

The Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy
Animal Studies Repository

2016

Exploring Attitudes Toward Euthanasia Among Shelter Workers and Volunteers in Japan and the U.S.

Maho Cavalier
Humane Society University

Follow this and additional works at: http://animalstudiesrepository.org/hsu_students

 Part of the [Animal Studies Commons](#), [Bioethics and Medical Ethics Commons](#), and the [Other Veterinary Medicine Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cavalier, Maho, "Exploring Attitudes Toward Euthanasia Among Shelter Workers and Volunteers in Japan and the U.S." (2016). *Student Thesis and Capstone Projects*. 3.
http://animalstudiesrepository.org/hsu_students/3

This Thesis or Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Humane Society Institute for Science and Policy. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of the Animal Studies Repository. For more information, please contact eyahner@humanesociety.org.

Exploring Attitudes Toward Euthanasia Among Shelter Workers and Volunteers in Japan and
the U.S.

Maho Cavalier

Humane Society University

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Foreward.....	5
Introduction.....	6
Euthanasia of Companion Animals: International Guidelines.....	8
Euthanasia of Companion Animals: US Guidelines.....	10
Euthanasia: Perspectives from Western Philosophers.....	11
The Use and Definition of the Term “Euthanasia” in Japan.....	13
Methods Used for Euthanasia in the US and Japan.....	15
Shelter Statistics and Euthanasia.....	20
No-Kill Movement.....	23
Literature Review.....	25
Attitudes toward Euthanasia.....	26
The Effect of Euthanasia on the Shelter Workers Perform Euthanasia.....	28
Research Methods.....	34
Participants.....	34
Data Collection.....	36
Data Analysis.....	37
Timeline.....	39
Results.....	40
When is Euthanasia Necessary and What is Suffering?.....	59
Conclusion.....	61
Appendix A: Participant Information.....	69
Appendix B: Individual Interview Data.....	70
References.....	76

Abstract

Conflicts between foreign and Japanese volunteers concerning decisions to euthanize animals that are in terminal condition were noted during anecdotal observation by this author at a Japanese animal rescue shelter. Thus, this research was undertaken to explore attitudes of shelter staff in Japan. As a point of comparison, U. S. shelter workers were also interviewed. Twenty current or former shelter workers (16 participants from Japan and 4 participants from the U.S.), ranging in age from 20 to 65, were interviewed. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with the Japanese participants; e-mail and/or Skype were used to conduct the interviews with the participants living in the U.S. Grounded theory was employed to analyze the interview data.

The analysis suggested that euthanasia is a difficult and emotional process for all of the participants, and many of them have experienced the "Caring-Killing Paradox" (Arluke, 1994; Arluke & Sanders, 1996; Reeves et al., 2005.) Both Japanese and U.S. participants indicated that euthanasia is a humane option to eliminate prolonged suffering of animals, and when their quality of life is greatly diminished. Most of them agree that euthanizing animals for space and behavioral reasons may not be fair and should be avoided.

There is a subtle yet notable characteristic among Japanese participants. They seem to be rather unsure about euthanasia in practice, while agreeing with and understanding its principle of eliminating suffering. This became more apparent when it comes to their pets. In short, it seems that there was some disparity between what they believe and what they actually do. In contrast, participants in the U.S. seemed to express, with confidence, that euthanasia is a humane option in certain cases for both shelter and owned companion animals. More research is needed to determine what influences this subtle difference, if it stems from cultural, religious or other factors.

Foreward

The author used to volunteer at a companion animal shelter in Tokyo that houses over 50 dogs, small to large, young to old. In 2014, the shelter informed volunteers that they were facing financial problems. In response to the situation, a group of the shelter volunteers, including Japanese and non-Japanese (three Americans, one Australian, one French, and two Japanese including the author) gathered and formed a group to strategize ways to help the shelter. In the course of the efforts, the group found out that their greatest cost is for veterinary care, which includes the care of terminally ill dogs that are in irreversible conditions. The group advocated strongly for euthanizing the terminally ill dogs, not because they have less value, but because the medical cost is hurting the shelter and also they thought that they have been getting unnecessary medical treatments to keep them alive despite their obviously terminal conditions and obvious suffering. However, the owner and the primary shelter staff have devoted themselves to the shelter's "no-kill" policy over the past 10-15 years; therefore, they strongly disagreed with euthanizing any terminally ill animals even if those animals were suffering and had no chance of recovery. They also stated that, "miracles could happen." The difference in attitudes between the Japanese shelter staff and the foreign volunteers at this same shelter was striking. Therefore, this research was undertaken to

explore attitudes of shelter staff in Japan. As a point of comparison, U. S. shelter workers were also interviewed.

While this debate about euthanizing shelter dogs was in full brew in this shelter in Japan, on the other side of the Pacific, the debate about euthanasia was making headlines due to the case of Brittney Maynard. Brittney Maynard was a young woman who chose to end her life via a physician-assisted euthanasia in Oregon. Ms. Maynard made the decision to end her own life as a result of suffering from terminal brain cancer.

In Oregon, there is “Death with Dignity Act” that allows terminally ill Oregonians to end their lives through the voluntary self-administration of lethal medication (Oregon Government, 2015). The 29-year-old newlywed Maynard committed voluntary euthanasia on November 1, 2014. The news of Brittany’s decision sparked debate on euthanasia in America and also in Japan. The ongoing debate about euthanasia at the shelter and the case of Maynard in Oregon led the author to explore the topic of euthanasia, especially for owned companion animals. The questions that came to mind: how is euthanasia of owned companion animals viewed by the general public and shelter staff/volunteers in Japan? and how are these views different from those in the United States?

Introduction

There is little research on the attitudes toward euthanasia of companion animals in Japan. Anecdotal evidence seems to suggest that attitudes among the Japanese are different than those attitudes of natives of other first world countries. It was the author's experience that the Japanese staff and volunteers at the shelter mentioned above believe that euthanasia is morally wrong because it is an act of "killing." They also have expressed that they believe that euthanizing animals goes against nature and is a disrespectful and immoral action. In contrast, volunteers at this same shelter who are from Western countries believe that euthanasia is a way to help animals who are suffering, and is in fact, a way to respect the lives of animals.

In this particular Japanese shelter, there was a clear division between those who are opposed to euthanasia and those who recognize euthanasia as a tool that might be used to end suffering. However, there is some evidence that indicates that there are shades of gray on the issue of euthanasia of companion animals. This study explored attitudes about euthanasia of companion animals. Specifically, this author was interested in exploring any possible differences between Japanese and American attitudes toward euthanasia in a shelter setting. This study also explored cultural components that may influence attitudes toward euthanasia in Japan and in the United States (US). This exploration was conducted via a search of the

literature on euthanasia and interviews conducted with shelter workers and volunteers in Japan and in the US.

Euthanasia of Companion Animals: International Guidelines

The International Companion Animal Management Coalition (ICAM) is comprised of: the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), the Humane Society International (HSI), the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), the International Arm of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA International), the World Small Animals Veterinary Association (WSAVA), and the Alliance for Rabies Control (ARC). ICAM published a guideline entitled, “The Welfare Basis for Euthanasia of Dogs and Cats and Policy Development” to be used by any public, private or charitable organization, agency or individual with responsibility for a program of work involving dogs or cats (ICAM, 2015). This guideline was created to provide a clear and agreed upon philosophy on the management of companion animals, including euthanasia, for the people and public who closely work and live with animals. ICAM recognized that euthanasia is sometimes an inevitable ending for companion animals, from an animal welfare perspective. When the suffering of an animal cannot be effectively reduced or prevented, humanely ending the life of the suffering animal may be considered the best course of action for the

animal (ICAM, 2015).

The word “euthanasia” originated in the Greek words “eu” meaning good and “thanatos” meaning death (AVMA, 2013, p.6). In general, the use of the word euthanasia, whether it is for humans or animals, is to release individuals with terminally ill or prolonging pains, whose physical or mental conditions are irreversible and facing death, from suffering.

In the case of non-human animals, the common understanding is that ending the life of animals should be as humane as possible. However, animal organizations and groups set their own definitions and categories of euthanasia. In addition, the term “humane” is a vague term, and its interpretation differs from one organization to another. What is “humane” should be further defined. Generally, people tend to rest their thoughts on the word “euthanasia” without knowing that there are differences in “euthanasia”. In some situations, euthanizing perfectly healthy animals is done for human convenience. For such killing, it is questionable if it is appropriate to apply the term “euthanasia” (good-death). Killing of healthy animals should be differentiated from euthanizing terminally ill animals who have no hope for recovery. For this project, the general term euthanasia is used to describe the deliberate ending of the life of an animal whether that is to end the suffering of the animal or for another reason. It is important to acknowledge that there are ongoing discussions on the application

of the term euthanasia to animals, especially healthy animals; for this reason, the following section briefly describes the types of euthanasia used by different organization and individuals.

Euthanasia of Companion Animals: US Guidelines

The American Veterinary Medicine Association (AVMA) (2013) established the Panel of Euthanasia (POE) in 1963. The POE developed euthanasia guidelines for veterinarians. According to the AVMA “the term euthanasia is usually used to describe ending the life of an individual animal in a way that minimizes or eliminates pain and distress. A good death is tantamount to the humane termination of an animal’s life” (AVMA, 2013, p.6). The veterinarians’ duty in carrying out euthanasia includes 1) his or her humane disposition to induce death in a manner that is in accord with an animal’s interest and/or because it is a matter of welfare, and 2) the use of humane techniques to induce the most rapid and painless and distress-free death possible (AVMA, 2013).

In its Euthanasia Reference Manual, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) (HSUS, 2013, p.1) points out that: “Euthanasia involves more than ending an animal’s life. It is a process that combines compassion and scientific consideration while providing each animal with a death that is free of pain and stress.” The HSUS sets five basic elements as

requirements for “humane” euthanasia, 1) compassion, 2) knowledge, 3) technical skills developed through training and experience, 4) appropriate application of the most state-of-the-art drugs, equipment, and techniques available, and 5) wisdom to know when euthanasia should, and should not, be performed (HSUS, 2013).

Euthanasia: Perspectives from Western Philosophers

A utilitarian philosopher, Peter Singer (1993) uses the terms “voluntary euthanasia,” “involuntary euthanasia,” and “non-voluntary euthanasia.” Voluntary euthanasia is euthanasia carried out at the request of the person killed where the person killed has ability to consent to his or her own death. According to Singer, involuntary euthanasia is only permissible when the motive of the person doing the killing intends to prevent unbearable suffering for the person killed. In the case of involuntary euthanasia the person who is killed is conscious and has ability to consent but does not wish to die (Singer, 1993); so as long as the intent of the killer is to prevent suffering, Singer sees involuntary euthanasia as legitimate. In other words, the important element is the intention of the killer, because according to Singer, an involuntary euthanasia committed when the killer does not think that killing benefits the person being killed is, in fact, murder. Singer goes on to explain that non-voluntary euthanasia is when someone does not have ability to consent, for example due

to his or her sickness, injuries or age, and the euthanasia is carried out to save the person from suffering (Singer, 1993). Singer states that in case of euthanasia used upon infants and non-human animals, they are both sentient beings but not rational or self-conscious, thus it will be non-voluntary euthanasia. (Singer, 1993).

Another philosopher, Tom Regan (2004) divides euthanasia into two types, active euthanasia and passive euthanasia. Regan (2004) says that, in the case of non-human animals, only active euthanasia will be applied, and there is no passive termination of their lives. Regan also intentionally excludes “involuntary euthanasia”, because the type of euthanasia is killing others against their will, which means that it is a murder (Regan, 2004). According to Regan (2004) active euthanasia may be voluntary or non-voluntary. For animals, there will not be voluntary euthanasia, as voluntary euthanasia involves that killing is done according to the interests and desires of the individual killed. For the case of animals, we cannot know the interest of them and cannot get consent from them about their desire for death. Regan (2004) adds two new categories for animals, “preference-respecting euthanasia” and “paternalistic euthanasia”. When animals are suffering from prolonged pain due to their illness, it is generally understood that animals are aware of their pain, and they would like to get rid of the pain as much as possible; in other words, this is the animal’s preference. Therefore,

euthanizing animals in irreversibly terminal conditions is “preference-respecting euthanasia” (Regan, 2004, p.114). Animals do not have a concept of their own long-term good, thus they cannot have a preference for the future. However, we as humans know when terminating their lives is a way to end when their condition will not improve; if we decide to euthanize them for their own good then this will be “paternalistic euthanasia” (Regan, 2004, p.114).

The difference between the two is we paternalistically end an animal’s life, when we believe that the animal has no possibility of future quality of life. We preference-respecting euthanize animals when they are in great pain right now.

Regan defines paternalistic euthanasia as euthanasia that is practiced when an animal’s foreseeable future is not hopeful for the animal, and it is clear that the animal will suffer. Regan (2013) makes a very important point: he states that destroying healthy animals to make space or to deal with their behavioral issues is outside of the idea of “euthanasia”, as such killing is not at all “good death”.

The Use and Definition of the Term “Euthanasia” in Japan

Euthanasia for humans is illegal in Japan, and there is no central or integrated definition of euthanasia for humans, let alone for animals. The organization in Japan that advocates for human “death with dignity” is the Japan Society for Dying with Dignity

(JSDD), founded in 1976. The JSDD's definition of euthanasia for humans is "when a terminally-ill patient whose death is drawing closer is suffering from unbearable physical pains, and the patient has an apparent desire 'to die quickly', and a doctor takes an appropriate measure to let the patient die. This is very different from not providing or removing life-supporting treatments" (JSDD, 2015, para.2). The JSDD (2015) states, "How you live the end of your life should be your own choice, not forced or pressured by someone else. Being able to choose your own medical care is one of the most fundamental human rights" (JSDD, 2015, para.2).

The central law that regulates the treatment of animals in Japan is the Act on Welfare and Management of Animals. The law regulates destroying of animals in article 40 in the Method to be Applied, the Case of Destroying Animals section: "In the case where an animal must be destroyed, a method that minimizes as much as possible the pain and distress to the animal shall be used" (Act on Welfare and Management of Animals, 2014, Ch.5).

The section about "minimizing the pain and distress as much as possible" is vague, as pain and distress are hard to see objectively. It is almost impossible to objectively describe with any degree of confidence, the amount of pain in an animal may feel.

The Japan Veterinary Medical Association (JVMA) does not have a definition of euthanasia; however, they have published guidelines for euthanasia. According to the JVMA, veterinarians can choose euthanasia as a humane option, when animals show no hope for recovery, or when the welfare of the animal is greatly compromised. In the case where prolonging life compromises the welfare of the animal, the veterinarian should closely work with the owner, respecting the owner's desire, to accept the option of euthanasia as the most humane choice. (JVMA, 2005, p.16).

Methods Used for Euthanasia in the US and Japan

In most states in the United States, animals are defined as personal property, but unlike inanimate objects, such as cars or chairs, these ownership rights are subject to certain constraints. Generally, statutes prohibit actions that cause unnecessary or unjustifiable pain or suffering to an animal. While the laws vary widely from state to state, all states legalize euthanasia on animals. The method of euthanasia is fairly standard across the 50 states, with most states authorizing the injection of sodium pentobarbital or a similar agent (AVMA, 2015a). In the case of the United States, the AVMA (2013) categorizes methods of euthanasia as “acceptable”, “acceptable with conditions”, or “unacceptable”. “Acceptable methods” are those methods that consistently produce a humane death when used as the sole

means of euthanasia; “acceptable with humane death” are those techniques that may require certain conditions to be met in order to consistently produce humane death; and finally “unacceptable” methods are those methods deemed inhumane under any conditions and those methods that pose a substantial risk to the human applying the technique. The AVMA (2013) recommends the injection of barbiturates and barbituric acid derivatives (e.g. pentobarbital, pentobarbital combination product). According to an AVMA (2015a), survey euthanasia laws in several states allow non-veterinarians to perform euthanasia on companion animals. In most cases, the euthanasia technicians are required to undergo a certain number of hours of training before being allowed to perform euthanasia on animals.

In the guidelines, the AVMA acknowledges “euthanasia to be a practical necessity for unwanted or unfit animals for adoption” (AVMA, 2013, p.6). In addition, it is disturbing to learn that the AVMA’s Panel On Euthanasia (POE) recognizes that “there will be less-than-perfect situations in which a method of euthanasia that is listed as acceptable or acceptable with conditions may not be possible, and a method or agent that is the best under the circumstances will need to be applied.” (AVMA, 2013, p.10). In this way the POE leaves the room for possibly using “unacceptable” methods.

The Japanese Veterinary Medical Association does not specifically recommend

medications that should be used to ensure humane euthanasia, although it seems like pentobarbital is also largely used in Japan for companion animals at veterinary clinics (2015, Nakano, personal communication). However, the public pounds in Japan still routinely use carbon dioxide (CO₂) gas chambers (All Lives In Viable Environment [ALIVE], 2012). They call the chamber a “Dream Box”. A Dream Box is a steel box of about three cubic meters. There is a glass window on the front door, so you can see the dogs (cats) inside. As soon as the door is closed, CO₂ will be diffused and as early as one minute after, most of the animals inside will be unable to stand still. Ten minutes later, all the animals inside will be dead, with their eyes wide open and the mouths also left open, perhaps they wanted to breath in the last oxygen (Ota, 2010). The Dream Box is used at public pounds in Japan for 57.6% of puppies, 59.8% of kittens, 72.8% of adult dogs and 75.0% of adult cats. The methods other than the Dream Box include injection of chemicals, such as sodium pentobarbital or ketamine. The majority (64.1%) of euthanasia via the Dream Box, do not include the administration of anesthesia to the animal beforehand (ALIVE, 2012). Dream Boxes are operated by the municipal governments, that run the animal “protection” facilities. The workers at the facilities are required to have adequate knowledge about animals. The Act on Welfare and Management of Animals requires the facilities to have veterinarians, and they are positioned

as supervisors at the protection facilities.

While CO₂ is routinely used in Japan, in the U.S. there seems to be an ongoing discussion about using carbon dioxide to put down animals. The AVMA (2013) listed CO₂ as “acceptable with conditions.” The “acceptable with conditions” methods are defined as, “a method considered to reliably meet the requirements of euthanasia when specified conditions are met” (AVMA, 2013, p.98). Director of the AVMA’s Animal Welfare Division, Gail C. Golab, states that “when all of the conditions are met, ‘acceptable with conditions’ methods are equivalent to ‘acceptable’ methods, and all conditions must be met, otherwise they are not considered ‘acceptable’ (Golab, 2013).

The AVMA’s conditions for using CO₂ are as follows:

1. Personnel must be instructed thoroughly in the gas’s use and must understand its hazards and limitations;
2. The gas source and chamber must be located in a well-ventilated environment, preferably out-of-doors;
3. The gas must be supplied in a precisely regulated and purified form without contaminants or adulterants, typically from a commercially supplied cylinder or tank;

4. The gas flow rate must allow operators to achieve known and appropriate gas concentrations within the recommended time;
5. The chamber must be of the highest-quality construction and should allow for separation of individual animals. If animals need to be combined, they should be of the same species, and, if needed, restrained or separated so that they will not hurt themselves or others. Chambers should not be overloaded and need to be kept clean to minimize odors that might distress animals that are subsequently euthanized;
6. The chamber must be well lighted and must allow personnel to directly observe the animals;
7. If the chamber is inside a room, monitors must be placed in the room to warn personnel of hazardous concentrations of gas; and
8. It is essential that the gas and the chamber be used in compliance with state and federal occupational health and safety regulations. (Golab, 2013, <http://atwork.avma.org/2013/02/26/euthanasia-guidelines-the-gas-chamber-debate/>)

The Humane Society of United States (HSUS) (2013) listed CO₂ as an “unacceptable method” and the HSUS is strongly opposed to the use of any type of gas chamber in a shelter setting (HSUS, n.d.). The HSUS refers to the Newcastle Consensus Meeting on

Carbon Dioxide Euthanasia of Laboratory Animals (Hawkins et al. 2006) to state their position on the use of CO₂. The consensus (Hawkins et al. 2006) reached a conclusion that it is no ideal way of killing animals with CO₂. When animals are placed into a gas chambers containing a high concentration of CO₂ (above 50%), they will have pain in the mucosa of upper airways for at least 10 to 15 seconds and so they suffer before the lost of consciousness (Hawkins et al. 2006). In addition to the physical suffering, when animals are in a chamber with a rising concentration of CO₂, they may experience “air hunger”(the perception of insufficient breathing; of not getting enough air) or dyspnea (a subject experience of breathing discomfort) (Hawkins et al. 2006, p.2). The HSUS (HSUS, n.d.) refers to the consensus and concluded that the use of CO₂ causes great physical suffering to the animals as well as mental stress by being placed in an unfamiliar dark chamber, where they can smell of the equipment. The HSUS also states that animals inside of the chamber are extremely fearful therefore react adversely, so handling such animals will cause greater physical and psychological harm to the staff (HSUS, n.d.).

Shelter Statistics and Euthanasia

According to Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) of the United States, the population of the United States in 2013 was 318,892,103 and the population of Japan in 2013 was

127,103,388 (Central Intelligence Agency [CIA], 2015).

The table below summarizes data on companion animals in these two countries. The data for the United States come from the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and the data for Japan come from All Live in Viable Environment (ALIVE).

	USA	JAPAN
Companion Animals (Pets Owned)	164 Million	2.1 Million
Estimated Animal Shelters	3,500	1,294
Cats & Dogs Entering Shelters/Year	6 to 8 Million	210,816
Cats & Dogs Adopted From Shelters/Year	3 to 4 Million	32,785
Adoptable Cats & Dogs Euthanized in Shelters/Year	2.7 Million	170,608
The Number of Euthanized Animals per population of 100,000	51,428	34,696
The Number of Euthanized Animals per person	0.51	0.01

According to the HSUS (2014), pet ownership in the United States has more than tripled since the 1970s. In 2014, the HSUS estimated that 62% of American households have at least one pet (HSUS, 2014). The number of dogs and cats euthanized each year in shelters has declined from 12 to 20 million in the 1970s to about 3 to 4 million in 2014, but this number includes 2.7 million (80%) that are considered adoptable each year (HSUS, 2014).

According to the AVMA (2013), owners choose euthanasia for their animals for

various reasons, including: prevention of suffering from a terminal illness, their inability to care for the animal, the impact of the animal's condition on other animals or people, and/ or financial considerations. The recent rise of veterinary costs has become a great burden to many financially struggling Americans, and this factor has caused many owners to surrender their pets (McGinnis & McElhaney, 2014).

The Japanese municipal animal protection facilities changed their operations in 2014. They used to keep captured animals or animals brought in by their owners for seven days (in the case for Tokyo), but in response to the recent public sentiment, there are more and more facilities that have extended the keeping period to give adoption opportunities to the animals (ALIVE, 2012). According to ALIVE (2012), the reasons that Japanese owners surrender their companion dogs include: behavior problems, age (too old or too young), owner's illness and age, moving, or complaints from neighbors. In the case of cats, the reasons for surrender include: surplus litters due to unplanned breeding, old age, owner's illness and age, moving or complaints from neighbors. Sadly, there are still a number of owners or caretakers who do not believe spaying or neutering helps the welfare of cats (or dogs), and they keep cats in the environment in which cats can go in and out anytime they want (ALIVE, 2012). Education

and information is necessary to raise awareness of the necessity of spaying or neutering for companion animals in Japan.

No-Kill Movement

The history of no-kill in US goes back more than half a century when independent caregivers began rescuing and sheltering homeless animals with the intention of keeping them alive (Foro, 2001). Up until the early 1990s, millions of animals were killed annually due to unplanned breeding, yet major humane organizations did not challenge the “killing” action itself, and the discussion concentrated on how to improve the euthanasia techniques (Foro, 2001).

The San Francisco Society of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SFSPCA) initiated the no-kill movement in the United States. The SFSPCA’s former president Rich Avanzio was the leading force of the movement, and he successfully implemented the no-kill policy in the SPCA in San Francisco in 1994, making this the first organization to implement such policy in the country. Through the no-kill policy, the SPCA offered a guaranteed adoption to every healthy shelter dog and cat, and brought euthanasia rates down to the lowest in any urban center in the United States (Avanzino, n.d.). In 1998, Avanzio became the president of Maddies’ Fund to continue to support the no-kill movement.

The term "no-kill" may have a calming effect to the public, but it can be a bit misleading because it gives the impression that no-kill shelters do not euthanize animals at all. Maddie's Fund, an organization dedicated to achieving a no-kill nation by 2015, and other no-kill organizations define the term no-kill as "a place where all healthy and treatable animals are saved and where only unhealthy and untreatable animals are euthanized" (Avanzino, 2003). Since Maddie's fund was started, many other organizations have followed. According to Maddie's fund (Maddie's Fund, 2015), between 2011 and 2012, there were at least 200 no-kill communities in the United States, and deaths of healthy and treatable pets went down from an estimated 23 million in 1940 to 3.4 million in 2010 (Maddie's Fund, 2015). The total of 200 no-kill shelters is still just a fraction of the shelters in the U.S. where there are 3,500 shelters. But these small steps have surely influenced the achievement of the no kill goals in some areas. The Mayor's Alliance for New York City has received funding from Maddie's Fund for the Maddie's Pet Rescue Project in New York City; this project is credited with reducing the number of animals euthanized from 31,700 in 2003 to 6,124 in 2013 (Maddie's Fund, 2015).

The no-kill movement had its roots in the belief that routine euthanasia of healthy animals is unethical, and shelters should be hopeful places for animal. Some argue that,

ironically, the no-kill movement also has added new problems to the existing animal issues.

The no-kill movement is widely exploited by hoarders who take and keep the number of animals that they can handle; as a result animals that are rescued and saved from death end up living in the deplorable conditions (Swirko, 2011). Nathan Winograd, the director of the No-Kill Advocacy Center disputed that the no-kill movement actually prompts hoarding, and goes on to state that this argument about hoarders is made by the people who do euthanize healthy animals to justify their views (Swirko, 2011). In addition, the terms “no-kill” and “unadoptable” are interpreted in various ways depending on the shelters and individuals.

For example, some organizations think that feral cats are unadoptable (Bloom, 2008). This raises a question about the adoptability of sick animals, such as cats with leukemia and FIV cats, or certain dog breeds that are difficult to adopt out (Bloom, 2008). Swirko (2011) points out that the no-kill movement should work properly for the animals and that people should not be left to decide between bad choices, i.e. to choose to bring their pets to a shelter and risk euthanasia, dump in somewhere or try to find a place that will promise no euthanasia.

Literature Review

In general, it has been the author’s experience that Japanese are not very informed about euthanasia of companion animals. However, when they are informed, they tend to

oppose euthanasia. Several studies have been conducted on attitudes toward the euthanasia.

In addition there are studies that have focused on the impact that performing euthanasia has on shelter staff. These studies will be reviewed and evaluated here beginning with studies on attitudes toward euthanasia.

Attitudes Toward Euthanasia

Yamazaki and Kogure (1990) pointed out three key reasons that may be causing the reluctance of the Japanese to accept euthanasia. One is that Japanese have long worshipped natural surroundings including animals, plants and rocks because they believed that these things have shamanistic god like powers. The second reason is the very strong fear of death and of the dead that is typical of the Japanese. Prehistoric Japanese went so far as to bury their deceased with stones placed upon their carcasses to stop the dead from returning to this world. The final reason is Shinto attitudes toward death. In the Shinto religion, death is viewed as impure. The purification rituals such as cleansing and exorcism ceremonies are held to keep the unclean aspects of death.

In “The Thought of Meat Eating: Rediscovering European Thought”, Toyoyuki, Sabata (1966) analyzes the Japanese hesitation toward euthanasia. Sabata (1966) thought that cruelty is akin to killing in the mind of Japanese therefore euthanasia is in fact a form of cruelty.

Sabata (1966) goes on to say that this way of thinking can help explain why some Japanese choose abandoning a pet as more humane option than euthanizing them. In contrast, Kogure and Yamazaki (1990) stated that Western anticruelty organizations define their position this way, “Owners should not disown animals for reasons of old age, sickness, or inability; rather, veterinary care and essential comforts should be given and, if this cannot be done or will not suffice, euthanasia is the correct choice to make.” (Kogure & Yamasaki, 1990, p.153)

The shelter that was introduced in the Foreward of this paper has received strong support from the public for over 35 years. This may be because their policy is to always do their utmost to avoid euthanizing animals. This seems to indicate that the idea of no-kill shelters would be popular in Japan.

However, as stated earlier, people in Japan may have misunderstandings about the concept of “no-kill” and they prefer no-kill shelters based on their misunderstanding. People in Japan who agree with no-kill concept may not be aware that no-kill could include euthanizing animals with no hope of recovery in order to prevent unnecessary prolonged suffering.

There is one important study done by Sugita and Irimajiri at Osaka University of Commerce in 2009. This study focused on the attitudes of small animal veterinarians toward

euthanasia. The survey was distributed to 3,000 veterinarians and 949 veterinarians responded. Among the respondents, 98% of the veterinarians euthanized animals in the year prior to the survey. Over 50% euthanized one or two animals. The majority of the participants (84.9%) supported euthanasia for the animals that are terminally ill or injured, when there is no sign of recovery. However, 67.1% feel that even when the animals are in irreversible conditions and suffering from pain, euthanasia should not be applied if that goes against the wishes of the owner of the animal. When asked about the case of owners requesting euthanasia of companion animals for financial reasons, 62.6% of the participants are opposed to euthanizing these healthy animals. When asked about euthanizing healthy companion animals due to changes with the owners' jobs or living conditions, 76.2% of veterinarians responded that euthanasia should not be performed in these cases. The survey also asked the participants if the general public in Japan knows and accepts euthanasia. 16 % answered, "yes, the public completely understands and accepts euthanasia", but over 50% answered, "the public understands but only somewhat accepts euthanasia".

The Effect of Euthanasia on the Shelter Workers who Perform Euthanasia

Considering pet overpopulation, animal shelter space and funding limitations, euthanasia is widely understood as a necessary evil. In many cases, it is accepted that animals

may be better off being euthanized than being kept at the shelters, which may only prolong suffering of the animals. However, it has a significant heavy mental and physical toll on the people involved in euthanizing animals (Rollins, 2009 ; Baran; 2013, Anderson et.al.,2013).

People who love animals often chose an occupation in sheltering or veterinary care hoping to help and do something good for animals repeatedly experience a moral dilemma when faced with euthanizing animals. As a result, people who are involved with euthanasia are prone to develop somatic or mental difficulties, which are unique to their occupations. Shelter workers are exposed to types of stressors qualitatively different from the typical types of physical, task and role-process stressors (Rollin, 2009). Existing studies have consistently linked euthanasia with emotional stress (Anderson et al, 2013; Kass et al, 2001; Reeve et al, 2005; Baran et al, 2009). Reeves et al. (2005) called this occupation stress Euthanasia-Related Strain (ERS). In the book “Regarding Animals”, Arluke and Sanders (1996) discussed the experience that is shared by the shelter workers who have been directly involved in performing euthanasia. According to Arluke and Sanders (1996), for the few shelter workers who continually experience sharp and disturbing feelings, quitting the job at the shelter was the most decisive way to manage emotions. It is clear from the stories in this book that performing euthanasia is very difficult emotionally. One shelter worker felt “plagued by

conflict” (Arluke & Sanders, 1996). This worker explains that it was like having two people in one head, one good and the other evil, that argue with her about destroying the animals (Arluke & Sanders, 1996). This comment describes the difficulty of being required to do something that is against the person’s nature.

The popularity of pet owning has had positive effects on the lives of many Americans. Companion animals have a unique and important role, as they lie between the human world and the natural environment (Frank & Carlisle-Frank, 2011), and they greatly help human to expand their thoughts about the natural world. Ironically, it also has brought undeniable negative consequences such as pet overpopulation, and as a result, euthanasia is being largely accepted as an inevitable tragedy and necessary reality. Often times, shelters are tasked with destroying healthy animals merely because shelters need to make space for other animals. In the U.S., most typically, the job of performing euthanasia on unwanted animals falls in the hands of animal-shelter workers (Reeve et al, 2005). It is not difficult to imagine how this part of the job of shelter worker traumatizes them and causes emotional scars. Shelter workers join the shelters because they want to contribute their time and emotions into humanitarian activities. They constantly struggle between their desire and reality.

As a result, shelter workers experience a severe form of work strain stemming from “caring-killing paradox” (Reeve et al, 2005.) Arluke (1994) and Arluke & Sanders (1996) state that especially new comers experience this caring-killing paradox when they face the feeling clash between the caring towards shelter animals and the institution’s practice of euthanasia. Rollin (2009) points out that for any technicians, authors, laboratory animal veterinarians or humane society or shelter personnel, the killing of animals creates “moral stress” (Rollin, 2009, p.1084). Euthanasia technicians often experience guilt, grief, and frustration as a result of their jobs, and they experience a unique type of stress that is not typical to other workplaces (Baran et al, 2009).

This type of stress seems to be experienced by animal professions in Japan. Ota (2010) interviewed a veterinarian, who works at a municipal government run pound and the veterinarian said, “I have become a veterinarian to save animals I know there are a lot of veterinarians who are struggling in the dilemma between their mission and the sad reality” (Ota, 2010, p.16). This veterinarian has seen animals being put down in Dream Boxes over many years. Ota (2010) criticizes some municipal governments for facilitating the easy disposal of companion animals. Ota (2010) sees that in Japanese society, this is seen as a responsible response to communities’ needs, however this is a cruel treatment of animals. In

addition to the Dream Box, some municipal governments in Japan regularly create companion animal disposal locations. The locations are created in order for the residents to stop by and drop off their “unwanted companion animals”. They have provided easy paths for the public to get rid of their companion animals. This is ethically problematic as well as socially problematic. Some areas have stopped the overly “kind service”. A municipal government worker who is in charge of animal protection administration in Ibaraki Prefecture admitted that their system makes it too convenient for residents to easily give up precious lives, and it has been contributing to the high number of destroyed animals in the prefecture (Ota, 2010).

Then the Sugita and Irimajiri’s study, mentioned in the section of attitude toward euthanasia, asked about the attitudes of veterinarians themselves toward euthanasia, 38.4% answered “yes, I completely accept”, and 46.6% answered, “I somewhat accept euthanasia”. The participants responded that the most stressful task is to inform the owners of animals about the needs to euthanize their companion animals. They also feel high stress and a sense of depression, when they think they can save an animal, yet the owner chooses to euthanize the animal. The participants expressed their feelings of sadness, loss, anger and depression

about euthanizing animals and not being able to help the animals. They also indicated that they wanted to be alone or drink alcohol; sometimes they lost sleep over euthanizing animals.

Currently the euthanasia guidelines similar to those of the AVMA do not exist for the veterinarians in Japan, thus 48.3% of veterinarians thought it would be very helpful to have guidelines on euthanasia in general (Sugita & Irimajiri, 2009). Again, it is difficult to know how euthanasia is seen by the larger population in Japan, but Sugita and Irimajiri's (2009) study showed that veterinarians who euthanize animals also feel a similar caring-killing paradox that is seen among the shelter workers in the United States.

Finally in addition to the dilemma of shelter workers, it is also important to recognize the dilemma that veterinarians feel when facing the euthanasia of a non-human animal. In the United States, upon graduation, veterinary students swear an oath:

“Being admitted to the profession of veterinary medicine, I solemnly swear to use my scientific knowledge and skills for the benefit of society through the protection of animal health, the relief of animal suffering, the conservation of animal resources, the promotion of public health, and the advancement of medical knowledge. I will practice my profession conscientiously, with dignity, and in keeping with the principles of veterinary medical ethics. I accept as a lifelong

obligation the continual improvement of my professional knowledge and competence” (AVMA, 2015b, “Veterinarian’s Oath”).

Veterinarians are in the position to inform their clients when “the right time” to euthanasia their loving companion animals, but sometimes euthanasia of a perfectly healthy adoptable may be requested by the owners due to the owner’s convenience. This certainly seems to be in direct conflict with the veterinary oath that is detailed above. A veterinarian euthanizes an animal about eight times per month in the United States (Dickinson, 2014). It is reasonable to assume that veterinarians may experience unique severe stress as a result of the euthanasia, a stress that is not likely to be experienced by physicians

Research Methods

Participants

Participants in this study are shelter staff in Japan and the United States. “Shelter” is defined as any facility that cares for dogs and/or cats including private/public shelters (Anderson et al, 2013), and “shelter staff” is defined as a person who regularly interacts with shelter animals including volunteers, paid-staff, owners and foster caretakers. Veterinarians are the only people who are allowed to euthanatize animals in Japan. For this research, veterinarians were not included as interviewees, except for two veterinary technicians. The

participants in Japan were recruited through the author's animal advocacy network in Japan.

The participants in the United States were collected through introductions to shelter staff known personally by the author's academic advisor.

The author interviewed four participants in the United States, who live and have experience working or are currently working at a shelter in the United States. One of American participants currently lives in Japan, so the interview with this individual was done in a face-to-face manner. The remaining three American participants were living in the US at the time of this research. The author did not use Skype for one of these three participants and only e-mail correspondence was used for this participant's interview. The participants requested email correspondence. The remaining two Participants in the United States had telephone interviews via Skype. The author interviewed sixteen participants from shelters in Japan. In accordance with privacy protocol, I have labeled Japanese participants JP 1-16, instead of using names. Eleven of them, JP 1- 11, work at the same shelter and their interviews were conducted in a face-to-face method, each one for 30 minutes to 1 hour. JP 12 and 13 participants working together at another shelter, as well as JP 14 – 16, who all each work at a different shelters, were interviewed in a face-to-face as well, each one for 30 minutes to 1 hour. Prior to the interviews, each participant was contacted via email or

telephone and provided verbal or written consent for their research participation. For participants the author quoted extensively, aliases for family names were used to protect their privacy.

Data Collection

In order for the participants to freely express their emotions, the oral interview format was used. Interviewing is the best tool for the author to be able to see the interviewee's subtle emotional changes and underlying views on euthanasia.

The author used the questions in the following list to find out information about the interviewees and their experiences. Additionally, the author informed that each interview was expected to take about 60 minutes to complete, but the natural flow of the interview and instruction would take precedent over time constraints. A number of interviewees informed the interviewer at the onset of the interview that they could only spare 30 minutes on the day for the interviews, accordingly those interviews were constrained by the interviewees' amount of availability.

Interview Questions

What is your age?

Are you new to volunteer/work at an animal rescue shelter? Or are you experienced?

How long have you been volunteering/working at the shelter?

Is the shelter where you work private or public?
How long has the shelter been in operation?
How many staff (paid/volunteer) are there at your shelter?
What is your position at the organization?
How many animals (dogs, cats and other animals) are sheltered on average at your shelter?
How many staff are there to take care of the animals at your shelter?
On average, how many animals (dogs, cats and other animals) does your shelter accept each year?
On average, how many animals (dogs, cats and other animals) are successfully adopted out every year?
Does your shelter euthanize animals? If so, in what circumstances, could you please share more about that?
Have you been involved with deciding which animal to be euthanized?
Have you physically been present when an animal at your shelter was euthanized?
Do you agree with euthanasia? Please tell me more about your beliefs.
Do you have any religious objections to euthanasia? Could you please tell me more about that?

In addition to the questions above, logical follow-up questions were asked as the interviews progressed. At the shelters in Japan, the author benefited from a fact that the interviews were conducted onsite, and the author was able to observe the shelters' staffs' daily operations. This was not possible with interviews conducted remotely with the three participants who reside in the United States.

Data Analysis

Grounded theory was used to analyze the collected qualitative data (Glaser & Strauss,

1967). Because the author had been involved with the sheltering community, she anticipated that her interviewees would express one or more of the following ideas about euthanasia:

- Euthanasia is morally wrong and should never be performed.
- Euthanasia should not be done and animals should die naturally, and humans must not interrupt the natural process.
- Euthanasia is a necessary option for animals who are terminally ill and suffering.
- Euthanasia must not be used on animals that are physically healthy.
- I have never thought about this topic.

However, the data analysis was an inductive process that allowed themes and hypotheses to emerge from the data. Hypotheses were formulated and reformulated as the data were being collected. The author recorded repeatedly used terms, common profiles, tendencies, behaviors and concepts shared by the interviewees. The constant comparative method was used to categorize open codes to form them into categorized core concepts. The author kept comparing the open codes and categories until the core categories were chosen. Once the theoretical concepts were developed and identified from the core categories, the author went back to review literature to reassess the theoretical concepts and finally build the research conclusion. Using grounded theory and the constant comparative method

enabled the author to develop hypotheses about the general attitudes towards euthanasia of shelter workers in Japan and in the U.S., and about how these workers deal with the issues surrounding the euthanasia of companion animals.

Timeline

Oral interviews (the data collection segment) were conducted from July through September in 2015. The data analysis was conducted in September and October in the same year. The final thesis report was completed in April, 2016.

Results

The staff from five shelters (Shelter A, B, C, D and E) in Japan participated in interviews. Four shelter staff (two current staff and two former shelter staff) from three shelters (Shelter F, G and H) in the United States participated in the interviews.

Appendix A is the list of interviewees by shelter. Participants in Japan are identified as “JP,” and participants in the United States are identified as “USP”.

Shelter A has been in operation since 1990 as a privately-owned shelter. The founder/owner has been dedicated to rescuing and adopting out animals for over two decades. The shelter houses 300 to 400 dogs on average throughout the year. There are paid full-time/part-time staff and volunteers.

The shelter has a veterinary clinic that is used to treat animals at this shelter. The shelter essentially accepts any animals that come to them. Occasionally they rescue animals from corrupted breeders or animal hoarders. In these cases, Shelter A faces situations that require them to take a large quantity of animals at one time.

At Shelter A, there are four sections: Team 1, Team 2, Team 3 and Clinic Team, and each section has a leader. Team 1 has the most adoptable animals, Team 2 has new incoming animals; the Team 2 staff monitors these new animals to assess their adoptability. Team 3 has

senior animals as well as the animals that were rescued from Fukushima Prefecture where there was a nuclear power plant explosion accident in 2011; Team 3 keeps the rescued animals from the devastated areas and takes care of them on behalf of their owners, who still live evacuation shelters. Clinic is the section that treats all of the shelter animals. There is a veterinarian on shift, and Clinic staff assist the vet on site and manage the operation of the section.

Shelter A in Japan is the only shelter among the five shelters in the study that has a written policy and guidelines for euthanasia and shares that policy with their staff. This shelter is the only shelter that publically states their support for euthanasia as a humane option in certain circumstances. During their over 20-year operation, they have had a number of euthanasia cases, but the interviewees did not have the data about the exact number. When interviewees from the Shelter A were asked about how many euthanasia cases they have experienced, for example, JP 1 who has worked at the shelter for six years and JP 2 who has worked there for seven years both said that the number is too many to remember. JP 3, whose role it is to go to the sites where animals are in need of rescuing, said that a lot of times, he is the one who has to make a quick decision about euthanasia at the sites, and he does not know the number of euthanasias that have been performed at this shelter, but he was sure that there

has been no year that were no euthanasias during his 15 year career at Shelter A.

Japanese Participants (JP) 1 to 11 work at Shelter A. Out of the participants, only JP 4 has never been either directly involved with euthanasia or the decision of euthanasia. All eleven participants indicated that they understood and agreed in principle with euthanasia in cases of animals who are terminally ill and suffering. However, none of them would admit to agreeing with euthanizing healthy and young animals for space or behavior reasons in principle, but all of them did admit to accepting this as operational necessity.

JP 9, who is the leader of Team 2, thinks that euthanasia is necessary as a shelter, but it is still hard for him to go through. JP 9's team members sometimes question him about euthanasia decisions. New workers usually have more trouble adjusting themselves to the reality at the shelter operation. He understands their feelings, as he was once at their position. JP 9 usually tells the new workers, "I am now in the position to tell them that I understand your feeling but it is necessary as a shelter worker. It is very hard." JP 5 who has worked at the shelter less than five years, told the author about her view on euthanasia: "When I came here, I had no idea what euthanasia really is, and I just followed my bosses. New workers usually have hard time adjusting themselves to their work responsibilities." JP 10, who has worked at Shelter A for over 10 years said, "I understand the principle of euthanasia and that

it is a humane option when necessary, but I have never once felt comfortable about the decision, and I always regret doing it but have to accept it, otherwise I can not work here.”

The author asked JP 10 if there is support program available to the staff that goes through euthanasia and she responded, “No. But after euthanasia, it would be nice, if the staff could get one or two comforting words from our bosses.”

When asked about euthanasia on their own companion animals, five participants (JP 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9) answered that they will euthanatize their companion animals when necessary. Five participants (JP 2, 4, 6, 10 and 11) answered they probably will euthanize when necessary, but not sure. JP 4 answered that she will probably choose euthanasia when necessary, but she will firstly exhaust all the possible options. JP 10 said, “It is really on a case-by-case basis. I am still not sure about the idea of euthanizing animals.” JP 11 stated, “Before I came here (Shelter A), I would not choose to euthanize animals, but now I think euthanasia may be an option.”

JP 2, 9, 10 and 11 contemplated their positions from time to time during the interviews and appeared to sometimes change their positions. They expressed their confusion out loud about the moral questions they wrestle with as well as their feelings about death. For example, JP 11 said, “I am not sure, if I have fully accepted euthanasia. Nobody tells me what to think

about euthanasia being morally wrong or right. I follow my boss's lead." However in the end,

JP 11 indicated that she agrees with euthanasia in principle for their own companion animals.

JP 1 was asked the question about her own companion animals, she became very subdued and quiet as she spoke, then finally concluded that she would not euthanize her own pet. JP 1 is the only one who refused to euthanize her own companion animals from Shelter

A. JP1 explained the reasons:

When I see an animal being so sick and suffering, I feel terribly sorry, but if the animal were my own pet, I would want to stay with it as long as possible. This is selfish, but I want to be with my pet as long as I can, so I would not euthanize my own pet (Personal interview, Saito, July 1st, 2015.)

Shelter B is a private shelter, located in and concentrates their efforts in the Kanto region of Japan. They have been in operation for 10 years. The size of the operations matches the amount of time and effort the founder and staff have, so they do not have nor intend to have facilities. They have dedicated volunteer foster families who keep and care for the animals until they are adopted. There are always at least 10 foster families, and each family usually has one fostering animal. Shelter B is a completely volunteer based organization, and the directors are also volunteers. Shelter B's main role is to regularly visit public pounds to

take out animals, and then care for them until they find new owners. These animals at the public pounds are scheduled to be put down after being kept a certain period of time according to the animal control law. The length of the periods varies depending on the different municipal governments. According to the Ministry of Environment (2006), 53% of the municipal governments set the period at three to four days and 13% set at seven to eight days.

Shelter B does not have written guidelines or policies on euthanasia. In the 10-year operation, they had no euthanasia cases. This is likely due to the fact that the shelter only takes in the number of animals according to the number of available foster families. Also in the process of taking animals from the public pound, they only select adoptable animals. JP 12 and 13 work at Shelter B. JP 12 was not really sure about euthanasia. JP 12 understands the principle of euthanasia, but she is unsure if she would or could choose the option for any animals, regardless of them being her own companion or shelter animals. JP 13 is the founder and director of Shelter B; she also agrees with the principle of euthanasia, but JP 13 clearly stated that she would not give up on animals, whether they are shelter or companion animals, and will try anything to sustain their lives. Euthanasia is the last option after exhausting all the options available to the situations, but JP 13 will still avoid euthanasia as much as

possible. It seems that JP 13 would not use euthanasia in practice. The author asked JP 13, if there is a guideline or policy about euthanasia at the shelter, and JP 13 answered they do not have it because, “we never felt it is necessary.”

Shelter C is a private shelter and has a similar operational style as Shelter B. It was founded in 2004, and their main action area is in the Kanto region of Japan. The owner expressed that she is not interested in expanding her operations, because she felt the size of the operations now is in line with how much time and effort she is able to expend; therefore, they do not have a shelter facility. They have dedicated volunteers who rescue and foster animals until they are adopted. It is a small organization, and they usually have fewer than 10 animals. They regularly visit the public pound to take animals out from there and care for them until they can rehome them. Shelter C is a completely volunteer group, founded and run by dedicated volunteers. JP 14 is the founder and the current representative of the shelter; she is a veterinary technician and was the only interviewee from this shelter.

Shelter C does not have a written guideline or policy on euthanasia. The author asked if JP 14 is planning to set guidelines or policies on euthanasia, and JP 14 responded that they have never felt it a necessity, as they restrict admissions and they carefully select only adoptable animals when they go to the public pound due to the limitation in their operational

capacity. JP 14 indicated though that euthanasia guideline or policy may be preferable in the near future but not specific policies or guidelines were mentioned.

In the 11-year operation, they had one case of euthanasia. It was a case of a dog that had a behavioral problem. No foster families could keep him, so JP 14 finally took him in. However, the dog was not easily trained, in fact, he bit the face of JP 14, then JP 14 decided that the dog was too dangerous to adopt out to a new owner so he was put down.

JP 14 believes that euthanasia is a humane option when necessary for both shelter animals and companion animals, but it is something that should not be practiced lightly or easily, or because of humans' convenience. In case of animals suffering due to sickness or injuries, available options for the animal in question should be considered first, and if there are no other options and euthanasia is the way to alleviate the suffering of the animal for sure, then it should be done.

Shelter D is a private shelter, located in the Kanto region of Japan and has been in operation for about 10 years. They remodeled an old house and made it into this shelter facility in 2012. The shelter makes great efforts to create an environment that is very close to a real family home. This way, animals kept at the shelter will have minimum problems when they are placed in a new family, and they can make a smooth and comfortable transition,

which also helps the families that adopt animals from Shelter D. They don't have written guidelines or policies on euthanasia. In the 10-year operation, they had never had a euthanasia case. Shelter D is a restricted admission shelter, and they do their best to choose adoptable animals. However they also take in senior and sick animals hoping they can be adopted. In some cases, these senior and sick animals are not adopted, but Shelter D has as its goal to make sure these animals have final comfort places. Since they tend to have more senior animals, the author further asked if they are planning to create a written guideline or policy on euthanasia for the shelter, and they indicated that in their care the animal's health and quality of life has always been kept to a standard, which made euthanasia unnecessary. They added, "Because we restrict admission so we never encountered such circumstance, in which we have to think of euthanasia. If we did, we would come up with a guideline for euthanasia." Shelter D recognizes euthanasia as a humane option but has successfully avoided it.

JP15 who works at Shelter D agrees with the principle of euthanasia and understands the reasoning behind it. When JP 15 was asked about euthanizing animals, JP 15 stated that her thoughts on euthanasia comply with those of the Shelter. The author further asked JP 15 about her opinion on euthanizing her own companion animals. JP 15 understands it in

principle; especially for an animal who is suffering, but was not sure if she could go through with it in reality. The author asked, “What is suffering?” JP 15 replied that suffering is physical and mental pain that is hindering the animal’s quality of life. The author continued to ask if JP 15 considers euthanasia to be a humane option even for her own companion animal, if that animal were suffering. JP 15 replied that as long as she is financially, mentally and physically able, she would not give up on the lives of her own companion animals.

Shelter E is a rather new facility, founded by JP 16, in 2007 with the goal of “emptying the pens at public pounds.” The shelter, which is located in the Kanto region, added cats to their shelter population in 2012 in a facility that is about one-hour-train-ride from the dog shelter. This shelter takes adoptable animals out from the public pounds to rehome them. Every year, about 300 animals come to the shelter, and about 20 animals monthly (about 240 animals yearly) are adopted out on average. They don’t have guidelines or policies on euthanasia. In the 8-year operation, they had one euthanasia case. It was a case of a very sick dog, and JP 16 had monitored his condition to decide when the best timing for him to be euthanized. JP 16 knew that the dog was too sick to go on and was in pain. One day, the shelter’s vet visited and the vet asked, “what do you think?” JP 16 responded, “it is time”, then the dog was euthanized.

Shelter E selects adoptable animals when they rescue animals from the public pound.

This is one of the reasons why they have only had one case of euthanasia so far, but JP 16 also mentioned that she can not judge when it is best to euthanize an animal.

JP 16 agrees that euthanasia is a humane option for shelter animals or companion animals. JP 16 believes that the key to euthanasia is to save animals from unnecessary suffering and pain, but she noted that the general public in Japan may not feel the same as she feels about euthanasia. In fact, JP 16's friend once told her that she was going to change her pet's veterinarian, because the veterinarian suggested euthanizing her companion animal that was very sick at that time.

Shelter F is a shelter founded by one of the largest and most influential animal welfare organization in the United States. Its foundation goes back to the 1800s. Shelter F launched a collective effort program to make a commitment to become no-kill shelter in 2007. Since then, no-kill has been the philosophical foundation of Shelter F. The organization has been authorized to make arrests for animal cruelty crime, and it is dedicated to preventing animal cruelty throughout the country. They have guidelines and policies on euthanasia. In their over 100-year operation, they had a numerous euthanasia cases. USP 1 formerly volunteered at Shelter F, working as an adoption counselor. Her role was to match families with adoptable

animals. Since she was not involved with any euthanasia decisions or witnessed any cases of euthanasia, she did not have information on the number of euthanasia cases or if euthanasia was practiced at Shelter F. The author asked USP 1, if she agrees with euthanasia for shelter and companion animals and USP 1 replied “yes, absolutely” without hesitation. USP 1 actually had to euthanize her own cat in the past; she shared some of her regrets about the timing of her decision to euthanize:

My cat kept meowing, so I took him to the vet. I came back with him but during the Night he had a stroke, so I took him to a different vet, but the vet there told me that There is nothing they can do, so I put him down. I regretted that I made my cat suffer One day longer. (Personal interview, Lowell, August 22nd, 2015)

Shelter G is located in the mid-western region of the United States. This shelter was founded in 1966 by a group of volunteers who decided to help abandoned and abused animals. They worked to find new families and rehome the animals. The shelter also works to lobby the local government to change the laws surrounding animals. Shelter G has both paid staff and volunteer staff working at the shelter.

USP 2 is a paid staff and the manager of Shelter G and she has seven staff members under her. USP 2 has worked at Shelter G for one year and has volunteered at different

shelters prior to coming to Shelter G. As the shelter manager, USP 2 acts as the primary decision maker together with veterinary technicians on each euthanasia case at Shelter G, however she stated that thankfully she has not had to participate in deciding upon or carrying out euthanasia very often at her time at the shelter.

USP 3 has been on the board of directors for 15 years. The board has no director at this point in time, and they are a working board. USP 3 is a registered/certified veterinary technician. USP 3 said that up until 2005, when a new manager proclaimed no more euthanasia except animals with irreversible health conditions or serious behavioral problem, Shelter G had been a “kill-shelter”. But now Shelter G is considered as an open admissions shelter (to dogs, puppies, cats and kittens) and when they have space limitation issues, they will ensure they find foster homes until they have room at the shelter. Some board members did not think that a no-more-euthanasia goal was possible, but it has become reality. One key to the success was that Shelter G implemented an affordable spaying/neutering public assistance program called SPOT (Serving Pets Outreach Team) in 2000. SPOT has helped greatly reducing the number of pets euthanatized at the shelter and has increased the shelter’s “out alive” rate to 95% or more for at least five years with just three to twelve cases of euthanasia a year.

Shelter G has a written guideline about euthanasia. USP 3 explained that basically euthanasia will be practiced, when an animal (dog, puppy, cat or kitten) is too ill or injured and it is impossible to save them and nothing can be done for them, or when a dog is so aggressive even after behavior re-training that it is a liability to adopt. A group called Medical, which is a sub-group of The Shelter Committee, decides on each euthanasia case. The Medical group consists of a shelter manager and a board member; both of these people have experience as veterinary technicians. When the author asked USP 2 and USP 3 about their views on euthanasia, USP 2 said, "It is a humane option." USP 3 also answered that euthanasia should only be done to relieve pain and suffering when nothing else, even with veterinary intervention, can be done for the animal.

As USP 3 explained, Shelter G does use euthanasia for animals unless there is no other choice to heal the animal, and it is the way to end its suffering. When they do have to euthanize, USP 3 is the person who performs the euthanasia. The author asked more details about her feelings after she has had to put an animal down, and she replied, "It hurts my heart very much to euthanize an animal, and many times I shed tears but if euthanizing is the only way I can give the animal relief I feel honored to do so." USP 3 goes on to say, "I am sad for the entire day after I euthanized an animal but know that was the best choice for it." (Personal

email interview, Martin, October 22, 2015)

Shelter H is a restricted admission shelter located on the East Coast of the United States. Restricted admission may be also referred to as a no-kill shelter. When accepting animals, they choose only animals that are most likely to be adopted. Shelter H initially had a contact with Animal Control, so they were an open-admission shelter, but sometime in the 90s, they switched to a restricted admission shelter. Shelter H has three shelters and one animal sanctuary on the East Coast. They have clear policies about euthanasia, but since it is a restricted admission shelter, euthanasia is not frequently used.

USP 4 has experienced working and volunteering at different animal shelters taking various roles, at both restricted and open admission shelters, all on the East Coast of the United States. USP 4 worked for the longest time at Shelter H. At Shelter H, she held many positions including: caretaker, adoption staff, veterinary assistant, and her last job at Shelter H was a position in the upper management. USP 4 has been directly involved with euthanasia at open-admission shelters when working as a caretaker and a veterinary assistant, and indirectly involved with the euthanasia decisions and discussions of cases as a consultant at other shelters.

USP 4 agrees that euthanasia is a humane option for both shelter and owned

companion animals, but only when an animal is suffering and shows no chance of recovery, and when the quality of life is declining. USP 4 understands that in case of open-admission shelters, euthanasia is used to alleviate space limitations. However, she has ethical concerns about the use of euthanasia. One of her concerns is the use of euthanasia to manage population, such as to manage shelter animal populations or feral cat populations. USP 4 has additional concerns about using euthanasia in the case of behavioral problems and costly veterinary medicine. USP 4 suggested ways to reduce euthanasias. USP 4 pointed out that with the advances medical treatments and understanding of quality of life of animals, our knowledge of effectively managing animal populations increases, so euthanasia is necessary decrease. USP 4 recognized that the animals with behavior problems are difficult matters to deal with; however, she suggested that people involved in sheltering should continue to gain knowledge on animal behavior issues to develop new treatment strategies and to be able to effectively assess prognosis and quality of life in these cases. USP4 went on to say that advances in veterinary medicine have changed the standard of care of companion animals. For example, 20 years ago, if an animal got cancer, the animal may be euthanized, because there was no treatment, however now treatments for diseases like cancer are available and there are owners who are willing to pay for the treatment, so this is likely to reduce the

euthanasia of companion animals. USP 4 concluded that we as a society need to continue to find ways to not to use euthanasia.

USP 4 shared that Shelter H had a very well defined written policy about euthanasia, but every animal is an individual unique case, thus there were policies, but at the end of the day, there is a dog that has his unique issues. USP 4 said shelter staff and people involved will exhaust all the possibilities to treat his issues, and the decision to euthanize is always difficult.

The Views on Euthanasia of Participants (see Appendix B)

Eight participants out of a total of 20 had no knowledge or opinions about euthanasia prior to working at the shelters, and had never had any experience with euthanasia. 12 participants had knowledge of euthanasia, but only six of them had ever had any direct experience with euthanasia.

All 20 participants agree that euthanasia is a humane option for animals who are suffering. 17 participants indicated that they are uncomfortable with euthanasia. For instance, JP 5 said, “I accept euthanasia as a part of my job, but each case I struggle if the timing of the decision of euthanasia was good for the animal.” JP 9 with almost 10 years experience said, “It never is easy for me.” JP 10 who also had over 10 years experience at Shelter A expressed

that she always regrets euthanizing animals.

For euthanasia of shelter animals, seven (JP 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11 and 15) participants answered, “I understand that there is the option in case of animals with irreversible physical conditions.” However, six (JP 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and USP 4) expressed that they feel uneasy when it comes to euthanizing healthy animals for space and behavior reasons. JP 2 said, “In the case of younger dogs with behavioral problems, it does not look like peaceful death (euthanasia in Japanese is written “peaceful-comfortable-death”) to me, because they are fearful and resist very hard. They want to live.” JP 5 shared that in the case of animals with serious behavior issue, she always feels uneasy and uncomfortable, because the behavior issues are caused by humans, usually by their owners. USP 1 to 4 all agree with euthanasia when necessary, but they add that there should be ways to reduce the number as much as possible. USP 4 added that we should actively work to strategize to minimize the number of animals that have to be euthanized.

When it came to participant views on euthanasia of their own animals, some struggled to express their position. As written earlier, JP 1 became subdued when answering about her view on euthanizing her own companion animals. She frequently paused as if she either hesitated to answer or did not know what to say, and finally she concluded that she would not

use euthanasia for her own companion animals. In contrast, JP 8, who works at the same Shelter A, said that he would choose euthanasia for his own companion animal, he would feel more strongly so, especially when it comes to his own companion animals suffering. The reason is, “If you truly love your pet, you want to save them from unnecessary suffering.” In addition to JP1, JP 13 also indicated that she would refrain from choosing euthanasia for her own companion animals, and she would do whatever to keep animals alive. However, she went on to say in the case where an animal is very ill, she would consider euthanasia. The reason both JP 1 and 13 gave was that they can stay by side of their companion animals, when the animals are sick or they are dying. Their pets can receive quality affection and attention until they die, unlike shelter animals who will not be able to receive the same quality attention and affection when they are too sick or when they die. Another reason given was that they feel that humans should not interfere with nature but follow nature, namely natural death. JP 15 stated that she is not sure if she could go through euthanasia for her own companion animals, and she would sustain their lives. She would keep them as long as she is able financially, physically and emotionally.

All eleven of participants from Shelter A said that they agree with euthanasia, because euthanizing animals is one of the practices at the shelter, and they would not have worked

there if they did not accept the practice. Two of them asked me to turn off the recording device, when they wanted to share the idea that euthanasia is included in the shelter's operational practice and accepted largely in the community, so unless they accepted it, I could not work here.

When is Euthanasia Necessary and What is Suffering?

All participants agree with the principle of euthanasia for animals suffering, and they usually use expression such as “when necessary.” The participants were asked to explain, “When is euthanasia really necessary.” 17 participants used one of the terms of such as when an animal is “suffering”, “in pain”, “with no chance of recovery” or “too ill and there is no other choice”, “prolonging pain” or “prolonging suffering.” The participants were further asked to explain “prolonging pain” and “prolonging suffering.” These terms are difficult to describe since pain and suffering cannot be measured quantitatively, so they provided examples like: inability to eat, move, walk or discharge / severe injuries due to an accident or fire / the condition is irreversible even when using available medical treatment. Eighteen participants stated that they are uncomfortable about using artificial methods to forcefully keep animals alive.

Nineteen of the total of 20 participants were asked to share if they are religious and if their religious beliefs have influenced to their views on euthanasia. The author missed asking this question to USP 3. All of these 19 (JP 1 -16, USP 1, 2 and 4) answered they are not religious or does not have any strong religious believes. JP 2 said that she does not believe in a particular religion but also indicated that there may be a Buddhism influence to her belief on euthanasia, as her grandfather was a Buddhist monk. JP 2 has talked to a spiritual medium, who claims to communicate with deceased animals, and the medium told her that deceased animals rest in peace in a special place and their memories are removed. After that, they will be just souls then reborn to places where they should be in their next lives. After hearing this, JP2 thinks that the souls that once lived in animals will be reborn into different forms of animals.

The author occasionally asked additional questions. Specifically, the author asked JP 1-16 and USP 1, if the shelter they worked has a support systems that help shelter staff to cope with being involved with euthanasia. None of them has such a system, and it was discovered that USP 1 was not aware of one at the shelter she volunteered at. JP 10 from Shelter A said, “After euthanasia, we try not to talk about it, and we deal with our own emotions on our own, but it would be nice if our directors came and said something to us.”

The author only asked this question to USP 1 if Shelter F had such a system but she did not know.

Another question that was occasionally included was about veterinarians' attitudes to euthanasia. According to the Japanese veterinarians' attitudes to euthanasia previous to the study, based on 72 veterinarians' responses, it would appear that Japanese veterinarians are somewhat more cautious or reluctant about euthanizing than their British counterparts (Kogure & Yamazaki, 1990).” Shelter A has a pool of veterinarians who agree with the shelter's policy on euthanasia. JP 7 said that people at Shelter A understand the operational necessity, but the vet for JP 7's companion dog with bad kidney failure was passive about euthanasia. JP 7 asked the vet to euthanize her dog, because she wanted to save the dog from suffering, but the vet told her to wait a little more. JP 7 added, “He seemed to prefer natural death.” JP 16 told the author that she thought that veterinarians in Japan in general do not like to offer “euthanasia” as an option, and even avoid the term when it is discussed and often use alternate expressions such as “a final option” or “a final method.”

Conclusion

Prior to the interviews, the author had an assumption that the majority of Japanese interviewees would disagree with euthanizing animals, regardless of whether they were

shelter animals or their own pets; however, the research revealed that the assumption was incorrect, and all Japanese interviewees agree with the principle of euthanasia, and believe that it is a humane option to eliminate animal's suffering. However, when it comes to euthanizing healthy or young animals for space and behavioral reasons, six participants (JP 1, 2, 4, 5, 10 and USP 4) said that they have a problem with such euthanasia. Singer and Regan state that non-voluntary euthanasia (Singer, 1993), preference-respecting euthanasia and paternalistic euthanasia (Regan, 2013) are legitimate only when it is done to save beings from suffering. When the participants in this study deal with these types of euthanasia, all of the participants seemed to accept euthanasia, because it is good for animals and saves them from unnecessary suffering. However, as Regan pointed out, destroying healthy animals to make space or to deal with their behavioral issues is outside of the idea of "good death." Six participants agree with this notion.

The author had another assumption: there would be a strong relationship between religions and attitudes on euthanasia. However, 19 participants (one participant did not respond to the question about religion. This was the participant who communicated via e-mail, so it is not clear why she did not respond. No follow-up was done on this question) answered that they are not religious so their views are not influenced by any religious beliefs.

Before starting interviews, the author had an assumption that there may be some level of the Buddhism or Shintoism influences in their views toward euthanasia, but religion did not seem to play strong roles in people's attitudes about euthanasia.

The majority of the participants seem to have moral conflict between their willingness to help animals and the institutional rationale that euthanasia is an operational necessity. Some comments in the interviews suggest that some participants experienced this kind of conflict, "a caring-killing paradox" (Arluke, 1994; Arluke & Sanders, 1996; Reeves et al., 2005.) For example, as stated earlier in the results section, JP 9 with almost 10 years experience from Shelter A said that euthanasia is still hard for JP 9. Another example, as stated in the views on euthanasia of participants of the result section, JP 10 with over 10 years experience from the same shelter also said that JP 10 still always regrets euthanizing animals. However, the research revealed that the participant gradually come to accept euthanasia as an operational necessity and to accept that euthanasia is a good thing to relieve suffering of an animal in question. These beliefs seem to help them cope with their emotional stress and enable them to continue working at shelters. Reeve et al. (2005) explains that shelter workers rationalize that euthanasia in the case of suffering is a good thing. This is a

coping mechanism for shelter workers and allows them to have fewer negative feelings about euthanasia.

The research also revealed that there is an inconsistency and disconnection between the attitudes of the participants toward euthanasia and the actual number of occasions when these participants either directly or indirectly participated in the actual performance of the euthanasia or making the decision to euthanize. This begs the question: Do these participants only support euthanasia in theory and not in practice? It should be noted that Shelter A is the only shelter that had a clearly defined policy on euthanasia and that it was this shelter that was run by someone who is not native to Japan. Shelter A was also the only shelter that openly shared their policy on euthanasia, and this shelter has euthanized animals throughout their operation. In contrast, Shelters B, C, D and E had zero or one case of euthanasia during their entire time of operation. The interviewees from Shelter B, C, and D agree with the principle of euthanasia; however, they do not practice it. Shelter A is not a restricted-admission shelter and Shelter B, C, D and E are restricted admission shelters; therefore, the difference in the numbers and frequencies of animals euthanized between Shelter A and B, C, D and E may be due to the admission policies. Further investigation is needed to find out why there is a big gap in the number of euthanasia cases between shelters.

This may be because of the timing of deciding on euthanasia. The level of suffering of another being is difficult to gauge and very subjective; therefore, the point at which euthanasia becomes a valid option is unclear. More research is needed on the assessment of suffering. This research could not quantifiably determine what exactly constitutes the level of suffering that requires euthanasia, even though, it appears there are differences based on cultures. There may be various factors to explain the culture difference, but the author tends to agree with Sabata's (1966) view on this: Japanese people see euthanasia as a form of cruelty because in their mind euthanasia is akin to killing; therefore, they try to refrain from taking the action as long as they can.

Based on the author's experience, euthanasia is a rather taboo topic to even bring up to Japanese people, so future research on this topic should probe cultural connections more deeply. One way to do this is to employ more active listening techniques in the interviews, for example, JP 1 was asked if she agreed with euthanasia, but JP 1 paused for a long while to provide her answer. The author was not sure what was going through the participant's mind, so the author told her to take her time to make her feel comfortable and asked the same question again. In other words, the author lost some of her objectivity and took on the responsibility for the comfort of the participant. This was not successful, so active listening

techniques, such as repeating the words of the interviewee, commenting on the level of discomfort that seems evident and/or restating questions might have helped the situation. For example the researcher could have said, “I noticed you were struggling and pausing”, then could have asked “could you me tell more about that?” As the author anticipated, Japanese participants were not as forthcoming as US participants. For this reason, more probing questions should be asked in the future. One of the issues discovered in the research is that the author was hesitant to push further to the points when the participants started to feel uncomfortable. The very first interviewee, JP 1, for the research often paused and did not openly share her thoughts and answers in her interview, as mentioned earlier. This experience lead the author to conclude that the topic of euthanasia is not only a difficult topic to discuss but also a very private matter, so a very careful approach that does not make participants feel forced would be appropriate. However, this conclusion was never verbalized to the interviewee, as it should have been. For example, the author could have said, “It seems like you are having difficulty discussing this topic, could you tell me more about that?”

It is likely that the author’s own cultural tendencies and understanding of the cultural tendencies of her participants created a barrier to gathering data that could validate her hypotheses. The author is a Japanese national, so she is sensitive to that fact that the Japanese

culture values modesty and politeness over straightforwardness. Therefore, the author was unsure how appropriate it was in the culture to push people to get what she wants. And because she did not want to be impolite, she probably erred on the side of not probing enough especially in the interviews where the participant displayed overt signs of discomfort. This made her feel hesitant to ask further questions, especially when the participants were contemplative and quiet. Finally, the author felt that some of the Japanese participants did not provide clear answers because they were worried that an “incorrect” answer might affect their job status. The author did not want them to feel as if this research would threaten their jobs in any way. For that reason, the author became conservative and careful about asking further questions to the Japanese participant because she did not want them to feel uncomfortable. Again, the author made hypothesis without checking it out with the interviewees.

Cultural background is a very important consideration in studies of attitudes toward euthanasia. Having sensitivity to cultural issues is necessary when conducting this research. In this case, however, the author’s sensitivity turned out to be both a blessing and a curse. It was a blessing because the author was able to hypothesize about the reasons for the discomfort and hesitancy on the part of the interviewees, but it was a curse because the author’s own desire to eliminate that discomfort caused her to stop probing which meant that

she did not gather the information necessary to support or refute these hypotheses. In the future, the author will work to put her own personal discomfort aside, take a more objective stance, and employ more active listening skills so that she can gather more information from the participants.

Appendix A: Participant Information

Shelter	Shelter Has Euthanasia Policy	JP# / USP#	Ages
A	Yes	JP1	60s
		JP 2	20s
		JP 3	30s
		JP 4	40s
		JP 5	20s
		JP 6	20s
		JP 7	60s
		JP 8	50s
		JP 9	20-30s
		JP 10	30-40s
		JP 11	20-30s
B	No	JP 12	60s
		JP 13	50s
C	No	JP 14	50s
D	No	JP 15	40s
E	No	JP 16	30-40s
F	Yes	USP 1	30-40s
G	Yes	USP 2	30-40s
		USP 3	60s
H	Yes	USP 4	40s

Appendix B: Individual Interview Data

Shelter	ID#	Age	View on Euthanasia		Prior knowledge and experience with euthanasia	Religion
			Shelter Animals	Personal Pet		
A	JP1	60s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons.	Will not euthanize.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.
	JP 2	20s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons.	Will probably euthanize when necessary but still not sure.	No experience and never thought about it.	May have Buddhist influence from her grandfather.

	JP 3	30s	Agreed, necessary as a shelter. It is not easy to euthanize animals for space or behavior reasons, but it is a part of my job.	Will euthanize when necessary.	No experience and never thought about it.	No
	JP 4	40s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons.	Will euthanize when necessary but will try various options first.	Knew about it, but never done.	No.
	JP 5	20s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons.	Will euthanize when necessary.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.
	JP 6	20s	Agreed, necessary as a	Will euthanize	Knew about it, but never	No.

			shelter.	when necessary but not sure.	done.	
	JP 7	60s	Agreed, necessary as a shelter.	Will euthanize when necessary.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.
	JP 8	50s	Agreed, necessary as a shelter. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons but I work at a shelter so I accept it.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it but never done.	No.
	JP 9	20-30s	Agreed, necessary as a shelter. It is still hard to go through.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it but never done.	No.
	JP 10	30-40s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior	Will euthanize when necessary on a case-by-case basis.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.

			reasons. Never felt comfortable about the decision.			
	JP 11	20-30s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible conditions. Still having trouble accepting it.	May be an option when necessary, but not sure.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.
B	JP 12	60s	May be an option when necessary, but not sure.	May be an option when necessary, but will try to treat as much as possible.	Knew about it, but never done.	No.
	JP 13	50s	Euthanasia is really the last option and will never give up till the end.	Will not euthanasia. Will never give up till the end.	No experience and never thought about it.	No.
C	JP 14	50s	Agreed, when necessary and it is a humane decision.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	No.
D	JP 15	40s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible	Will euthanize when necessary but not sure.	Knew about it but never done.	No.

			conditions. But this shelter has avoided using the option.			
E	JP 16	30-40s	Agreed, when necessary and it is a humane decision.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	No.
F	USP 1	30-40s	Agreed, when necessary and it is a humane decision.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	No.
G	USP 2	30-40s	Agreed, when necessary and it is a humane decision.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	No.
	USP 3	60s	Agreed, when necessary and it is a humane decision but it should be reduced as much as possible.	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	N/A.
H	USP 4	40s	Understood in principle and agreed in case of animals with irreversible	Will euthanize when necessary.	Knew about it and done.	No.

			conditions. Having trouble accepting euthanizing young and healthy animals for space or behavior reasons. Euthanasia should be reduced as much as possible.			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

References

ALIVE (All Life in Viable Environment). (2012). The Annual Nationwide Survey

Report on The Animal Control of The Municipal Governments 2012. Tokyo,

Japan.

American Veterinary Medicine Association (AVMA). (2013). Guidelines for the

euthanasia of animals. *The AVMA policies*. 2013 edition. Retrieved on March

6, 2015 from

[https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Documents/Euthanasia_Guidelines_2013_](https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Documents/Euthanasia_Guidelines_2013_ExecSummary.pdf)

[ExecSummary.pdf](https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Documents/Euthanasia_Guidelines_2013_ExecSummary.pdf)

American Veterinary Medicine Association (AVMA). (2015a). State law governing

euthanasia. *The AVMA advocacy*. Last updated February, 2015. Retrieved on

March 8, 2015 from

[https://www.avma.org/Advocacy/StateAndLocal/Documents/euthanasia_laws](https://www.avma.org/Advocacy/StateAndLocal/Documents/euthanasia_laws.pdf)

[.pdf](https://www.avma.org/Advocacy/StateAndLocal/Documents/euthanasia_laws.pdf)

American Veterinary Medicine Association (AVMA). (2015b). Veterinarian's Oath. *The*

AVMA policies. Retrieved on December 2015 from

<https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/veterinarians-oath.aspx>

Anderson, K., Brandt, C.J., Lord, L.K., & Miles, A. M. (2013). Euthanasia in animal shelters: management's perspective on staff reactions and support programs.

Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of the Interactions of People & Animals. Volume 26, Number 4, pp. 569-578(10).

Arluke, A. (1994). Managing emotions in an animal shelter. *Animals & society: changing perspectives*. Manning, A. & Serpell, J (Ed.). London. U.K. Routledge pp.145-165.

Arluke, A. & Sanders, C.R. (1996). *Regarding Animals*. Philadelphia, PA. Temple University Press. Ch.4. ISBN: 1-56639-441-4

Avanzino, R. (2003). Defining no-kill editorial. *Maddie's Fund*. Retrieved on March,15 from <http://www.maddiesfund.org/defining-no-kill-editorial.htm?p=E100BA49-304A-406E-8E5A-ED2483A6FC9C>

Avanzino, R. Animal Law Conference. *Lewis & Clark Law School*. Retrieved on March 19, 2015 from <https://law.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3622-rich-avanzino>

Baran, B. E., Allen, J. A., Rogelberg, S. G., Spitzmüller, C., DiGiacomo, N. A., Webb,

J. B. & Walker, A. G. (2009). Euthanasia-related strain and coping strategies

in animal shelter employees. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical*

Association, 235(1), 83–88. DOI:10.2460/javma.235.1.83

Bloom, C. (2008). “No-kill” definition will vary at shelters. *Feral cats and very sick or*

unadoptable animals often will be euthanized. The Akron Beacon Journal,

Ohio.com. Akron, OH. Retrieved on October 1, 2015 from

<http://www.ohio.com/lifestyle/no-kill-definition-will-vary-at-shelters-1.83583>

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2014). Country Comparison: Population. *The*

world factbook 2013-2014. Washington DC. Retrieved on April 27, 2015

from

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2119r>

[ank.html](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2119rank.html)

Dickinson, G. (2014). Household pet euthanasia and companion animals last rites. *Phi*

Kappa Phi Forum; Summer 2014. Vol.94. Issue 2. P.4 Accession Number

96231107

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Herndon, VA. Aldine Transaction. ISBN: 0-202-30260-1.

Golab, G. (2013). Euthanasia guidelines: the gas chamber debate. *AVMA@Work*. American Veterinary Medicine Association (AVMA). Retrieved on June 15, 2015 from <http://atwork.avma.org/2013/02/26/euthanasia-guidelines-the-gas-chamber-debate/>

Foro, L. (2001). The history of the no-kill movement. *Maddie's Fund*. Pleasanton, CA. Retrieved on March 18, 2015 from <http://www.maddiesfund.org/the-history-of-the-no-kill-movement.htm>

Frank, J. & Carlisle-Frank, P. (2015). Companion animal overpopulation: trends and results of major efforts to reach a “no-kill” nation. Maddie’s Funds. Retrieved on March 27, 2015 from <http://www.firepaw.org/cao.PDF>

Hawkins, P., Playle, L., Golledge, H., Leach, M., Banzett R., Coenen, A., ... Raj, M. (2006). *Newcastle consensus meeting on carbon dioxide euthanasia of*

laboratory animals. University of Newcastle. Type, U.K. Retrieved on

February 14, 2016 from

<http://www.animalsheltering.org/page/hsus-statement-gas-chambers>

<http://www.uff.br/animaislab/a4.pdf>

Humane Society of the United States (HSUS). (2013). Euthanasia preference manual.

The Humane Society of the United States. Animal Sheltering.

Retrieved on March 4, 2015 from

<http://www.animalsheltering.org/resources/all-topics/euthanasia/euthanasia-reference-manual.pdf>

Humane Society of the United States. (2014). Pets by the Numbers. U.S. Pet Ownership,

Community Cat and Shelter Population Estimate. Retrieved on March 10,

2015 from

http://www.humanesociety.org/issues/pet_overpopulation/facts/pet_ownership_statistics.html

Humane Society of the United States. HSUS statement on gas chambers. Retrieved on

February 14, 2016 from

<http://www.animalsheltering.org/page/hsus-statement-gas-chambers>Internatio

International Companion Animal Management Coalition. The welfare basis for

euthanasia of dogs and cats and policy development. *International Fund for*

Animal Welfare. Retrieved on March 22, 2015 from

<http://www.ifaw.org/sites/default/files/ICAM%20Euthanasia%20Protocol.pdf>

Japan Pet Food Association. (2013). The Number of Companion Dogs and Cats Kept in

Japan. Retrieved on March 7, 2015 from

<http://www.petfood.or.jp/topics/img/140101.pdf>

Japan Society for Dying with Dignity (JSDD). *Living Will*. Retrieved on February 25,

2015 from <http://www.songenshi-kyokai.com/english>.

Japan Veterinary Medicine Association (JVMA). (2005). Small Animal Euthanasia

Guideline. Retrieved on March 3, 2015 from

http://nichiju.lin.gr.jp/about/chikai_pdf/2-1.pdf

Kass, P.H., New, J.C.Jr, Scarlett, J.M., & Salman, M.D. (2001). Understanding animal

companion surplus in the United States: relinquishment of nonadoptables to

animal shelters for euthanasia. *Journal of applied animal welfare science*: 4(4),

237-248. DOI:10.1207/S15327604JAWS0404_01

Kogure, N. & Yamazaki, K. (1990). Attitudes to animal euthanasia in Japan: a brief review on cultural influences. *Anthrozoos* 3 (3): 151-154. DOI:

10.2752/089279390787057559

Maddies' Fund. (2015). *Getting to no-kill by 2015*. Maddies' Fund. Retrieved on September 22, 2015 from

<http://www.maddiesfund.org/documents/no%20kill%20progress/getting%20to%20no%20kill%20by%202015.pdf>

McGinnis, A. & McElhaney, A. (2014). Euthanizing pets increasing as vet costs rise. *USA Today*. Retrieved on March 19, 2015 from

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/06/07/economic-euthanasia-pets-increases/7790733/>

Ota, Masahiko. (2010). *Who is responsible of killing dogs?* Asahi Shimbun Publications Inc.. Tokyo. Japan. ISBN978-4-02-261770-5

Oregon Government Public Health Division. (2015). *Death with dignity act*. Oregon health authority. Retrieved on March 4, 2015 from

<http://public.health.oregon.gov/ProviderPartnerResources/EvaluationResearch/DeathwithDignityAct/Pages/index.aspx>.

Sugita, I. & Irimajiri, M. (2009). Attitude survey of veterinarians concerning euthanizing pets. Osaka, Japan. *Osaka University of Commerce*. Vol.6-2-158.

Retrieved on January 16, 2015 from

<http://ouc.daishodai.ac.jp/profile/outline/shokei/pdf/158/15808.pdf>

Swirko, C. (2011). Is no-kill movement leading to more cat hoarding? The haven acres cat sanctuary illustrates how things can go wrong. *The Gainesville Sun*.

Gainesville.com. Retrieved on March.20, 2015 from

<http://www.gainesville.com/article/20110723/ARTICLES/110729763?p=1&tc=pg>

Regan, Tom. (2004). *The Case for Animal Rights*. Oakland, CA. University of California Press. ISBN:9780520243866

Reeve, C.L., Rogelbert, S., Spitzmüller, C. & Digiacomo, N. (2005). The Caring-Killing. Paradox: Euthanasia-Related Strain Among Animal-Shelter Workers. *Journal of applied psychology*, 35,1. p.119-143.

DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02096.x

Rollin, B. (2009). Ethics and euthanasia. *Canadian Veterinary Medical Association*.

Retrieved on March 22, 2015 from

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2748292/>

PMCID: PMC2748292

Sabata, Toyoyuki. (1966). The Thought of Meat Eating (Nikuchoku No Shiso),

Rediscovering European Thinking". Chuo Koron Shin-sho. Tokyo, Japan.

ISBN: 4-12-100092-7

Singer, Peter. (1993). Taking Life: Humans. Practical Ethics. 2nd edition. Cambridge,

UK. Cambridge University Press. P.175-217. ISBN:9780511975950,

Hardback ISBN:9780521881418, Paperback.

The Brittany Maynard Funds. (2015). About Brittany Maynard. *An initiative of*

compassion & choices. Retrieved on February 25, 2015 from

<http://www.thebrittanyfund.org/>

The Ministry of Environment. (2006). Accepting and Destroying Dogs and Cats.

Retrieved on December 30, 2015, from

https://www.env.go.jp/nature/dobutsu/aigo/2_data/arikata/h16_05/mat04.pdf

The Ministry of Environment. (Revised on May 30, 2014). Act on welfare and

management of animals. Retrieved on March 6, 2015 from

<http://law.e-gov.go.jp/htmldata/S48/S48HO105.html>