to highlight the "family" dynamic of domestic violence, where pets and

children were part of a cohesive unit that should be given protection and a chance to start over

together.

Summary

The reliance on community and professional networks to help establish, maintain, and

support these animal-friendly programs is central to the success each of my respondents have

experienced. Throughout this chapter, the connected communities of animal welfare, human

services, and the Link advocate network provided access to resources such as fosters, funding,

guidance, and supplies. In addition, the awareness of my respondents of their own status as

"animal lovers", and the sense of shared identity with their clients, allowed them to access a collective identity that also informed their understanding of how the experience of domestic violence stigmatized their human clients while also granted a level of immunity to stigma for their nonhuman clients.

In the realm of the influence on political representation – in particular the protection of animals in a legal capacity as co-victims, these networked connections do share a similar process with traditional resource mobilization theory. However, the clear importance placed on both the individual and collective identity of being "animal lovers", the navigation of the framing of both human and nonhuman victims, as well as the emphasis on social justice, creates a stronger theoretical connection with new social movement theories. The larger theoretical applications of these findings will be addressed in the following chapter.

Chapter 6 - Major Findings and Conclusions

My initial interest in this topic originated from the personal experiences of women facing a particular type of oppression: incarceration. As my own understanding of the complexity of how incarceration intersected with the politics of identity – race, class, gender, sexuality, and motherhood, to name a few – this research evolved to reflect my interest in the reality of animal abuse and domestic violence as a "linked" experience. This research examines the importance of the relationships that shelter workers had with community partners, the roles that individuals play in establishing and maintaining these animal-friendly programs, and the navigation of the social justice field as it applies to the "Link" by shelter workers. My focus on shelter workers was guided by a primary focus on the "Link" movement, and framed by the driving questions of: (1) What is the relationship between the current "Link" movement and the on-the-ground advocates in animal-friendly domestic violence shelters?, (2) What network connections are being activated in order to access the necessary resources to address the needs of humans and nonhuman domestic violence victims in these shelters?, and (3) What, if any, identities and perspectives are shared by individuals involved with animal-friendly programs?

As an extension of these questions, I sought to understand this (seemingly uncoordinated) movement through the framework of social movement theories. To answer these questions, I interviewed a range of women and men and focused on their personal and organization experiences, and how their own individual advocacy intersects with the Link movement. The major findings are: the personal identity of advocates as "animal lovers" and the manner in which this identity informs and enables human/nonhuman advocacy; the importance of community networks to access necessary resources for both the shelters and the victims; the awareness (or lack thereof) of respondents of the Link as both a body of knowledge and a social

movement; and how the way in which activists and academics have framed animal abuse in the context of domestic violence has shaped the perspectives of shelter workers.

The origin stories of the animal-friendly programs and policies at the shelters were unique in that there was no central theme or driving principal. Each had a clear example of a case involving either a client or themselves as a victim of human/nonhuman animal violence, and these narratives provided an important talking point when interacting with the general public.

The "animal lover" identity shapes shelter worker's response to human and nonhuman victimization. Several of the respondents in this study described their relationship with their own animals as crucial to their empathy for their human and nonhuman clients. For some of them, this relationship was the origin point for the creation of their own organization. Identifying as an "animal lover" allows shelter workers to connect with others through a shared perspective, thus accessing a moral stance that can bridge diverse professions and ideologies. For some, their status as an "animal lover" also created a disconnect with their clients due to an lack of "basic care" given to the nonhuman members of the family – though a few indeed recognized the influence of economic restrictions that are often used by abusers to control victims. These findings present an important application of Fraser's (2011) concept of how identity politics operate. Interestingly, respondents highlighted their position as "animal lovers" (often noting their status as pet owners) as critical in community education and training. Their legitimacy as creators of knowledge and discourse was influenced by the intensity of their relationship to nonhuman animals.

However, none of my respondents noted their status as women (or men) as a positive point of legitimacy. My female respondents did not highlight a sense of shared knowledge regarding victimization and empathy that relied on their status as women – in fact, the only other

shared status noted by respondents was personal history as a victim of domestic violence. Thus, my findings indicate that the use of identity politics is complicated with regard to nonhuman animals – without possessing a shared status with the nonhuman animals, respondents create a shared identity as "animal lovers' to promote the politics of both recognition and redistribution for both human and nonhuman victims. This finding elaborates on Einwohner's (1999) study on how personal identity influences animal activism by expanding that activism into the realm of the domestic violence shelter. Here, advocates are not engaged in mainstream public animal welfare advocacy; rather, they are utilizing their own professional spheres, combined with their identity as an "animal lover" to promote both local awareness and larger social changes with regard to protecting nonhuman victims of domestic violence.

Another finding highlights the importance of coalition building between community networks in order to address the needs of human and nonhuman victims. I asked each respondent questions regarding coordinated community response (CCR) programs – DVERT in particular – as well as questions about what community relationships and networks have been the most beneficial for their program. Overwhelmingly, the findings indicate that the availability of fostering networks to provide homes for nonhuman victims of domestic violence is crucial to the success of these programs. The ability to create partnerships with the animal welfare community was of critical importance – and was often facilitated by the status of respondents as pet owners or fosters of rescue animals themselves. Although relationships with law enforcement ranged from excellent to complicated, several respondents noted the benefits of having a relationship with the local animal control officers due to their ability to access the family unit in a manner that is not directly threatening to the control of the abuser. Animal control officers were said to

be more observant and capable of making solid judgments regarding the likelihood of human abuse alongside animal abuse.

Although respondents addressed their own knowledge of the Link – highlighting connections of violence between humans and nonhumans – few had concrete awareness of the actual research on the Link. Most respondents were connected to the Link community via Allie Phillips, or through one another. As animal-friendly shelters, these organizations both rely on the experiences of one another, and noted their own willingness to provide guidance to others. Thus, the network connections for the Link community were facilitated through direct contact with experts – Allie Phillips, Frank Ascione, Phil Arkow, and Arnold Arluke, primarily – and with one another through social media networks and advocacy interests.

In addition to the connection that shelter workers had to the Link community, my last findings provide a glimpse at the current state of the Link movement – success in improving awareness and access, challenges to assumptions about the nature of human/nonhuman victimization, and the overall framing of the issue. Of interest to this project is the framing process that has occurred with regard to the "Link" between animal abuse and domestic violence. Pioneering researchers such as Ascione, Arluke, Lockwood, and Arkow provided the framework to connect the spheres of violence from an interdisciplinary approach. Although Ascione's work provided a source of information for some of my respondents, most had established policies that were, for the most part, organic to their own organization. Most of my respondents were aware of the resources located on Allie Phillips' website, and several had personal interactions with Allie herself. As for Allie – her unique position as a web-savvy, media-friendly advocate made her accessible, and her own understanding of the legal side of both domestic violence and animal abuse created a solid base for her to see the practical applications of Link-based theories. Allie

has provided web-based trainings and webinars to assist shelters with improving animal programs and access for clients with animals, which is of particular use to professionals in the field that need to increase their own knowledge base or update their credentials.

As part of this focus on the influence of the Link movement, one of my findings highlights the importance of how activists and academics have framed animal abuse in the context of domestic violence. When the victim is an animal, we assume a lack of agency, a grace of innocence that is not granted to human victims. Adult females, and to an extent older children, are considered to be a part of the "problem" of domestic violence – a problem that resides on the side of the victim. Due to the traditional focus on victims rather than abusers, we have framed the problem with an assumption of responsibility on the part of the victim (Berns 2004). It is therefore the actions of the victim that are argued to be the solution to the problem of domestic violence, and the decision to leave a violent home is viewed at the "right" choice for victims. Respondents were aware of this framing, and one provided a clear example of just how problematic that "choice" is for victims:

> To consider having your best friend have to be treated that way is paramount in one's mind…abusing them. Because they have never had to do that before. We are having to ask them to look at us like we are the abuser…and that isn't right. It is unacceptable. To make them identify with those roles is wrong. I can see why women have chosen to stay in the relationship, because it is unacceptable to have to cross that line into that other place… If you can put yourself in your client's shoes, and feel for a minute what she must be feeling…and have to leave your dog somewhere that isn't with you…that is a horrible feeling because it was by choice. Even if it isn't by choice because you have to survive…but it still feels that way. And so by choice you leave your dog behind with the abuser, God forbid…that is unacceptable in most survivors' minds. (Lea, 40s)

Lea's point highlights an intersection in my findings – the assigned identity of the victim shifts when children and animals are involved, and forces us to frame the abuse as an attack on a family unit, rather than just an individual. To blame the victim, we must see her as such; when

asking why the victim stayed, including the lived experiences of children and animals shifts that identity from "victim" to "protector". This not only shifts the perspective of the audience, it also presents an opportunity to change the discourse used with the client. In this way, we can see abuse as an attack on identity – leaving "innocents" (children and animals) behind is unacceptable to these women – therefore, they remain as protectors and, arguably, demonstrate agency in choosing to do so. When they do have a chance to flee, it is on their terms – by finding an animal-friendly shelter.

Much as Berns addresses the "exploitation" of victims for the use of media framing, so too do advocates use animals in order to frame the topic of victimization of innocents and "family". The moral emotions (Jasper 2011) commonly associated with the social justice field are both intimately experienced by the advocates themselves, and are also used as a form of capital by the advocates, and the larger movements of animal abuse and domestic violence. Much like Clara's mention of the ASPCA commercial eliciting an emotional response from her, these advocates know how to tap into the emotional energy of their audience to bring about increased awareness and resources to further the cause to end human and nonhuman violence.

Human-Animal Studies and "Link" Relevance

Human-animal studies is an evolving, interdisciplinary field. As such, this project approaches the topics of both domestic violence and animal abuse from perspectives that represent the body of knowledge that intersect the with human-animal interactions. Thus, the primary benefit from this research is associated with the intersections of victim framing and social movement advocacy on behalf of both humans and nonhumans. In the following sections I highlight where my research contributes to the current theoretical perspectives regarding victimization and the need for continued improvements to human-animal coalitions.

The "Ideal" Victim

Meyer's (2015) application of the "worthy" and "ideal" victim status to the experiences of the stigma faced by victims of IPV serves as an excellent example of how respondents viewed the identity navigation that their clients engaged in. Including animal-friendly programs and policies enabled more victims to seek services with these organizations, but it also presented a challenge for these shelter workers. Although domestic violence advocacy recognizes the complexity of the relationships involved in intimate partner violence, the general public does not often possess this awareness. Thus, in garnering support for the "innocent" victims of domestic violence (children and animals), shelter workers unintentionally enable a problematic frame. According to Meyer (2015), IPV survivors must meet certain criteria to be viewed as a "worthy and ideal" victim. Included in these conditions are assumptions of relative weakness, blameless behavior prior to victimization, respectable, innocent of provocation, and victimized by the "unknown assailant". Due to the intimate nature of domestic violence, these conditions are almost impossible to meet, in particular due to the fact that the assailant is almost always "known" to the victim, thus framing the victims as less-than ideal. Even in the case of children, there is the potential for the general audience to find fault with the behavior of an adolescent – in theory, they could engage in provocation. Of interest to this research, however, is how this framing does not extend to the nonhuman victims of domestic violence.

Rather than frame nonhuman victimization as problematic, respondents all highlighted the "innocence" of the pets associated with their clients. Even though nonhuman victims do not meet the criteria of the "ideal and worthy" victim noted by Meyer (they are known to the abuser, for example), these animals are granted a special status. While the process of blaming the victim is not unknown to researchers and advocates in the domestic violence field, there has been no systematic focus on the framing of nonhuman victims in the field of human-animal studies.

Indeed, even though respondents occasionally mentioned the behavior of a pet as "protective" of the victim (potentially "provocative" and thus a violation of the above criteria), these nonhuman victims are never seen as "at –fault". In essence, the attempts to reframe domestic violence in the context of the actions of the abuser, thus far met with limited success in the social justice field and movement advocacy, has actually been successful with regard to nonhuman victims.

In addition, the findings in this study suggest that the reconstruction of the identities of the victims, specifically their attempts to navigate the stigma associated with their victimization, is complicated by the presence of pet companions. Decisions to stay, either temporarily or long-term, are complex negotiations of the awareness the victim has of their own risk, the risk to those they love, and their access to resources. Staci provides a clear example of this negotiation, and highlights the need to protect a sense of identity and agency by victims:

> If faced with the decision to leave their pets…their knowledge of what will happen almost places them in the situation of the role of the perpetrator…by leaving the animals – to agree to the abuse that they know will happen. (Staci, 40s)

Staci is describing the role that a victim has accepted – which is part of the coercive power of domestic violence. This is not about "playing the victim" – it is actually about serving as a protector to a cherished companion. Much as victims highlight their role as mothers and caretakers, respondents in this study are aware that the role of "guardian" is shared by both human and nonhuman victims. Narratives of survival are personal stories told by victims, as well as experiences shared with their nonhuman companions. Intentional or otherwise, victims thus become advocates for their pets when they seek out animal-friendly shelters – sharing a potentially unrecognized collective identity with their "animal lover" shelter advocates.

"Link"ed Communities

Domestic violence and animal abuse have been debated and highlighted by overlapping social movements throughout American history. The "public discovery" of domestic violence in the 1970s due to the interest by the battered women's movement shifted the framing of the social problem out of the private sphere into the public one. As I've noted throughout this study, this process has been anything but simple. Resistance faced by advocates and victims regarding the reality of intimate partner violence comes from a social construction of accountability placed on the victims rather than the abuser, and influences how law enforcement, legal services, and community members respond to movement advocates and victims.

Although several of the organizations that I spoke with had a system of formal or informal cross-reporting and coordinated response approach, the majority of my respondents highlighted that there was still a disconnect between community partners and shelter advocates. This disconnect originates in the resistance that domestic violence workers and victims face. When respondents talk about the emphasis that donors or volunteer fosters place on the animals, while "not caring about who owns it", as Verna noted, you are hearing a recognition from shelter workers that although strides have been made in advocating for victims of domestic violence, there is still significant work to be done. As such, the findings in this study indicate that, despite the resistance that occurs, coordinated responses, community partnerships, and cross reporting systems provide a clear advantage for both human and nonhuman victims of domestic violence.

The data from this study lend strength to the findings of the Charlotte Project (Long et. al, 2013). Shelter workers in my study noted the importance of collaboration, and argued that the use of cross-training programs enabled them to be on the same page as law enforcement, animal control, and humane society workers. Much as the Charlotte Project researchers note, shelter workers in my study mentioned that the resistance to implementing a coordinated response

model is less about the belief that it won't provide a significant benefit, but instead about fears of an increase in workload (Long et al, 2013). However, those same shelter workers state that this fear was unfounded – their workload is no more complex or difficult. In addition, the organizations I spoke with that had mandatory cross-reporting and training systems were also the ones that served the most clients – indicating that not only were the wrap-around services benefiting the clients, the model was successfully increasing the awareness of how these spheres of violence were connected.

The strongest support for cross-training and reporting in my findings appears, initially, as simple praise. Respondents noted their support for working with animal control officers in a number of ways – this is, in fact, a sign of a productive and more significant relationship that that which exists with law enforcement. Research on the Link has been challenged (Patterson-Kane and Piper 2009) with regard to the consequences of arguing for mandatory reporting; however, the use of animal abuse as a marker for human violence must be given the recognition it deserves. DeGue and DiLillo's (2009) study on co-occurring violence provides a key point on the significance of animal cruelty in the lives of those also affected by domestic and/or child abuse. Importantly, one of the most significant relationships found by the authors is that animal cruelty is a clear "red flag" for human violence. Although this finding is not "new", as the pioneering researchers in the Link have found – it is important as a potential resource for victim advocates. If respondents praise the work and beneficial partnerships that they have with animal control officers, and we have clear research indicating that animal cruelty can help detect human-based violence, then establishing a collaborative relationship between animal control officers and domestic violence shelters would provide a mechanism to connect these spheres of violence in a beneficial manner. Cross-training and mandatory reporting by animal control officers would

benefit victims of violence by establishing another point of contact between a domestic violence advocate and human and nonhuman victims, maintaining an awareness by law enforcement, but without the potential spike in violence against victims that police response can trigger.

Implications and Future Research

The data from this study suggest that shelter workers in animal-friendly organizations experience similar challenges with regard to providing services for their human and nonhuman clients, and that the success of these programs lies in the ability of these organizations to work with community partners to educate and train both the public and members of the human services field on the link between animal abuse and intimate partner violence. In addition, my findings demonstrate that the identities of these shelter workers as "animal lovers" provides an opportunity to activate a sense of collective identity that can bridge the experiential gaps among victims, advocates, and the general public. Finally, the data highlight the manner in which the framing of domestic violence victims shifts when comparing human victims to nonhuman, "ideal" victims.

Due to the ever-expanding knowledge base of human-animal studies, there is great potential for future research. First, research that addresses the unique challenges of shelters that provide services to primarily rural clients is necessary to capture the importance of access to resources for large-animal rescue and relocation. Although I include Littlegrass Ranch in my study, there is clear need for additional studies that investigate the specific experiences of these organizations and shelters. Second, due to the nature of the sampling I used for my study, my ability to secure a demographically diverse sample of respondents proved difficult. Therefore, more research is needed on how the needs of urban and inner-city shelters differ from those of suburban shelters. Third, Krienert et al. (2012) noted a missing component of their own national

survey that is still absent from mine – the ability to account for animal-friendly programs that utilize protective orders to allow human and nonhuman victims to remain within their own homes. None of the shelters I spoke with utilize such programs, and the collection of this data would enable a more in depth understanding of the importance of protective orders for victims of violence. Finally, there is no current data on the intersection of race and ethnicity as it pertains to pet ownership and domestic violence trends. This research is a necessary component that is needed in order to expand our knowledge of how intersecting patterns of inequality are also associated with access to resources for individuals and families that have pets included in their households. The data in this study indicate that although the Link movement has shown signs of success, there is still a need for additional research on how to implement victim-focused programs and policies.

Conclusion

Sociological interest in human-animal interactions is still evolving. Research involving humans and nonhumans is argued to be similar to other academic interests that walk a fine line between activism and scholarly inquiry; it is the "dirty work" performed by a relatively small, segregated community of individuals (Wilkie 2015). The implications for my research are, therefore, both academic- and advocacy-focused. My findings provide a new application of Einwohner's (1999) research on identity management by animal-rights activists – the "animal lover" identity shared by my respondents does indeed bridge a gap between advocates and victims, and provides a sense of collective identity. In addition, the framing of human and nonhuman victims provides new depth to both the traditional research on the domestic violence movement, as well as initiating a question regarding the "personhood" of animals. If animals are "ideal, worthy victims" (Meyer 2014), then how might that framing be harnessed for the larger

discussion of animal rights and the promotion of the politics of personhood for animals? Finally, my research expands Williamson's (2010) "cage of coercive control" by addressing how the violence against the pets that share space with human victims can contribute to the control over them. It is in this sociological framework – the assigning of meaning to victims, victimizations, and identity – that my project finds the most significance in that it helps to expand upon the previous research. The patterns of experience, perspective, and identity I found with my respondents intersect with the Link movement, but not in the manner I had initially expected. While I approached the topic of the Link through the sociological framework of social movements and identity politics, I soon found that these theories only explain the external workings of the Link as a networked moment of different professions. Instead of finding individuals that were using the Link as a way to guide their decisions and frame their experiences, I found that my respondents expressed a more organic approach to applying their personal and professional histories to supporting their animal-friendly programs and policies. Supporting animals alongside humans was a manifestation of their "animal-lover" identity rather than simply the newest version of "best practices" in their profession. The key to my research was the connection to animals that both my respondents, and the clients that they worked with, shared. Indeed, the importance of inter-species interactions is the heart of this research; arguably, it is also the next frontier for the discipline of sociology to expand beyond the focus of human patterns of behavior and interactions and include the sociology of human-nonhuman interactions as integral to the core of the discipline rather than a separate field of inquiry.

Bibliography

Adams, C.J. 1994. "Bringing peace home: A feminist philosophical perspective on the abuse of women, children, and pet animals." *Hypatia* 9:63-84.

Allen, Nicole E., Deborah I. Bybee, and Cris M. Sullivan. 2004. "Battered Women's Multitude of Needs: Evidence Supporting the Need for Comprehensive Advocacy." *Violence Against Women* 10(9): 1015-1035.

Anderson, W.P., C.M. Reid and G.L. Jennings. 1992. "Pet ownership and risk factors for cardiovascular disease." *Medical Journal of Australia* 157: 298-301.

Andrews, Kenneth T. and Bob Edwards. 2004. "Advocacy Organizations in the U.S. Political Process". *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 30: pp. 479-506.

Arkow, P. 1996. "The relationship between animal abuse and other forms of family violence." *Family Violence and Sexual Assault* Bulletin 12: 29-34.

--------. 1999. "The Evolution of Animal Welfare as a Human Welfare Concern." In F. Ascione & P. Arkow (Eds.), *Child abuse, domestic violence, and animal abuse : linking the circles of compassion for prevention and intervention* (pp. 19-35). Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Arluke, Arnold. 2006. *Just a Dog: Understanding Animal Cruelty and Ourselves.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

--------. 2002. "Animal Abuse as Dirty Play." *Symbolic Interaction* 25:405–431.

Arluke, A., Levin, J., Luke, C., & Ascione, F. 1999. "The relationship of animal abuse to violence and other forms of antisocial behavior." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14: 963-975.

Arnold, Gretchen. 2011. "The Impact of Social Ties on Coalition Strength and Effectiveness: The Case of the Battered Women's Movement in St. Louis." *Social Movement Studies* 10(2): 131-150.

Ascione, F.R. 1998. "Battered women's reports of their partners' and their children's cruelty to animals." *Journal of Emotional Abuse* 1: 119-133.

Ascione, F. R. 2000. *Safe Haven for Pets: Guidelines for programs sheltering pets for women who are battered.* Logan, UT: Author. Retrieved October 12, 2012, from http://www.vachss.com/guest_dispatches/ascione_safe_havens.pdf.

Ascione, F.R., Weber, C.V., & Wood, D.S. 1997a. "The abuse of animals and domestic violence: A national survey of shelters for women who are battered." *Society and Animals* 5: 205-218.

Ascione, F. R., & Shapiro, K. (2009). "People and animals, kindness and cruelty: Research directions and policy implications." *Journal of Social Issues,* 65(3): 569 – 587.

Ascione, Frank R., Claudia V. Wber, Teresa M. Thompson, John Heath, Mika Maruyama, and Kentaro Hayshi. 2007. "Battered Pets and Domestic Violence: Animal Abuse Reported by Women Experiencing Intimate Violence and by Nonabused Women." *Violence Against Women* 13(4): 354-373.

Babbie, Earl. 2002. The Basics of Social Research, 2nd ed. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.

Batson, K., B. McCabe, M.M. Baun and C. Wilson, C. 1997. "The effect of a therapy dog on socialization and physiological indicators of stress in persons diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease." In C. C.Wilson & D. C. Turner (Eds.), *Companion animals in human health* (pp. 203-215). London: Sage.

Baun, Mara M. and Barbara W. McCabe. 2003. "Companion Animals and Persons With Dementia of the Alzheimer's Type." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 42-51.

Beck, Alan M. and Aaron Katcher. 2003. "Future directions in human-animal bond research." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 79-93.

Beers, Diane L. 2006. *For the Prevention of Cruelty*. Athens: Swallow Press/Ohio University Press.

Berns, Nancy S. 2004. *Framing the Victim: Domestic Violence Media and Social Problems*. Aldine Transaction Press.

Birke, Lynda. 2002. "Intimate Familiarities? Feminism and Human-Animal Studies". *Society & Animals* 10 (4): 431-436.

Browne, Angela. 2004. "Fear and the Perception of Alternatives: Asking "Why Battered Women Don't Leave" Is The Wrong Question." Pp.343-359 in *The Criminal Justice System and Women, vol.3*, edited by Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff. New York: McGraw Hill.

Bryant, Antony and Kathy Charmaz (Eds). 2007. *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. SAGE Publications.

Boat, B.W. 1995. "The relationship between violence to children and violence to animals: An ignored link?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 10: 229-235.

Catanzaro, Thomas E. 2003. "Human-Animal Bond and Secondary Prevention." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 40-41.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

DeGue, Sarah and David DiLillo. 2009. "Is Animal Cruelty a "Red Flag" for Family Violence? Investigating Co-Occurring Violence Toward Children, Partners, and Pets." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24(6): 1036-1056.

della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow (Eds.). 2004. *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Rowman & Littlefield Publications.

DeMello, Margo. 2012. *Animals and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Eddy, J., L. Hart and R.P. Boltz. 1988. "The effects of service dogs on social acknowledgements of people in wheelchairs." *Journal of Psychology* 122: 39-44.

Edwards, Bob & John D. McCarthy. 2004. "Strategy Matters: The Contingent Value of Social Capital in the Survival of Local Social Movement Organizations". *Social Forces.* 83:2 621-651.

Edwards, N.E. and A.M. Beck, A.M. 2002. "Animal-assisted therapy and nutrition in Alzheimer's disease." *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 24(6): 697-712.

Einwohner, Rachel L. 1999. "Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns." *Gender and Society* 13(1): 56-76.

Filiatre, J. C., J.L. Millot and H. Montagner. 1983. "New findings on communication behaviour between the young child and his pet dog." In *The human-pet relationship: International symposium on the occasion of the 80th birthday of Nobel Prize Winner Prof. Dr. Konrad Lorenz* (pp. 50- 57). Vienna: IEMT.

Fitzgerald, Amy J. 2005. "Animal abuse and family violence : researching the interrelationships of abusive power." *Animals in Society* 48: 213-224.

Flynn, C.P. 2000a. "Battered women and their animal companions: Symbolic interaction between human and nonhuman animals." *Society & Animals* 49: 87-95.

------. 2000. "Woman's Best Friend: Pet Abuse and the Role of Companion Animals in the Lives of Battered Women." *Violence Against Women* 6(2): 162-177.

-----. 2012. *Understanding Animal Abuse: A Sociological Analysis*. New York: Lantern Books.

Fox, Mitchell. 1999. "Treating Serious Animal Abuse as a Serious Crime." In F. Ascione & P. Arkow (Eds.), *Child abuse, domestic violence, and animal abuse : linking the circles of compassion for prevention and intervention* (pp. 306-3315). Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Francione, Gary L. 1995. *Animals, property, and the law*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 1999. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation." In Larry Ray and Andrew Sayer (Eds.), *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn* (pp. 25-52). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Friedman, E. A.H. Katcher J.J. Lynch and S.A. Thomas. 1980. "Animal companions and one-year survival of patients after discharge from a coronary care unit." *Public Health Reports* 95: 307-312.

Friedman, E. and S.A. Thomas. 1995. "Pet ownership, social support, and one-year survival after acute myocardial infarction in the cardiac arrhythmia suppression trial (CAST)." *American Journal of Cardiology* 76: 1213-1217.

Furst, Gennifer. 2006. "Prison-Based Animals Programs: A National Survey." *The Prison Journal*.

Gilson, S.F. and E. DePoy. 2002. "Theoretical approaches to disability content in social work education." *Journal of Social Work Education* 38(1): 153-165.

Granados, Francisco J. and David Knoke. 2005. "Organized Interest Groups and Policy Networks". In T. Janoski, R. Alford, A. Hicks, & M. Schwartz (Eds.) *The Handbook or Political Sociology* (pp. 287-309). Cambridge University Press.

Grant, Anne. 1999. "Resistance to the Link at a Domestic Violence Shelter." In F. Ascione & P. Arkow (Eds.), *Child abuse, domestic violence, and animal abuse : linking the circles of compassion for prevention and intervention* (pp. 159-175). Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Hart, Stephen. 1996. "The cultural dimension of social movements: a theoretical assessment and literature review". *Sociology of Religion.* 57:1 87-101.

Hensley, Christopher and Suzanne E. Tallichet. 2005. "Animal Cruelty Motivations: Assessing Demographic and Situational Influences." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20(11): 1429-1443.

Hines, Linda M. 2003. "Historical Perspectives on the Human-Animal Bond." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 7-15.

Irvine, Leslie. 2004. *If You Tame Me.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jasper, James M. and Dorothy Nelkin. 1992. *The animal rights crusade: the growth of a moral protest.* New York: Free Press.

Jasper, James M. 2011. "Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research". *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 285-304.

Johnson, M. P. and Leone, J. M. 2005. "The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence findings from the national violence against women survey". *Journal of family issues*, *26*(3): 322-349.

Johnson, Rebecca A., Richard L. Meadows, Jennifer S. Haubner, and Kathy Sevedge. 2003. "A Complimentary/Alternative Medical (CAM) Intervention for Cancer Patients." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 55-69.

Jorgensen, S., & Maloney, L. 1999. "Animal abuse and the victims of domestic violence." In F. Ascione & P. Arkow (Eds.), *Child abuse, domestic violence, and animal abuse : linking the circles of compassion for prevention and intervention* (pp. 143-158). Indiana: Purdue University Press.

Kelly, J. B. and Johnson, M. P. 2008. "Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions". *Family Court Review*, *46*(3): 476-499.

Kogan, Lori R., Sherry McConnell, Regina Schoenfeld-Tacher, and Pia Jansen-Lock. 2004. "Crosstails: A Unique Foster Program to Provide Safety for Pets of Women in Safehouses." *Violence Against Women* 10(4):418-434.

Krienert, Jessie L., Jeffrey A. Walsh, Kevin Matthews, and Kelly McConkey. 2012. "Examining the Nexus Between Domestic Violence and Animal Abuse in a National Sample of Service Providers." *Violence and Victims* 27(2): 280-295.

Lai, J. 1998. *Literature Review: Pet Facilitated Therapy in Correctional Institutions*. Prepared for Correctional Services of Canada by Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Women. Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service Canada.

Lea, Suzanne R. Goodney. 2007. *Delinquency and Animal Cruelty: Myths and Realities about Social Pathology*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Lehrner, Amy and Nicole E. Allen. 2009. "Still a Movement After All These Years? Current Tensions in the Domestic Violence Movement." Violence Against Women 15(6): 656-677.

Long, Dennis D. and Shanti J. Kulkarni. 2013. "Cross-reporting of Interpersonal Violence and Animal Cruelty: The Charlotte Report." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 40(4): 131-148.

Marcus, Sharon. 2010. "Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words: A Theory and Politics of Rape Prevention." In Carole R. McCann and Sueng-kyung Kim (Eds.) *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (pp. 431-445). New York: Routledge.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970. 2d. ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Melson, Gail F. 2003. "Child Development and the Human-Companion Animal Bond" *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(1): 31-39.

Meyer, Silke. 2015. "Still Blaming the Victim of Intimate Partner Violence? Women's Narratives of Victim Resistance and Redemption when Seeking Support." *Theoretical Criminology* 19 (2): 1-16.

Murray, Susan B. 1988. "The Unhappy Marriage of Theory and Practice: An Analysis of a Battered Women's Shelter." *NWSA Journal* 1(1): 75-92.

National Institutes of Health. (NIH) 1988. *Health benefits of pets: Summary of working group*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

O, Toole, Laura L., Jessica Schiffman, and Margie Kiter Edwards. 2007. *Gender Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. 2d. ed. New York: New York University Press.

Patterson-Kane, Emily and Heather Piper. 2009. "Animal Abuse as a Sentinel for Human Violence: A Critique". *Journal of Social Issues* 65 (3): 589-614.

Peek, Charles W., Nancy J. Bell, and Charlotte C. Dunham. 1996. "Gender, Gender Ideology, and Animal Rights Advocacy." *Gender and Society* 10(4): 464-478.

Serpell, J. 1991. "Beneficial effects of pet ownership on some aspects of human health and behaviour." *Journal Royal Society Medicine* 84: 717-720.

----------. 2009. "Having Our Dogs and Eating Them Too: Why Animals Are a Social Issue". *Journal of Social Issues* 65 (3): 633-644.

Stacey, Judith. 1988. "Can there be a feminist ethnography?" *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11: 21-27.

Terrance, Cheryl, Karyn Plumm, and Betsi Little. 2008. "Maternal Blame: Battered Women and Abused Children." *Violence Against Women* 14(8): 870-885.

The Humane Society of the Unites States. 2007. "Pet Protection". *Allanimals,* 9(4): 13.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1998. *Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends, and Girlfriends.* Washington, DC.

Vaughn, Mary and Glen H. Stamp. 2003. "The Empowerment Dilemma: The Dialectic of Emancipation and Control in Staff/Client Interaction at Shelters for Battered Women." *Communication Studies* 54 (2): 154-168.

Wheeler, Evangeline and Margaret Faulkner. 2015. "The "Pet Effect": Physiological Calming in the Presence of Canines." *Society & Animals* 23 (1):1-14.

Wilkie, Rhoda. 2015. "Academic "Dirty Work": Mapping Scholarly Labor in a Tainted Mixed-Species Field." *Society & Animals* 23(2): 211-230.

Williamson, Emma. 2010. "Living in the World of the Domestic Violence Perpetrator: Negotiating the Unreality of Coercive Control". *Violence Against Women* 16 (12): 1412-1423.

Wisch, Rebecca F. 2011. "Domestic Violence and Pets: List of States that Include Pets in Protective Orders." Animal Legal and Historical Center, Michigan State University College of Law. Retrieved at www.animallaw.info/articles/ovusdomesticviolencelaws.htm.

Appendix A - Respondents

Name	Age Range	Region	Years with Organization
Shannon	30s	Midwest	7
Kristy	50s	Southwest	4
Doug	40s	Southwest	4
Wendy	40s	Southwest	4
Mark	40s	Southwest	4
David	40s	Southwest	4
Scott	40s	Southwest	3
Cheryl	50s	Southwest	3
Valerie	40s	Midwest	10
Jennie	20s	Northwest	4
Elizabeth	40s	Midwest	19
Patty	30s	Midwest	14
Carmen	40s	Midwest	14
Colleen	50s	Midwest	16
Maya	30s	South	6
Ann	30s	South	17
Matt	30s	West Coast	9
Jamie	40s	Midwest	18
Staci	40s	Northwest	12
Lea	40s	Northwest	8

Lisa	40s	Northwest	20
Claudia	30s	Northeast	2
Jeanette	30s	Southwest	15
Marci	40s	South	13
Tonya	40s	Midwest	12
Carol	50s	South	10
Vickie	40s	Southeast	18
Angie	30s	Midwest	5
LaShawnda	30s	Northwest	17
Alisa	20s	Southwest	1
Allie	40s	Northeast	15

Appendix B - Interview Schedule

Work and educational background:

1. When did you first decide you were interested in working/volunteering for a women's shelter? Tell me about how you came to this occupation.

2. Did you have any other jobs in community services before you ended up here at your current job? If so, can you describe them for me?

3. Describe your educational experience. Did you attend college? What was it like? What types of classes did you take? What other forms of training (formal or informal) have you had?

4. Do you think your previous training and education adequately prepared you for the job? Please explain.

Shelter background:

1. What is the history of this shelter/organization? Who started it? How big is it?

2. How long has this location had a human-animal program? Why was it started? What issues have come up from this program?

3. Have any of your animal-friendly policies or programs been informed by the Link? If so, which trainings/people have you used?

General work environment:

      Workplace/job:

1. Can you please describe a typical day on the job? What are your duties/tasks at work? Where do you spend most of your time? Do you enjoy these duties?

2. Can you describe the history of this shelter? How long has it been around? Do you enjoy working here?

Interaction with coworkers:

3. How many people work in the shelter? How long have they been employed/volunteering here? Do people generally work here for a long time?

4. What is the overall work environment like? Do people get along with one another and the individuals staying at the shelter?

Division of labor in the shelter:

5. How are jobs/duties in your office split up or assigned? Are certain people better at certain jobs than others? Why?

6. Do the occupants engage in labor within the shelter?

Interaction with families:

7. How many women/families do you serve per month? How long do most stay?

8. Who generally deals with the intake procedure? Walk me through a typical interaction with a woman/family. What does this involve? How do you talk to them? How do you interact with them?

9. What is a typical procedure for women/families leaving the shelter?

10. What is the hardest part about interacting with families who have recently left an abusive/dangerous situation? The most rewarding thing?

11. Have you ever had any negative experiences with women/families that you've worked with? If so, please describe this experience. What about positive experiences?

Working with human victims:

12. What is it like working with victims/survivors of violence? Describe the skills needed to negotiate this type of interaction and environment. Where did you learn how to do this? What do you like/dislike about this task?

13. How do you think the general public perceives victims/survivors? Do you think that women are treated differently from children in this perception? Have you found your own perceptions to have changed? How do people generally react when you tell them what your job is?

Working with non-human victims:

14. What is it like working with the non-human survivors? Describe the skills needed to handle these interactions. Do you work with the animals personally, or are you associated with an animal rescue group?

15. How do you think the general public perceives non-human victims/survivors? Do you think that the general public understands the connections between the violence against humans, and the violence against animals? Did you expect to have non-human victims as part of this community service?

Closing questions:

16. What are the most rewarding aspects of your job? What aspects would you like to change or improve?

17. If you had to do it all over again, would you still want to work/volunteer at a women's shelter?

18. Anything else you'd like to talk about/add?

Appendix C - Coding Tree

Nodes
Nodes\\animal lovers
      Nodes\\animal lovers\horse people
Nodes\\animals as therapy
Nodes\\animals
      Nodes\\animals\birds
      Nodes\\animals\exotics
      Nodes\\animals\ferrets
      Nodes\\animals\dogandcats
      Nodes\\animals\horses
Nodes\\clients
      Nodes\\clients\animals as innocent
      Nodes\\clients\bravery
      Nodes\\clients\children
            Nodes\\clients\children\adjusting to shelter
            Nodes\\clients\children\innocent
      Nodes\\clients\demographics
      Nodes\\clients\horror stories
      Nodes\\clients\rural
      Nodes\\clients\stigma
      Nodes\\clients\success stories
      Nodes\\clients\tough love
      Nodes\\clients\want to be with pet
      Nodes\\clients\what they need
      Nodes\\clients\why they stay
Nodes\\community education
      Nodes\\community education\focus on pets
      Nodes\\community education\focus on women
      Nodes\\community education\public awareness of Link
Nodes\\control over clients
Nodes\\funding
      Nodes\\funding\grants
      Nodes\\funding\grants\PAWS
      Nodes\\funding\grassroot
      Nodes\\funding\private
      Nodes\\grassroots
Nodes\\leaving
      Nodes\\leaving\conflicted
      Nodes\\leaving\ready to leave

Nodes\\LINK
      Nodes\\LINK\organic knowledge

Nodes\\LINK\people
    Nodes\\LINK\people\allie phillips
    Nodes\\LINK\people\ascione
Nodes\\network connections
    Nodes\\network connections\animal control
    Nodes\\network connections\animal shelters
    Nodes\\network connections\law enforcement
    Nodes\\network connections\legal
    Nodes\\network connections\other orgs
    Nodes\\network connections\public
    Nodes\\network connections\publicity
    Nodes\\network connections\social media
    Nodes\\network connections\tensions
    Nodes\\network connections\university
    Nodes\\network connections\vets
Nodes\\Origin
    Nodes\\Origin\founder
    Nodes\\Origin\individual experience
        Nodes\\Origin\individual experience\victim
        Nodes\\Origin\individual experience\work related
    Nodes\\Origin\unofficial
Nodes\\procedure
    Nodes\\procedure\intake
    Nodes\\procedure\shelter rules
    Nodes\\procedure\staff allowed pet interaction
Nodes\program model
    Nodes\\program model\boarding
    Nodes\\program model\breed restrictions
    Nodes\\program model\in room housing
    Nodes\\program model\onsite kennels
    Nodes\\program model\residential complex with animals
    Nodes\\program model\shelter allow staff animals
Nodes\\respondents
    Nodes\\respondents\burn out
    Nodes\\respondents\education
    Nodes\\respondents\management
    Nodes\\respondents\relationship to own animals
Nodes\\secrecy

Appendix D - IRB Consent Form

Informed Consent Statement

1. **Name of Researcher**: Principal Investigator: Robert Schaeffer, Professor of Sociology, Kansas State University, Co-Investigator: Andrea Button, Graduate Student, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, Kansas State University

2. **Title of Study:** The Rescuers: Intersections of Individual and Group Activism and the Origin of the Human-Animal "Link"

3. **Objectives of Study**: The focus of this study is on the experiences of individuals that helped to establish the information and policies on the animal-friendly programs that have been implemented in family violence shelters in the past few years. The point of interest for my study is (1) how these shelters initially dealt with this issue, (2) how they have evolved in their policies and programs to respond to this complex issue, and (3) why have individuals associated with victim protection and advocacy made the decision to take on the sheltering of animals in addition to their human companions?

4. **Description and purpose of procedures**: The research involves interviews with individuals who are employed or volunteer at family shelters throughout the United States, but is limited to individuals that have been part of the decision-making process of including animal-friendly programs. There is one interview per person, and the interview will last approximately 45-60 minutes. With your permission, I will tape record this interview. The questions asked throughout the interview will involve basic demographic information, questions regarding your everyday work experiences, information about your professional training, and the history or your location. The information will then be used to better understand the working dynamics within family shelters that have modified their policies or physical structures to include the animal victims of violence.

5. **Use of results**: Data collected will be used for a PhD dissertation. The data may be presented

at professional meetings or published in sociological journals. Should this research prove beneficial to other shelters that intend to incorporate animal-friendly policies, the data may be made available if permission has been given. Your name will never be used in any published or unpublished report unless you have expressly granted permission, and locations used in the study will be stripped of all identifiable information.

6. The risks and discomforts: The questions I will ask are related to the origins of the animal-friendly programs, and the experiences of day to day work and network connections. I do not anticipate that the interview will create emotional distress beyond the normal level experienced during your working hours. If you are uncomfortable at any time you may end the interview.

7. Possible benefits to you or to others from participating in this study: Being interviewed may offer you a time to reflect on personal experiences and feelings about your job and working in the funeral industry. Your participation in this research will also contribute to the study of human-animal interactions and domestic violence within sociology.

8. Reducing potential risk: You may terminate your participation in this study at any time. Your name will never be used in any published or unpublished report based on this study without your expressed consent. With your permission, I will tape record our interview, but I will keep this recording separate from this consent form at all times. The tape will be erased immediately after it is transcribed.

9. Debriefing: The main purpose of this study is to gain greater insight into the everyday experiences of people who work at domestic violence shelters that have incorporated animal-friendly programs. The information gathered here will be used for a PhD dissertation at Kansas State University. In the future, I may present a paper from this research at sociological meetings. If you would like, I can give you a copy of the completed research.

10. Rights as a research participant: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may **REFUSE** to participate at any time without penalty. If you have any questions regarding this interview, please contact me, Andrea Button, at XXXXXXXXX or aljones@ksu.edu. If you have questions about the research project, you should contact the professor supervising the project, Robert Schaeffer, at XXXXXXXX or XXXXX@ksu.edu. Questions about the role of the university or your rights as a participant in this research should be directed to Rick Scheidt, Chair, Institutional Review Board, Kansas State University, (785) 532-3224.

Signed Consent Portion – TO BE RETAINED BY INTERVIEWEE

I understand my role in the study "The Rescuers: Intersections of Individual and Group Activism and the Origin of the Human-Animal "Link" as explained to me. I consent to participate in this study, and my participation is completely voluntary. I understand that the research information given during interviews is strictly confidential and that my identity will not be exposed in any reports. I understand and I can stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty or prejudice.

_____   _____
  (Respondent Signature)   (Date)

_____   _____
  (Researcher Signature)   (Date)

===

Signed Consent Portion – TO BE RETAINED BY RESEARCHER

I understand my role in the study "The Rescuers: Intersections of Individual and Group Activism and the Origin of the Human-Animal "Link"" as explained to me. I consent to participate in this study, and my participation is completely voluntary. I understand that the research information given during interviews is strictly confidential and that my identity will not be exposed in any reports. I understand and I can stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty or prejudice.

_____   _____

   (Respondent Signature)   (Date)

_____   _____

   (Researcher Signature)   (Date)

****Location may change. The corresponding information for the appropriate facility will be added prior to interview.