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Study focused on the matter, in-home facilties throughout New York.

Rehabilitators and their facilities below as they relate to 1 of 4 study objectives.

Find survey response rate was 71% (n=299). Survey results are reported.

RESULTS

Received up to 3 follow-up mailings.
Cover letter and a self-addressed, self-stamped mail questionnaire. Nonrespondents
in April 1999, all 430 rehabilitators licensed during 1999 received a

Wildlife rehabilitators association (NWRA)

York State wildlife rehabilitation council (NSWRC) and the national
instruments were finalized with input from representatives of the DEC.
New perceptions of DEC involvement with rehabilitation/rehabilitators. The
characteristics of educational activities conducted, and
involvement in rehabilitation/rehabilitators activities; rehabilitation
attitudes toward animals and wildlife conservation; motivational factors;
rehabilitation/rehabilitators, we developed a mail survey instrument to assess:

METHODS:

and perceptions of how interaction with the rehabilitation community.
Assess rehabilitators' attitudes toward wildlife, wildlife management,

educators.
Characterize wildlife rehabilitators' attitudes toward wildlife, wildlife management,

perceived constraints as animal care providers.
Characterize wildlife rehabilitators' attitudes toward wildlife, wildlife management and

perceived constraints as animal care providers.
Characterize wildlife rehabilitators and their facilities.

STUDY OBJECTIVES:

To the people of New York.
Wildlife rehabilitators that foster the provision of wildlife benefits.

To facilitate DEC efforts to create a relationship with licensed

STUDY PURPOSE:

*** STUDY HIGHLIGHTS ***
About 1 in 3 rehabilitationists gave public educational presentations in

"through interviews for newspapers, television or radio.

'6,000 telephone inquiries in 1999.

Information requests, college/teaching, rehabilitationist responded to over

Most (84%) rehabilitationists had an interest in providing public education.

"Wildeffe Education Activities

rehabilitation center heard discussions on human health and safety

Considering education, interpersonal and intragroup communication, and

rehabilitation center heard discussions on human health and safety

Based on input from NSRC board members, we developed 20 items to

treated 20 or fewer birds and 35 or fewer mammals.

rehabilitationist operating exclusively at in-home facilities (about 75%)

About 75% of rehabilitationists who operated exclusively at in-home facilities in 1999.

About half of the 12,000 animals handled by rehabilitationists in 1990.

Animal Care Activities

of their operating expenses through public donations.

Rehabilitationists claim they covered the majority

rehabilitation activities in 1990. About 70% paid all

support expenses, about 62% of rehabilitationists spent $0 or less on

The majority (87%) of rehabilitationists operated in an in-home facility.
opportunities are needed to help rehabilitators identify practical and additional training materials and equipment, and frequently support facilities were the primary constraints.

As a basis for future communication between rehabilitators and wildlife managers, we used 2 scales to assess how rehabilitators currently manage their facilities, funding animal care, and securing facilities, supplies.

**Discussion**

Interventions for future interaction with rehabilitators:

Level of uncertainty about DECs activities, personal, and it is low or moderately about DEC's activities (22-42%), depending on the question reported a high DECs, but others (22-44%) depend on the question. Reported a higher percentage of rehabilitators reported a generally supportive relationship with specific DEC and relations between DECs and the rehabilitator community.

As a basis for future communication between rehabilitators and wildlife managers, we used 2 scales to assess how rehabilitators currently manage their facilities, funding animal care, and securing facilities, supplies.

**Interaction Between Rehabilitators and DECs**

Populations to reduce wildlife nuisance and damage. Hunting and trapping, and not hunt, were opposed to limiting wildlife. However, about 75% were opposed to recreational hunting and trapping, and many believed it was appropriate to use wildlife for food, but that some management techniques and wildlife harvest were not. The majority (60%) favored human management of wildlife, and many believed that more wildlife, but that some management techniques and wildlife harvest were not.

Wildlife management and use. Most rehabilitators believed some use of wildlife habitat. Wildlife conservation, the majority (60%) believed that wildlife conservation showed strong interest in wildlife conservation.

**Wildlife Conservation -- Rehabilitators Showed Strong Interest in Wildlife Conservation**

Common motivations for involvement in wildlife rehabilitation. A sense of moral obligation to assist animals in need was a strong factor. Most rehabilitators believed that wildlife needs are. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife management was a strong factor. Most rehabilitators believed that wildlife needs are. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife management was. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife needs are. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife management was. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife needs are. Some rehabilitators believed that wildlife management was.

**Informal Settings**

Presentations to audience members of all ages, in both formal and
Continuing research in 1992 revealed the potential for unnecessary misunderstandings and conflicts between DEC and rehabilitation facilities.

In addition to philosophical differences, a second factor that may contribute to these misunderstandings is the lack of effective interaction between DEC and rehabilitation facilities. This lack of effective interaction led to conflicts of interest, some of which were not predicted by either DEC or rehabilitation facilities. Rehabilitationists hold a range of philosophical views on appropriate human-animal interactions, and these views are often expressed through existing wildlife management policies. Rehabilitationists express their views through various channels, including forums and conferences, but the effectiveness of these interactions is limited by the quality and quantity of the data available. The need for better data collection and analysis may be able to enhance both rehabilitation and wildlife management communities by providing wildlife-related information that is relevant to the conservation of New York's wildlife. The wildlife management issues related to the conversion of urban and rural areas of New York State. These issues have a demonstrable impact on wildlife and require a coordinated approach to wildlife management and rehabilitation.
Wildlife rehabilitation facilities in New York State were held by New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Wildlife conservation attitudes held by New York State.

Animal welfare attitudes held by New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Motions for involvement in wildlife rehabilitation held by New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Rehabilitation facilities who delivered information to the public in 1990.

Topics addressed by the majority of New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Rehabilitation facilities to deliver information to the public in 1990.

Modes of communication used by New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Telephone requests to provide wildlife-rehabilitated education and outreach.

New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

By number of birds and mammals received in 1990.

By number of birds and mammals in New York State.

Public donations covered with proportion of 1990 facility operating budget.

Facilities in New York State.

Percent of in-home wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Operating expenditures for in-home wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

1990 operating expenditures for in-home wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

By year of non-home, 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Percent of non-home, 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Highest level of formal education attained by 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

By years of license participation in wildlife rehabilitation facilities.

Percent of 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitation facilities.
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The study reported herein was conducted to address these information needs. Informed decisions about the future of wildlife rehabilitation in New York, public is an important part of the total information base DEC needs to make to wildlife in the way they do, and their interactions with both DEC and the understanding how rehabilitation interacts with wildlife, why they relate

DECR/Bureau of Wildlife Information Needs Related to Wildlife Rehabilitation

this study. Individuals (who we will refer to simply as rehabilitators) are the focus of orphans, or distressed wildlife, the activities and attitudes of these rehabilitators, their education, and their actions. The Environmental Conservation (DEC) to receive, possess, and aid sick, injured, or diseased wildlife, who have been authorized by the New York State Department of

in New York. In New York State, there are currently more than 400 individuals (Stephens, 1999). In New York State, there are currently more than 400 individuals who have been authorized to legally rehabilitate wildlife under the definition and licensing before they may legally rehabilitate wildlife. Approximately 40 states, including New York, require individuals to undergo training and licensing before they may legally rehabilitate wildlife. A variety of organizations, including veterinary hospitals, nature centers and zoos, are authorized by private individuals and a

Wildlife rehabilitation is conducted by private individuals and a

Wildlife Rehabilitation and Rehabilitation

WILDLIFE REHABILITATORS IN NEW YORK STATE

CHARACTERISTICS, ACTIVITIES, AND ATTITUDES OF LICENSED
Initially, 3 broad areas of information need were identified. These represent
the basis for developing a line of research that will help DEC understand
rehabilitators, and thereby lay a foundation for a mutually-beneficial
relationship between DEC Bureau of Wildlife and New York's rehabilitators.

Information to Guide Licensing Practices

Over the past 10 years, DEC has monitored some aspects of rehabilitators' activities, including the number of animals treated, the species involved, and the disposition of the animals treated. DEC monitored the activity of the New York Wildlife Rehabilitators Association, which has been involved in both local and national efforts to improve wildlife rehabilitation. During the mid-1980s, the association played a key role in developing a state-wide network of rehabilitators. This network has been instrumental in promoting best practices and sharing information among members.

With the exception of animal treatment involving endangered species, wildlife rehabilitation may have little effect on wildlife populations. To understand how wildlife rehabilitators affect public attitudes toward wildlife rehabilitation activity, detailed, current information on the activity and its participants will help DEC make considered administrative decisions related to wildlife rehabilitation activity.

Information to Understand How Wildlife Rehabilitators Affect Public Attitudes Toward Wildlife Rehabilitation Activity.
1991 (Note: data not reported for licence year 1984).

Figure 1: Participation in wildlife rehabilitation in New York State: 1982-1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wildlife; and (4) wildlife as indicators of environmental quality. This 1989 document noted widespread public interest in: human interaction with wildlife, where a large segment of the public could benefit. The DEC recently surveyed public opinion, which shows great interest in wildlife management programs and public education programs. The survey indicates that wildlife education activities are part of a broad-based wildlife management program, which may identify ways in which DEC could supplement its education efforts to enhance rehabilitators' understanding and influence public attitudes toward wildlife.

Rehabilitation, this avenue of direct contact with the public, gives The New York State Environmental Conservation Law allows people to capture distressed wildlife and deliver such wildlife directly to a licensed education activities, and public information services (Marion 1989).

Due to frequent interaction with various publics through media coverage, rehabilitation efforts enjoy a positive public image and high visibility. Nevertheless, rehabilitation often is not well documented, and the animals brought to New York State Rehabilitators are released, and the records (Appendix C-D) suggest that fewer than half of such cases are documented. The DEC has surveyed Rehabilitators to determine how well Rehabilitators perform their tasks and what resources are needed. The DEC is especially interested in learning about: (1) wildlife management programs as both could benefit from that involvement; (2) continued existence of species; (3) opportunities to learn about wildlife; and (4) wildlife as indicators of environmental quality. This 1989 document noted widespread public interest in: human interaction with wildlife, where a large segment of the public could benefit. The DEC recently surveyed public opinion, which shows great interest in wildlife management programs and public education programs. The survey indicates that wildlife education activities are part of a broad-based wildlife management program, which may identify ways in which DEC could supplement its education efforts to enhance rehabilitators' understanding and influence public attitudes toward wildlife.

Rehabilitation, this avenue of direct contact with the public, gives The New York State Environmental Conservation Law allows people to capture distressed wildlife and deliver such wildlife directly to a licensed education activities, and public information services (Marion 1989).

Due to frequent interaction with various publics through media coverage, rehabilitation efforts enjoy a positive public image and high visibility. Nevertheless, rehabilitation often is not well documented, and the animals brought to New York State Rehabilitators are released, and the records (Appendix C-D) suggest that fewer than half of such cases are documented. The DEC has surveyed Rehabilitators to determine how well Rehabilitators perform their tasks and what resources are needed. The DEC is especially interested in learning about: (1) wildlife management programs as both could benefit from that involvement; (2) continued existence of species; (3) opportunities to learn about wildlife; and (4) wildlife as indicators of environmental quality. This 1989 document noted widespread public interest in: human interaction with wildlife, where a large segment of the public could benefit. The DEC recently surveyed public opinion, which shows great interest in wildlife management programs and public education programs. The survey indicates that wildlife education activities are part of a broad-based wildlife management program, which may identify ways in which DEC could supplement its education efforts to enhance rehabilitators' understanding and influence public attitudes toward wildlife.
The purpose of our study was to facilitate DEC efforts to create a relationship with licensed rehabilitators that fosters cooperation to provide wildlife benefits to the people of New York. This goal will be met through a 3-phase study involving surveys of rehabilitators, wildlife management professionals in New York State, and the public public rehabilitation programs. Activities of study phase I (reported heretofore) were to: (1) characterize objectives of study phase I (reported heretofore) were to: (1) characterize

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

benefits (Fraser and Moss 1985).

DEC efforts to address additional, unmet public demands for wildlife-related treatment of distressed and deceased wildlife can also serve as an attempting to conserve endangered species of wildlife. Diagnosing and activity also adds to the knowledge base valuable to wildlife managers agencies may not have the fiscal ability to provide, wildlife rehabilitation

convalesced, rehabilitators provide a public service. Wildlife management benefits. By accepting and treating individual animals that are injured or rehabilitation may also be addressing demands for a variety of more tangible those who deliver injured or distressed wildlife to rehabilitators. Wildlife animals appear to provide psychological benefits to both rehabilitators and the most identifiable addressed by rehabilitators, assisting individual benefits. The demand for the humane treatment of wildlife is perhaps activities of rehabilitators may be meeting part of the public demand for...
RESULTS

(SPSS Inc., 1986).

analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX) software.

questionsnaires were coded by Human Dimensions Research Unit (HDRC) staff and

cosponses were made to nonrespondents at 7 to 10 day intervals. Completed

to 3 mailings were made to nonrespondents on 22 April 1991. Up

лене to rehabilitate wildlife in New York State in 1990. Each licensee

mailing addresses were obtained from DEC for all 430 individuals.

DEC, NYSDEC and NFWA, we revised and finalized the survey instrument.

DEC, NYSDEC, and NFWA, we revised and finalized the survey instrument.

of NYSDEC, based on internal peer review and input from representatives of

were developed based on input from a nominal group meeting with board members

interaction with rehabilitators. Items assessing rehabilitator constraints

involvement in rehabilitation; and attitudes toward DEI regulations and

attitudes toward wildlife and wildlife conservation; motivations

education, training, income; wildlife care activities; and high

location, operating budget; background characteristics (i.e., age, sex,

information on each rehabilitator's facility (i.e., facility size, staffing,

A self-administered mail-back questionnaire was developed to assess

METHODS

and information providers.

factors they perceived as impediments to their effectiveness as wildlife care

assess perceptions about their interaction with DEC, and (3) identity

In a degree in veterinary medicine and 8% were certified veterinary technicians.

In a held a post-graduate degree (Table 2). Nearly 10% of rehabilitators held
old (mean age = 42; range = 18-76). Most (67%) had attended some college, and 1

The majority (69%) of rehabilitators were both female and 30-49 years

York, the Finger Lakes region and western New York (DEC Regions I, 3, 4, 7,

Rehabilitator). Participation was highest in Long Island, southeastern New

provide animal care under the supervision of a type II wildlife

served as an assistant wildlife rehabilitator (assistant rehabilitators may

York 1990, 432 persons were licensed to rehabilitate wildlife in New York.

Rehabilitators and Their Facilities

Wildlife and wildlife management.

information-education activities; and (4) attitudes and values related to

rehabilitators and their facilities; (2) animal care activities; (3)

Findings are grouped and reported within the following sections:

other staff in such facilities were not explored in this study.

facilities such as nature centers, the broader educational efforts made by

facilities such as rehabilitation. Though some of these individuals operated in

Likewise, the educational activities reported here represent the efforts of

activity conducted in these smaller, in-home facilities throughout New York.

operated in an in-home facility. The results we report relate mainly to

home (e.g., a veterinary practice or animal hospital), but the majority

survey response. Some rehabilitators operated in a facility outside their own
Table 1. Percent of 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitators, by years of licensed participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Years</th>
<th>% of Rehabilitators (n=288)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Highest level of formal education attained by 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>% of Respondents (n=299)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or technical school</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a two-year college degree</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed an undergraduate degree</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post-graduate education</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed a post-graduate degree</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
through public donations (Table 6). Fewer than 10% covered the majority of their operating expenses (rehabilitators may accept public donations, but cannot charge a fee for their services). About 70% paid all rehabilitation expenses personally. Table 5). Facilities (52%) expended $500 or less on their rehabilitation activities. The majority of in-home operations consisted of I, rehabilitation, no assistant rehabilitators, and no at-an-in-home facilities (65%) were exclusively in-home). Most in-home facilities (77%) of rehabilitators conducted animal care activities.

In-Home Rehabilitation Facilities:

smaller, in-home facilities throughout New York. Characterization of these facilities. Rather, our study focused on the education activities. We did not attempt to provide a detailed wildlife in operating budget, staff size, animal treatment activities, and widely in rehabilitation centers (16.1%) (Table 3). Nonhome facilities varied. Wildlife rehabilitators practiced (30.1%), animal hospitals (21.5%) and facilities (35%) and in-home facilities (65%). The most common nonhome facilities (93.5%) were active (1.5). Had received at least 1 animal college educated, and 35-50 years old.

compared to those groups, rehabilitators were more likely to be female.

By wildlife-related recreation (e.g., wildlife watching or photography). By New York State hunters and residents who participated in "nonconsumptive" rehabilitation sex, education, and age are compared to 1995 data (USFWS 1999).

the characteristics of other groups of interest. In Figures 2-4, data on the demographic characteristics are most useful when used in comparison to These demographic characteristics are most useful when used in comparison to
and Wildlife Service 1989].


Figure 2. Sex of 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitators, 1990 New York.
Figure 3: Education of 1990 New York State Wildlife Rehabilitators, 1985 New York State Hunters, and 1985 Nonconsumptive Users

[Image: Bar chart showing education levels of wildlife rehabilitators, hunters, and nonconsumptive users.]

[Graph data: Education levels for Rehabilitators, Hunters, and Nonconsumptive Users compared across different education levels (High School, Some College, Post College) with percentages on the y-axis and number of participants on the x-axis.]

### Table 4. Staffing Levels at In-Home Wildlife Rehabilitation Facilities in New York in 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Elementary or High School</th>
<th>Museum/Zoo</th>
<th>Animal Shelter</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Nature Center</th>
<th>Zoo</th>
<th>Rehabilitation Center</th>
<th>Animal Hospital</th>
<th>Veterinary Practice</th>
<th>% of All Nonhome Facilities (n=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitators (% of 228)</td>
<td>% of 1990 Budget Active In-Home</td>
<td>1990 Expenditures (n=227)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>75 - 99</td>
<td>5,001 - 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>50 - 74</td>
<td>2,501 - 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>25 - 49</td>
<td>2,001 - 2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1 - 24</td>
<td>1,001 - 2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500 or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. 1990 operating expenditures for in-home wildlife rehabilitation facilities in New York State.
Requests. In the majority of cases (65%), rehabilitators received fewer than
about wildlife, and more than 90% had responded to telephone information
Most (64%) rehabilitators had an interest in providing public education
Informal-Education Activities

Rehabilitators.

Education and training opportunities were perceived as constraints by fewer
considerations, intergroup, and intergroup communication, and rehabilitator
most common and important constraints (Table 8). Human health and safety
limited time and money, and availability of animal holding facilities were the
groups (e.g., D.EC personnel, local officials), or other rehabilitators.
human health and safety considerations, and (4) communication with other
considerations (e.g., supplies, staff support, animal holding facilities, (3)
unilateral constraints (i.e., limited time and money), (2) operational
constraints identified fell into several categories, which we labeled: (1)
assess the importance of potential constraints to animal care provision. The
Based on input from NSWR Board Members, we developed 20 items to
Constraints to Providing Animal Care:
Rehabilitators in 1999 dealt with just a few individual animals (Appendix E).
consistent with 1999 rehabilitator information, which shows that most
rehabilitators handled 25 or fewer animals (Table 7). These findings are
Rehabilitators accepted hundreds of animals in 1990, but most (75%) in-home
at in-home facilities. Some nonhome treatment facilities and individuals
indicate that about half (approximately 7,000) of those animals were treated
13,000 animals (Chris von Schilgen, DEC, pers. commun.). Our results
DEC records indicate that in 1990 rehabilitators accepted approximately
Animal Treatment Activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Animals Handled</th>
<th>% Active In-Home Rehabilitators</th>
<th>Number of Birds (n=235)</th>
<th>Mammals (n=230)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Percent of in-home wildlife rehabilitation in New York State, by number of birds and mammals received in 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Constraint listed as a potential constraint (% of respondents (n=266))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State wildlife rehabilitation services, including personnel and public health, restrictions on handling rabies vectors.

Human health and safety considerations:

2.2 Rehabilitation

Communication/interaction with other central office personnel.

1.3 Local communication with local faculty officers.

9.4 Communication with local personnel.

3.5 Communication with DEC.

Communication with the public.

Intergroup, Intragroup Communication:

1.9 Requests to answer information.

2.4 Lack of information, training opportunities.

2.3 Availability of veterinary assistance.

2.8 Availability of faculty support staff.

2.7 Availability of animals to my faculty.

2.6 Availability of supplies and equipment.

2.7 Availability of facilities for non-researchable.

2.8 Availability of animal holding facilities.

Operational Considerations:

1.9 The cost of providing animal care.

3.8 Time available to provide animal care.

Table 8. Constraints on animal care provision. Perceived by 1990 New York
(3) opportunities to deliver educational presentations, we developed 7 items
universal limitations (i.e., time and money), (2) educator training needs, and
providers. These fell into several categories, which we labeled (1)
a range of factors that could constrain rehabilitation efforts as information
through a nominal group meeting with NYSDEC Board members, we identified

Constraints to Rehabilitators Providing Information

(1) Conservation Law (Table 11)

control, habitat conservation, wildlife natural history, and environmental
related topics, including care of individual animals, nuisance and damage
Rehabilitators used these opportunities to address a variety of wildlife.
Rehabilitators contacted 59,000-60,000 people through these presentations in 1990.
addressed less frequently (38% in both cases). Individual rehabilitators
and general audiences (69%). Service groups and high school groups were
spoke most often to elementary school groups (83%), other youth groups (73%),
About a quarter of all rehabilitators gave such presentations in 1990. They
York’s rehabilitators reach the public through educational presentations.
of special interest to wildlife managers was the extent to which New
broaden audience by providing newpaper, television or radio interviews.
10). About half of those involved in education activities tried to reach a
through personal contact, written materials, and oral presentations (Table
requests. Rehabilitators commonly provided information directly to the public
related education activities, in addition to answering telephone information
more than half (57%) of all rehabilitators had conducted wildlife-
16,000 telephone information requests.
100 such requests (Table 9). Collectively, rehabilitators received over
50 telephone information requests, but some individuals (19%) answered over
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Calls Handled in 1990</th>
<th>&lt;1</th>
<th>1-25</th>
<th>26-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101-150</th>
<th>151-200</th>
<th>201-250</th>
<th>251 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>License Years</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Years</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 Years</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Telephone information requests received in 1990 by New York State wildlife rehabilitators operating at in-home facilities, and specifically by rehabilitators with 1-4 and 5 or more years licensed experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Mode</th>
<th>One-to-One Dialogue with People who Delivered Animals</th>
<th>Formal Information Presentations</th>
<th>Distribution of Written Materials</th>
<th>Exhibition of Information Displays</th>
<th>Radio, Television or Newspaper Interviews</th>
<th>News Releases for Radio, Television, Newspapers</th>
<th>Publication of Wildlife-Related Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Respondents (n=170)</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Modes of communication used by New York State wildlife rehabilitators to deliver information to the public in 1990.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Respondents (n=740)</th>
<th>Education Topic Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>Dealing with wildlife nuisance and damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>Systems that support wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>Importance of the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>Preventing wildlife casualties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>Basic wildlife ecology and natural history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>Encouraging concern for individual animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>Human impacts on wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>The importance of habitat conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>Laws against keeping wildlife as pets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>How to tell if an animal needs help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Topics addressed by the majority of New York State wildlife rehabilitators who delivered information to the public in 1990.
Examples of statements reflecting these motivational themes (Table 13) are given in Appendix G. However, the item did not elicit responses that suggest several common relative strengths of particular motivations in the rehabilitation community.

Often, multiple factors were cited as reasons for involvement. This item was not designed to provide a quantitative assessment of the distribution of respondents reported a wide variety of reasons for their involvement in wildlife rehabilitation. Thus, it is not surprising that comparable high levels of participation in rehabilitation activities is a fundamental part of understanding wildlife rehabilitation activity.

To understand more about the impacts of rehabilitators as public and (3) perceptions about DEC and DEC-rehabilitator interactions.

(2) attitudes and values on key wildlife management issues; and (1) motivations to participate in wildlife rehabilitation: explore 3 areas of interest: motivations, attitudes, values and perceptions. Toward information providers, wildlife managers need to gain a better understanding of rehabilitators' motivations, attitudes, values, and perceptions. To understand more about the impacts of rehabilitators as public and wildlife educators. Or access to educational settings (Table 12).

Wildlife educators cited constraints related to training needs. Lack of standards for limited time, money, and access to printed education materials. Fewer rehabilitation community. The most widespread educator constraints were to assess the degree to which these were perceived constraints across the
Table 12. Impediments to providing wildlife-related education perceived by New York State wildlife rehabilitators operating in-home rehabilitation facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint Description</th>
<th>Active in ed. (n=88) (%)</th>
<th>Inactive in ed. (n=62) (%)</th>
<th>Active in ed. (n=88) (%)</th>
<th>Inactive in ed. (n=62) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to conduct activities.</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of printed educational materials.</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds to conduct activities.</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for training as an educator.</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of standards for wildlife educators.</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited personal skills as a communicator/educator.</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to formal education settings.</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Description:</td>
<td>% of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of moral obligation to provide care to animals.</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to offset human impacts on wildlife.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that one had to fill a need for trained rehabilitation in the local area.</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to &quot;give something back&quot; to animals.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to reach others about wildlife.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of remorse/regret for human impacts on animals.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to encourage compassion for wildlife.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to persuade people to share, not rule the planet.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that people should show respect for individual animals.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that every individual animal is important.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that one has a natural gift for wildlife rehabilitation and should use it.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interest in developing a humane ethic in other people.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A desire to replace what is destroyed by traps or vehicular collisions.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>% of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something good and worthwhile</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From diseased animals</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect people and other wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress reduction as a result of working with animals</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of personal challenge</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction from helping something helpless</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide a service to people who are in need of something</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel I am making some kind of difference</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction from providing for something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that I am helping nature</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service organization</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of personal fulfillment</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of personal enrichment</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second chance at life</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of giving animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting, interacting with animals</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction gained from handling, an animal returned to the wild</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Satisfactions**

Motivation Description:

Table 13. Cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Description</th>
<th>% of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving my knowledge of wildlife and natural history</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my knowledge of wildlife diseases and toxicology</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my skills in animal treatment</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests in Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that rehabilitation contributes to wildlife conservation</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that rehabilitation helps preserve endangered species</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An interest in wildlife conservation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A belief that rehab. helps perpetuate wildlife</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to ensure healthy and diverse wild populations</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A drive to protect areas where animals are allowed to live free and natural</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Description</td>
<td>Nature Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of wild animals</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General interest in wildlife and natural history</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping a connection to the wild</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A love of nature and wilderness</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain a sense of appreciation for wildlife</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Cases do not add up to 100% since respondents could report multiple motivations.
WILDLIFE REHABILITATION AS A MEANS OF ACQUIRING SUCH SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE.

Conduct their animal care activities. Some participants were attracted to

skills (e.g., animal health care, wildlife diseases, natural history) to
growth and enrichment. Rehabilitators must develop specific knowledge and
some also found wildlife rehabilitation to be a means for personal
important and rewarding activity in their lives.

Personal Satisfactions: Direct, physical contact with animals attracted
repetitive remove for human activities. They believed violated those rights.
violations of animals, and their sense of obligation seemed to

and compassion for animal suffering. Still others believed human activities
expressed a sense of obligation that stemmed from respect for life, empathy,

sense of obligations as stewards, caretakers, and users of wildlife. Others
relationship that should exist between people and wildlife. Some expressed a

and from concerns focused on individual animals, to concerns about ecosystems or the
were not uniform. Concern was expressed at a variety of levels, extending

It is important to note that the nature of the obligations expressed
positive impact on wildlife were commonly noted as motivators.

Take responsibility, make things right, give something back, or have a

e.g., development, habitat alteration, motor-vehicle operation). The urge to

animals, especially when these conditions were a result of human activities.

This study was a sense of moral obligation to help orphaned or injured

MORAL OBLIGATION: THE STRONGEST MOTIVATIONAL THEME THAT EMERGED FROM
that term refers to considerations of animal pain and suffering. Most (90%)

Animal Welfare.--Four topics explored in issues of animal welfare, where

varied widely. However, several general findings did emerge.

between rehabilitationists and wildlife managers. Attitudes on these issues

rehabilitationists hold in these three areas critical to ongoing relations

based on this thesis, we developed a scale to explore the perspectives that

issues, animal welfare issues, and environmental/wildlife conservation issues.

critical to that relationship are those related to wildlife management and use

people should relate to wildlife. We believe that the perspectives most

large part on the degree to which these diverge in their perspectives on how

communication between rehabilitationists and wildlife managers is based in

Attitudes and Values on Wildlife-Related Issues:

management, and natural resource management,

hunting, wildlife damage control, domestic animal control, wildlife

activities, including: animal husbandry, veterinary medicine, falconry,

described their involvement as a natural progression of involvement in other

enrich and act on that appreciation by “feeding nature” still others

wild. For these participants, rehabilitation was attractive as a way to

their feelings as interest in, respect for, and love of things natural and

positive feelings about wildlife, nature, and the outdoors. They expressed

conservation. Others participated in wildlife rehabilitation due to strong

educating people about wildlife was attractive to many rehabilitationists as a

other factors leading to involvement: Rehabilitation of wildlife and

to domestic and captive wildlife animals.

simply to enrich their lives, or enhance their ability to provide health care

Wildlife-use opinions, a hierarchical, agglomerative method of cluster
attitudes toward wildlife use. Based on data from 9 items assessing
determining whether rehabilitators could be placed in subgroups based on their
to explore these opinions further, we conducted additional analyses to
nuisance problems (Table 17).

Wildlife populations to reduce human health and safety risks, crop damage, or
number were personally opposed to population manipulation, or limiting
personally opposed to recreational hunting and trapping, and a substantial
for food or educational display (Table 17). However, about 75% were
management of wildlife, and many believed it was appropriate to use wildlife
activities were not (Table 16-17). The majority (60%) favored human
use of wildlife was appropriate, but that some management techniques and
opinions on the management and use of wildlife, overall, they believed some

Wildlife Management and Use--Rehabilitators held a wide range of
habitat (Table 15).

that limiting human behavior was appropriate to conserve wildlife and wildlife
not doing enough to conserve the natural systems that support wildlife, and
wildlife populations and diversity. Nearly 90% believed that New Yorkers were

Wildlife Conservation--Rehabilitators showed strong interest in
management programs (Table 14).

animal pain was an important consideration in New York State's wildlife
suffering. However, the majority (80%) also seemed unsure about whether
those who use animals should do so in a way that minimizes animal pain and
population status of an animal. Nearly all (99%) rehabilitators believed that
believed animal pain and suffering were important, regardless of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Statement</th>
<th>SA&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>A&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>N&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>D&lt;sub&gt;d&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People who are allowed to hunt or trap should follow practices that cause the least animal pain and suffering.</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone who uses wild animals in some way should be concerned about the pain and suffering of those animals.</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain and suffering of individual wild animals is not important if the population is not jeopardized.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing animal pain and suffering is an important consideration in New York's wildlife management programs.</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Strongly Agree; <sup>b</sup>Agree; <sup>c</sup>Neutral; <sup>d</sup>Disagree; <sup>e</sup>Strongly Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Statement</th>
<th>% Respondents (n=284–295)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WILDLIFE CONSERVATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resources expended in New York to manage wildlife for hunting would be better spent on conservation of threatened or endangered wildlife.</td>
<td>39.8 22.4 16.7 12.9 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resources society expends to care for individual animals in non-threatened populations would be better spent on conservation of habitat used by that species.</td>
<td>21.1 41.0 25.0 9.4 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perpetuation of wildlife populations is more important than the welfare of individuals within populations.</td>
<td>16.7 24.3 23.2 21.9 13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people of New York are not doing enough to conserve the natural systems that wildlife depend on for survival.</td>
<td>68.8 24.0 4.8 2.1 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more important to manage wildlife for species diversity than it is to manage for a large number of species.</td>
<td>35.9 31.0 26.4 3.9 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ethical for society to restrict human activities to minimize negative impacts on wildlife.</td>
<td>60.2 27.6 8.5 2.4 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strongly Agree; bAgree; cNeutral; dDisagree; *Strongly Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not felt compassion for wildlife...</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who participate in trapping animal to exist as a right of an individual violates is morally wrong because it...</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is wrong to regard wildlife as renewable source of food...</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is morally wrong because it is morally wrong to sell their fur...</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural part of human existence is morally wrong because...</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting wildlife for food is morally wrong...</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of wildlife gives society a vested interest in the long-term...</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is done primarily for recreation...</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping wildlife is morally wrong...</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of hunting to protect it from all...</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wildlife Management and Use**

Table 16. Wildlife management/use attitudes held by New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1990 (n=286-297).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Favor</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapping wildlife primarily for recreation.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapping wildlife for sale of their fur.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting for nuisance wildlife problems.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife damage to agricultural crops.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife threats to human health or safety.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting primarily for recreation.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting wildlife primarily for food.</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of animals for public educational displays.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(n=286-297)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Respondents</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Attitudes toward key wildlife management activities held by New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1990 (n=286-297).
Hunting, trapping, or limiting wildlife populations. Though some members of
the minority subgroup (29.5 percent) of rehabilitators was more likely
wildlife populations was ethical (Tables 18-19).

violated the rights of animals. Only 34 percent thought human manipulation of
wounding, About 02 percent believed hunting was morally wrong because it
threatened or endangered species. Nearly 01 percent believed trapping was morally
spend on hunting and trapping would be better spent on conservation of
growth of life for people in New York; most (62 percent) thought resources
concerns. Only 02 percent believed hunting activity contributed to the
wildlife populations to control damage or address human health and safety
characterized as relatively opposed to hunting, trapping, and limiting
The majority subgroup (71.5 percent) of rehabilitators can be

all men in the minority subgroup.

groups, with 45 percent of all men in the majority subgroup, and 55 percent of
men were almost evenly split between
percent female and 68 percent male. In the majority subgroup. The minority subgroup was 38
subgroups were different in male-female composition. The majority

like to provide public education.

activity, propensity to operate an in-home, independent facility, and
age, income, highest level of education, years of licensed rehabilitation
demographic and participation-related variables (i.e., they were similar in
respectively. The membership of these subgroups was similar on several
contacted approximately 71 percent and 29 percent of respondents,
identified 2 clusters, or attitudinal subgroups. The attitudinal subgroups
Attitude Group 2 (n=80)

- It is done primarily to obtain food
- Hunting wildlife is morally wrong
- Conservation of wildlife
- Having uses for wildlife gives society a vested interest in the long-term
- Trapping wildlife is morally wrong
- Forms of hunting
- If it is done primarily for recreation

Attitude Group 1 (n=198)

- It is done primarily to protect it from all species
- Necessary to sustain human life
- Hunting is justified only when it is

Attitude Group 2 (n=78)

- Important to maintained the quality of life for people in New York State
- The use of wildlife through hunting is
- It is essential for humans to manipulate population of wildlife

Wildlife Management Use

State Wildlife Rehabilitation in 1990.

Table 18. Wildlife management/use attitudes held by subgroups of New York % Respondents (n=284-295)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Group 2 (n=80)</th>
<th>Group 1 (n=198)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to view wildlife with reverence and still participate in hunting</td>
<td>75.0, 22.5, 18.2</td>
<td>6.3, 36.9, 16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is endangered wildlife.</td>
<td>6.3, 32.1, 36.3</td>
<td>30.0, 4.0, 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who participate in trapping do not feel compassion for wildlife.</td>
<td>0.0, 0.0, 7.5</td>
<td>26.3, 13.0, 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife is morally wrong because it animates the right of an individual</td>
<td>0.0, 3.0, 15.0, 31.3</td>
<td>2.5, 33.0, 16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is wrong to regard wild animals as a remarkable source of food.</td>
<td>12.5, 3.8, 22.5</td>
<td>7.7, 3.0, 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing wild animals to sell their fur is morally wrong.</td>
<td>76.3, 20.2, 14.2</td>
<td>11.2, 26.9, 31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using wildlife for food is a natural part of human existence.</td>
<td>6.3, 3.0, 5.0</td>
<td>0.0, 0.0, 22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Cont.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Favor</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.2 35.4 24.1 12.7 12.7</td>
<td>0.5 13.5 18.9 9.9 3.8</td>
<td>12.7 4.1 11.7 13.9 7.6</td>
<td>2.1 1.9 7.0 4.0 8.0</td>
<td>2.1 1.9 7.0 4.0 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce nuisance wildlife problems</td>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife damage to agricultural crops</td>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife threats to human health or safety</td>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife threats to human health or safety</td>
<td>Limiting wildlife populations to reduce wildlife threats to human health or safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 6.4 46.2 12.8 6.4 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 1.0 9.0 15.2</td>
<td>2.9 6.2 19.0 0.0 15.2</td>
<td>2.9 6.2 19.0 0.0 15.2</td>
<td>2.9 6.2 19.0 0.0 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of animals for public educational display</td>
<td>Trapping wildlife primarily for recreation</td>
<td>Trapping wildlife for sale of their fur</td>
<td>Hunting primarily for recreation</td>
<td>Hunting wildlife primarily for food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5 26.6 9.2 19.0 0.0 15.2</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 12.8 1.2 9.3</td>
<td>11.3 28.8 21.3 21.3 17.5</td>
<td>11.3 28.8 21.3 21.3 17.5</td>
<td>11.3 28.8 21.3 21.3 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Attitudes toward key wildlife management activities held by subgroups of New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1990.
care provision. Respondents to a 1991 NYMSC survey of Rehabilitators also
communication with the public and with DEC as potential impediments to animal

In a focus group meeting, NYMSC Board members identified poor
Animal Care Activities

Discussion and Implications

It is Importantly for future DEC/Rehabilitator Interaction (Tables 20-21).
expressed a high level of uncertainty about DEC's activities, personal, and
Rehabilitators reported a generally supportive relationship with DEC, whereas
personal characteristics, or communication with Rehabilitators. While some
question (were "undecided" in their opinions related to DEC program actions,
their responses were that many Rehabilitators (22% to 44%) depending on the
Rehabilitation activity in New York. An important theme that emerged from
on an agency, and their perceptions of the impact of DEC activities on
we asked Rehabilitators a variety of questions to assess their image of DEC as
and Rehabilitator community. Toward this end, Rehabilitators currently perceive DEC
managers, it is necessary to assess how Rehabilitators currently perceive DEC
To facilitate communication between Rehabilitators and DEC:

Interaction Between Rehabilitators and DEC

Wesed interest in Wildlife conservation (Tables 18-19).
Moreover, 22 percent agreed that using wildlife gives society a
species. Moreover, 22 percent agreed that using conservation of threatened or endangered
participation in hunting. A majority (66 percent) did not think resources spent
percent) believed it was possible to view animals with reverence and
few believed that hunting and trapping were morally wrong. Nearly all (97%
this supports opposed trapping for fur or hunting primarily for recreation,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Uc (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. DEC personnel in the Albany office are concerned with developing a rehabilitator examination process that is fair.</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. DEC personnel in my local area are only concerned about species of wildlife</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DEC personnel in the Albany office are more concerned with hunting-related than nonhunting-related wildlife issues.</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DEC personnel in the Albany office want to design licensing requirements for rehabilitators that promote professional development.</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. DEC personnel in the Albany office are willing to consider input from rehabilitators in decisions related to rehabilitator licensing practices.</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The DEC Albany office places unnecessary restrictions on rehabilitators.</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The DEC Albany office will consider the results of this study as they make decisions that affect rehabilitators.</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Strongly Agree; b. Agree; c. Undecided; d. Disagree; e. Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Perceptions of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation held by New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1990 (n=286-297).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL CHARACTERISTICS:</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. DEC personnel in my local area view rehabilitators as a group of professionals...</td>
<td>i. DEC personnel in my local area are interested in establishing an effective communication network with rehabilitators...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. DEC personnel in my local area do not believe rehabilitators make any contribution to wildlife conservation...</td>
<td>m. DEC personnel in my local area want to establish a more cooperative relationship with rehabilitators...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Most DEC personnel believe rehabilitators are opposed to management of wildlife...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Most DEC personnel do not believe rehabilitators make any contribution to wildlife-related education...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Uc</th>
<th>Dd</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strongly Agree; *Agree; *Undecided; *Disagree; *Strongly Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The rehabilitator licensing renewal process</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interactions with DEC Conservation officers in my local area</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions related to handling rabies vector species</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interactions with DEC wildlife personnel in my local area</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rehabilitator examination in the Albany office</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: 1990 New York State wildlife rehabilitators perceptions of the impacts selected DEC actions have on wildlife rehabilitators in New York (n=286-297).
A recent study by the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Animal Care and Administration (RRATC) has identified several factors that contribute to the difficulties in providing effective rehabilitation programs for animals. The study suggests that additional training materials and opportunities are needed to help rehabilitators improve their practice and effectiveness.

Recent data from the RRATC survey indicate that animal care training is often inadequate. These findings are supported by a 1991 study by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), which found that rehabilitators often lack the necessary skills and knowledge to properly care for animals.

Personal challenges to providing animal care provision, such as equipment, veterinary support services, and supplies, are identified as the most pressing issues. Demands on time, funding animal care, and securing facilities, supplies, and equipment are also problematic.

Effective rehabilitation programs require clear communication between DCC and rehabilitators. A lack of coordination and communication between these groups can lead to difficulties in the rehabilitation process. Rehabilitation guidelines suggest that animals are often mistreated and mistreated animals can be difficult to rehabilitate.

Logbooks indicate that most rehabilitators deal with a few common species (e.g., rabbits, raccoons, skunks, oppossums) Appendix A-B), usually delivered by a person believing them to be abandoned or injured. In some cases, rehabilitators deal with these animals even if they have been left in the wild.

Despite these challenges, rehabilitators and veterinarians that should have been left in the wild. (Appendix F.) Yet, respondent comments suggest that people are often mistaken for received by people who believe them to be abandoned or injured. The data from the survey show that about 25% of rehabilitators said they were impacted by communication problems with others.
provided wildlife-related information, reaching a large and diverse audience.

Range of wildlife-related issues. At least half of all rehabilitators
Most rehabilitators were interested in providing information about a
sometimes incorrectly perceived as local DE Wildlife Personnel.

Most providers of wildlife-related services and information, and as such, are
activities they become more than a "wildlife user group." They become
in wildlife-related education activities. When engaged in these specialized
facturers, wildlife researchers, who handle live animals and actively engage
wildlife-related activity group. They are also among the few groups (e.g.,
DE. They may have the largest female-to-male participant ratio (2:1) of any
Rehabilitators are in several ways distinct from other publics served by
Informatio-Education Activities

Rehabilitator training tools.

use: summative evaluation is needed to assess their usefulness as
become licensed rehabilitators. These documents are in their first year of
that potential participants achieve a minimum level of competency before they
community, and the wildlife rehabilitation community were designed to insure
which were developed with input from representatives of DE, the Veterinary
examination booklet (Porkas and Thomas 1991), and the Wildlife Rehabilitation
study guide (Porkas and Thomas 1991). These training documents,
by sponsoring the development of 2 documents: the wildlife rehabilitation
that year, DEC also made a key contribution to training for rehabilitators.
facilities provide several continuing education workshops for rehabilitators.
State Rehabilitation Organization (NYSWCO) and individual rehabilitation
the need for improved education materials and opportunities. In 1991, the
both DEC and the rehabilitation community have taken steps to address
Attitudes and Values

Effective means to enhance wildlife-related education in New York State. The impediments facing these private sector educators may be able to reduce some wildlife management and rehabilitation communication networks between independent, in-home rehabilitators. The worthwhileness of DECs to cooperate with non-governmental efforts to create effective that might be made in information quality and consistency, it may be to provide wildlife-related information and education. In light of the gains standardized training and help create a network of rehabilitators better able between independent rehabilitators, it may be possible to encourage more relatively uniform training and experiences. With better communication and apprenticeship as assistant rehabilitators, where they might have received their own homes. Moreover, few I(ZX) rehabilitators had experienced a formal. This may stem from the fact that most operated independently, out of the exact nature of the services and information they provided varied. The audiences that can be difficult for wildlife managers to contact directly. They reached people of all ages and interacted with nonhuming problems. They reached people of all ages and interacted with nonhuming natural history, ecology, and control of wildlife nuisance and damage. They had regular opportunities to influence public understanding of wildlife.
Inquiry will further clarify potential communication concerns, and will lay a
foundation for implementation in the spring of 1992 (scheduled for implementation in the
study phase III). When combined with data collected and differences in critical issue areas, other, accurately perceived one another, and understand their true similarities
and differences, reported in a forthcoming HDU series publication, provides insights
comparative analyses of data from both surveys has been completed. That a
critical attitude and value areas was obtained from personnel in DEC. A
survey, personnel, was completed late in 1991. In that survey information on the same
examined these issues in New York State. Study phase II, a survey of DEC
This survey represents the first phase of a comprehensive effort to
Continuing Research Plans

...potential for unnecessary misunderstanding with rehabilitation...
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Appendix C  Disposition of mammals treated, by DEC administrative region, by New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1989.
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Appendix F  Cause of distress in animals received by wildlife rehabilitators in New York in 1989.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squirrels</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoons</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits/Hares</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opossum</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>6067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No rehabilitators (%)*

*This table is based on animal care logbook information completed by all licensed wildlife rehabilitators, returned to DEC, and summarized by the New York State Wildlife Rehabilitation Council.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Grouping</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
<th>Region 9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigeons/Doves</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prey</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl/Grebes</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorebirds/Gulls</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swifts/Swallows</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total n | 664 | 324 | 1156 | 1141 | 194 | 420 | 1169 | 504 | 944 | 6516 |

2 This table is based on animal care logbook information completed by all licensed wildlife rehabilitators, returned to DEC, and summarized by the New York State Wildlife Rehabilitation Council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doa</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Care</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanized</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disposition of Reinstated in 1989**

Appendix C. Disposition of mammals treated by DEC administrative region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
<th>Region 9</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Released</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthanized</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Under Care</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.O.A.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is based on animal care logbook information completed by all licensed wildlife rehabilitators, returned to DEC, and summarized by the New York State Wildlife Rehabilitation Council.*
### State Wildlife Rehabilitation Council

This table is based on animal care Logbook information completed by all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Rehabilitators (%)</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>202</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E. Summary of animals handled by DEC administrative region, by New York State wildlife rehabilitators in 1989.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Distress</th>
<th>Birds (n=6516)</th>
<th>Mammals (n=6067)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orphaned</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumed injured</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predation (dog or cat)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit by a Car</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virus</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision (window, wall)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entanglement</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxin/poison</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil/Tar/Peel</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasites</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Anomaly</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trap-related injury</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunshot/arrow</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emaciated/Dehydrated</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 1%

This table is based on animal care logbook information completed by all licensed wildlife rehabilitators, returned to DEC, and summarized by the New York State Wildlife Rehabilitation Council.
To encourage people to understand that we share rather than rule this planet.

We are all in it together. Animals and humans. Humans should help animals.

It is a way I can help educate the local public on the importance of providing suitable habitat for many wildlife species. Also, it is a small token of return to wildlife for all the great amount of damage caused by man.

My life centers around the caring of injured and orphaned wildlife.

I wanted to educate the populace of Long Island to understand the importance of wildlife and the importance of wildlife habitat to the people of the state.

Also the affects we may have on the system.

I felt we are part of the web of life and responsible for our role and this planet's problems.

I am distressed with humans' disrespect, disregard and neglect of other species. How we species, arrogance, greed and misuse are the causes of most of the Far Enough.

This planet wasn't made just for man—when the animals are gone, we won't be.

### FEELINGS OF MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>In the space below please try to describe the most important reasons why you were involved in wildlife rehabilitation in 1990.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Appendix G: Motivations 1990 New York State Wildlife Rehabilitators Rad for Participation in Wildlife Rehabilitation.
Because some animals are almost human, they have a mind and a heart.

true when most inflicted wildlife is a direct result of human activities.

I feel "morally obligated" to help an animal in distress. This is especially

man, man should try to make things right.

I like the animals and feel that since most of their injuries are inflicted by

I feel an imperative need to aid individual wildlife animals in distress.

Welfare-Based Obligations:

perspective and balance in our lives.

As our environment becomes more populated with houses and people, wildlife are

perspective. I do not accept or understand this principle, hence this is my

application to wildlife rehabilitation. Many individuals in the overall

application to the advances of veterinary medicine and specifically in this

I understand and uphold the approach of "wellness management" in

I understand and uphold the approach of "wellness management" in these areas.

So is assisting and informing people who want to do this. I have the skills

Assisting the ill and injured of any species is a morally good thing to do.

My concern for mankind’s humanity to other species. Mankind should be

there.

time we as human beings and the dominant species put back. This is my small

citizen has taken and taken and taken from our natural resources. It's

respect their right to live among us.

Most caring people love animals, God put them here for a reason and we should

To help one of God’s creations put on this earth for man’s purpose.

It’s just one way of giving a title something back.

The natural world has given us so much. Helping individual animals in need is

Anthropocentric Obligations:

the nuisance syndrome.

To educate the public concerning a variety of wildlife issues and to combat
I have great pleasure in giving these animals a chance to survive. They have just as much right to get proper care as anything else on God’s earth.

Rights-Based Obligations:

To provide care to those in need, I do this for people, why not for wildlife?

Our planet.

Responsibility to ease the pain and suffering of the other beings who share that I’m good at it. No one in My area does rehabilitation.

I believe that all life is precious. That as human beings we have the fact

that I have an unconditional desire to “save” everything—especially by the face

including euthanasia if needed.

Human nature causes people to be concerned about the fate of a distressed animal—someone has to care or take responsibility.

One capability. That is what made me decide to help.

When was a need in my area to help wildlife. So people do not have to travel far to help. So why couldn’t I be sub-human intelligence.

For help. To do so would be sub-human ignorance. I feel I must do so.

Having been close to wildlife and realizing these feelings of another human I feel I must do so.

Those of us who can serve have an obligation to do so. If I can keep one chance to.

It is my contribution to the world around me and to nature. I feel I am able to understand of the natural world.

Public to our wildlife. It is an opportunity to promote concern, care and publicize what the animals are suffering but also services as a link with the general public.

Animals should also receive humane care. Providing that service not only helps keep the animal alive but also in distress because of human activity. I feel that will help the animals that are injured and orphaned often because of man’s doing.

Because I have always cared about wildlife, there are not enough people to.

Acting on a better of respect for all life.
If there is no hope for recovery...
to save animals does that.

I support many conservation and environmental organizations but I wanted to do something more personal and immediately recognizable and fulfilling. Helping endangered species is a way to reduce my environmental footprint. I have been inspired by the work of many conservationists, and I want to do my part to help save the animals that are on the brink of extinction.

I recently attended a wildlife rehabilitation center and was amazed by the variety of animals they had there. From birds to reptiles to small mammals, every creature has a unique story to tell. It was heartwarming to see the dedication and care that the staff put into the animals' recovery.

I also had the opportunity to participate in some hands-on activities, such as feeding the animals and cleaning their enclosures. It was a rewarding experience to see firsthand how much difference even small actions can make.

2: MOTIVATIONS RELATED TO PERSONAL SATISFACTIONS FROM PARTICIPATION

Expense

Just to do what is in his mind maybe (good for man--all other "living" things, man has the right even though he has the power to decide the fate of a species may not understand or recognize that purpose today. That doesn't mean that I believe that all living things were put on this earth for no purpose--we hundreds of others and they in turn inform others.

I strongly respect animals' rights to co-exist with man. My work gives me not only a second chance to these wonderful creatures but an opportunity to educate habitat. Interference is destroying their habitat--they were here first.

I care very much for most creatures that can't speak for themselves. Human help wildlife, and so I decided to do my small part to be one of the "savers.", I feel that the "killers" of wildlife far outnumber the people who actively help wildlife.
Helping them is the most rewarding and important facet of my life.

I am a community service. I feel like we are returning something to nature. I feel like we are releasing them back into their natural habitat.

Releasing back into their natural habitat, there is nothing more fulfilling than watching an animal be free. To see the joy on their face when you raise them as a pet or nurse or release them back into the wild is immeasurable.

My personal efforts have touched the lives of many children.

Being a rehabilitator also fills a desire to be a veternarian.

I enjoy working with animals. I find it especially rewarding to help those in treating domestic species.

As a veterinarian, I feel that my skills were more useful in terms of treating opportunity to handle and be close to wild birds.

I enjoy birds, both from a biological and aesthetic viewpoint. I like the relationships with other people.
I know the environment around me. I wanted to better understand and appreciate the wildlife species and animals, the animals share my soul. I am nature's handmaid. The clouds are my sisters, the rocks are my brothers.

I have always had a keen interest in nature and animals in particular. A love for animals that goes beyond words.

5: Motivations Related to Nature Appreciation

Feeling this was a small way to do my part to protect our natural resources, because I have a deep appreciation of animals and our natural environment and need to help preserve the environment and wildlife for future generations.

I feel I contribute to conservation of natural resources as a rehabilitation.

For animals to be allowed to be natural, need to help protect what little bit of "forever free" areas there are left people to care about all animals, not just endangered ones. Always been interested in wildlife conservation - I also love animals, I feel as a vet I can best do this by caring for individuals and education of the populace. I feel it is important to maintain a diverse and healthy wildlife population.

4: Motivations Related to Interest in Environmental Conservation

Improves both medical and surgical skills. As a zoo veterinarian, treating injured animals broadens my knowledge and general.

It gives me a chance to exercise and enrich my knowledge of animals in activities may make the difference some day as to a species survival. Techniques and skills acquired and knowledge gained through rehabilitation.

Interest in wildlife diseases and impacts of pesticides, etc. It is very rewarding at times (release) and I find it very interesting.
but be a rehabilitator they could trust.

People always bring wildlife to a vet and then want to take them back home to use as pets and I didn't want to see that. So as a vet, I could ask them if they could trust me to take them home to the wildlife in my area. In seeing humans and animals coexist in cities and suburbs, I believe animals and have invested interest in my job and hobby, occupation, and avocation in seeing humans and animals coexist in cities and suburbs.

I need for rehabilitators in my area.

Through my job as an animal control officer I received many calls for injured through. My hands-on experiences that the Jacksonville would just make things easier. I have been involved with animals throughout my life. In 1998 I began to have formal training.

As a veterinarian, as a person concerned about nature and the environment,

my nature center naturally attracted distressed wildlife and precipitation encountered.

Working as a vet tech for so many years, I learned so much from wildlife. Rehabilitating a natural thing for me to be involved with.

As a veterinarian and a person concerned about nature and the environment, it is only natural that I had a gift with injured/ orphaned wildlife since childhood. Resting in a geographical locale in which there is abundant wildlife, it is only natural that I became a wildlife rehabilitator.

If I was a wildlife rehabilitator because of a deep love and respect for

6: PARTICIPATION AS A RESULT OF INVOLVEMENT IN OTHER ACTIVITIES

I love animals, and the outdoors and wilderness.

I enjoy all wildlife activities and feel I am helping nature.

appreciation...
It was a natural part of [my] life to take care of distressed wildlife.

For a sportsman who is an avid falconer and keenly interested in wild hawks as well, it seemed only natural for me to begin taking care of them. As an avian biologist, General interest, saw a need for helping birds and their kin who fell victim to the cruel world outside. I have been involved in caring for birds for 10 years and have made a personal commitment to help injured or orphaned birds wherever possible. The rehab work is a direct outgrowth of the sport.

I have been involved in caring for wildlife for 10 years and wanted to get a license so that I could do more.

For a sportsman who is an avid falconer and keenly interested in wild hawks as well, it seemed only natural for me to begin taking care of them. As an avian biologist, General interest, saw a need for helping birds and their kin who fell victim to the cruel world outside. I have been involved in caring for birds for 10 years and have made a personal commitment to help injured or orphaned birds wherever possible. The rehab work is a direct outgrowth of the sport.

I have been involved in caring for wildlife for 10 years and wanted to get a license so that I could do more.
We take care of sick and injured people, why not take care of our wildlife.

machining in N.Y.S. and that animal welfare is secondary.

public about animals, I feel that the DEC is a part of the big money making I love animals. I feel that there is not enough being done to educate the help it.

love animals cannot let one that is hurt or suffering die without trying to eliminate pain and suffering of any and all animals.

desire to help individual animals or all species. Desire to minimize or recover.

to help any organism that is distressed to relieve its pain and help it environmental.

Because I care for animals--each and every one are important to our genuine concerns for the welfare of raptors and other injured animals.

of animals that are usually left to die or orphans who are raised improperly.

I believe that all life is important. I wanted to minimize pain and suffering. I believe wildlife and can't stand to see it hurt or abused.

I care for all wildlife and think they should all be given a chance to survive.

I care for all wildlife and think they should all be given a chance to

decrease of habitats against them, not to mention sadistic hunters. They need decreased.

Most domestic animals have someone to care for them. Wild animals have no one existence.

Their [animals] need for concern and help in surviving the pressures on their appreciation of animals.

I abhor animals suffering in any way and I feel that people in general lack of feelings for animals caught in "progress of man." There is a lack of