THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN-CANINE

PERSONALITY MATCH AND PET SATISFACTION

By

LISA A. CURB

Bachelor of Arts
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK
1983

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK
1987

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2011

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN-CANINE

PERSONALITY MATCH AND PET SATISFACTION

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Charles I. Abramson
Thesis Adviser

Dr. James W. Grice

Dr. Shelia M. Kennison

Dr. Mark Payton
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Dogs are the most owned pets in the United States. More than 37% (43,021,000)

of households have at least one dog (U. S. Pet Ownership & Demographics, 2007). Even

so, many dogs are homeless. The majority of the 6 to 8 million animals that are homeless

each year are dogs (Humane Society of the United States, HSUS, 2009; National Council

on Pet Population Study & Policy, NCPPSP, 2009). Of the dogs and cats that end up at

shelters due to animal control or owner relinquishment, approximately 56% (HSUS,

2010) to 58% (American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, ASPCA,

2010) are euthanized. In attempt to keep so many dogs from being euthanized, pet

adoption has been promoted, but with limited success. Worldwide, studies reveal that a

significant number of adopted dogs are returned to the shelters. The return rate of dogs to

shelters ranges from about 15% (Mondelli et al., 2004) to 50% (NCPPSP, 2009).

Significance of the Present Study

The purpose of the present research was to investigate the factors related to dog

relinquishment. In a preliminary study, I conducted interviews with animal shelter

personnel in Oklahoma. They indicated that the pet adoption process typically involves a

brief observation period of about 30 minutes. Animal shelters routinely use

questionnaires to assess the prospective adopters' viability as a pet owner; however, the questionnaires rarely aim to match prospective owners and pets on factors that might be related to pet ownership satisfaction. Table 1 displays items from animal shelter questionnaires (see Table A1).

The preliminary study demonstrated that there is no reliable procedure used to match prospective pet owners and dogs, despite the fact that there is a great need to reduce the number of pets relinquished by owners each year. In the present research, I developed a procedure that involved a personality-based pet-to-owner matching that was less arduous to use than one implemented nationwide. In the research, I tested the hypothesis that personality-matching may improve pet-owner satisfaction. If a prospective pet owner adopted a dog with similar personality characteristics, the pet owner may be more satisfied with the pet and less likely to relinquish it. If a brief procedure is found to significantly predict pet owner satisfaction, then the procedure could be utilized by animal shelters for the purpose of reducing the rates of pet relinquishment. In the following chapters, I will provide information about the benefits of dogs and problems of relinquishment. A detailed critique of theoretical ideas and programs in place will follow. Finally, an alternative human-canine matching program will be proposed, which if effective, could result in fewer dogs being returned to shelters.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Benefits of Dogs and Need for Relinquishment

Dogs provide benefits to people. Some of these benefits are social and

psychological, (Allen, 1997; Rogers, Hart, and Boltz, 1993). People who owned dogs

took "twice as many daily walks as non-owners" and reported "significantly less

dissatisfaction with their social, physical, and emotional states" (p. 265). Dogs were a

"conversational companion" (p. 275) for the elderly trailer park residents who walked

their dogs.

Despite the benefits dog ownership provides, pet owners relinquish their dogs at

significant rates. The reasons for relinquishment vary. In a major study of 12 shelters,

former pet owners were surveyed to determine the reasons they relinquished their dogs.

When asked to give up to five reasons, 40% of the people stated at least one behavioral

reason. When citing only one reason they relinquished a dog, 27% of the people listed

behavior. Between 11% and 13% of the people relinquished their dog because it could

not get along with other pets. People did not give up dogs that remained hyperactive or

overly attentive-seeking after adoption. However, if either of these behaviors was

complemented by being destructive, aggressive toward people, disobedient, too vocal, or

escaping, people relinquished their dogs (Salman, et al., 2000). Another study found that biting was the primary reason for relinquishment (National Humane Education Society, 2010). Other reasons for relinquishing a dog include: "moving, landlord not allowing pets, too many animals in the household, cost of pet maintenance, owner having personal problems, inadequate facilities, no homes available for litter mates, having no time for pets, and pet illness(es)" (National Humane Education Society, 2010, "Companion Animals," para. 3).

The problem of relinquished dogs is a worldwide problem. In Italy, in the first study of its kind (Mondelli, et al., 2004), researchers reviewed questionnaire responses of people who returned a dog to a shelter. They found that during a six-year period, 86.3% of dogs were adopted. Of these, about 15.2% were returned. Of the people who returned a dog, 71.2% completed a survey. Responses indicated that 38.8% of these people returned the dog primarily for behavioral reasons. Some of the problematic behaviors included: "vocalizes too much, hyperactive/stereotypes, destructive/soils house, escapes, and disobedient and problems with other pets" (p. 259). Next, 34% stated management problems, which included "animal medical issue, no time for pets, personal or family reasons, pet conflict, small house, and no apparent owner" (p. 259). Other reasons people returned dogs were aggression (14.9%), allergy (5.5%), and apartment block regulation (4.5%). In a few instances (2.3%), people did not give a reason for returning the dog (Mondelli, et al., 2004).

Pet owners may return dogs for behavioral reasons more often than statistics indicate. Participants' responses were often ambiguous. Participants may have underreported "if they believed that this information would be used by the shelter's staff

to determine their dog's outcome" (Segurson, Serpell, & Hart, 2005, p. 1759). Owners may have avoided providing genuine reasons, if they perceived the dog would be euthanized.

<div align="center">ASPCA Pet-Owner Matching Program</div>

Animal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) has implemented a pet-owner matching system. The program is called *Meet Your Match Canine-ality Adoption Program* (Time, 2010). A press release claims that "*ASPCA's Meet Your Match Canine-ality Adoption Program* is the only method in existence that scientifically evaluates an animal's behavior and interests and then matches them to an adopter's preferences" (ASPCA, 2010a). The program has been implemented in more than 150 animal shelters in seven cities at a cost of about $1million dollars (ASPCA, 2010b). In the program, a dog and prospective owner each are assigned a color based on their characteristics. The goal is to match colors according to The Canine-ality Assessment and The Dog Adopter Survey (ASPCA, 2010a).

The matching process has two parts. The Canine-ality Assessment part evaluates a dog's "friendliness and sociability, playfulness, energy level and ability to focus, motivation, and people manners" (ASPCA, 2010a). Dogs are then given a color (green, orange, or purple) according to their rating on each of the characteristics. Next, the potential adopter takes The Dog Adopter survey to obtain a label of a green, orange, or purple based on dog preference. The participant who receives a green label prefers a dog that enjoys being physically and mentally active. The participant who gets orange prefers a dog that is responsive and enjoys activity and interaction whereas the recipient of a purple label prefers a dog that is laidback and easygoing (ASPCA, 2010a).

Further, although there are distinct categories in the *Meet Your Match* program, they do not allow for customized matching. Three of the category dogs *Life of the Party* (green) and *Go-Getter* (green) and *Couch Potato* (purple) could all belong to a playful/sluggish category. Further, *Constant Companion* (purple) fits neatly into an independent/dependent category. *Wallflower* (orange) could fit into an outgoing/shy category.

Additional problems exist with the overlap in the categorization of other dogs. If *Busy Bee* just had the characteristic of "playful," it would fit into this playful/sluggish category, but it has "trusting" listed as well so it could fit into an independent/dependent category, and "being curious" could put it in a creative-curious/not-creative, not-curious category as well. This is problematic because people might want a dog that has characteristics of different categories.

Further, the following categories do not work for personality. *Free Spirit* (green) could fit into an independent/dependent category. *Goofball's* (orange) characteristic of "happy all of the time" is difficult to assess in a dog, as a comparison cannot be made with a human. *Teacher's Pet* (purple) has characteristics of "love to learn" and "live to please" which are personality traits that cannot be objectively measured in a dog; therefore a match with a person is impossible.

Noticeably, the categories of aggressive/cowardliness, noisy/quiet, affectionate/not affectionate and anxious/calm have been omitted. These would work well for additional distinct categories. Consider the following examples. Those living on an acreage who encounter few people on their property without invitation might prefer a watchdog that advances toward the strangers. Someone who lives in the city might prefer

a dog that does not engage in excessive aggressive acts when children are around and prefer that the dog hide when they approach. Therefore, an aggressive/cowardliness category is needed. In another instance, apartment dwellers might be allowed to keep only a small quiet dog that does not annoy nearby tenants, hence there is a need for the noisy/quiet category. Further, some might prefer a dog that enthusiastically greets them by jumping on them and licking their face and leaning all over them. Other people would find this an unwelcome intrusion. Perhaps the latter would prefer their dog to come close and wag its tail, but not lick all over them. Hence, there is a need for the affectionate/not affectionate category. Last, some dogs may have a tendency to become extremely anxious when the owner leaves and tear up the house and/or make excessive noises such as whimpering or howling. This may or may not concern the owner, hence the need for the anxious/calm category.

In Oklahoma, the ASPCA program is seldom used. The primary disadvantage of the matching system was that it required at least one hour to implement per human-canine match (C. Phillips, personal communication, January 15, 2010). Further, this matching system found lack of distinct categories in the program as well.

<center>Personality Traits in Humans and Dogs</center>

Prior research supports the view that some dog characteristics can be described as personality differences (Gosling & Vazire, 2002) and not as an idea projected onto the animal (Gosling, 2001). Some characteristics have been described as breed-specific (Gosling, Kwan & John, 2003; Duffy, Serpell & Hsu, 2008). For example, breeds can vary in terms of aggression (Gosling, Kwan & John, 2003) and anxiety (Duffy, Serpell &

<center>7</center>

Hsu, 2008). Dog breeds developed for companionship (Palmer & Custance, 2008) are more likely to exhibit anxiety than dog breeds developed for utility.

Some have discussed the feasibility of using the same personality traits to describe human and non-human animal behavior (Gosling & John, 1999; Draper, 1995; Svartberg and Forkman, 2002). The Big Five personality traits, adapted and popularized by Goldberg in the 1990's, have been used, with success, to describe human behavior (Ashton, Lee, Goldberg & de Vries, 2009). The basic concept is that the domain of personality can be summarized well by using five factors. These five factors include: Openness to Experience (O), Conscientiousness (C), Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), and Neuroticism (N) (Ashton, Lee, & Goldberg & de Vries, 2009). Openness refers to being creative, curious, and welcoming to new experiences. Conscientiousness is being organized and thorough and efficient. Extraversion is being outgoing and sociable. Agreeableness is tendency to get along with others. Neuroticism is being overly anxious and worried and tense (Funder, 2007). Despite their success, some problems do exist when applying the Big Five to humans. For example, it has been stated that "a person can be introverted and enthusiastic" (J. Grice, personal communication, February 10, 2008).

Gosling and John (1999) noted that of the Big Five factors, conscientious was found only in humans and chimps. Draper (1995) and Svartberg and Forkman (2002) concluded that neuroticism and openness were not useful to characterize differences in non-humans. Ley, Coleman, and Bennett (2008) pointed out that the core traits in the Big Five may not work well to describe dog behavior. They stated that although neuroticism may be observed in humans and dogs, the operational definitions may differ. "Further,

research will be required to determine the exact component of a 'neuroticism' dimension in dogs" (p. 314).

In another example, openness to experience did not resemble the human factor because it included the ease of "dog's responsiveness to obedience training and by the ease with which it could be housebroken" (Draper, 1995, p. 244). Draper (1995) argued that the Big Five model is too broad. Similar behaviors exist under the same trait since personality is a series of behaviors. A case in point is Draper's research (1995) in which he lists surgency, agreeableness, and openness, as resembling the Big Five model. It does not seem like a good idea to include general activity, excitability, and excessive barking and demand for attention in the category of surgency. The overlap is illustrated with several questions: What if someone wanted a dog that jumped around and was eager to play but did not bark excessively? What if someone wanted a dog that barked at strangers, but did not demand a lot of attention?

Another problem exists with extraversion, identified consistently as a personality characteristic in human studies (Phares & Chaplin, 1997); being energetic is equated with extraverted (Ley, Coleman, & Bennett, 2008). The dog may be energetic at time for a walk, but may not approach unfamiliar people in an extroverted manner. Gosling and John (1999) pointed out that there is too much overlap between the traits. In openness to experience, the two main components were curiosity-exploration and playfulness, the latter of which is "associated with extraversion when social rather than imaginative aspects of play are assessed" (Gosling & John, 1999, p. 70). Factors correlate with each other to some extent. They are not five orthogonal -- separate and independent -- traits (Funder, 2007).

The present research did not employ Gosling's personality traits for dogs: "reactivity/excitability-stability, fearfulness-courage/confidence, aggression/agreeableness, sociability/friendliness-lack of interest in others, responsiveness to training, dominance/submission, and activity level" (Jones & Gosling, 2005, p. 17). The reactivity trait mentioned by Jones and Gosling (2005) was viewed as too broad. Reactivity could be noisy barking or jumping. These two items alone deserve separate categories. Further, the opposite pole of reactivity/excitability is stability. How does one define stability in a dog? Second, the fearfulness trait (Jones & Gosling, 2005) was viewed as too vague. How is fearfulness shown -- barking or hiding under a bed? How do we know a dog is experiencing fear? Also, regarding the opposite pole, how does a dog show courage or confidence? A better descriptor that lends itself to overt behavior is aggression/cowardliness because it does not require knowing the dog's internal "state of mind" (Jones & Gosling, 2005). Compared to reactivity/excitability and stability, anxious and calm are more exact opposites. Third, Gosling's trait of aggression/agreeableness (Jones & Gosling, 2005) was viewed as questionable because agreeableness is not overtly observable in dogs. It was reasoned that aggression/cowardliness would be used. Fourth, Jones and Gosling's (2005) sociability-friendliness/lack of interest in others was viewed as not feasible because animal shelters tend only to retain and list for adoption sociable dogs. The outgoing/shy was used instead of sociability-friendliness/lack of interest in others. Lack of interest should be replaced with descriptors of cowardliness and independent. Fifth responsiveness to training (openness/non-openness) (Jones & Gosling, 2005) was viewed as more related to attention and intelligence than personality. For this reason, it was excluded as a

personality factor. Sixth, Gosling's dominance/submission (Jones & Gosling, 2005) was not used. Instead, dogs were categorized in terms of seeking or not seeking human company. The degree to which a dog likes and desires to give attention to humans can be determined in an affectionate/non-affectionate category. Seventh, Gosling's activity level of the dog (Jones & Gosling, 2005) was retained according to the following specific categories of outgoing/shy, aggressive/cowardly, noisy/quiet, anxious/calm, playful/sluggish, and affectionate/non-affectionate.

Preliminary Study

In a preliminary study, I aimed to determine the characteristics humans use to describe dogs and to determine whether there were any procedures being used for matching pets to owners. An open-ended questionnaire was formulated using these traits and attempts were made to get the animal shelter personnel to elaborate on any related traits in a dog they owned (see Appendix D). The structured interview was administered orally to those employed at human societies/shelters and responses were studied for new descriptors, but none were found. The rationale for doing these was to come up with as many discrete descriptors as possible to describe a dog's behavior.

Participants were the Humane Society of Stillwater, Central Oklahoma Humane Society, Second Chance Animal Sanctuary, and the Pets and People Humane Society of Yukon. Thirty minutes of observation and interaction with the dog prior to adoption is not enough time to provide a good match between dogs and owners, according to Jackie Ross-Guerrero of the Stillwater Humane Society. She explained that dog owners may become unhappy with their pet when these people see behaviors not revealed during that brief observation period (J. Ross-Guerrero, personal communication, June 8, 2010). To

illustrate, a potential pet adopter may interpret hyperactivity as welcomed human interaction instead of realizing this is the typical behavior of the dog. In contrast, a dog glad to have human interaction may, once adjusted, prefer to just lie around rather than participate in an active lifestyle. Complaints of "My dog insists on being the center of attention" or "This dog is too much of a couch potato" (J. Ross-Guerrero, personal communication, June 8, 2010) indicate that some type of selective process must be done beyond the initial brief period of observation and interaction.

Attempts were made to obtain questionnaires used for pet adoption from four humane shelters/societies. Three of the sites had written questionnaires, and one asked a few oral questions. Based on a review of questionnaires obtained from these sites, there has been little agreement among those who work hands-on with animals about personality type traits, behaviors, and maintenance requirements. An analysis of questionnaire content/oral inquiries from these four humane societies yielded a combined total of 58 different questions on their written questionnaire/oral survey. Only 33% (19) of the same questions were even asked by 50% (2/4) of the humane societies (Table A1).

One question "Where will the pet be kept during the day?" was asked by 75% (3/4) of the humane societies. One question that was rather open-ended was "What qualities or characteristics are important to you in a pet?" A question of "Will you be moving in the foreseeable future?" is reasonable, but the question of "Where will you be moving?" did not seem relevant for the adoption process. A quite detailed question of "If you own a pick-up truck, where will the pet ride?" was unusual. Given the number of dogs returned to shelters and the different attempts at matching using varied questions, a better matching process for human and dog is needed (Table A1).

To come up with as discrete and diverse descriptors as possible for a matching process, after examining 20 books for descriptors (see Appendix C), a structured interview was used (see Appendix D). Five people who worked daily with animals at humane societies, shelters, and animal control agreed to the hour interview. During the structured interviews, follow-up questions were asked to clarify responses and encourage further detail. In designing this survey, a careful attempt was made to use those behavior traits that applied to both humans and dogs and to make the categories as distinct as possible. There were 16 distinct traits operationally defined as overt observable behavior that humans and dogs could share. These were listed as eight separate categories (Table A2). Information from this was used to design AONAPACI: Adopt One Now: A Person and Canine Inventory. The distinct traits determined to exist in dogs according to the surveys and literature included: (A) aggressive/cowardliness; (O) outgoing/shy; (N) noisy/quiet; (A) anxious/calm; (P) playful/sluggish; (A) affectionate/not affectionate; (C) creative-curious/not creative-curious; and (I) independent/dependent (Appendix B).

<div align="center">Limitation of Previous Research and Need for Current Study</div>

The results of the preliminary study exposed a number of limitations in the matching processes available to prospective dog owners. The ASPCA's matching program is not routinely used because it is perceived by some shelters as being too time-consuming. If a new, easy-to-use matching instrument could be shown to be effective in predicting pet-owner satisfaction, it may be more likely to be utilized by shelters and adoption agencies. In the present research, a new pet-owner matching instrument was constructed. In an empirical study, its effectiveness in predicting pet-owner satisfaction was tested.

Current Study

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether dog owners'

satisfaction with their pets can be can be predicted by their having personality

characteristics that are similar to their pet's personality characteristics. In a survey,

current pet owners were asked to report personality characteristics for their pet and

themselves. They also reported their current level of satisfaction with the pet. The

survey was unique in that it isolated the 16 distinct personality traits that coexist in dogs

and people (Table A2). These dog traits were determined by reviewing 20 books and

interviewing humane society personnel. A match was determined by having the same

personality characteristics and being satisfied with the pet. To measure satisfaction, a

Likert-type rating scale was used. Due to most of the participants being satisfied, the

research was extended to recruit participants who had returned a dog.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

To assure there was enough power in the study, G Power Version 3.12, a priori

sample size for a medium effect size of *d=0.5, alpha .05 and Power (1-beta error*

probability), .80 was used. It was determined that 45 pairs of dogs and owners were

needed. To ensure that there was enough power, 88 pairs were used. Participants were

dog owners in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area and Stillwater area who had

personally selected their dog. The research design limited the population to either those

in a setting that provided for animals or graduate students and faculty who were involved

in research themselves. The expectation was that, by being invested in research or caring

for pets themselves, participants would respond carefully to the lengthy survey rather

than merely mark answers without reading the survey. After completing the survey,

participants could enter a drawing for a $30.00 cashier's check.

The sample of the population met one or more of the following criteria:

veterinarian/staff/office personnel for a veterinarian clinic or emergency pet center;

employee at animal shelter, humane society, zoo, or pet/feed store; pet groomer;

university faculty/staff/graduate student, or someone who had adopted and returned a

dog. Participants were 88 adult dog owners in the Oklahoma City metro and Stillwater areas. There were 14 (15.9%) males and 74 (84.09%) females. Participants' *M* age was 33.52 (*SD* = 11.92, range = 18 to 71). The number of Caucasian participants were 75 (85.23%); Black was 1 (1.14%); American Indian 7 (7.95%); and Asian 1 (1.14%). Four participants (4.54%) did not complete the ethnicity question. As for education, 14 (15.91%) were high school graduates; 34 (38.63%) had post high school experience; 23 (26.14%) had a bachelor's degree; 9 (10.23%) had a master's degree; and 7 (7.95%) had a doctoral degree. One (1.14%) person did not answer the education question.

Eighty-one of 85 (95%) people recruited face-to-face participated. For those who returned a dog to a humane society, contact by telephone was less successful. Of the 21 names received, four had telephone numbers that were disconnected or no longer in service. One person had adopted a dog, but changed her mind the day she was to pick it up from the shelter. Another person returned the dog because the landlord would not allow it. Seven of 15 (46%) people contacted by telephone participated.

Possible participants were screened to be sure their dog was one they adopted themselves. Further, they were informed of the purpose of the 20 minute study and their eligibility to enter a drawing for a $30.00 cashier's check. Participants answered 45 questions about their dog followed by 45 questions about themselves. These were paired to assess the same personality construct. For example, one statement had the following content: My dog expresses/does not express its dislike by growling and snarling and/or showing its teeth when reprimanded. The corresponding person statement was: I talk back/do not talk back to authority when reprimanded. Five of the statements were reverse keyed. An example of this is: My dog runs and hides/does not run and hide when

it sees a stranger. The corresponding person statement was: When a stranger approaches me, I do not/do elude them.

Some participants omitted an item or two. They could not respond to the questions due to the multiple choice format which was basically a "yes" or "no" response without qualifying their answer. Since this happened with only a few questions and was not a trend for the same questions, all 88 surveys were used.

Materials

In the first phase of developing the questionnaire, 20 books were examined to determine dog traits (see Appendix C). To determine if there were other unique traits, structured interviews with humane society personnel were conducted. From this process 45 traits were determined and these were assigned to eight categories: outgoing/shy; aggressive/cowardliness; noisy/quiet; calm/anxious; playful/sluggish; affectionate/non-affectionate; creative-curious/not creative- not curious, and dependent/independent. The only materials needed were the informed consent statement, survey AONAPACI: Adopt One Now: A Person and Canine Inventory, answer sheet, and a pen. The survey consisted of three parts. The first section was 45 questions about their dog followed by 45 questions about themselves. The second section was four questions to determine the participants' satisfaction rating. The third section was a demographic survey. Those who returned a dog were asked one additional open-ended question: reasons for returning the dog. A copy of the survey is displayed in Appendix B.

The scoring of the questionnaire was conducted *in SPSS Version 17* (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL) as follows: the analysis began with coding each "A" response with a 1 and each "B" response with a 2. A match for each pair of statements (i.e. Dog Item Number

1 and Person Item Number 1) was an A-A response or a B-B response, except for the reversed keyed items in which a match was an A-B response or a B-A response. If a response was not given, the item was left blank. This survey had reverse keyed items in attempt to determine if participants marked answers to the questions before reading them. The data for Items Number 7, 16, 21, 22, and 28 were reverse keyed and coded so that a value of 1 for the dog or the person indicates the behavior. Taking the absolute difference between the dog and person scores thus yields values of 0 or 1. These were coded so that a value of 1 indicates a match. Other reverse keyed items were Numbers 2 and 3 of the four satisfaction statements. Ratings for satisfaction adhered to a 7-point *Likert-type* scale. Responses for Items Number 2 and 3 satisfaction statements were recoded so 7 = strongly agree, 6 = agree, 5 = somewhat agree, 4 = neutral, 3 = somewhat disagree, 2 = disagree and 1= strongly disagree. A total satisfaction score was computed.

The data for Items Number 7, 16, 21, and 28 on the person questions were recoded so 2 = 1 and 1 = 2. The data for Number 22 on the dog questions was recoded also, so that a 2 = 1 and 1 = 2. The data for Items Number 1 through 45 for the dog and person questions were recoded so 2 = 0 and 1 = 1. The absolute value of the difference between each of the paired person and dog questions was computed. The reason for doing this was to limit the tally counts to two (i.e. 1's and 0's) instead of three (i.e. 1's, 0's, and -1's). This facilitated the analysis of the data's direction. Prior to computing the absolute value difference on each pair, each of the person's responses were recoded so 0 = 1, and 1 = 0. This generates an absolute difference of 1 which represents a match while a 0 indicates a mismatch for the pairs. Syntax for the SPSS statistical software was used to calculate the required results.

Procedure

      Participants were handed a flyer and individually recruited in person or by telephone to participate in the study. After reading the informed consent statement, those who wanted to participate were given a survey and answer sheet. The researcher waited or came back a few hours later, according to their preference. Additional participants who had returned a dog were desired. The Stillwater Humane Society provided a list of these people, and they were contacted by telephone.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A bivariate nonparametric correlation was conducted to determine if there was a

relationship between matching personality traits and pet satisfaction. A two-tailed test

was selected since this is the first known research to test all 16 traits in humans and dogs.

For the binary and ordinal data, *kendall's tau b* was selected to determine the strength of

the relationship. This nonparametric measure is based on the number of concordances

and discordances in paired observations. Although the pairs of 45 questions for the

humans and dogs could be clustered into eight categories of polar opposites, it was

decided to analyze each according to the 45 distinct traits. Several of the questions were

closely related to the same category, so this was determined best. A few of the questions

were reverse keyed to assess whether or not participants likely read the questions. Some

of the satisfaction items were comprised of similar questions, and a total satisfaction

score was computed and analyzed. The *Likert-type* scale was coded in the same direction

before entering data. The ratings were strongly agree, agree, somewhat agree, neutral,

disagree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree.

Participants' responses are summarized in Table A3. In looking at personality as

a construct related to behavior, Table A3 shows the results. The amount of personality-match between the pet owner and the dog was calculated by summing the number of items that matched and determining how that correlated with pet owner's satisfaction. Of the 45 possible matches, only one was moderately significant and three were weakly significant.

Descriptive statistics indicated that most people were satisfied with their dogs despite the range from 4 to 28 on the total satisfaction rating (see Table A3). Due to the negatively skewed total satisfaction score (-1.62), *kendall's tau b* was used in the nonparametric correlation between pet-to-owner match and satisfaction total. Table A3 displays three correlation coefficient columns. The bold numbers in the third column indicate the absolute difference in the human-to-pet personality match of highly satisfied pet owners. There is one slightly moderate positive correlation and three slightly weak positive correlations. For Item Number 13, there is a moderate positive correlation. Highly satisfied pet owners and their dogs are in agreement regarding whether or not they share their possessions, $r(86)=.303$, $p=.001$. There were three weak positive correlations between human and dog behaviors. Item Number 34 indicates highly satisfied pet owners match on whether or not they enjoy running outside, $r(88)=.249$, $p=.007$. Item Number 28 indicates highly satisfied pet owners match regarding whether or not they engaging in destructive activity, $r(88)=.212$, $p=.022$. Further, Item Number 20 indicates highly satisfied pet owners match on whether or not they are able to get along with their peers, $r(88)=.195$, $p=.036$. Last, a weak, positive correlation approaching significance on Item Number 29 indicates highly satisfied people and their dogs match on the amount of patience shown, $r(86)=.177$, $p=.058$.

Results also indicated that people who were highly satisfied with their pet owned a dog that exhibited certain behaviors, but there was a weak correlation in each of the following instances. Item Number 4 indicates a negative correlation. People were highly satisfied with having their dog running right up to them without hesitation, $r(88)=-.239$, $p=.010$. For Item Number 13 the correlation was negative. Highly satisfied people own a dog that will share toys or food without being territorial, $r(86)=-.213$, $p=.023$. Item Number 28 indicates a negative correlation. Highly satisfied people have a dog that is not likely to tear up things, $r(88)=-.279$, $p=.003$.

Results showed that people who were highly satisfied with their dog had particular personality characteristics themselves, but the correlations were all weak. There were positive and negative correlations. Item Number 30 shows a positive correlation. Highly satisfied people are very motivated to exercise, $r(88)=.202$, $p=.029$. Item Number 31 indicates a negative correlation. Highly satisfied people would rather do exercise than lounge on the sofa, $r(88)=-.197$, $p=.033$. However, as indicated in Item Number 34, these highly satisfied people do not like running outside, $r(88)=.203$, $p=.029$. Last, Item Number 41 shows these highly satisfied people were creative with the tasks of everyday life, $r(88)=.210$, $p=.023$. Most other correlations for each of the three types of matches were about .1 or lower, so they will not be discussed. Several negative correlations were found as well. Number 14 indicates a negative correlation. These highly satisfied people do not insist on getting their own way in situations of daily life, $r(88)=-.250$, $p=.007$. Further, Item Number 26 indicates a negative correlation. People are not likely to tear up anything when they are anxious, $r(88)=.232$, $p=.012$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the research was to construct a pet-owner matching instrument that could predict pet-owner satisfaction. The research involved a preliminary study in which pet owners and animal shelter personnel were interviewed about pet adoption practices and dog characteristics. Subsequently, a pet-owner matching instrument was constructed and tested in an empirical study. Overall, the results showed that the instrument did not do a good job predicting pet-owner satisfaction.

Out of the 45 traits for a possible human-to-pet match, there were four matches. The one slightly moderate correlation is stated below, followed by three weak correlations. These results do indicate a trend in human-to-pet matches. Both humans and dogs are willing to share possessions and make an attempt to get along with others. Both enjoyed running outside together. The dog owner is not likely to leave trash such as wrappers around, and the dog does not chew up items, so the living space is kept clean. Further, there was a trend for people highly satisfied with their pets to own a dog that had certain behaviors. These included dogs that greeted their owners by running up to them, shared toys and food with other family pets, and refrained from tearing up items. A trend existed to show that people who were highly satisfied with their dog had particular

personality characteristics themselves. They were more motivated to exercise rather than lounge on the sofa, but were not likely to go running outside without a pet. Further, they tended to be satisfied with the routine of everyday life. These people seem well adjusted in that they are not likely to tear up anything when anxious or insist on getting their own way in situations of everyday life.

Despite the few significant results, the research provides an important contribution to the literature in that it demonstrates the challenge of isolating personality of dogs and prospective owners for the purpose of matching them during pet adoption. The results of this survey are believed to be correct since special care was taken to recruit those involved in research themselves, as well as those who work with or around animals. Since this sample is somewhat invested in research or the care of animals, it is believed that the results are accurate and do not in any way indicate a careless marking of answers.

This research is supported by the previous work of others regarding personality. Others have indicated the Big Five model is too broad (Draper, 2005) as it includes some personality traits that are too different in the same category and others that are going to overlap with some other category (Gosling & John, 1999). Further, the literature review found researchers stating that operational definitions differ in dogs (Ley, Coleman & Bennett, 2008) but they were applied anyway to dogs without defining them differently (Jones & Gosling, 2005).

After looking at the lack of the same questions on adoption screening questionnaires, it is suggested that a more thorough one be developed. It may be useful in helping the potential adopter to think about some possible situations and, as our study

indicated, some behaviors that could result in a pet being returned to the shelter. Considering these beforehand will hopefully make for a better match.

If this study were extended, it would be recommended that recruitment for those who returned a dog not be limited to participants who returned a dog to a humane society. In several telephone interviews, participants would make comments that necessitate returning a dog because it was too aggressive, but then would give a satisfactory rather than unsatisfactory rating about the dog. They would state that the dog just needed to be placed in another environment. It is possible that the participant did not want to say anything too negative about the pet for worry that the humane society or shelter might euthanize the dog or not allow another adoption.

This study is helpful in advancing the idea of certain personality matching that might be effective to some slight degree for some who share the aforementioned traits. However, overall, this study did not achieve the desired significance level. It had limitations regarding statistical power in that there were few who were not satisfied with their dog, including even some who had returned a dog. More participants who returned dogs were needed to be able to have enough power to analyze this population separately. It is recommended that this study be replicated with a large number of participants who have returned a dog and compare the results. Further, it is suggested a more thorough questionnaire be used by adoption sites. The goal is to reduce the number of dogs relinquished.

REFERENCES

A personality test for pets. *Time.* December 14, 2007, Rita Healy/Boulder. Retrieved

    January 8, 2010 from

    http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1694804,00.html

Allen, D. (1997). Effects of dogs on human health. *Journal of the American Veterinary*

    Medical Association, 8, 1136-1139. doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2006.01.003

Application. (2010). Central Oklahoma Humane Society, Oklahoma City, OK.

Application. (2010). Pets and People, Yukon, OK.

Application. (2010). Second Chance Animal Sanctuary, Norman, OK.

Application. (2010). Stillwater Humane Society, Stillwater, OK.

Arden, A. (2007). *Dog-friendly dog training*, 2nd ed. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley

    Publishing Inc..

Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., Goldberg, L. R, & de Vries, R. E., (2009). Higher order factors of

    personality: Do they exist? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, 79-

    91. doi: 10.1177/1088868309338467

ASPCA Meet Your Match: Meet the Canine-alities. Retrieved January 21, 2010 from

    http://www.aspca.org/adoption/meet-your-match/meet-the-canine-alities.html

ASPCA Selects Oklahoma City as Next Partner Community in National ASPCA Mission:

    Orange Campaign. Retrieved January 22, 2010 from

    http://www.aspca.org/pressroom/press-releases/041309-1.html

Bauer, N. K. (2006). *Dog heroes of September 11th: A tribute to America's search and rescue dogs*. Allenhurst, New Jersey: Kennel Club Books, LLC.

Bielakiewicz, G. J. (2003). *The everything dog training and tricks book.* Avon, Massachusetts: F & W Productions, Inc..

Boneham, S. W. (2008). *Training your dog for life*. Neptune City, New Jersey: T. F. H. Publications, Inc..

Central Oklahoma Humane Society Adoption Center (2010). Oklahoma City, OK.

Common Questions about Animal Shelters: October 26, 2009. The Humane Society of the United States. Retrieved March 4, 2010 from http://www.humanesociety.org/animal_community/resources/qa/common_questions_on_shelters.html#How_many_animals_enter_animal_shelters_e.

Companion Animals. National Humane Education Society (2010). Retrieved March 4, 2010 from http://www.nhes.org/articles/view/195

Coren, S. (2006). *Why does my dog act that way: A complete guide to your dog's personality*. New York: Free Press.

Dodman, N. H. (2008). *The well-adjusted dog*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dog Breed Selector Quiz-- Choosing the Best Dog Breed for your Needs. Retrieved 8 January 2010 from http://www.doggiedealer.com/dog_breed_selector.php

Draper, T. W. (1995). Canine analogs of human personality and factors. *Journal of General Psychology* 122, 241-252.

Duffy, D. L., Serpell, J. A., Hsu, Y. (2008). Breed differences in canine aggression. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 114, 441-460. Doi: 10.1016/j.applanim.2008.04.006

Duno, S. (2008). *Be the dog: Secrets of the natural dog owner*. New York: Sterling

Publishing Co., Inc.

Eldredge, D. M., Carlson, L. D., Carlson, D. G., & Giffin, J. M. (2007). *Dog owners*

home veterinary handbook, 4th ed. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley Publishing Inc.

Fogle, B. & Holder, P. (2002). *New complete dog training manual*. New York: DK

Publishing Inc..

Funder, D. C. (2007). Using personality traits to understand behavior. University of

California, W.W. Norton & Company.

Gerstenfeld, S. L. & Schultz, J. L. (1999). *ASPCA complete guide to dogs*. San Francisco:

Chronicle Books, LLC.

Gosling, S. D. (2001). From mice to men: What can we learn about personality from

animal research? *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 45–86. DOI: l0.l037//0033-

2909.l27.l.45

Gosling, S. D. & John, O. P. (1999). Personality dimensions in nonhuman animals: A

cross-species review. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 69-75.

DOI: 10.1111/1467-8721.00017

Gosling, S. D., Kwan, V. S. Y. & John, O. P. (2003). A dog's got personality: A cross-

species comparative approach to personality judgments in dogs and humans.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(6), 1161-1169. DOI:

10.1037/0022-3514.85.6.1161

Gosling, S. D. & Vazire, S. (2002). Are we barking up the right tree? Evaluating a

comparative approach to personality. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 36, 607-

614. DOI: 10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00511-1

Hasbrouck, M. (2007). *Gentle dog training*. London: Souvenir Press Ltd..

Horowitz, A. (2009). *Inside of a dog: what dogs see, smell, and know*. New York:

Scribner.

Humane Society of the United States (2009-10).

Jones, A. C., & Gosling, S. D. (2005). Temperament and personality in dogs

(*Canis familiaris*): A review and evaluation of past research. *Applied*

Animal Behaviour Science 95, 1-53.

.

Ley, J., Coleman, G., & Bennett, P. (2008). Personality dimensions that emerge in

companion canines. *Applied Animal Behavior Science* 110, 305-317.

Maran illustrated dog training. (2005). Boston: MaranGraphics Inc..

Market Research Statistics. American Veterinary Medical Association. Retrieved January

22, 2010 from http://www.avma.org/reference/marketstats/ownership.asp

Market research statistics in *U.S. Pet Ownership & Demographics Sourcebook* (2007

Edition). Retrieved March 4, 2010 from

http://www.avma.org/reference/marketstats/sourcebook.asp

McConnell, P. A. (2006). *For the love of a dog: Understanding emotion in you and your*

best friend. New York: Balantine Books.

Miller, P. (2001). *The power of positive dog training*. New York: Wiley Publishing Inc..

Mondelli, F., Previde, E. P., Verga, M., Levi, D., Magistrelli, S., & Valsecchi, P.   (2004).

The bond that never developed: Adoption and relinquishment of dogs in a rescue

shelter. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 7, 253-266.

National Council Research. *National Council on Pet Population Study and Policy*

(NCPPSP, 2009). Retrieved March 2, 2010 from

      http://www.petpopulation.org/research.html

National Humane Education Society (2010). Retrieved March 2, 2010 from

      http://www.humanesociety.org/about/

Oklahoma City Animal Shelter (2010). Oklahoma City, OK.

Palmer, R., & Custance, D. (2008). A counterbalanced version of Ainsworth's Strange

      Situation Procedure reveals secure-base effects in dog-human relationships.

      Applied Animal Behaviour Science, 109, 306-319.

Pet Statistics (2010). ASPCA. Retrieved January 18, 2010 from

      http://www.aspca.org/about-us/faq/pet-statistics.html

Pets and People (2010). Yukon, OK.

Phares, E. J. & Chaplin, W. F. (1997). Introduction to personality (4th ed.). Reading,

      MA: Addison-Wesley.

Rogers, J., Hart, L. A., & Boltz, R. P. (1993). The role of pet dogs in casual conversations

      of elderly adults. *Journal of Social Psychology,* 93, 133, 265-277.

Rogers, K. M. (2005). *First friend: A history of dogs and humans*. New York: St.

      Martin's Press.

Salman, M. D. et al. (2000). Behavioral reasons for relinquishment of dogs and cats to 12

      shelters. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science,* 3, 93-106.

Saunders, K. (2008). *Petfinder.com: The adopted dog bible*. New York: A Stonesong

      Press Book.

Second Chance Animal Sanctuary (2010). Norman, OK.

Segurson, S. A., Serpell, J. A., & Hart, B. L. (2005). Evaluation of a behavioral

      assessment questionnaire for use in the characterization of behavioral problems of

dogs relinquished to animal shelters. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 227, 1755-1761.

Silverman, J. (2009). *What color is your dog? Train your dog based on his personality color.* Freehold, New Jersey: Kennel Club Books.

SPSS for Windows, Rel. 11.0.1. 2001. Chicago: SPSS Inc..

Stillwater Humane Society (2010). Stillwater, OK.

Svartberg, K., & Forkman, B. (2002). Personality traits in the domestic dog (*Canis familiaris*). A*pplied Animal Behavior Science,* 79, 133-155. DOI**:** 10.1016/S0168-1591(02)00121-1

Taylor, D. (2006). *Old dog, new tricks.* Buffalo, NY: Firefly books Ltd..

U.S. pet ownership & demographics sourcebook (2007). American Veterinary Medical Association.

Wilson, S. & Croke, V. (2008). *Dogology: What your relationship with your dog reveals about you.* New York, NY: Macmillan.

APPENDICES

Table A1

Survey Questionnaire/Oral Questions from Oklahoma Humane Society Shelter, Pets & People Humane Society, Second Chance Animal Sanctuary, and Stillwater Humane Society

want size	want age	want sex	where live	info. Landlord	current pets/ owner before	current age	current sex
1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1

spayed/ neutered	current pet status	adopt reason	taken animal shelter	# people	# kids	implications if pregnant	asthma allergy
2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2

who responsible/ feed	length pet alone day	place keep pet day	place keep pet night	amount plan spend	vacation	pet if move?	potential anticipated problems new
2	2	3	2	1	1	1	2

Table A1
(cont'd.)

Survey Questionnaire/Oral Questions from Oklahoma Humane Society Shelter, Pets & People Humane Society, Second Chance Animal Sanctuary, and Stillwater Humane Society

plans to handle problems	plan on dog training	crate to train dog	current/ vet plan to use	plan to spay/ neuter comp. animals	home visit by H.S. rep.	ref. familiar w/ you & animals	adopted from before
1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1

adopted	adopted when	how often take pets to vet	age kids	fenced yard	height fenced yard	where pet kept when alone	if own pickup truck, where will pet ride
1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1

moving?	where moving	if move, what do with animal	ever had to give pet away	why had to give pet away	where did pet had to give away go	describe kind of pet you are looking for	What qualities or characteristics are important to you in a pet
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table A1 (cont'd.)

Survey Questionnaire/Oral Questions from Oklahoma Humane Society Shelter, Pets & People Humane Society, Second Chance Animal Sanctuary, and Stillwater Humane Society

what is your lifestyle? What is typical day?	tell us about past experience with animals	what is most important thing you want your pet to do or be	what behaviors, if any, can you not tolerate, or feel would be difficult to manage	what questions do you have	interested in house training	how plan on exercising dog	type of activities you would like to do with dog
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
chewing	aggression level						
1	1						

Table A2

Questions for Each of the Eight Categories

OUTGOING

OSfriendly –D1-1; P1-1

OSoutgoing -- D3-1; P3-1

OSctrattention -- D5-1; P5-1

SHY

OSreserved -- D2-1: P2-1

OSshy -- D4-1; P4-1

_____

AGGRESSIVE

ACwarystr -- D6-1; P6-1

ACaggressstrangers -- D8-1: P8-1

ACaggressnthdegree -- D9-1; P9-1

ACaggressothers -- D10-1; P10-1

ACincharge -- D12 -1; P12-1

ACguardstuff -- D13-1; P13-1

ACbossy -- D14-1; P14-1

ACreactauthority – D15-1; P15-1

COWARD

ACcowarddanger -- D7-1; P7-2 REVERSE CODE

ACtremble -- D11-1; P11-1

_____

NOISY

Lot of loud noise/talk-- D16-1; P16-2 REVERSE CODE

NQtalk -- D17-1; P17-1

NQlikenoise-- D18-1; P18-1

NQnoisyplay -- D19-1; P19-1

QUIET (opp)

_____

CALM

Gets along well with others – "laid back" ANXCagree -- D20-1; P20-1

ANXCsubmissive -- P29-1

ANXIOUS

Nervous habit ANXCnervoushabit -- D21-1; P21-2 REVERSE CODE

Excessive Fear of Things beyond control

ANXCexcessfear -- D22-2; P22-1 REVERSE CODE

Actions showing Anxious

ANXCexcessfear -- D23-1; P23-1

ANXCverbalanxiety -- D24-1; P24-1

ANXCnverbalanxiety -- D25-1; P25-1

ANXCIntenDest -- D26-1; P26-1

ANXCessanxpart -- D27-1; P27-1

ANXCreactive -- D28-1; p28-2 REVERSE CODE

_____

PLAYFUL

      PSenergetic -- D30-1; P30-1

      PShyper -- D32-1; P32-1

      PSinitiate -- D33-1; P33-1

      PSoutdoorexper --D34-1; P34-1 (enjoys running)

SLUGGISH

      PSlethargic -- D31-1; P31-1

_____

AFFECTIONATE OR NOT-AFFECTIONATE (response 2)

      AFNAFphysical -- D35-1; P35-1

      AFNAFinitiator -- D36-1; P36-1

      AFNAFlicking -- D37-1; P37-1

      AFNAFjump -- D38-1; P38-1

      AFNAFphysicaleffect -- D39-1; P39-1

      AFNAFextremepa -- D40-1; P40-1

_____

CREATIVE OR CURIOUS or NOT (response 2)

      CRCURcreative -- D41-1; P41-1

      CRCURcurious -- D42-1; P 42-1

      CRCURwatchful -- D43-1; P43-1

_____

DEPENDENT

      DEPscratched -- D44-1: P44-1

      DEPsidebyside -- D45-1: P45-1

Table A3 Canine and Human Behaviors that Correlate with Satisfaction using Kendall's tau B

Factor	(D) Dog			(P) Person			Absolute Diff (D-P)
	Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD	Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD	Correlation coefficient
1. OSfriendly	-.087	0.602	0.492	.048	0.864	0.345	-.147
2. OSreserved	-.110	0.136	0.345	.160	0.477	0.502	-.130
3. OSoutgoing	.148	0.773	0.421	-.045	0.636	0.484	-.005
4. OSshy	**-.239**	0.068	0.254	-.050	0.545	0.501	-.040
5. OSctrattention	-.037	0.727	0.448	-.062	0.250	0.435	.099
6. Acwarystr	.011	0.250	0.435	-.061	0.216	0.414	-.034
7. Accowarddanger	.015	0.114	0.319	.012	0.322	0.470	-.114
8. Acaggressstrangers	-.113	0.295	0.459	.048	0.080	0.274	-.030
9. ACaggressnthdegree	-.063	0.209	0.409	.000	0.209	0.409	.107
10. Acaggressotherdogs	-.134	0.365	0.484	-.009	0.011	0.107	.131
11. Actremble	.052	0.517	0.503	.101	0.182	0.388	.047
12. Acincharge	.006	0.586	0.495	.093	0.705	0.459	-.031
13. Acguardstuff	**-.213**	0.233	0.425	-.065	0.227	0.421	**.303**
14. Acbossy	-.136	0.291	0.457	**-.250**	0.273	0.448	.016
15. ACreactauthority	-.137	0.602	0.492	-.028	0.125	0.333	.013

Correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are printed in bold.
Sample size varied from 85 to 88.

Table A3 (cont'd.) Canine and Human Behaviors that Correlate with Satisfaction using Kendall's tau B

Factor	(D) Dog			(P) Person			Absolute Diff (D-P)
	Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD	Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD	Correlation coefficient
16. NQbarking	.019	0.170	0.378	-.039	0.500	0.503	.094
17. NQothernoises	-.089	0.318	0.468	.061	0.655	0.478	-.110
18. NQnoisytoys	.061	0.609	0.491	.052	0.864	0.345	.047
19. NQnoisyplay	.041	0.322	0.470	-.084	0.250	0.435	.103
20. ANXCagree	.052	0.795	0.406	.150	0.932	0.254	**.195**
21. ANCnervoushabit	-.053	0.182	0.388	-.026	0.547	0.501	-.021
22. ANXexcessfear	.095	0.287	0.455	-.098	0.091	0.289	-.035
23. ANXCspin	.100	0.241	0.430	.025	0.057	0.234	-.107
24. ANXCverbalanxiety	-.049	0.247	0.434	.054	0.299	0.460	-.019
25. ANXCnverbalanxiety	-.001	0.125	0.333	.048	0.398	0.492	-.039
26. ANXCIntenDest	-.021	0.261	0.442	**-.232**	0.125	0.333	.069
27. ANXCessanxpart	-.158	0.012	0.108	.035	0.125	0.333	-.084
28. ANXCreactive	**-.279**	0.193	0.397	.027	0.148	0.357	**.212**
29. ANXCsubmissive	.041	0.586	0.495	.163	0.793	0.407	.177

Correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are printed in bold.
Sample size varied from 85 to 88.

Table A3 (cont'd.) Canine and Human Behaviors that Correlate with Satisfaction using Kendall's tau B

	(D) Dog				(P) Person				Absolute Diff (D-P)
Factor	Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD		Correlation coefficient	Mean	SD		Correlation coefficient
30. PSenergetic	.096	0.807	0.397		**.202**	0.545	0.501		.031
31. PSlethargic	.185	0.506	0.503		**-.197**	0.477	0.502		-.068
32. PShyper	-.075	0.284	0.454		-.046	0.466	0.502		.030
33. PSinitiate	.077	0.693	0.464		.012	0.830	0.378		-.026
34. PSoutdoorexper	-.079	0.920	0.272		**.203**	0.466	0.502		**.249**
35. AFNAFphysical	-.022	0.614	0.490		-.032	0.659	0.477		.049
36. AFNAFinitiator	.070	0.523	0.502		-.032	0.239	0.429		-.044
37. AFNAFlicking	-.018	0.864	0.345		-.065	0.261	0.442		.057
38. AFNAFjump	.085	0.557	0.500		.036	0.602	0.492		.038
39. AFNAFphhysicaleffect	-.120	0.989	0.107		-.002	0.632	0.485		.024
40. AFNAFextremepa	.013	0.943	0.233		-.104	0.420	0.496		-.101
41. CRCURcreative	.069	0.545	0.501		**.210**	0.739	0.442		.092
42. CRCURcurious	.144	0.864	0.345		.060	0.864	0.345		.080
43. CRCURwatchful	-.139	0.818	0.388		.008	0.909	0.289		-.134
44. INDEPscratched	-.105	0.898	0.305		-.111	0.659	0.477		-.006
45. INDEPsidebyside	-.004	0.727	0.448		-.010	0.330	0.473		.013

Correlations significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed) are printed in bold.
Sample size varied from 85 to 88.

APPENDIX B

Factors Influencing Satisfaction with Pet Ownership Survey

Title of Instrument: Adopt One Now: A Person and Canine Intervention (AONAPACI):

Read each statement carefully. It is likely that neither of the two choices will exactly describe your dog. However, select the statement that best describes your dog. Write either letter A or B on the answer sheet. If you wish to explain more, feel free to add comments in the blanks.

#1

(A) My dog shows it is ready to play by making a bow – lowering the front of its body and raising its back.

(B) My dog does not indicate it is ready to play by making a bow -- lowering the front of its body and raising its back.

#2

(A) My dog does not run right up to me. My dog wags its tail and slowly approaches.

(B) My dog runs right up to me rather than just wagging its tail and slowly approaching.

#3

(A) My dog greets me by running up and licking me.

(B) My dog does not greet me by running up and licking me.

#4

(A) My dog looks at me at first and then slowly crawls over to me.

(B) My dog does not hesitate in coming to me.

#5

(A) My dog gets in the middle of everything.

(B) My dog does not get in the middle of everything.

#6

(A) When encountering a stranger, my dog has the following behaviors: stands erect, raises its hackles, charges, snaps, barks, stalks, and intently stares.

(B) When encountering a stranger, my dog does not show these behaviors: stands erect, makes hackles go up on its back, charges, snaps, barks, stalks, and intently stares.

#7

(A) My dog runs and hides when it sees a stranger.

(B) My dog does not run and hide when it sees a stranger.

#8

(A) When strangers advance, my dog growls, barks, and raises its hackles.

(B) When strangers advance, my dog does not growl, bark, and raise its hackles.

#9

(A) After my dog gives a warning by such as barking, growling, and raising its hackles, my dog charges forward when a stranger continues to approach.

(B) My dog gives a warning by such as barking, growling, and raising its hackles, but if a stranger continues to approach, the dog will not charge forward.

#10

(A) My dog paws another dog on the back to show its dominance.

(B) My dog does not paw another dog on the back to show its dominance.

#11

(A)When my dog is scared, it cowers and trembles.

(B) When my dog is scared, it does not cower and tremble.

#12

(A) My dog walks in front of me and pulls on the leash.

(B) My dog does not walk in front of me and pull the leash.

#13

(A) My dog is very territorial and does not let other animals share its toys or food.

(B) My dog is not very territorial and lets other animals share its toys or food.

#14

(A) My dog shows the other animals it is boss by pushing them out of the way or away from the food or taking over toys.

(B) My dog does not try to boss the other animals by pushing them out of the way or away from the food or taking over the toys.

#15

(A) My dog expresses its dislike by growling and snarling and/or showing its teeth when it is reprimanded.

(B) My dog does not express its dislike by growling and snarling and/or showing its teeth when it is reprimanded.

#16

(A) My dog barks excessively.

(B) My dog does not bark excessively.

#17

(A) My dog is likely to howl, whine, emit woo-woos, and make other chatter noises when it is around others.

(B) My dog is not likely to howl, whine, emit woo-woos, and make other chatter noises when it is around others.

#18

(A) My dog prefers noisy toys such as a croaking frog or a squeaky toy rather than toys that do not make noise.

(B) My dog prefers toys that do not make noise rather than noisy toys such as a croaking frog or a squeaky toy.

#19

(A) My dog makes noise by throwing its bowl in the air or playing with objects.

(B) My dog does not make noise by throwing its bowl in the air or playing with objects.

#20

(A) My dog does not growl a lot at other people.

(B) My dog growls a lot at other people.

#21

(A) My dog chews its paws or licks its leg until raw.

(B) My dog does not chew its paws or lick its leg until raw.

#22

(A) My dog does not have excessive fear of any of these: thunderstorms, loud noises, or gun shots.

(B) My does has excessive fear of one or more of these: thunderstorms, loud noises, or gun shots.

#23

(A) When my dog is scared, it may pace and pant or spin and bark or thrash around in the cage.

(B) When my dog is scared, it will not pace and pant or spin and bark or thrash around in the cage.

#24

(A) My dog howls or barks or whines excessively as I leave.

(B) My dog does not howl or bark or whine excessively as I leave.

#25

(A) My dog sulks or paces or chews its paws when I am not at home.

(B) My dog does not sulk or pace or chew its paws when I am not at home.

#26

(A) My dog only tears up stuff when the dog is separated from me.

(B) My dog does not tear up stuff when the dog is separated from me.

#27

(A) When I leave my dog sometimes spins and slams into things.

(B) When I leave my dog does not spin and slam into things.

#28

(A) My dog tears up pillows and other items.

(B) My dog does not tear up pillows and other item.

#29.

(A) My dog waits patiently while I attach its leash and walks without straining.

(B) My dog does not wait patiently when I attach its leash and strains while walking.

#30

(A) My dog jumps and shows it is ready to play.

(B) My dog does not jump and show it is ready to play.

#31

(A) My dog just sits in my lap rather than jumping around.

(B) My dog jumps around instead of sitting in my lap.

#32

(A) My dog runs around me in circles barking and being the center of attention.

(B) My dog does not run around me in circles barking and being the center of attention.

#33

(A) My dog brings its toys such as a pull or Frisbee or stick to me or runs to them in attempt to get me to play.

(B) My dog does not bring its toys such as a pull or Frisbee or stick to me or run to them in attempt to get me to play.

#34

(A) My dog enjoys running outside.

(B) My dog does not enjoy running outside.

#35

(A) My dog tries to get my attention by pawing at me or chewing lightly on my hand with its teeth.

(B) My dog does not try to get my attention by pawing at me or chewing lightly on my hand with its teeth.

#36

(A) My dog goes up to strangers and licks and rubs on them.

(B) My dog does not go up to strangers and lick and rub on them.

#37

(A) My dog shows affection by licking me.

(B) My dog does not show affection by licking me.

#38

(A) My dog greets me by jumping on me.

(B) My dog does not greet me by jumping on me.

#39

(A) My dog enjoys being petted and scratched.

(B) My dog does not enjoy being petted and scratched.

#40

(A) My dog likes to do one or more of these: sits close to me or leans on me, sits on my feet, puts its head in my lap, or crawls into my lap.

(B) My dog does not like to do one or more of these: sits close to me or leans on me, sits on my feet, puts its head in my lap, or crawls into my lap.

#41

(A) My dog does such as: hides toys in blankets and finds them, tosses toys around outside, finds common objects and tosses them around, and jumps playfully as I pass by.

(B) My dog does not do any of these: hides toys in blankets and finds them, tosses toys around outside, finds common objects and tosses them around, and jumps playfully as I pass by.

#42

(A) My dog hears a noise and proceeds to try to find it.

(B) If my dog hears a noise, it does not proceed to try to find it.

#43

(A) My dog turns its head sideways and watches something it has not seen before.

(B) My dog does not turn its head sideways and watch something it has not seen before.

#44

(A) My dog comes up to me to be scratched.

(B) My dog does not come up to me to be scratched.

#45

(A) My dog is always trying to be at my side.

(B) My dog is not always trying to be at my side.

Factors Influencing Satisfaction with Pet Ownership Survey

Title of Instrument: Adopt One Now: A Person and Canine Intervention (AONAPACI):

Read each statement carefully. Select the statement that best describes you. Write either letter A or B on the answer sheet. If you wish to explain more, feel free to add comments in the blanks.

#1

(A) I like it when someone invites me to some activity so we can spend time together.

(B) I don't care whether or not someone invites me to some activity so we can spend time
together.

#2

(A) I prefer the company of someone who is reserved.

(B) I do not prefer the company of someone who is reserved.

#3

(A) When I see a friend, I usually shout to get the person's attention and then give the
person a hug.

(B) When I see a friend, I usually neither shout to get the person's attention nor do I give the person a hug.

#4

(A) I am shy at first, but after I am around someone for a while, I reach out more to them.

(B) I am not shy upon first greeting someone.

#5

(A) I like to be the center of attention.

(B) I do not like to be the center of attention.

#6

(A) My body language shows that I am scared of strangers.

(B) My body language does not show that I am scared of strangers.

#7

(A) When a stranger approaches me, I do not elude them.

(B) When a stranger approaches me, I elude them.

#8

(A) When strangers approach, I am likely to yell boldly something like, "What do you want?"

(B) When strangers approach, I am not likely to yell boldly something like, "What do you want?"

#9

(A) If a stranger is approaching me, I give a warning. If they continue to approach, I will try to injure them.

(B) If a stranger is approaching me, I give a warning. If they continue to approach, I will not try to injure them.

#10

(A) I believe in being physically aggressive to get my way with others.

(B) I do not believe in being physically aggressive to get my way with others.

#11

(A) When I am scared, I try to stay out of sight and tremble.

(B) I do not get scared to the point of staying out of sight and trembling.

#12

(A) I tend to take the lead boldly and interact with others in daily situations.

(B) I tend not to take the lead boldly and interact with others in daily situations.

#13

(A) I tend to be possessive of my belongings and do not share with them others.

(B) I tend not to be possessive of my belongings and do share them with others.

#14

(A) I insist on getting my own way.

(B) I do not insist on getting my own way.

#15

(A) I tend to talk back to authority when reprimanded.

(B) I do not talk back to authority when reprimanded.

#16

(A) I do not talk loudly and a lot to others.

(B) I do talk loudly and a lot to others.

#17

(A) I tend to talk a lot and with expression when I am around others.

(B) I do not tend to talk a lot nor do I use expression when I am around others.

#18

(A) I like to turn up the volume when I listen to music.

(B) I do not like to turn up the volume when I listen to music.

#19

(A) When I play, I tend to slap things around and be noisy.

(B) When I play, I do not tend to slap things around and be noisy.

#20

(A) I make a special attempt to get along with others.

(B) I do not make a special attempt to get along with others.

#21

(A) I tend to chew on something or have a similar nervous habit that doesn't bother me.

(B) If I were to chew on something or have a similar nervous habit, it would bother me.

#22

(A) I tend to have excessive fear of one or more of these: thunderstorms, loud noises, or gun shots.

(B) I tend not to have excessive fear of one or more of these: thunderstorms, loud noises, or gun shots.

#23

(A) When I am scared, I tend to react in ways that might cause self-injury but this doesn't concern me.

(B) When I am scared, I tend not to react in ways that might cause self-injury.

#24

(A) If I have to leave my comfort zone, I make verbal complaints.

(B) If I have to leave my comfort zone, I do not make verbal complaints.

#25

(A) When I am worried excessively, I tend not to say anything, but signs that indicate such are pacing, chewing my fingernails, or walking in a sulking position.

(B) When I am worried excessively, I do not engage in particular behaviors such as pacing, chewing my fingernails, or walking in a sulking position.

#26

(A) When I am feeling anxious, I am likely to tear up something.

(B) When I am feeling anxious, I am not likely to tear up something.

#27

(A) When I am really worried, I may not be as attentive and tend to physically hurt myself.

(B) When I am really worried, I am not likely to physically hurt myself.

#28

(A) If my house has trash like wrappers scattered throughout, it bothers me.

(B) If my house has trash like wrappers scattered throughout, it does not bother me.

#29

(A) I tend to wait patiently in line and complete a transaction without complaining or gesturing.

(B) I do not tend to wait patiently in line and complete a transaction without complaining or gesturing.

#30

(A) I am very motivated to engage in physical exercise.

(B) I am not very motivated to engage in physical exercise.

#31

(A) I prefer to lounge on the sofa rather than do physical exercise.

(B) I prefer to engage in physical exercise rather than lounge on the sofa.

#32

(A) I am likely to be teasing/playful/hyper and enjoy being the center of attention.

(B) I am not likely to be teasing/playful/hyper; I do not enjoy being the center of attention.

#33

(A) I like to be engaged in outdoor physical activity.

(B) I do not like to be engaged in outdoor physical activity.

#34

(A) I enjoy running outside.

(B) I do not enjoy running outside.

#35

(A) I am likely to pat someone on the back or give them a hug upon greeting.

(B) I am not likely to pat someone on the back or give them a hug upon greeting.

#36

(A) When I see a stranger, I go up to them and initiate conversation.

(B) When I see a stranger, I do not go up to them and initiate conversation.

#37

(A) I kiss people on the cheek.

(B) I do not kiss people on the cheek.

#38

(A) I tend to hug others in greeting them.

(B) I do not tend to hug others in greeting them.

#39

(A) I like to have physical contact in the form of a hug and caress.

(B) It is not important for me to have physical contact in the form of a hug and caress.

#40

(A) I like to be with someone all of the time and have a lot of physical attention.

(B) I do not like to be with someone all of the time nor have a lot of physical attention.

#41

(A) I like to be creative with the mundane tasks of everyday life.

(B) I am not creative with the mundane tasks of everyday life.

#42

(A) When I hear an unusual noise, I proceed to try to find it.

(B) When I hear an unusual noise, I do not proceed to try to find it.

#43

(A) I tend to stop and observe and wonder about something new when I encounter it.

(B) I do not tend to stop and observe and wonder about something new when I encounter it.

#44

(A) I like for people to do something for me that I cannot do myself.

(B) I do not like for people to do something for me that I am unable to do myself.

#45

(A) I prefer to be with someone all of the time.

(B) I do not need to be with someone all of the time.

Pet Satisfaction Survey

Circle the answer that best describes your feelings about owning your dog.

1. All in all, I am very satisfied with my experiences owning my dog.

strongly disagree
disagree
somewhat disagree
neutral
somewhat agree
agree
strongly agree

2. There are times when I regret my decision to have obtained this dog.

strongly disagree
disagree
somewhat disagree
neutral
somewhat agree
agree
strongly agree

3. There are many things I would like to change about my dog.

strongly disagree
disagree
somewhat disagree
neutral
somewhat agree
agree
strongly agree

4. I am satisfied with my dog just the way it is.

strongly disagree
disagree
somewhat disagree
neutral
somewhat agree
agree
strongly agree

Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions.
 1. I have:
   ___ one dog
   ___ more than one dog

2. The dog that I am describing is:
   ___ the one I have owned the longest
   ___ not the one I have owned the longest

3. Do you have other pets besides dogs?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

4. I have owned _____ dogs in my life.

5. I have returned _____ of these dogs to a shelter or had to give the dog to someone.

6. Check all that apply:
   I:
   _____ am a veterinarian
   _____ am staff/office personnel for a veterinarian
   _____ am a pet groomer
   _____ work at an animal shelter
   _____ work at a humane society
   _____ work at a pet store/feed store
   _____ am university faculty/staff
   _____ am a university student
   _____ visited a pet store/feed store
   _____ other

7. My gender is _____.

8. My ethnicity is _____.

9. My age is _____.

10. My education level is:
   _____high school
   _____post high school
   _____bachelors degree
   _____masters degree
   _____doctoral degree
   _____post-doctorate

11. Do you and your pet have basically the same personality?
   ___yes
   ___no

12. On a scale of 1 -- 100 (one = not like the dog; 100 = most like the dog), how close to a personality
    match are you and your dog? ___

13. Do you think it is important for the dog owner and dog to have basically the same personality?
    Why or why not? _____

APPENDIX C

Sources for Survey Development

Books Accessed:	Detailed Structured Interviews:	Questionnaires:
ASPCA Complete Guide to Dogs	Oklahoma Humane Society Shelter --1	Dog Adopter Survey: Meet Your Match (ASPCA)
Be the Dog: Secrets of the Natural Dog Owner	Pets & People Humane Society -- 1	Dog Adoption Questionnaire (Central Oklahoma Humane Society)
Dog Friendly Dog Training, 2nd ed.	Second Chance Animal Sanctuary -- 1	Second Chance Animal Sanctuary Application for Adoption (Second Chance)
Dog Heroes of September 11th: A Tribute to America's Search and Rescue Dogs	Stillwater Humane Society -- 2	Animal Adoption Application (Stillwater Humane Society)
Dogology: What Your Relationship with Your Dog Reveals about You		Pets & People -- oral questions
Dog Owner's Home Veterinary Handbook, 4th ed.		
First Friend: A History of Dogs and Humans		
For the Love of a Dog		
Gentle Dog Training		
Inside of a Dog: What Dogs See, Smell, and Know		
Maran Illustrated Dog Training		
New Complete Dog Training Manual		
Old Dog, New Tricks		
Petfinder.com: The Adopted Dog Bible		
The Everything Dog Training and Tricks Book		
The Power of Positive Dog training		
The Well-Adjusted Dog		
Training Your Dog for Life		
What Color is Your Dog? Train Your Dog Based on His Personality Color		
Why Does my Dog Act that Way?		

Humane Society Questionnaire

1. How many dogs are usually houses at the humane society at any given time?

2. I know there is a color coded matching procedure. Explain how the adoption process works (i.e. once a match is found and the dog selected, does the person pay right then and leave with the dog or do they give it a bath and you come back?)

3. Are potential adopters required to complete the Meet Your Match Canine-ality to get a pet, or can they just walk around and find one?

4. About what percent choose to do the test?

5. How do they find out if the selected dog is a good match? What is the time frame/procedure?

6. Can I do the personality match?

7. May I have a copy of the questions used for the match?

Before we get to the individual dog behavior/disposition/personalities, what are some things that you ask potential adopters?

1. Size

2. Breed

3. Mixed/Purebred

4. type of coat (shedding)

5. energy level

6. good with children

7. one person dog

8. time in hours per day

9. walking space

10. indoor/outdoor

11. allergies

12. afford per week

13. a lot of visitors

14. timing ok with family

15. attitude -- dominance or submission

1. ATTITUDE/SOCIABILITY category

    A. A dog with a distinctive attitude toward people was _____.

        This attitude was evidenced by

        Prompts: (if needed)

        patient/impatient

        independent

        friendly

        ignores

        overwhelming desire to please

        approaches everyone

        cowering

        laid back

        submissive (roll, tail wag, lowered body)

        dominant

        owner possessive

        guarding

        tries to get attention

    B. A dog with a distinctive attitude toward strangers was _____.

        The attitude was characterized by

        Prompts:

        accepting

        protective of owner

        aloof

1. ATTITUDE/SOCIABILITY category (cont'd)

 C. A dog with a distinctive attitude toward other animals was _____.

  The attitude was characterized by

  Prompts:

  accepting

  rivalry

2. AGGRESSIVE/REACTIVE Category

 The most aggressive dog I recall was _____.

  The dog showed aggression by

  Prompts:

  barks

  growls

  shows teeth

  lifts hair on neck (hackles)

  direct stare

  coveting (laying head over object; sitting in food dish to eat)

  territorial

  stalking

  tugging

  guards

3. ANNOYING/DESTRUCTIVE CATEGORY

 A dog with annoying/destructive behaviors was _____.

  Some of the things it did were

3. ANNOYING/DESTRUCTIVE CATEGORY (cont'd)

Prompts:

incessantly begging

eating feces

rolling in garbage

jumping fence

straying

digging

tearing up objects

chewing paw

4. FEAR/PHOBIAS

A dog showing distinctive fear/phobia was _____.

This dog would

Prompts:

tremble

cringe

hide

bark

children

men with beards

unexpected noises

loud noises

thunderstorms

4. FEAR/PHOBIAS (cont'd)

fireworks

loud unexpected noises

striped umbrellas

unfamiliar places

vet visit

5. ENERGETIC/EXCITABLE

A dog that was especially energetic was _____.

Examples of this were

Prompts:

excessive licking greeting

jumping

tinkling upon greeting

knocking things over

center of attention

constantly in motion

6. CARRIES SELF category

A dog that carried itself a particular way was _____.

It carried itself by

Prompts:

proud posture

graceful

agility

7. OBEDIENCE/TRAINABLE/LEARNING ABILITY

A. A dog that was easy to train was _____.

I recall that it

Prompts:

simple commands

return when called

return on own after leash release

learning pace

number of repetitions

B. A dog that showed the ability to focus was _____.

This was seen as it

Prompts:

not distracted by commotion or noise

learns new tasks

learns from mistakes

8. AFFECTIONATE

An especially affectionate dog was _____.

The dog showed this characteristic by

Prompts:

licking

wagging tail

pawing you

leaning on you

8. AFFECTIONATE (cont'd)

        sitting in lap

        snuggling

9. SEPARATION/ANXIETY ISSUES

    A dog that indicated anxiety was _____.

        This was evidenced by

        Prompts:

        sulking

        digging

        destroying

10. PLAYFULNESS

    An especially playful dog was _____.

        It showed this by

        Prompts:

        chasing

        rough housing

        dropping toy at feet

        retrieving

        play biting

11. NOISE LEVEL/EXCESSIVE BARKING

    A really noisy dog was _____.

        This dog would

        Prompts:

11. NOISE LEVEL/EXCESSIVE BARKING (cont'd)

bark

growl

whimper

whine

12. BEHAVIORS THAT REMIND OF A CLOSE FRIEND

A dog named _____ reminds me of a good friend.

It would

Prompts:

look into your eyes

animated

13. CREATIVE BEHAVIORS

A dog that showed creative behaviors was _____.

Prompts:

walk up or down ladder

investigate noises and show expressions on face

14. DEMANDING/DOMINANT

A dog that was very demanding/dominant was _____.

This was shown by

Prompts:

nudge

pawing

center of attention

14. DEMANDING/DOMINANT (cont'd)

   growling when put outside or punished

15. HOUSEBREAKING

   A dog that was easy to housebreak was _____.

      The dog learned by

      Prompts:

      reactions in process

VITA

<div align="center">

Lisa Annette Curb

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

</div>

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMANE-CANINE PERSONALITY

<div align="center">

MATCH AND PET SATISFACTION

</div>

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

    Education:

    Completed the requirement for Master of Education in Reading at University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 1987

    Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in English at University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 1983

    Experience:

    Secondary Teacher, Western Heights High School, August 1988 through May 2011

    Adjunct Professor, Learning Skills, Oklahoma City Community College, August 1987 through December 1997

    Professional Memberships:

    Current: Psi Chi; Golden Key International Honor Society, ONTOP

    Past: SWPA, ORA, APA, OPA

Name: Lisa Annette Curb   Date of Degree: May 2011

Institution: Oklahoma State University   Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HUMAN-CANINE PERSONALITY
                 MATCH AND PET SATISFACTION

Pages in Study: 73   Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Psychology

Scope and Method of Study: I tested the hypothesis that pet-to-owner personality-matching may improve pet-owner satisfaction on an instrument I designed. If a prospective pet owner adopted a dog with similar personality characteristics, the pet owner may be more satisfied with the pet and less likely to relinquish it. The 88 participants had self-selected their dog. The participants worked in a veterinarian clinic/hospital, zoo, grooming parlor or were employed as university faculty or graduate students. The survey consisted of 45 questions about the dog and 45 questions about the participants. A satisfaction rating and demographic survey were used.

Findings and Conclusions: Out of the 45 traits for a possible human-to-pet match, there were four matches. The one slightly moderate correlation is stated below, followed by three weak correlations. These results do indicate a trend in human-to-pet matches. Both humans and dogs are willing to share possessions and make an attempt to get along with others. Both enjoyed running outside together. The dog owner is not likely to leave trash such as wrappers around, and the dog does not chew up items, so the living space is clean. Further, there was a trend for people highly satisfied with their pets to own a dog that had certain behaviors. These included dogs that greeted them by running up to them, shared toys and food, and refrained from tearing up items. A trend existed to show that people who were highly satisfied with their dog had particular personality characteristics themselves. They were more motivated to exercise rather than lounge on the sofa, but were not likely to go running outside without a pet. Further, they tended to be satisfied with the routine of everyday life. These people seem well adjusted in that they are not likely to tear up anything when anxious or insist on getting their own way in situations of everyday life. Despite the few significant results, the research provides an important contribution to the literature in that it demonstrates the challenge of isolating personality of dogs and prospective owners for the purpose of matching them during pet adoption. This study is helpful in advancing the idea of certain personality matching that might be effective to some slight degree for some who share the aforementioned traits. However, overall, this study did not achieve the desired significance level. It had limitations regarding statistical power in that there were few who were not satisfied with their dog, including even some who had returned a dog. More participants who returned dogs were needed to be able to have enough power to analyze this population separately The goal is to reduce the number of dogs relinquished.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Charles I. Abramson, PhD.