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Background – Catalysts for encounters?

- One of the **consistent failures of supported accommodation and supported living options** is around the domains of **social inclusion and interpersonal relationships** (Bigby et al., 2016).

- What might be a catalyst for encounters in the community for individuals with intellectual disabilities?
Background – Catalysts for encounters?

- What might be a catalyst for encounters in the community for individuals with intellectual disabilities?
Background – Companion animals can be catalysts for social interactions

- Companion animals can be catalysts for incidental social interactions; becoming known and formation of new friendships in local communities.

- In an Australian survey, 58% of pet owners indicated they had got to know people and made friends through having pets.
Background – Companion animals can be catalysts for social interactions

- Few people with intellectual disabilities in supported accommodation and supported living have a pet
Background – Benefits of Service Dogs

- Benefits of service dogs for adults and children with physical disabilities:
  - Increase the number of social interactions
  - Reduce the negative effects of social ostracism
  - Feel more secure and confident in public

- These studies provide support of the potential role of dogs to facilitate encounters
Aim of the Study

- Using the concept of ‘encounter’, we aimed to explore:
  - Differences in the **types** and **number** of encounters with other community members.

- Trialled a program in collaboration with Righteous Pups Australia to provide individual support to adults with intellectual disabilities to regularly go out into their local community with and without a dog.
Dog Walking Program

6 RPA Labrador dogs

Both received additional training prior to the program

2 Handlers from RPA –
What we did

Recruited 16 participants

Group 1
(n = 8)

Group 2
(n = 8)
What we did

Recruited 16 participants

Group 1
$n = 8$

14, one hour outings with an RPA handler and a dog

Group 2
$n = 8$

14, one hour outings with a handler alone (i.e. minus the dog)
What we did

Group 2
\( (n = 8) \)

5, one hour outings with an RPA handler and a dog
Analysis – Group 1 & Group 2 Characteristics

- No statistically significant differences between the two groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N/n</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1 ABS score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>130-234</td>
<td>81-241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage with autism</strong></td>
<td>(n = 1) 13%</td>
<td>(n = 1) 13%</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage socially impaired</strong></td>
<td>(n = 2) 25%</td>
<td>(n = 3) 38%</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>21 to 64</td>
<td>32 to 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage male</strong></td>
<td>(n = 2) 25%</td>
<td>(n = 3) 38%</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score on the ABC</strong></td>
<td>(n = 4) 50%</td>
<td>(n = 3) 38%</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2-42</td>
<td>3-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage with a physical impairment</strong></td>
<td>(n = 4) 50%</td>
<td>(n = 3) 38%</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

Group 1
\((n = 8)\)

\(\text{VS.}\)

Group 2
\((n = 8)\)
Results – Average number of encounters each outing for participants in Group 1 and Group 2

- Average Outings 1-14
  - Group 1 = 2.6 vs. Group 2 = 1.2
Results – Average number of encounters each outing for participants in Group 1 and Group 2

- Average Outings 15-19
  - Group 2 (without a dog) = 1.2
  - Group 2 (with a dog) = 3.4

- Average Outings 1-14
  - Group 2 (without a dog) = 1.2

![Graph showing number of encounters over outings for Group 2 (without a dog) and Group 2 Crossover (with a dog).]
Qualitative Results

Group 1

Group 2

Encounters

VS.
Qualitative Results
I am noticing an interesting pattern in the outings where there is no dog present. Only shop attendants’ initiate conversation. Some say hello to me, but they try not to look at the person with the disability. (P8, without a dog, outing 8).

Three high school kids were making fun of Lyle as we were having a drink today. They were laughing and giggling, and when Lyle looked over, they covered their mouths, and it was clear they were making Lyle the subject of their jokes. (P5, without a dog, outing 4).
Presence of a dog helps avoid unfulfilled or negative encounters
Presence of a dog helps becoming acknowledged in regular places more quickly

- It took until outing 13 for Mark in Group 2 to be acknowledged

  We have been coming to the same café each week, and we now have a waitress that remembers our orders and how Mark likes things. (P15, without a dog, outing 13).

- This occurring by outing 4 for Frankie in Group 1

  When Frankie walked into the café today, he was greeted directly by the staff, by name, with, 'Hello Frankie'. The other shop attendant commented to him that that was Seraphim wasn't it (he had remembered from the week before). (P3, with a dog, outing 4).
A neighbour also begun to acknowledge one participant.

At the start of the program Michelle had spoken about not liking any of her neighbours because they never talk to her. She had said “they just ignore me”. However, today one smiled and said hello to Michelle, and Michelle smiled and said hello back. (P1, with a dog, outing 3).
Presence of a dog helps initiate convivial and fleeting encounters

- No interactions without a dog

For Lauren, no one talks to her, and she talks to no one other than the staff at the cafe where we get afternoon tea. No one thinks to say hello to two people having coffee. Nor does Lauren seek interaction with anyone other than me - unless there is a purpose to it, i.e. a transaction of some kind. (P14, without a dog, outing 13).

- Two outings later when she visited the same café with a dog,

People came up to Lauren and myself today and asked if they could pat the dog. Lauren said to me “People are friendlier when you have a dog, I have seen people look and smile”. (P14, with a dog, outing 15).
Dog acts as a catalyst for convivial encounters with strangers

We were walking and a man yelled out “I love your dog” and Claire thanked him with the biggest smile on her face. (P7, with a dog, outing 1).

One of Michelle’s neighbours seems to like dogs, so she has started coming over to Michelle and I when we are out walking. Today the neighbour began talking about her dogs in the past and then Michelle started talking about how she loves Ivy. The neighbours’ cat then appeared from nowhere and Michelle started talking about the cat, and the two continued to talk for about ten minutes. (P1, with a dog, outing 5).

Rachael was excited to see Murphy, and wanted to take him out for a walk. Whilst out walking, a lady and her young sons wanted to meet Murphy, and Rachael told the mum about her two young nieces. I cannot get over the transformation with Rachael. I struggled to get her to go out before, as she can be incredibly shy, but she is really coming out of her shell. (P9, with a dog, outing 16).
Discussion

- With a dog participants had significantly more encounters of a different and more convivial nature.

- Our findings support research with non-disabled individuals and individuals with physical disabilities demonstrating a dog:
  - Acts as a social stimulant. Members of the community often initiated contact to ask questions about the dog
  - Helps to reduce some of the negative effects of social ostracism
  - Increases individual’s confidence in public
Conclusions

- The study highlights the potential for a dog walking program to help people with intellectual disabilities build a sense of identity and belonging in the community.

- It is a timely project, given the heightened awareness of people with disability in the community due to the launch of the NDIS.

Limitations

- Methods of data collection
- Sample size

Further research is required!
Key Question

- How do we increase the size of this research?
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