

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE USE OF PETS IN CANADIAN RESIDENTIAL  
CARE FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN

by

HEATHER FERGUSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

January, 1981

THE USE OF PETS IN CANADIAN RESIDENTIAL  
CARE FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN

BY

HEATHER LYNNE MARY FERGUSON

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

© 1980

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to  
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this  
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY  
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to explore the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada. A sample of 316 facilities, drawn proportionately by region and size, was sent a five-part questionnaire on their use of pets. Those facilities with more than one residential unit under their auspices were asked to complete as many parts on the use of pets as they had types of pet use. Eighty-six facilities returned usable questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 27.2%. From these 86 facilities, there were responses from 98 units -- 54 keep pets now, 16 kept pets in the past, 10 would consider keeping pets in the future, and 18 would never consider keeping pets. The data analysis consisted of three parts: 1) the relationship between 12 characteristics of the facilities and the keeping of pets, 2) the relationship between 11 aspects of pet use and the keeping of pets, and 3) the relationship among the 11 aspects of pet use for those units that keep pets now. Those units that keep pets now tended to serve small (1 - 7) or large (13 and over) numbers of children, those which kept pets in the past tended to serve a medium number (8 - 12), and those which had never kept pets tended to serve medium or small numbers. In addition, those units which have never kept pets tended to serve only one age group of children. In terms of their use of pets, more units which kept pets in the past experienced problems with the care of the pets, with the staff, and with the children than those units which keep pets now. The pets were introduced to the unit more often by a person in management in those units which keep pets now and more often by another staff person in those

units that kept pets in the past. Thirty relationships were found between the aspects of pet use for those units that keep pets now; the relationships involved five of the twelve areas examined (i.e., type of pets, supervision of the children with the pets, access of the children to the pets, planning the introduction of the pets, and the role of the pet). It was concluded that pets are being used in Canadian residential care facilities for children for educational and therapeutic purposes, with small animals playing primarily an educational role and large animals, especially dogs, taking a therapeutic role. The findings also suggest that the success of a pet program may be largely determined by the attitude of the staff and the children towards the pets.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Lola Jackson, for her unfailing patience and encouragement, and my other committee members, Dr. Lois Brockman and Prof. Les West, for their helpful comments and suggestions.

A special thank you is extended to Maureen Olafson for her valuable assistance in typing and coding during the proposal and data collection phases of the study, and to Vi Patrick and Brigitte Wiebe for typing the final copy of this thesis.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the Health Promotion Directorate, Health and Welfare Canada, for their financial assistance through a grant from the Summer Resources Fund; to Wendy Fergus, their Program Coordinator; and to all the people who participated in this study.

Finally I would like to thank my husband, Wayne, for his constant encouragement and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT .....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION .....	1
Review of Literature .....	2
Residential Care Facilities for Children .....	2
The Use of Pets with Children .....	6
Pets in Residential Care Facilities for Children .....	9
Statement of the Problem .....	17
II METHOD .....	23
Selection of the Population .....	23
Selection of the Sample .....	24
Description of the Sample .....	27
Research design .....	28
Instruments .....	30
Procedure .....	33
Data Analysis .....	34
III RESULTS .....	36
Characteristics of the Facilities and the Units ...	36
Use of the Pets .....	61

	Comparison of Pet Use Among those Units Which Keep Pets Now .....	92
	Additional Information on the Use of Pets .....	115
IV	DISCUSSION .....	123
V	SUMMARY .....	147
	REFERENCES .....	150
	APPENDICES .....	155
	APPENDIX A - Sources for the Facilities in the Population .....	156
	APPENDIX B - Description of the Population and the Sample .....	160
	APPENDIX C - Replacements of the Sampled Facilities .....	163
	APPENDIX D - English Version of the Questionnaire ..	166
	APPENDIX E - French Version of the Questionnaire ...	215
	APPENDIX F - Letter of Introduction .....	264
	APPENDIX G - Letter of Reminder .....	267
	APPENDIX H - Requests for Pamphlets by Region and the Keeping of Pets .....	270
	APPENDIX I - Levels of Significance and Chi-Square Values of the Relationships Between the Hypothesis 3 Variables .....	272
	APPENDIX J - Pamphlet Summarizing the Study .....	310

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Position of the Respondents to the Questionnaire by the Part of the Questionnaire Completed . . . . .	28
2. $\chi^2$ Tests of Number of Children by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	38
3. Chi Square Analyses of the Age Groups of the Children in the Facilities and in the Units by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	40
4. $\chi^2$ Tests of Facilities and Units with Children Under 12 Years Only or Over 12 Years Only by Keeping of Pets . . .	41
5. $\chi^2$ Tests of Facilities and Units with Children of One Age Group Only or Mixed Age Group by Keeping of Pets. . .	42
6. Frequencies of the Sex of the Children in the Facilities and the Units by Keeping of Pets. . . . .	43
7. Frequencies of the Reasons for the Children Being in Care by the Keeping of the Pets. . . . .	45
8. Chi Square Analyses of the Reasons for the Children Being in Care by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	46
9. $\chi^2$ Test of Type of Child by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	47
10. Frequencies of the Professional Orientation of the Principal Caregivers by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	48
11. Frequencies of the Professional Orientation of the Principal Caregivers in "More than one answer given" Category by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	49
12. $\chi^2$ Test of the Training of the Principal Caregivers by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	50
13. $\chi^2$ Tests of the Child/Staff Ratios by the Keeping of Pets .	51
14. $\chi^2$ Test of the Budgeted Cost Per Child by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	52
15. Frequencies of Housing Styles of the Units by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	53
16. $\chi^2$ Test of Housing Style by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	54
17. $\chi^2$ Test of Children Per Sleeping Unit by Keeping of Pets. .	55

Table	Page
18. $\chi^2$ Test of the Size of the Premises by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	56
19. $\chi^2$ Test of the Area Per Child by the Keeping of Pets . . .	57
20. $\chi^2$ Tests of the Size of the Premises by the Keeping of Pets, Controlling for Geographic Location. . . . .	58
21. Frequencies of Other Features of the Facilities by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	59
22. $\chi^2$ Test of Pet-Related Features by the Keeping of Pets . .	60
23. $\chi^2$ Test of Geographic Location of the Facility by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	61
24. Frequencies of Type of Pets by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	62
25. Size of Pets by Keeping of Pets . . . . .	63
26. Chi Square Analyses of the Most Popular Types of Pets by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	64
27. Ownership of the Pets . . . . .	65
28. Ownership of the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	66
29. Children Allowed to Own Pets by the Keeping of the Pets. .	66
30. Access of the Children to the Pets . . . . .	67
31. Type of Access to the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . .	68
32. Restrictions on the Access of the Children to the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	69
33. Housing of the Pets. . . . .	70
34. Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Housing of the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	71
35. Supervision of the Children with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	72
36. Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Problems of the Children by the Supervision of the Children with the Pets . . . . .	73
37. Type of Problem of the Children by Supervision of the Children with the Pets . . . . .	74

Table	Page
38. Persons Who Care for the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . .	74
39. Planning the Introduction of the Pets to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	75
40. Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Planning for the Introduction of the Pets to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	76
41. Whether Problems Were Encountered Due to Not Planning the Introduction of the Pet to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	77
42. Professional Orientation of the Person Who Introduced the Pet to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	78
43. Training of the Person Who Introduced the Pet to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	79
44. Position of the Person Who Introduced the Pet to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	80
45. Comparison of Whether the Introducer of the Pet was Manage- ment or Staff by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	81
46. Allowance of a Child's Pet from Home to Live in the Unit by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	82
47. Types of Pets Which May Stay at the Unit by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	83
48. Allowance of a Child's Pet from Home to Visit the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	84
49. Types of Pets Which May Visit the Unit by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	85
50. Educational and Therapeutic Roles of the Pets by the Keeping of Pets. . . . .	86
51. Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Roles of the Pet by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	87
52. Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	88
53. Problems or No Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	89
54. Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	90

Table	Page
55. Reasons Why Pets No Longer Kept by the Keeping of Pets . . .	91
56. Size of the Pets by the Type of Housing of the Pet . . . . .	94
57. Size of the Pet by the Children Who were Supervised with the Pets . . . . .	95
58. Size of the Pets by the Position of the Person Who Intro- duced the Pets to the Unit . . . . .	95
59. Size of the Pet by the Role of the Pet in the Unit . . . . .	96
60. Keeping Fish as Pets by the Position of the Person Who Introduced the Pets . . . . .	97
61. Keeping Fish as Pets by Whether or Not a Child's Pet Can Visit the Residence . . . . .	98
62. Keeping Small Rodents as Pets by Making Alterations to the Facility for the Pets . . . . .	98
63. Keeping Cats as Pets by Giving the Pets a Free Run of the Inside of the Residence . . . . .	99
64. Keeping Cats as Pets by Keeping Dogs as Pets . . . . .	100
65. Keeping Dogs as Pets by the Presence or Absence of a Therapeutic Role for the Pet . . . . .	100
66. Restrictions on the Access of the Children to the Pets by Problems with the Children . . . . .	101
67. Housing the Pets in Animal Shelters by Having an Educa- tional Role for the Pets . . . . .	102
68. Housing the Pets in a Playroom or Lounge by Supervision of the Children with the Pets . . . . .	103
69. Housing the Pets in Other Rooms in the Residence by Supervision of the Children with the Pets . . . . .	104
70. Housing of the Pets in Other Rooms in the Residence by Whether or Not there is a Therapeutic Role for the Pet. . . . .	105
71. Supervision of the Children with the Pets by the Person Who Cares for the Pets . . . . .	106
72. Supervision of the Children with the Pets by Whether the Introduction of the Pets was Planned . . . . .	106

Table	Page
73. Supervision of the Children with the Pets by the Role of the Pet in the Unit . . . . .	107
74. Person Who Cares for the Pets by Whether or Not the Pet has an Educational Role. . . . .	108
75. Planning the Introduction of the Pet to the Unit by an Educational Role for the Pet . . . . .	109
76. Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by Preparation of the Children for the Pets . . . . .	110
77. Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by Whether a Child's Pet Can Visit the Residence . . . . .	111
78. Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by an Educational Role for the Pets . . . . .	111
79. Having an Educational Role for the Pets by Having a Therapeutic Role for the Pets . . . . .	113
80. Therapeutic Role for the Pets by Problems with the Pets .	114
81. Advice on Pet Programs Given by Respondents by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	116
82. Information Felt Needed by Those Considering Pet Programs in the Future . . . . .	118
83. Definite Plans for the Future for Pets by the Keeping of Pets . . . . .	119
84. Reasons Pets Would Never Be Kept in Some Units. . . . .	120
85. Advantages of a Child Having a Pet as Seen by Those Who Would Never Keep Pets in Their Unit . . . . .	121
86. Reasons Pets Would Never Be Kept Even if a Similar Facility Found Pets Beneficial for Children . . . . .	122

## Chapter I

The number of children in residential care in Canada was estimated by Hepworth (1975) to be between 80,000 and 96,000 in 1973. Health and Welfare Canada compiles statistics annually on the child care institutions approved under the Canada Assistance Plan. These statistics indicate that the number of these facilities has increased steadily every year. In the five-year period from 1973 to 1978, the number of facilities has increased from 757 to 1246, and the number of children in care has increased from 24,393 to 30,786 (Canada. Health and Welfare Canada, Welfare Information Systems Branch, 1973 & 1978).

The transition from the family home to a residential care facility can involve many potential hazards to a child's maturation and growth (Rae-Grant & Moffat, 1971). However, some children must live away from their families due to specific problems in their development, learning, behavior, and/or family situation. Pets have been found to alleviate some of the negative aspects of residential care for children (Burmeister, 1960; Brill & Thomas, 1964; Levinson, 1968; Sundaram, 1969; Levinson, 1971). Unfortunately, there is very little research on the use of pets in residential care facilities for children.

In a thorough review of the literature, only four studies were found on the use of pets with children in residential care (Levinson, 1968; Sundaram, 1969; Levinson, 1971; Corson, Corson, and Gwynne, 1975). All four studies were very limited in scope and involved facilities in the United States. Information on the use of pets in Canadian facilities is almost non-existent. It would seem that an investigation of the use of

pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada should be made.

The purpose of this proposed study was to investigate the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada in relation to a number of selected variables which may influence their use.

### Literature Review

A review of the literature indicates three areas for discussion: residential care facilities for children with respect to their effect on the child and the situation in Canada; the use of pets with children in terms of the types of settings, children, and pets, and the roles which the pets have played; and the use of pets in residential care facilities for children. Each of these areas will be dealt with separately. For the purpose of this study, a pet is defined as an animal which provides some form of pleasure to those with whom it lives. This does not exclude its use for other purposes (e.g., work animal, source of food).

#### Residential Care Facilities For Children

Canada does not have a strong tradition of residential child care, tending to develop small group homes rather than large institutions (Hepworth, 1975). Residential child care in Canada began as an attempt to provide substitute family living for orphans, and correctional training in a self-supporting trade for those who had fallen in with "bad companions". Most of Canada's large institutions were built for this purpose. However, with the increasing use of foster homes, the placement of older children for adoption, and the emphasis on family

rehabilitation in recent years, these large facilities have been transformed into residential treatment centres (Rae-Grant & Moffat, 1971). The trend in Canada is towards smaller residential care facilities for children (Hepworth, 1975).

Residential care in Canada is under the jurisdiction of the provincial departments concerned with child welfare. As a result, the services provided and the type of children served varies from province to province. In some provinces (e.g., Quebec), training schools come under the authority of child welfare, whereas in other provinces (e.g., Manitoba) they are under the authority of corrections. Although governments largely finance all residential care facilities in Canada, most facilities fall under private and voluntary auspices (Hepworth, 1975).

The effect of a residential care facility on a child can be examined from two viewpoints. The negative viewpoint is the degree to which the facility interrupts and alters the normal growth and maturation of the child. The positive viewpoint is the ability of the facility to provide diagnosis and treatment of a specific problem (Rae-Grant & Moffat, 1971).

From the negative viewpoint, the placement of a child into a residential care facility implies a separation of the child from his family. Bowlby (1953) has stated that the family is very important to the child for the continuity of care that it provides. "In no other relationship do human beings place themselves so unreservedly and so continuously at the disposal of others" (Bowlby, 1953, p. 76). A child remains involved in a relationship with his parents even though he may be separated from them and even if they have neglected or mistreated him in the past (Mason, 1968).

Trasler (1968) felt that the chief problem in separating a child from his family was the loss of the confidence which sustained him through his ventures outside the home. With a secure homebase, a child can venture away from home and develop the skills needed to function independently in the world, as he knows that there is someone at home to console him in his failures and rejoice at his successes (Rae-Grant & Moffat, 1971). Separation shatters this secure homebase and the confidence it produced, and it must be rebuilt in the residential care facility (Trasler, 1968).

The family also provides the child with a sense of belonging (Mason, 1968) and a sense of being special to someone (Bowlby, 1953; Mason, 1968). It is difficult for a child to develop such a genuinely individual relationship, in which he does not fear rivalry from others, with a staff person in a residential care facility (Trasler, 1968). The family also provides the child with an ideal for the development of attitudes (e.g., towards work and authority) (Brill and Thomas, 1964). It also gives the child his first experience in community living and provides him with access to the larger community (Brill and Thomas, 1964).

In addition to separation from the family, residential care has certain attributes which are potentially hazardous to the child. These attributes include a lack of privacy or a place of the child's own, less individualization, an impersonal atmosphere, a lack of private property, too many rules and too much routine, the necessity of relating to a large number of nonrelated children and adults, and insufficient opportunities to make decisions and learn responsibility (Child Welfare League of America, 1964; Konopka, 1968).

However, some authors feel that many of these attributes of residential care do not have to be negative, but can be compensated for, and in some cases made into positive attributes. A child can rebuild his confidence to venture out into the world again and can develop an individual relationship with a staff person in residential care (Trasler, 1968). The facility can also foster ideal attitudes in the child, give him a good experience in group living, and provide him with access to the community (Wolins, 1974). A place can be set aside for the children, especially adolescents, to be alone when they want to be (Konopka, 1968). Children can keep their individualism by being allowed to wear their own clothes from home (Brill and Thomas, 1964). Private lockers can keep cherished possessions out of the reach of others (Konopka, 1968).

For a child from an unstable family, a daily routine can provide security, a number of adults can provide opportunities for a variety of role models and adult-child relationships, and a number of children can give the child a sense of belonging to a group (Burmeister, 1960). It is also possible for a residential care facility to provide many opportunities for successful accomplishments and recognition (Burmeister, 1960). Some children require treatment in a protected therapeutic environment away from their families (Klein, 1975).

The effect of the residential care facility on the child is therefore the result of how well the facility meets the needs of the individual child (Mayer, Richman, & Balcerzak, 1977). There are "no intrinsically destructive aspects in child care institutions. Such institutions are essentially neutral tools which may be used constructively or destructively depending on the particular mix of social,

economic, educational, and psychological ingredients" (Gil, 1974, p. 75).

A cross-cultural study of group care among the institutionalized revealed little or no intellectual or psychosocial deficiencies in the children compared with controls from home environments (Wolins, 1974). Wolins feels that American culture seems to hinder the development of the six basic ingredients necessary for good group care in the following ways: 1) there is the expectation that group care will harm the child, 2) separation from the family is often not permanent and unequivocal, hindering the development of long-range plans for the child, 3) the residential care facility is often not an integrated and accepted part of the community, 4) the children's peer group is not seen as being a healthy influence, 5) the children are not given constructive work at the facility to give them feelings of competence and a sense of ownership, and 6) there is a lack of a consistent ideology in our society which could be presented as an ideal for the children.

#### The Use of Pets with Children

The literature indicates that pets can be beneficial to people at any stage of the life cycle (Levinson, 1972; Lowie, undated). However, much of the literature on pets discusses the use of pets with children.

Pets have been used in various settings. For the "normal" child in the home, most child care manuals include a section on pets, citing such benefits as teaching the child about sex, birth, and death (Bowley, 1951; Duncan, 1952; Levinson, 1967) and helping the child gain a sense of

self-worth through the pet's affection for him (Katz, 1953). Furthermore, taking care of a pet can help a child develop affectionate feelings, learn to take into account other's feelings, learn the art of giving, and the feeling of being in control (Kugelmass, 1959; Levinson, 1972; Spock, 1972). These manuals also provide advice to parents on the care of the pets and the type of pet suitable for a child at different ages.

Pets have been found to be useful in therapy with children who live at home. The pet may be introduced into the home of a patient or the therapist may use the pet as part of the therapeutic sessions in his office. A pet may be introduced into the home for the benefit of a particular family member, or as an aid to the whole family (Lowie, undated; Levinson, 1969). In a disturbed family, a pet can be a useful diagnostic tool in helping to understand the interrelationships of the family (Friedman, 1965). It can also stabilize a family in times of crisis and foster communication between the members by providing an area of common interest in an otherwise incompatible family (Levinson, 1969).

In the therapist's office, the pet provides an opportunity to talk about difficult subjects such as feelings, dislike for others, and sex (Levinson, 1962). In addition, a child's play with the pet can reveal some of his problems (Levinson, 1969). A pet can "break the ice" with a shy patient; a child will often talk to the pet even if he is not ready to talk to the therapist (Levinson, 1964; Levinson, 1969).

In addition to the family home, pets have been shown to have beneficial effects in residential care facilities for "normal" children (Burmeister, 1960; Brill & Thomas, 1964), in a children's psychiatric ward (Dishon, 1970; Yates, 1973), in a school for trainable and

educable mentally retarded children (San Diego Unified School District, 1972), in schools for normal children (Healer, 1972; Reed, 1973; Roswell, 1974; Toll, 1974; Caras, 1976); in a school for emotionally disturbed children (Anderson, 1974), in residential schools for exceptional children (Levinson, 1968), and in training schools (Levinson, 1971).

The literature cites many examples of the use of pets with special needs children. Animals have been found to provide strong motivation for mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed children to learn (Levinson, 1969; San Diego Unified School District, 1972). The San Diego Zoo Project not only improved the language skills of its mentally retarded participants, but also resulted in an unexpected behavioural growth in such areas as improved social interaction, increased self-image and confidence, and an increased sense of responsibility (San Diego Unified School District, 1972).

Pets have been found to be useful with handicapped children and those who are suffering from a long illness. Lifting, patting, and playing with the pet can exercise the child's smaller muscles. These children are also provided with a companion when they are not able to play with the other children (Levinson, 1969). Pets have also provided the motivation for a child to get well (Fales, 1960).

Levinson (1969) used his pet dog in therapy with emotionally disturbed children who came to his office. At the Children's Psychiatric Hospital at Ann Arbor, a female dog named Skeezer was found to be a great asset to the children there (Yates, 1973; Dishon, 1970). A detailed study was conducted to indicate the type of animal best suited at the hospital. Besides being a cuddly companion, she represented acceptance and love to the children. They would tell Skeezer their

problems when it was difficult to tell them to someone else, and they would confide their secrets to her. Skeezer greeted the new children when they came to the hospital and sat with those who were sick and lonely.

Pets have also been found to be useful to delinquent children in care. In California, teenagers who are criminally inclined are sent to a 32-acre wild animal park instead of jail. Each child is given an animal to care for, train, and love. None of the children who go through this system have become involved with the juvenile justice system again (Dangaard, 1977). In its guide for institutions serving delinquent children, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1962) states that the attachment of a child to his pet should be recognized and, where possible, provisions should be made for a cottage pet, young farm animals, or an occasional personal pet, where the treatment plan indicates.

A pet can play other roles in the life of a child, in addition to the ones already mentioned. For a child who is last in the pecking order of a family, a pet can be an outlet for anger for a child and satisfy the human desire for power (Bossard, 1944). A pet can be a social aid for a shy child or a child new to an area (Lowie, undated). Through his pet, a child can be accustomed to physical processes (Bossard, 1944).

#### Pets in Residential Care Facilities for Children

Most of the literature on the use of pets in residential care facilities for children is in the form of anecdotal accounts by staff

members. Only four research studies were found in the literature review. Two of these studies were conducted by Dr. Boris Levinson.

Levinson's first study (1968) was a preliminary survey of the use of pets in 121 residential schools for exceptional children (mentally retarded, blind/partially sighted, deaf/hard of hearing, and emotionally disturbed/socially maladjusted) in the United States. This study served as a model for the proposed research. Of the respondents, 40.7 percent permitted the children to own pets, 54.9 percent permitted the children access to pets belonging to staff members or the school, and 76 percent permitted the parents to bring pets from home to visit the schools.

Allowing the children to own pets varied by the type of handicap of the child and the size of the school. Over half of the schools for the emotionally disturbed/socially maladjusted (55.5%) and the mentally retarded (65.2%) permitted the children to own pets, whereas considerably fewer permitted the ownership of pets in the schools for the blind/partially sighted (14.8%) and the deaf/hard of hearing (28.1%). With respect to size, in the schools for the mentally retarded those with fewer than 500 children were more likely to allow the children to own pets than were those with over 500 children. In schools for the emotionally disturbed/socially maladjusted, those with less than 100 children permitted pet ownership more frequently. No such distinctions occurred for the other two types of schools.

In half of the schools the children cared for the pets and the staff in the other half. The types of pets kept by most schools were dogs, then fish, birds, rabbits, hamsters, and cats. Other types of pets mentioned included turtles, baby chicks, ducks, horses, mice,

snakes, hawks, game birds, skunks, ocelots, frogs, guinea pigs, insects, white mice, and rats.

These pets were used more as an educational tool (e.g., teaching responsibility, understanding the animals, sex education) than a psychotherapeutic tool. However, a few schools mentioned such therapeutic roles as providing companionship for the child until he felt more secure in the home, assisting in giving the school a "home-like atmosphere", and helping the child relate to people by "using the pet as a wedge or a training ground". Some of the reasons for not keeping pets in the schools included a fear of the animals scratching or biting the children, a lack of proper facilities for pets, a fear of health problems associated with pets (e.g., rabies), and a fear of sadistic treatment by the children.

In his second study, Levinson surveyed the use of pets in 112 training schools for delinquent children in the United States. Thirty-four percent of the respondents had farm programs where animals such as hogs, cows, horses, ponies, sheep, and poultry were kept. Those facilities with farm programs did not permit the children to have individual pets, but allowed the children to share the facility's animals. Fifty-four percent of the responding schools permitted the children access to pets belonging to the staff or the school.

The children were permitted to own pets in forty-one percent of the schools responding. Over half of those schools allowed the pets to live in the children's quarters. The most popular pets were dogs, followed by cats. Children were permitted to own pets more often in those schools which had a moderate staff-child ratio (1:3), than in those where the ratio was high (2:1) or low (1:5). In slightly fewer

than half of the schools permitting pet ownership, the children cared for the pet and in the remainder, this responsibility was shared by the staff and the children.

Thirty-nine percent of the schools responding to the questionnaire felt that pets would be helpful to the children in training schools. However, the use of pets tended to be incidental rather than planned, thereby not utilizing their full therapeutic potential. Some problems mentioned regarding the use of pets were the prohibition of pets in some facilities due to federal regulations, extra staff, extra work, added expense (veterinary supervision, insurance against damage), disturbance of the routine, health problems, and pet neglect, abuse or perversion.

The third research study reviewed was an unpublished master's thesis in nursing by Sandra Sundaram (1969). Sundaram explored the feasibility of using pets as a psychotherapeutic modality in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children through a review of the literature, interviews with professionals working with emotionally disturbed children, and correspondence with potential informants who were outside the Boston area. The literature review suggested a use for pets as both diagnostic and therapeutic aides in a variety of settings (private practice, out-patient, residential care, and in the home).

The interviews with professionals working with emotionally disturbed children indicated that pets were used only in an unplanned and circumstantial manner. Both these interviews and the correspondence showed that an interest in this treatment modality was positively related to the amount of experience with it. The interviewees reported that pets had been used in group therapy, on wards to provide a home-

like atmosphere, and in camp settings to establish a friendly atmosphere, to facilitate communication between the staff and the children, and as a method of getting a group together for an activity.

The interviewees felt that the psychiatric problems most suitable for pet therapy were withdrawn, noncommunicative children, children with self-image and body image problems, and emotionally-deprived children, where the pet could be used as a love object. In addition to being a therapeutic aide, pets were also seen as being an educational tool, a means of relieving tension during anxiety periods, and a projective technique. Pets were not seen to be useful where the child was abusive, the child exhibited phobias, allergies or a negative identification with the animal, the animal rejected the child, nor where the therapist used the animal instead of himself in the therapy. Pets were seen as being suitable in almost any setting for emotionally disturbed children as long as proper facilities and supervision were provided. The most popular choices among pets that are easily handled were dogs and cats.

Corson, Corson, and Gwynne (1975) explored the feasibility of using pet-facilitated psychotherapy (PFP) on a psychiatric ward with adolescent and adult patients. Dogs (and in some cases cats) were introduced to 30 psychiatric patients, most of whom had not responded to traditional forms of therapy (i.e., psychotherapy, drug treatment, electroshock, occupational and recreational therapy). The patients selected for the study were withdrawn, uncommunicative, dependent, and lacking in self-esteem. Twenty-eight of the patients accepted the pet and all of them showed some improvement in self-respect, independence, and responsibility. Some of the patients began to walk or run with

their dogs outdoors and others came down to the kennels at regular times to groom their pets.

Five patients were studied in depth with videotape recordings of patient-therapist interactions, patient-dog interactions, patient-dog-therapist interactions, and patient interactions with other patients. During the course of PFP, the patients showed a decrease in the question-answer interval and an increase in the mean number of words per answer.

Care was taken to match the personality of the pet with the patient. Psychologically bed-ridden, uncommunicative patients were attracted to the playful and friendly Wire Haired Fox Terrier, whereas hyperactive adolescents and energetic adults preferred "the strong, very active, aggressively loving, fast running German Shepherd X Husky hybrid" (Corson et al., p. 24).

The introduction of the pet widened the social circle of the patient rather than causing the patient to become attached to the pet to the exclusion of other people, as was feared. There was also concern that the patient would become so attached to his pet that leaving the hospital and the pet would be very traumatic. However, this reaction did not occur, suggesting that the pet did not monopolize the patient's affection but rather enhanced his psychological well-being and strengthened his self-reliance.

The remaining literature on pets in residential care facilities for children comes from anecdotal accounts of the use of pets in manuals for workers in these facilities, as well as Dr. Levinson's writings on the subject. Levinson (1968) feels that a child's first few weeks in a residential setting are frequently very traumatic, as the child adjusts to separation from his family and a number of new experiences,

professional staff, and other children. A pet can be a stable, ever-present source of sympathy, understanding, and love during this difficult time. Pets can also provide continuity of contact for the child in facilities where the staff work shifts and there is a high turnover rate (Levinson, 1969).

Levinson (1969) suggested that there are three ways in which pets may be used in institutions. First, the child may bring his pet from home. This has been shown to make the separation from home easier by providing some security while the child adjusts to the institution. Secondly, the child's pet can be allowed to visit him at the residential care facility. These visits give the child some contact with home as well as provide the parents with the feeling that they still have some responsibility for their child's care. Thirdly, a pet may be assigned to the child. This pet then becomes something who especially belongs to the child to give comfort and care.

As the superintendent of a children's home, Burmeister (1960) found that "pets can and do make such a positive and definite contribution to the life of a children's home that it sometimes almost seems as if they should be paid members of the treatment team because of all they add to the interest, life, warmth, and often humour of the group" (p. 136). A pet could facilitate a new child's entry into the home; the child may be able to stroke, talk, and play with the pet before he is willing or able to accept the friendliness of the cottage parents or the other children. Brill and Thomas (1964) add that a pet can be one way of compensating a child for the things that he lost when he had to leave his family.

Both Levinson (1969) and Burmeister (1960) stress that the use

of pets in residential settings must be planned. Factors which should be considered are whether or not the staff are willing to cooperate, whether or not the child is able or willing to cooperate in the care of the pet (and how much could be expected from him), whether or not the introduction of the pet will disrupt established friendships with other children in care, and whether or not the child is sufficiently stable emotionally to handle a pet.

Levinson (1969) points out that the children need to be taught how to handle a pet and the facility needs to be prepared for the pet's introduction. It should be recognized that established routines will be disrupted and will have to be reorganized, insurance will be needed to cover any damage done by the pet (e.g., bites, damage to the furniture), and provisions should be made for the medical and physical care of the pet.

The selection of the pet is also a very important aspect of the planning process. Burmeister (1960) states that dogs are the most popular animals and are often the choice of an institution acquiring a pet for the first time. They like children and actively offer them their love, acceptance, and devotion. A dog is a pack animal and easily fits into a group setting. Cats, however, are not group animals and do not like noise, confusion, and great amounts of activity. It is best to introduce a cat which has been exposed to children since kittenhood and who has been loved and cared for by trusted adults. Cats can be very relaxing and their purr reassuring to a new child. Other types of animals cannot take as active a part in the life of the facility, but can still add interest and life to the setting.

In summary, the literature suggests that pets can be beneficial to children in residential care facilities. The research in this area is very limited and mostly pertains to the United States. Information on the use of pets in Canadian residential care facilities is almost nonexistent. The number of residential care facilities in Canada and the number of children which they accommodate appears to be increasing every year. The literature suggests that residential care does not have to be a negative experience for a child. Therefore, a study on a factor which has been found to be beneficial to children in residential care is certainly warranted.

#### Statement of the Problem

This study was basically a replication of Levinson's (1968) survey of residential schools for exceptional children. A survey was conducted on the frequency of the use of pets and the type of pets used in Canadian residential care facilities for children.

The research questions that were investigated are as follows:

1. What is the extent and type of use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada?
2. Are there differences between the facilities that presently keep pets, that have kept pets in the past, that would consider keeping pets in the future, and that would never consider keeping pets?
3. Are there differences in the use of pets between and among those facilities which keep pets now and those which have kept pets in the past?

4. What plans do the staff in residential care facilities have for the use of pets in the future?
5. What benefits have been experienced or are anticipated as a result of keeping pets in a residential care facility?
6. What problems have been experienced or are anticipated as a result of keeping pets in a residential care facility?
7. What advice can be given to those wishing to introduce pets into their residential care facility?

The following hypotheses were formulated. For the purpose of analysis they were stated in the null form, followed by the alternate form. No direction has been given in the alternate form, as there is insufficient information available to make such decisions.

1. There will be no significant differences between the facilities that keep pets now, that have kept pets in the past, that would consider keeping pets in the future, and that never would consider keeping pets, with respect to the following variables:
  - (a) number of children served by the facility
  - (b) age range of the children
  - (c) sex of the children
  - (d) type of child
  - (e) professional orientation of the majority of the principal caregivers
  - (f) child/staff ratio
  - (g) budgeted cost per child

- (h) housing style
- (i) number of children sleeping together in one room
- (j) outdoor area of the premises
- (k) other facilities on the premises
- (l) geographic location of the facility

Alternate Hypothesis: There will be significant differences on variables (a) to (l) between the facilities that keep pets now, that have kept pets in the past, that would consider keeping pets in the future, and that never would consider keeping pets.

2. There will be no significant differences in the use of pets between those facilities which keep pets now and those who have kept pets in the past, with respect to the following variables:

- (a) type of pets used
- (b) ownership of the pets
- (c) how often the children are/were permitted access to the pets
- (d) supervision of the children with the pets
- (e) the person who cares/cared for the pets
- (f) the planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the facility
- (g) the professional orientation of the person who introduced the pets to the facility
- (h) the position of the person who introduced the pets

to the facility

(i) the allowance of a child to bring his pet from home to stay at the facility

(j) the allowance of a child's pet from home to visit the facility

(k) the role of the pet in the facility

Alternate Hypothesis: There will be significant differences in the use of pets on variables (a) to (k) between those facilities which keep pets now and those who have kept pets in the past.

3. There will be no significant differences among those facilities which keep pets now, with respect to the following variables:

(a) type of pets used

(b) ownership of the pets

(c) how often the children are permitted access to the pets

(d) supervision of the children with the pets

(e) the person who cares for the pets

(f) the planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the facility

(g) the professional orientation of the person who introduced the pets to the facility

(h) the position of the person who introduced the pets to the facility

- (i) the allowance of a child to bring his pet from home to stay at the facility
- (j) the allowance of a child's pet from home to visit the facility
- (k) the role of the pet in the facility

Alternate Hypothesis: There will be significant differences on on variables (a) to (k) among those facilities which keep pets now.

4. There will be no significant differences among those facilities which have kept pets in the past, with respect to the following variables:

- (a) type of pets used
- (b) ownership of the pets
- (c) how often the children were permitted access to the pets
- (d) supervision of the children with the pets
- (e) the person who cared for the pets
- (f) the planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the facility
- (g) the professional orientation of the person who introduced the pets to the facility
- (h) the position of the person who introduced the pets to the facility
- (i) the allowance of a child to bring his pet from home to stay at the facility
- (j) the allowance of a child's pet from home to visit

the facility

(k) the role of the pets in the facility

Alternate Hypothesis: There will be significant differences on variables (a) to (k) among those facilities which have kept pets in the past.

## Chapter II

### METHOD

#### Selection of the Population

As there was no complete list of all the residential care facilities for children in Canada, a population of 928 facilities was identified by compiling listings from a number of directories and government publications (see Appendix A for a complete list of all these sources). For the purpose of this study, a residential care facility was defined as a building, or a group of buildings under the auspices of one organization, established in Canada to provide residential care to children under sixteen years of age, who were living away from their families due to specific problems in their development, learning, behaviour and/or family situation. The age of sixteen years was chosen as the upper boundary for the definition of "child" in order to exclude those facilities designed to serve adults, defined as sixteen years and over in some provinces. Facilities exclusively for unwed mothers were excluded from the population because the keeping of pets is often in conflict with the health standards deemed desirable for pregnant women (e.g., the safety of the fetus). Private boarding schools for normal children were also excluded because their primary function does not involve serving children with specific problems.

The facilities chosen for the population were then separated into six regions: Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, British Columbia, and the North (Yukon and N.W.T.). The facilities were

grouped by region instead of province because of the small number of facilities in the Maritime and Prairie provinces and the Northern territories. Within each region, the facilities were stratified by size (i.e., number of children served) using the categories employed by Health and Welfare Canada in their publication, Listing of Homes for Special Care by Municipality, March 31, 1978. The population was not stratified by the type of child served because this information was not available for a number of facilities. The size could not be obtained for 42 facilities which necessitated the inclusion of a "No Size" category. For those facilities with more than one residential unit under their auspices, the size was the average size of the units rather than the total size of the facility. Appendix B presents the population and sample sizes by region and size of the facility.

#### Selection of the Sample

Each facility in the population was assigned a number. Using the table of random numbers procedure described by Blalock (1960), a sample proportional by region and size was drawn. Return rates of 30 percent are common (Fox, 1969); therefore, an invited sample of 300 was chosen to ensure a data-producing sample of approximately 10 percent of the population. The final invited sample size was 316, composed of 299 facilities chosen from those with identified sizes, 14 from the "No Size" category (which were sampled proportionately by region and size over and above the sample size of 300), and 3 facilities from cells where the proportionate number was less than .5 of a facility (which were assigned a sample size of one in order that every cell which had at least one facility listed was allowed to have at least one

facility sampled). (see Appendix B).

Some of the facilities in the population did not have complete addresses given on their list of origin. When such a facility was selected for the sample, an alternate was immediately drawn. The alternate was used if attempts to locate an address, by consulting government publications, telephone directories and long-distance telephone operators, proved unsuccessful by the mailing date. Twenty-six facilities were replaced in this manner (see Appendix C, for these replacements by region and size).

Questionnaires that were returned because the facility had closed, the address was wrong or incomplete (and no correct address could be obtained), or the facility did not meet the sample criteria (provision of residential care to children under 16 years of age), were replaced using the table of random numbers. Replacements were chosen for only those questionnaires that were returned up to two weeks before data analysis was to begin. Two questionnaires were replaced because the facility had closed, 21 due to a wrong or incomplete address, and 23 because the facility did not meet the sample criteria. One additional facility was replaced because the staff were away for the summer and no one knowledgeable in the use of pets was available to complete the questionnaire. Appendix C presents these replacements by region and size.

The procedure for selecting the population and the sample differed from the above description for three regions. In the Northern region, most of the residential care facilities for children are run by the two territorial governments with a small number being run by private groups. In order to make the sample more representative of

the population, one questionnaire was sent to the appropriate government department in each of the territories, with a third sent to a randomly selected private facility. The problems with the other two regions, British Columbia and Ontario, arose because the requested list of residential care facilities for children in each of these provinces was not sent by the departments concerned.

In British Columbia, many of the residential child care facilities are group homes run by private individuals and supervised by the Department of Human Resources coordinator in their region. The list of origin for most of these group homes did not provide complete addresses. When one of these facilities was drawn for the sample and a more complete address could not be found, the questionnaire for that facility was sent to the regional coordinator to be forwarded. If the facility was no longer in use, the coordinator was asked to substitute a facility of similar size in that region. The coordinator was also asked to send the address of the facility to the researcher so that letters of reminder could be sent, if needed. If the coordinator preferred to forward the letters of reminder, an indication of this preference was also requested.

Most of the small group homes in Ontario are run by either one of the 51 Children's Aid Societies or by private individuals. The list of origin for most of these group homes was the Health and Welfare Canada (1978) publication, which was often unclear as to whether the home was under the auspices of a Children's Aid Society or private individuals. Therefore, it was decided that the population of the "1-9" size category would comprise the 51 Children's Aid Societies plus the privately owned facilities listed in the 1974 Ontario publication,

Institutions for Children and Youth, in this size range. This publication was not a recent issue, but was the only resource available.

#### Description of the Sample

Responses were received from 95 (30%) of the facilities sampled. Nine of these questionnaires were incomplete<sup>1</sup>, resulting in a data-producing sample of 86 facilities. Within these 86 questionnaires were responses from 98 individual residential units. Fifty-four of these units reported that they keep pets now, 16 stated that they kept pets in the past but not now, 10 said that they did not keep pets now but would consider doing so in the future, and 18 responded that they did not keep pets at present and would not in the future.

Table 1 presents the respondents to the questionnaire by their positions in the facility and the part of the questionnaire they completed. The majority of the respondents were in management positions of the facility (director, superintendent, or administrator) or of the unit (unit supervisor, houseparent, or senior counsellor). Respondents from units that keep pets now (Part Two) were more frequently from positions other than management, compared to respondents from the other units.

A description of the children, the staff, and the facilities in the sample will be presented as part of the results for Hypothesis 1 (Chapter III).

---

<sup>1</sup>To be included in the data analysis, a facility must have completed Part One of the questionnaire (general information) plus at least one additional part on their use of pets.

Table 1

Position of the Respondents to the Questionnaire by the Part  
of the Questionnaire Completed

Position of the Respondent	Part of the Questionnaire Completed					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Director, Superintendent, Administrator	52	4	3	1	5	65
Unit Supervisor, houseparent, senior counsellor or child care worker	23	10	2	4	0	39
Child care worker	1	4	1	0	3	9
Teacher	0	1	1	1	0	3
Nurse, nurse's aide	2	2	0	0	0	4
Social worker	2	1	0	0	0	3
Office staff	3	0	0	0	0	3
Special staff (e.g., research, staff development)	1	1	0	0	0	2
No answer	2	31	9	4	10	56
TOTAL	86	54	16	10	18	184

Note: Part 1 was general information and answered by all facilities.

Part 2 was for those units which keep pets now.

Part 3 was for those units which kept pets in the past.

Part 4 was for those units which might consider pets for the future.

Part 5 was for those units which would never consider pets.

### Research Design

The study employed the pseudo-experimental design of a one-shot

study because the facilities were asked about their keeping of pets at only one point in time (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974).

The independent variable was the keeping of pets by the residential units. On the basis of this variable, the respondents were divided into four groups:

1. those units which keep pets on their premises at the present time.
2. those units which do not keep pets on their premises at the present time, but who have in the past.
3. those units which have never kept pets on their premises but who would consider doing so in the future.
4. those units which have never kept pets on their premises and who would not consider doing so in the future.

There were two sets of dependent variables in this study. Part One of the questionnaire dealt with the dependent variables describing the facilities and the units, the children in care, and the staff. The second set of dependent variables described the use of pets and were found in Parts Two, Three, and Four of the questionnaire. The dependent variables are listed in the Statement of the Problem, Chapter I.

Three research designs were used in the study. Three independent samples (i.e., units that keep pets now, units that kept pets in the past, and units that have never kept pets) were compared on characteristics of the unit, the children, and the staff for Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 required comparing two independent samples (i.e., units that keep pets now and units that kept pets in the past) on their use of pets. Hypothesis 3 was tested using a one-sample design

in which the variables describing the use of pets were compared with each other for those units that kept pets now. A similar analysis was planned for those units that kept pets in the past (Hypothesis 4) but it was not conducted due to the small number of cases in this group.

### Instrument

The instrument consisted of a questionnaire (see Appendix D) developed specifically for this study. The questionnaire was in a structured form with both closed- or open-ended questions. The questions were mainly modifications from three sources. Hylton's (1964) questionnaire, designed to determine the costs of residential treatment centres for children, was the source for many general information questions (i.e., number, ages, and sex of the children served; child/staff ratio, budget, housing of the children, other features on the premises) as well as providing the categories for the children who are in care due to their family situation. Levinson's (1968) article on the use of pets in residential schools was the model for this study. Although most of the questions that were asked in Levinson's study were not specified, the article did provide suggestions for the questions on the types of children served by the facilities; the types of pets kept, the ownership of, access to and care of the pets; and the allowance of a child's pet from home to stay at or to visit the unit. Sundaram's (1969) unpublished master's thesis on the use of pets with emotionally disturbed children provided the source for the open-ended questions concerning the benefits and problems encountered as a result of keeping pets, as well as the questions on the professional orientation of the staff who introduced the pets to

the unit. The remaining questions were suggested by the literature.

The questionnaire consisted of five parts, each printed on a different color of paper for identification. Part One of the questionnaire asked all respondents for general information on the children, the staff, and the units. A cover page asked for the name of the facility (to determine which had responded), the position of the person completing Part One and an affirmation of the sample criteria (i.e., provision of residential care to children under sixteen years of age). At the end of Part One, instructions were given on how to complete the rest of the questionnaire. Respondents from facilities that had only one residential unit under their auspices were instructed to answer the remaining part of the questionnaire which corresponded to their keeping of pets (i.e., Part Two, Three, Four, or Five).

Respondents from facilities which had more than one residential care unit under their auspices were asked how many of their units applied to each of the four categories on the keeping of pets. The respondents were then asked to distribute the relevant part of the questionnaire to a staff member in each of these units. If more than one residential unit applied to a category on the keeping of pets, the executive director or administrator was asked to determine which unit would be able to supply the most extensive information on this subject. The respondents were also asked the number, age range, and sex of the children in each category. If there was more than one unit in each category, the average number of children per unit was asked.

Parts Two, Three, and Four of the questionnaire sought basically the same type of information about the pet program in the unit but each part was worded in a different tense in order to correspond to when the

pets were kept (i.e., now, in the past, or in the future).

Part Five was for those respondents who had never and would never consider introducing pets to their facility. They were asked the reason for this choice as well as whether they could see any benefits in a child having a pet. There was also a question asking whether they would consider keeping pets on their premises if a facility similar to theirs had found beneficial results for the children.

The last question of Parts Two to Five was to be answered only by those respondents from facilities which had more than one residential unit under auspices. The first part of this question asked the number, age range, and sex of the children residing in this unit. The second asked the name of the facility and the position of the person completing this part of the questionnaire.

At the end of each part of the questionnaire there was a form that the respondents were asked to complete if they wanted a pamphlet summarizing the results of the study. Pamphlets were requested by respondents from 73 (77%) of the facilities that returned questionnaires (see Appendix H for a summary of the pamphlet requests by the keeping of pets and region).

The questionnaire was translated into French (see Appendix E) as an attempt to maximize the response rate from the province of Quebec. The French version of the questionnaire was sent to those facilities in Quebec which listed their addresses in French. Those facilities which listed their addresses in English were sent the English version. The French version was sent to 67 facilities and 11 (16%) were returned (two were not complete and therefore could not be analyzed).

Each questionnaire was accompanied by a letter of introduction

which contained an explanation of the research study, instructions for completing the questionnaire, and the deadline for returning the questionnaire (see Appendix F). A letter of reminder (see Appendix G) was sent to those facilities which had not returned their questionnaires by the deadline date. French versions of these letters were sent with the French questionnaires.

The questionnaire and the letter of introduction were pretested by two people who had experience with the types of residential care facilities for children that were excluded from the study (i.e., a home for unwed mothers and a private boarding school). In addition, three people pretended that they were staff members in a residential care facility in order to test the comprehensibility of the instructions.

#### Procedure

After the sample was selected, telephone books and long-distance operators were consulted in an attempt to verify the addresses of all the sampled facilities whose list of origin was other than the recent one supplied by a provincial government. The envelopes to the facilities were addressed to the executive director or administrator by name (if it was known). Each facility was sent a letter of introduction, a questionnaire, and five business reply return envelopes. Five return envelopes were included to enable each respondent to return their part of the questionnaire at their convenience and in confidence. For those facilities which had only one residential unit under their auspices, the letter of introduction requested that the questionnaire be completed by the staff member who was the most knowledgeable about the use of pets in their facility. For those facilities which had more

than one unit for residential care under their auspices, the executive director or administrator was asked to complete Part One of the questionnaire as it applied to the total facility and to then distribute the remaining parts to the appropriate staff members in the units.

Letters of reminder were sent to those facilities that had not responded by the deadline date stated in the letter of introduction (two weeks from the original mailing date).

When the questionnaires were returned, they were quickly scanned to ensure that the responses were complete. Those with serious errors or omissions were contacted to remedy the problem. When a questionnaire was considered complete, the cover sheet was removed and the facility and the position of the person completing the questionnaire were recorded on separate sheets. The request form for a copy of the results was also removed. The questionnaires therefore contained no identifying information about the facility or the respondent when they were coded and analyzed, thereby assuring confidentiality.

#### Data Analysis

The questionnaires were coded and the data entered into the computer using the MANTES program. Statistical analysis was conducted with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program (SPSS).

Descriptive statistics, in the form of frequencies and cross-tabulations, were used to summarize the independent and dependent variables. Statistical analyses were conducted using chi-square because most of the data were at the nominal and ordinal level. For the 2 X 2 tables with 21 cases or more, Yates' correction for continuity was utilized. Fisher's Exact Test was employed for those 2 X 2 tables

with fewer than 21 cases. The accepted level of probability was  $p \leq .05$ .

Crosstabulations with expected frequencies less than one in one or more cells were not statistically analyzed, as this violates one of the requirements for using chi-square (Siegel, 1956). The other requirement mentioned by Siegel, having no fewer than 20% of the cells with an expected frequency of less than five, was not followed, however. Bradley, Bradley, McGrath, and Cutcomb (1979) have found that "the chi-square test of independence may be safely used in nearly all situations likely to arise in practice" (p. 1296), except in those cases where row and column probabilities are highly skewed.

Between-group analyses were conducted for Hypotheses One and Two, and within-group analyses were conducted for Hypothesis Three. Hypothesis Four was not analyzed due to the small number of cases (16) for those units which kept pets in the past.

## Chapter III

### RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented as a response to the null hypotheses that were stated in the Statement of the Problem, Chapter I. Missing observations (i.e., no answer, not applicable) were excluded from statistical analysis and therefore do not appear in the tables presenting such data. The number of missing observations is indicated below the table. When other categories were excluded from analysis, it is indicated in the text.

#### Characteristics of the Facilities and the Units

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant differences between the units that keep pets now, that have kept pets in the past, and that have never kept pets, with respect to twelve characteristics of the facilities and the units, i.e., variables 1(a) to 1(l).

Statistically significant relationships appear for only two of the variables. The keeping of pets is significantly related to the number of children in the unit,  $\chi^2(4) = 10.73$ ,  $p = .03$ . Those units that keep pets now tend to have small or large numbers of children, whereas those which kept pets in the past tend to have a medium number and those which have never kept pets tend to have medium or large numbers. There is also a significant relationship between the age of the children and the keeping of pets. Those units which have never kept pets tend to serve only one age group, whereas those units which have had experience with pets (pets kept now or in the past) tend to

serve a mixed age group,  $\chi^2(2) = 5.99$ ,  $p = .05$ . A more detailed discussion of Hypothesis 1, variables (a) to (1), follows.

The original intention was to examine Hypothesis 1 with the units divided into those that keep pets now, that have kept pets in the past, that would consider keeping pets in the future, and that never would consider keeping pets. However, due to the low response rate for the latter three types, the units were divided into three groups for statistical analysis. Those units that would consider pets for the future or that would never consider pets were combined into the group, "pets never kept". For the presentation of frequencies, however, the four groups are used.

1(a) Number of children served by the facility and the unit.

The facilities responding served from 2 to 767 children. Table 2 presents the number of children by the keeping of pets. The facilities and the units were categorized as small, medium, or large, in terms of the number of children served, with the divisions made at approximately the 33 1/3 and the 66 2/3 percentiles, to ensure cell sizes large enough for statistical analysis. Neither the capacity of the facility nor the present number of children in the facility are related to the keeping of pets. A significant relationship exists, however, between the keeping of pets and the number of children in the unit,  $\chi^2(4) = 10.73$ ,  $p = .03$ . Pets tend to be kept now by units with either small (7 and under) or large (13 and over) numbers of children, in the past by units with a medium number (8-12), and never by units with medium or large numbers.

Table 2

 $\chi^2$  Tests of Number of Children by Keeping of Pets

Number of Children	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
<u>Capacity of the Facility</u>				
Small (11 & under)	16	6	7	29
Medium (12-53)	19	2	10	31
Large (54 & over)	15	7	9	31
TOTAL	50	15	26	91
Missing Observations = 7	$\chi^2 = 3.72$	<u>d f</u> = 4		p = .44
<u>Present Number in the Facility</u>				
Small (10 & under)	18	6	7	31
Medium (11-44)	19	2	10	31
Large (45 & over)	14	8	11	33
TOTAL	51	16	28	95
Missing Observations = 3	$\chi^2 = 5.15$	<u>d f</u> = 4		p = .27
<u>Present Number in the Unit</u>				
Small (7 & under)	23	2	6	31
Medium (8-12)	10	8	11	29
Large (13 & over)	18	4	10	32
TOTAL	51	14	27	92
Missing Observations = 6	$\chi^2 = 10.73$	<u>d f</u> = 4		p = .03

1(b) Age range of the children. The number of facilities and the number of units having children in each of the four age groups are presented in Table 3. The children tended to be from the older rather than the younger age groups. Fifty-two units reported having children 5 to 11 years old, and 84 served children 12 years old and over, compared to only nine units serving children under 2 years, and 17 units reporting children 2 to 4 years old. The keeping of pets is not related to the presence or absence of children in each of these age groups in the facility as a whole or in the individual units.

The data suggested a segregation of age groups between those children under 12 years of age and those 12 years and over more often than between any other age groups. The keeping of pets was thus examined on a facility and a unit basis, with no significant differences found (Table 4).

Table 3

Chi Square Analyses of the Age Groups of the Children in the  
Facilities and in the Units by the Keeping of Pets

Age of the Children	Keeping of Pets			Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Signif- icance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept			
Analysis by Facility						
Under 2 Years						
Yes	6	5	5	16	3.60	.17
No	47	11	23	81		
2-4 Years						
Yes	12	6	7	25	1.43	.49
No	41	10	21	72		
5-11 Years						
Yes	37	10	17	64	0.78	.68
No	16	6	11	33		
12 Years and Over						
Yes	51	14	26	91	1.67	.43
No	2	2	2	6		
Analysis by Unit						
Under 2 Years						
Yes	4	3	2	9	2.61	.27
No	48	11	25	84		
2-4 Years						
Yes	9	4	4	17	1.24	.54
No	43	10	23	76		
5-11 Years						
Yes	33	8	11	52	3.73	.15
No	19	6	16	41		
12 Years and Over						
Yes	49	11	24	84	3.18	.20
No	3	3	3	9		

d f = 2

Table 4

$\chi^2$  Tests of Facilities and Units with Children Under 12 Years  
Only or Over 12 Years Only by Keeping of Pets

Age of the Children	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
<b>Facility</b>				
Under 12 Years only	2	2	2	6
12 Years and Over only	16	5	11	32
TOTAL	18	7	13	38
Missing Observations = 60 $\chi^2 = 1.16$ <u>df</u> = 2 <u>p</u> = .56				
<b>Unit</b>				
Under 12 Years only	3	3	3	9
12 Years and Over only	19	5	16	40
TOTAL	22	8	19	49
Missing Observations = 49 $\chi^2 = 2.37$ <u>df</u> = 2 <u>p</u> = .31				

N.B. The missing observations refer to those facilities and units which have children in both age groups.

Significant differences are found in the ages of the children when the keeping of pets is compared to whether the children in the unit are of one age group or of mixed age groups,  $\chi^2(2) = 5.99$ ,  $p = .05$ . As Table 5 illustrates, units which have never kept pets tend to serve one age group of children whereas those which have had experience with pets (i.e., pets kept now or in the past) tend to serve a mixture of age groups. However, no relationship exists between these variables when they are examined on a facility basis.

Table 5

$\chi^2$  Tests of Facilities and Units with Children of One Age Group Only or Mixed Age Group by Keeping of Pets

Age of the Children	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
<b>Facility</b>				
One age group only	18	5	13	36
Mixed ages	35	11	15	61
TOTAL	53	16	28	97
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2 = 1.50$		<u>df</u> = 2	$p = .47$
<b>Unit</b>				
One age group only	22	6	19	47
Mixed ages	30	8	8	46
TOTAL	52	14	27	93
Missing Observations = 5	$\chi^2 = 5.99$		<u>df</u> = 2	$p = .05$



1(c) Sex of the children. The majority of the facilities and units served both sexes of children; the remainder were almost equally divided between those serving males only and those serving females only. The only exception were those units which keep pets now, which had twice as many units for males as for females (Table 6).

Table 6

Frequencies of the Sex of the Children in the Facilities and the Units by Keeping of Pets

Sex of the Children	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
<b>In the Facility</b>					
Males only	10	3	1	2	16
Females only	5	3	1	2	11
Both sexes	39	10	8	14	71
TOTAL	54	16	10	18	98
<b>In the Unit</b>					
Males only	12	3	3	3	21
Females only	6	3	1	2	12
Both sexes	33	7	6	11	57
No answer	3	3	0	2	8
TOTAL	54	16	10	18	98

Statistical analysis revealed no relationship between the keeping of pets and the sex of the children when compared on whether there is one sex of children present (males only or females only) or both sexes. This is found when the analysis is conducted on the

facility as a whole,  $\chi^2(2) = 1.32$ ,  $p = .52$ , and on the individual units,  $\chi^2(2) = .59$ ,  $p = .74$ . There is also no relationship between the keeping of pets and the sex of the children when comparing those facilities,  $\chi^2(2) = .77$ ,  $p = .68$ , and those units,  $\chi^2(2) = .77$ ,  $p = .68$ , serving males only and females only.

1(d) Type of child. The two most frequently reported reasons for the children being in care were emotional disturbance and social maladjustment (reported by 63% of the units). The third most frequently mentioned reason was children who were in care due to disturbed or unfit families. Mental, retardation, physical handicaps, and family problems (i.e., stable families unable to provide care or no families) followed in frequency. This order of frequency appeared for all groups of pet keeping (see Table 7).

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the reasons for being in care were grouped into mental retardation, physical disabilities, multiple handicaps, emotional/social problems, and family problems. Table 8 indicates that the presence or absence of these types of children is not related to the keeping of pets.

Table 7

Frequencies of the Reasons for the Children Being in Care  
by the Keeping of the Pets

Reason for Children Being in Care	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
Mentally Retarded					
Profound	7	3	1	2	13
Severe	8	3	2	3	16
Trainable	6	2	1	3	12
Educable	18	2	3	3	26
Blind/partially sighted	8	4	0	3	15
Deaf/hard of hearing	13	4	3	2	22
Physically handicapped	12	5	2	3	22
Emotionally disturbed	33	11	6	12	62
Socially maladjusted/ delinquent	32	12	5	13	62
Multiple handicapped	13	5	2	4	24
Disturbed family	26	7	2	5	40
No family or stable family unable to provide care	11	5	1	3	20
Learning disabled	3	1	1	0	5
Hospitalized/physically ill	0	1	1	1	3

Table 8

Chi Square Analyses of the Reasons for the Children Being in  
Care by the Keeping of Pets

Reasons for Being in Care	Keeping of Pets			Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Signif- icance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept			
Mental Retardation						
Yes	23	4	7	34	3.31	.19
No	31	12	21	64		
Physical Disabilities						
Yes	19	7	10	36	0.41	.82
No	35	9	18	62		
Multiple Handicaps						
Yes	13	5	6	24	0.54	.76
No	41	11	22	74		
Emotional/Social						
Yes	41	12	21	74	0.01	.99
No	13	4	7	24		
Family						
Yes	26	8	7	41	4.58	.10
No	28	8	21	57		

df = 2

The units were also grouped into those with handicapped children only (mentally retarded and physically disabled), disturbed children only (emotional/social problems and family problems), and both types of children. No relationship is found between the keeping of pets and these types of children, as illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9

 $\chi^2$  Test of Type of Child by Keeping of Pets

Type of Child	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Handicapped only	9	4	7	20
Disturbed only	26	8	15	49
Both types	19	4	6	29
TOTAL	54	16	28	98

Missing Observations = 0       $\chi^2 = 2.25$       d f = 4      p = .69

1(e) Professional orientation of the majority of the principal caregivers. The most frequently mentioned professional orientation was technical or community college, followed by inservice training, education, psychology, nursing, and social work. (The frequencies in Tables 10 and 11 were combined to obtain this order.) The order of frequency was similar for all three groups of pet keeping. Table 10 presents the frequencies of the different professional orientations of the principal caregivers for those who gave one answer only, as requested. As a large number (21%) of respondents gave more than one

answer, Table 11 is included to present the frequencies for this group.

Table 10

Frequencies of the Professional Orientation of the Principal  
Caregivers by the Keeping of Pets

Professional Orientation of Caregivers	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
No formal training	2	0	0	0	2
Inservice training	15	6	2	0	23
Technical or community college	14	4	4	8	30
Education	2	1	0	1	4
Home Economics	0	0	0	1	1
Nursing	2	1	1	2	6
Psychology	3	2	1	1	7
Social Work	2	0	0	1	3
More than one answer given	13	2	2	4	21
No answer	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	54	16	10	18	98

Table 11

Frequencies of the Professional Orientation of the Principal Caregivers in the "More than one answer given" Category by Keeping of Pets

Professional Orientation of Caregivers	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
No formal training	1	0	0	0	1
Inservice training	5	0	1	3	9
Technical or community college	9	2	0	3	14
Education	6	2	1	2	11
Home Economics	0	0	0	1	1
Nursing	3	0	0	2	5
Psychology	5	1	0	3	9
Social Work	5	0	0	2	7
Sociology	2	0	0	1	3
Recreation	0	0	0	0	1
Other	1	0	0	0	1

For the purpose of statistical analysis, professional orientation was collapsed into paraprofessional training (no formal training, inservice training, technical or community college) and professional training (education, home economics, nursing, psychology, social work). As shown in Table 12, no relationship is found between the keeping of pets and the professional orientation of the principal caregivers.

Table 12

$\chi^2$  Test of the Training of the Principal Caregivers by  
the Keeping of Pets

Training of Caregivers	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Paraprofessional	31	10	14	55
Professional	9	4	8	21
TOTAL	40	14	22	76

Note: 22 missing observations (1 - No answer, 21 - more than one answer given).

$$\chi^2 = 1.37 \quad \text{d f} = 2 \quad p = .50$$

1(f) Child/staff ratio. Respondents were asked to give the exact child/staff ratios in terms of children per total staff and children per principal caregivers. These ratios were grouped into small, medium, and large at approximately the 33 1/3 and 66 2/3 percentiles. Table 13 indicates that there is no relationship between the keeping of pets and the budgeted cost per child.

Table 13

 $\chi^2$  Tests of the Child/Staff Ratios by the Keeping of Pets

Ratio	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
<u>Children Total Staff</u>				
Small (1: < 1.2)	12	7	12	31
Medium (1:1.2-1.8)	20	2	7	29
Large (1: > 1.8)	16	7	7	30
TOTAL	48	16	26	90
Missing Observations = 8	$\chi^2 = 7.01$	<u>d f</u> = 4	<u>p</u> = .14	
<u>Children Caregivers</u>				
Small (1: < 2.0)	15	7	9	31
Medium (1:2.0-3.4)	16	3	7	26
Large (1: > 3.4)	20	5	7	32
TOTAL	51	15	23	89
Missing Observations = 9	$\chi^2 = 2.06$	<u>d f</u> = 4	<u>p</u> = .71	

1(g) Budgeted cost per child. The raw data were grouped into the categories of small, medium, and large at approximately the 33 1/3 and 66 2/3 percentiles. Table 14 demonstrates that there is no relationship between the keeping of pets and the budgeted cost per child.

Table 14

$\chi^2$  Test of the Budgeted Cost Per Child by the Keeping of Pets

Budgeted Cost Per Child	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Small (\$10,950 and under)	16	5	7	28
Medium (\$10,951 - \$17,000)	13	4	4	21
Large (\$17,000 and over)	11	4	11	26
TOTAL	40	13	22	75

Missing Observations = 23       $\chi^2 = 3.48$       df = 4      p = .48

1(h) Housing style. Houses, followed by institutions, were the housing mentioned most frequently by the units in general, as well as by those units experienced with pets (i.e., pets kept now or in the past), as shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Frequencies of Housing Styles of the Units by the  
Keeping of Pets

Housing Style	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
Rooms, dormitories or wards in an insti- tution	15	6	4	9	34
Rooms in a large building	3	1	0	0	4
Cottages	6	1	0	3	10
Apartments	1	0	0	0	1
Houses	27	8	4	6	45
More than one type	1	0	2	0	3
No answer	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	54	16	10	18	98

For statistical analysis, the categories of housing style were collapsed into two groups: institutional styles (rooms, dormitories, or wards in an institution and rooms in a large building) and individual units (cottages, apartments, houses). The categories of "more than one type" and "no answer" were excluded from the analysis. Table 16 illustrates that the keeping of pets is not related to housing style.

Table 16

 $\chi^2$  Test of Housing Style by Keeping of Pets

Housing Style	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Institution	18	7	13	38
Individual Units	34	9	13	56
TOTAL	52	16	26	94

Missing Observations = 4       $\chi^2 = 1.79$       d f = 2      p = .41

1(i) Number of children per sleeping unit. In order to eliminate expected frequencies of less than one, the number of children per sleeping unit were divided into two categories, at approximately the 50th percentile. No significant differences are found in the keeping of pets for this variable (see Table 17).

Table 17

 $\chi^2$  Test of Children Per Sleeping Unit by Keeping of Pets

Children Per Sleeping Unit	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
2 and under	33	9	17	59
Over 2	20	7	11	38
TOTAL	53	16	28	97

Missing Observations = 1       $\chi^2 = 0.19$       df = 2      p = .91

1(j) Size of the premises. The size of the premises was divided into groups of small, medium, and large at approximately the 33 1/3 and the 66 2/3 percentiles. As Table 18 indicates, lot size of the facility is not related to the keeping of pets.

Table 18

$\chi^2$  Test of the Size of the Premises by the Keeping of Pets

Size of the Premises (in acres)	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Small (<.53)	13	3	8	24
Medium (.53-5.00)	20	3	3	26
Large (> 5.00)	15	3	8	26
TOTAL	48	9	19	76

Missing Observations = 22       $\chi^2 = 4.12$       d f = 4      p = .39

The area per child was calculated and is presented in Table 19 in categories of small, medium, and large, divided at the 33 1/3 and the 66 2/3 percentiles. No relationship is found between the keeping of pets and area per child.

Table 19

 $\chi^2$  Test of the Area Per Child by the Keeping of Pets

Area per Child (in acres)	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Small (<.040)	11	5	9	25
Medium (.040-.200)	18	1	5	24
Large (>.200)	16	3	5	24
TOTAL	45	9	19	73

Missing Observations = 25       $\chi^2 = 5.998$       d f = 4      p = .199

The size of the premises, controlling for geographic location, was also examined (see Table 20). There is no relationship between the keeping of pets and the size of the premises for the urban units. No statistical analysis was conducted on the nonurban units due to expected frequencies of less than one in four cells.

Table 20

$\chi^2$  Tests of the Size of the Premises by the Keeping of Pets,  
Controlling for Geographic Location

Size of the Premises (in acres)	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Urban				
Small (< .53)	9	2	6	17
Medium (.53-5.00)	13	2	3	18
Large (> 5.00)	2	2	6	10
TOTAL	24	6	15	45
Missing Observations = 16 $\chi^2 = 7.37$ <u>df</u> = 4      p = .12				
Nonurban				
Small (< .53)	4	1	2	7
Medium (.53-5.00)	7	1	0	8
Large (> 5.00)	11	1	1	13
TOTAL	22	3	3	28

Missing Observations = 5      No statistical analysis due to four cells having an expected frequency of less than one.

1(k) Other features on the premises. Table 21 presents the frequencies of the other features of the facility for the four types of units. All but three of the units have a lounge, livingroom, or playroom, and almost half have a school or classroom. The majority of the remaining features reported are for recreation and athletics. Two of

the units which would consider keeping pets in the future reported already having animal shelters on their premises. The units that have a wooded area or a pond on their premises keep pets at present and those which have a tool shed, storage shed, or garage keep pets now or would consider doing so in the future.

Table 21

Frequencies of Other Features of the Facilities by the Keeping of Pets

Feature	Keeping of Pets				Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Never Kept	
Lounge, livingroom, playroom	53	14	10	18	95
School, classroom	19	8	7	7	41
Hospital, infirmry	4	3	1	4	12
Tool shed, storage shed, garage	5	0	1	0	6
Workshop, craftroom	1	1	0	0	2
Gymnasium	14	7	6	7	34
Swimming pool	2	0	1	1	4
Playground, playing fields, track	2	1	0	0	3
Pond, lake	1	0	0	0	1
Animal shelters	9	1	2	0	12
Park, wooded area	1	0	0	0	1
Staff offices or residences	2	1	0	0	3
Sauna	1	0	1	0	2
Ice rink	1	0	0	0	1

For the purpose of statistical analysis, those features that could be used to house the pets (i.e., classroom or school, tool shed, storage shed, or garage; and animal shelters) were combined into the

category of pet-related features. The "lounge, livingroom, playroom" category was not included, as these features were present in almost all the facilities. As Table 22 illustrates, the keeping of pets is not related to pet-related features.

Table 22

$\chi^2$  Test of Pet-Related Features by the Keeping of Pets

Pet-Related Features	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Yes	26	8	15	49
No	28	8	13	49
TOTAL	54	16	28	98
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 0.22$	<u>d f</u> = 2	<u>p</u> = .90	

1(1) Geographic location of the unit. Geographic location was divided into urban and nonurban (rural and town) for statistical analysis. Almost twice as many units responding are from an urban setting. There is no relationship, however, between the keeping of pets and the geographic location of the unit, as shown in Table 23.

Table 23

$\chi^2$  Test of Geographic Location of the Facility by the Keeping of Pets

Geographic Location	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Never Kept	
Urban	29	10	22	61
Nonurban	23	5	5	33
TOTAL	52	15	27	94

Missing Observations = 4       $\chi^2 = 5.18$       d f = 2      p = .07

#### Use of the Pets

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant differences in the use of pets between those facilities which keep pets now and those which have kept pets in the past, with respect to eleven aspects of the use of pets, i.e., variables 2(a) to 2(1).

A statistically significant relationship appears for only one of the eleven variables on pet use. The person who introduced the pet to the unit tended to be in a management position in those units that keep pets now and in another staff position in those units that have kept pets in the past,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.84$ , p = .03. The relationship between the keeping of pets and the problems caused by the pet programs was also analyzed. Significantly more units that kept pets in the past experienced problems than those units that keep pets now,  $\chi^2(1) = 9.33$ , p = .002. The problems concerned the care of the pets,

$\chi^2(1) = 4.32$ ,  $p = .038$ ; the staff,  $\chi^2(1) = 10.12$ ,  $p = .002$ ; and the children,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.34$ ,  $p = .037$ .

2(a) Type of pets. Fish, cats, small rodents, small domesticated birds, and dogs were the types of pets reported most frequently (see Table 24).

Table 24  
Frequencies of Type of Pets by Keeping of Pets

Type of Pet	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
Insects	4	0	5	9
Fish	32	9	8	49
Turtles	4	2	4	10
Reptiles	4	1	2	7
Amphibians	3	0	2	5
Small domesticated birds	11	3	7	21
Small rodents	12	6	5	23
Rabbits	8	3	4	15
Cats	20	5	7	32
Small dogs	10	3	4	17
Medium dogs	11	4	3	18
Large dogs	16	1	2	19
Small farm animals	6	2	4	12
Medium farm animals	3	0	2	5
Large farm animals	4	1	2	7
Tamed wild animals	2	1	1	4
TOTAL	150	41	62	253

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the units were divided into those who keep small pets only (insects, fish, turtles, reptiles, amphibians, birds, small rodents), those who keep large pets only

(rabbits, cats, dogs, farm animals, and tamed wild animals), and those who keep both sizes of pets. Table 25 illustrates that keeping pets now or in the past is not related to the size of the pets.

Table 25  
Size of Pets by Keeping of Pets

Size of Pets	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Small only*	16	7	23
Large only**	15	4	19
Small and large	23	5	28
TOTAL	54	16	70

\* insects, fish, turtles, reptiles, amphibians, birds, rodents.

\*\* remaining types of pets.

Missing Observations = 0       $\chi^2 = 1.18$       df = 2      p = .55

The two types of units also do not differ significantly in the keeping of the five most popular types of pets (Table 26).

2(b) Ownership of the pets. The most frequently reported owner of the pets was the facility. This was true for all types of pets except the large dogs and the medium farm animals which are owned more often by staff members. The children, individually or in groups, are the second most reported owners of the small animals. In a number of units there is more than one type of ownership for a certain type of pet. This

multiple ownership was mentioned at least once for all the types of pets. The frequencies of ownership for all types of pets are presented in Table 27.

Table 26

Chi Square Analyses of the Most Popular Types of Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Type of Pet	Keeping of Pets		Total	$\chi^2$ *	Level of Significance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past			
Fish					
Yes	32	9	41	0.00	1.00
No	22	7	29		
Birds					
Yes	11	3	14	0.00	1.00
No	43	13	56		
Small rodents					
Yes	12	6	18	0.81	.37
No	42	10	52		
Cats					
Yes	20	5	25	0.02	.90
No	34	11	45		
Dogs					
Yes	31	6	37	1.25	.26
No	23	10	33		

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

df = 1

Table 27  
Ownership of the Pets

Type of Pet	Type of Ownership of the Pets				
	Staff Members	Facility	Specific Groups	Individual Children	More than one type
Insects	1	3	0	2	2
Fish	6	23	6	7	6
Turtles	0	3	3	1	3
Reptiles	1	1	1	1	2
Amphibians	0	1	0	1	1
Birds	1	7	4	3	3
Small rodents	3	7	3	6	4
Rabbits	1	6	1	2	4
Cats	7	12	3	3	7
Small dogs	4	7	0	0	5
Medium dogs	7	7	0	0	3
Large dogs	8	5	1	0	4
Small farm animals	2	5	0	0	5
Medium farm animals	1	0	0	0	3
Large farm animals	2	2	0	0	2
Tamed wild animals	0	0	0	1	3
TOTAL	44	89	22	27	57

As Table 28 demonstrates, there is no relationship between ownership of the pets and the keeping of pets now or in the past.

Pets were owned by children in 34 of the units. In seven of these units some of the children are not allowed to own pets because they might abuse the pet or are too irresponsible to own a pet (see Table 29).

Table 28

## Ownership of the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Ownership of the Pets	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Staff members	10	3	13
Facility	21	3	24
Specific groups of children	2	3	5
Individual children	6	2	8
More than one type	15	4	19
TOTAL	54	15	69

Missing Observations = 1       $\chi^2 = 5.58$       df = 4      p = .23

Table 29

## Children Allowed to Own Pets by the Keeping of the Pets

Children Allowed to Own Pets	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
All the children	15	6	3	24
Only those who will not abuse it	1	2	0	3
Only those who are responsible	2	1	1	4
Restriction not described	0	0	1	1
No answer	1	1	0	2
Not applicable (no pets owned by children)	35	6	5	46
TOTAL	54	16	10	80

2(c) Access to the pets. Table 30 presents the types of access the children are allowed to the different types of pets. The most frequently reported access for all the pets is during the children's free time. The type of access to the pets is similar for both types of pet keeping, as shown in Table 31.

Table 30  
Access of the Children to the Pets

Type of Pet	Type of Access to the Pets			
	Anytime	Free time	Scheduled time	When staff can supervise
Insects	1	7	0	0
Fish	5	35	6	0
Turtles	0	9	1	0
Reptiles	1	3	2	0
Amphibians	1	3	0	0
Birds	2	19	0	0
Small rodents	3	16	4	0
Rabbits	0	12	2	0
Cats	10	21	0	0
Small dogs	5	10	0	1
Medium dogs	3	13	1	0
Large dogs	2	16	0	0
Small farm animals	1	9	1	0
Medium farm animals	1	3	0	0
Large farm animals	0	4	2	0
Tamed wild animals	0	4	0	0
TOTAL	35	184	19	1

Table 31

## Type of Access to the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Type of Access	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Anytime day or night	10	2	12
Free time only	35	8	43
Scheduled time only	3	4	7
More than one type	4	1	5
TOTAL	52	15	67

Missing Observations = 3       $\chi^2 = 5.46$       d f = 3      p = .14

Eighteen units restricted the access to the pets for some children either for the pet's sake (abusing children), the child's sake (allergies, physical illness), or other reasons (those with duties regarding pet care are allowed more access to the pets than the other children, the owner of the pet had to give permission to see the pet, only those attending the facility's school are allowed access). This information is presented in Table 32. No statistical analysis was conducted as the expected frequency in one cell was less than one.

Table 32

Restrictions on the Access of the Children to the Pets  
by the Keeping of Pets

Type of Restriction	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
No restrictions	38	10	48
Restrictions for the pet's sake	5	3	8
Restrictions for the child's sake	3	1	4
Other restrictions	5	1	6
TOTAL	51	15	66

Missing Observations = 4

Access to the pets was also examined in terms of where the pets were housed. Table 33 presents the housing locations of the different types of pets. The free run inside and/or outside of the unit and the animal shelters are restricted to the large pets. The classroom and the playroom or lounge house primarily small pets. All types of pets, except for reptiles, amphibians, farm animals, and tamed wild animals are kept in the children's rooms. No relationship is found between the housing of the pets and the keeping of pets, as illustrated in Table 34.

Table 33  
Housing of the Pets

Type of Pet	Type of Housing for the Pets							
	Free Run In & Out	Free Run In	Free Run Out	Animal Shelter	Playroom or Lounge	Children's Rooms	Other Rooms	Classroom or School
Insects	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0
Fish	0	0	0	0	15	14	3	6
Turtles	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0
Reptiles	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
Amphibians	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Birds	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	0
Small rodents	0	0	0	0	5	6	2	2
Rabbits	0	0	0	6	0	3	1	0
Cats	2	11	2	1	1	5	2	0
Small dogs	1	3	3	0	0	2	2	0
Medium dogs	2	6	4	0	0	1	0	0
Large dogs	3	2	4	1	0	2	3	0
Small farm animals	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0
Medium farm animals	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Large farm animals	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Tamed wild animals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	8	22	16	23	36	43	17	9

Table 34

Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Housing of the  
Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Housing Type	Keeping of Pets		$\chi^2$ *	Level of Signif- icance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past		
Free run inside & out				
Yes	6	0	0.79	.38
No	48	16		
Free run inside				
Yes	12	3	0.00	1.00
No	42	13		
Free run outside				
Yes	6	2	0.00	1.00
No	48	14		
Animal shelter outside				
Yes	8	2	0.00	1.00
No	46	14		
Playroom or lounge				
Yes	8	5	1.25	.26
No	46	11		
Children's rooms				
Yes	13	4	0.00	1.00
No	41	12		
Other rooms in the residence				
Yes	9	2	0.00	.99
No	45	14		
Classroom or school				
Yes	6	0	0.79	.38
No	48	16		

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

d f = 1

2(d) Supervision of the children. As Table 35 illustrates, there is no significant difference in the supervision of the children with the pets between those units which keep pets now and those which have kept pets in the past.

Table 35

Supervision of the Children with the Pets by  
the Keeping of Pets

Supervision of the Children with the Pets	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
No children supervised	13	3	16
Some children supervised	19	4	23
All children supervised	12	7	19
TOTAL	44	14	58
Missing Observations = 12	$\chi^2 = 2.5$	<u>d f</u> = 2	<u>p</u> = .29

The supervision of the children with the pets is also not related to the types of children served. This is found when the presence or absence of children with mental retardation, physical handicaps, emotional disturbance/social maladjustment, and family problems were compared with supervision (Table 36) and also when the units were grouped into handicapped children only, disturbed children only, and both types of children (Table 37).

2(e) The person who cares/cared for the pets. Table 38 illustrates that in 80% of the units both the children and the staff care for the pets, in 11% of the units the children care for the pets, and in the remaining 9% the staff provide the care. There is no relationship, however, between the keeping of pets and the person who cares for the pets.

Table 36

Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Problems of the Children  
by the Supervision of the Children with the Pets

Type of Problem	Supervision			Total	$\chi^2$	Level of Signif- icance
	No Children	Some Children	All Children			
Mentally retarded						
Yes	4	8	9	21	1.92	.38
No	12	15	10	37		
Physically handicapped						
Yes	4	9	8	21	1.24	.54
No	12	14	11	37		
Emotionally disturbed						
Yes	13	18	12	43	1.82	.40
No	3	5	7	15		
Family Problem						
Yes	8	14	8	30	1.49	.47
No	8	9	11	28		

d f = 2

Table 37

Type of Problem of the Children by Supervision of the  
Children with the Pets

Type of Problem	Supervision			Total
	No Children	Some Children	All Children	
Handicapped only	1	3	7	11
Disturbed only	10	12	8	30
Both types	5	8	4	17
TOTAL	16	23	19	58
Missing Observations = 12	$\chi^2 = 6.39$		<u>df</u> = 4	<u>p</u> = .17

Table 38

Persons Who Care for the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Persons Who Care for the Pets	Keeping of Pets		Total	
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past		
Children alone	7	1	8	
Staff alone	5	1	6	
Children and staff	42	14	56	
TOTAL	54	16	70	
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 0.76$		<u>df</u> = 2	<u>p</u> = .68

2(f) Planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the unit. Those units which keep pets now and those which kept pets in the past do not differ significantly in whether planning was conducted before the pets were introduced to the units (see Table 39). Over two-thirds of the units reported that some planning was conducted.

Table 39

Planning the Introduction of the Pets to the Unit by  
the Keeping of Pets

Planning	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Yes	34	12	46
No	18	3	21
TOTAL	52	15	67

Missing Observations = 3       $\chi^2 = 0.58$       d f = 1      p = .45

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Table 40 illustrates that the two types of units are also similar in terms of the type of planning conducted. Most of the units prepared the children and the staff for the pet's arrival. Over half of the units investigated the nature of care required for the pet whereas less than a quarter made any adjustments to the facility. Those units that reported that no planning was conducted also reported that no problems occurred as a result of a lack of planning (see Table 41).

Table 40

Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Planning for the Introduction  
of the Pets to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Type of Planning	Keeping of Pets		$\chi^2$ *	Level of Signif- icance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past		
Nature of care required				
Yes	18	7	0.00	1.00
No	12	4		
Preparation of the staff				
Yes	31	10	X	X
No	0	2		
Preparation of the children				
Yes	26	10	0.00	1.00
No	7	2		
Preparation of the facility				
Yes	8	1	0.41	.52
No	28	11		

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

X-No statistical analysis due to the expected frequency in one cell being less than one.

Table 41

Whether Problems Were Encountered Due to Not  
Planning the Introduction of the Pet to the  
Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Problems Encountered	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Yes	0	0	0
No	16	3	19
No answer	2	0	2
TOTAL	18	3	21

2(g) Professional orientation of the people who introduced the pets to the units. Table 42 presents the professional orientation of the introducers by the keeping of pets. Education, followed by technical or community college training, were mentioned most frequently.

Table 42

Professional Orientation of the Person Who Introduced the Pet  
to the Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Professional Orientation	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
No training in child care or development	3	0	1	4
Inservice training	1	0	1	2
Technical or community college	5	2	1	8
Social Work	4	0	0	4
Psychology	0	2	0	2
Education	10	2	1	13
Children or their parents	1	1	0	2
Nursing	1	0	0	1
Rehabilitation	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	25	8	4	37

Note: Ten units stated that persons from more than one type of profession introduced the pets. The table represents all the professional orientations mentioned.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, professional orientation was collapsed into paraprofessional (no training, inservice training, technical or community college) and professional (social work, psychology, education, nursing, rehabilitation). The category of "children or their parents" was excluded as these persons are not staff members. As Table 43 illustrates, there is no relationship between the keeping of pets and the professional training of the persons who introduced the pets to the unit.

Table 43

Training of the Person Who Introduced the Pet to the Unit  
by the Keeping of Pets

Professional Orientation	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Paraprofessional	8	2	10
Professional	5	3	8
Both types	9	1	10
TOTAL	22	6	28

Missing Observations = 42       $\chi^2 = 2.02$       d f = 2      p = .37

2(h) The positions of the people who introduced the pets to the unit. The positions of the introducers are presented by the keeping of pets in Table 44. The most frequently mentioned position in those units that keep pets now was unit supervisor or houseparent, followed by child care worker and teacher. In those units which kept pets in the past or which might consider keeping pets in the future, child care worker, followed by teacher, were reported most often.

Table 44

Position of the Person Who Introduced the Pet to  
the Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Position	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
Executive director, director	8	0	0	8
Unit supervisor, houseparent	18	1	1	20
Child care worker	17	7	6	30
Life skills worker	2	1	0	3
Teacher	10	2	2	14
Nurse, nurse's aide	2	1	0	3
Groundskeeper, maintenance staff	1	0	1	2
Children or their parents	2	1	0	3
TOTAL*	60	13	10	83

\*The totals exceed the number of units in the study because 12 units had persons in more than one type of position introduce the pets.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, these positions were divided into management (executive director, director, unit supervisor, houseparent) and staff (child care worker, life skills worker, teacher, nurse, nurse's aide, groundskeeper, maintenance staff). Excluded from the analysis were those units in which the pets were introduced by staff in more than one type of position. The "children and their parents" category was also excluded as these persons are not staff members. As Table 45 illustrates, the pets were introduced significantly more often by management in those units which keep pets

now and by other staff in those units which kept pets in the past,  
 $\chi^2(1) = 4.84, p = .03.$

Table 45

Comparison of Whether the Introducer of the Pet was  
 Management or Staff by the Keeping of Pets

Position	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
Management	20	1	21
Staff	16	9	25
TOTAL	36	10	46

Missing Observations = 24       $\chi^2 = 4.84$       d f = 1      p = .03

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

2(i) Allowance of the children to bring their pets from home to stay at the unit. The majority of the units for all three types of pet keeping reported that pets from home would not be allowed to stay there. Two units that keep pets now and two that kept pets in the past allow(ed) all types of pets to stay, and 22 units would allow certain types of pets to stay (see Table 46).

Table 46

Allowance of a Child's Pet from Home to Live in the Unit  
by the Keeping of Pets

	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
Allowance of a child's pet from home to live in the unit				
All pets may stay	2	2	0	4
Only small pets in cages or tanks may stay	7	0	0	7
Only smaller pets may stay	2	0	1	3
Only inexpensive pets may stay	1	0	0	1
No pets may stay	31	12	8	51
Depends on individual situation	3	1	1	5
Depends on pets in unit at present	2	0	0	2
Issue hasn't come up, don't know	6	0	0	6
No answer	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	54	16	10	80

The responses were collapsed into two categories--all or some types of pets and no types of pets--for the purpose of statistical analysis. The categories of "issue hasn't come up yet, don't know" and "no answer" were excluded. As Table 47 illustrates, there is no relationship between the keeping of pets and the allowance of a child to bring his pet from home to stay at the unit.

Table 47

## Types of Pets Which May Stay at the Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Types of Pets	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
All or some types of pets	17	3	20
No types of pets	31	12	43
TOTAL	48	15	63

Missing Observations = 7       $\chi^2 = .64$       d f = 1      p = .43

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

2(j) Allowance of the children's pets from home to visit the unit. Among those units that keep pets now, twice as many allow the children's pets to visit as do not. The opposite is reported by those units that have kept pets in the past or which might keep them in the future (see Table 48).

Table 48

Allowance of a Child's Pet from Home to Visit the Unit  
by the Keeping of Pets

	Keeping of Pets			
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
Allowance of a Child's Pet from home to visit the unit				Total
Yes, all pets may visit	24	3	3	30
Only smaller pets may visit	5	3	0	8
No pets may visit	13	7	6	26
Depends on individual situation	1	1	1	3
Only certain pets may visit, but not described	1	0	0	1
Issue hasn't come up yet, don't know	9	1	0	10
No answer	1	1	0	2
TOTAL	54	16	10	80

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the responses were divided into three groups (all types of pets, some types of pets, and no types of pets). The categories of "issue hasn't come up yet, don't know" and "no answer" were excluded. The keeping of pets now or in the past is not related to the allowance of all, some, or no types of pets to visit the unit, as shown in Table 49.

Table 49

Types of Pets Which May Visit the Unit by the Keeping of Pets

Types of pets which may visit the Unit	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
All types of pets	24	3	27
Some types of pets	7	4	11
No types of pets	13	7	20
TOTAL	44	14	58
Missing Observations = 12	$\chi^2 = 4.69$	$d f = 2$	$p = .10$

2(k) The role of the pets in the unit. Table 50 summarizes the educational and therapeutic roles of the pets in the units. Most respondents reported more than one role for the pet, with a maximum of four reported in each of the categories. The most frequently mentioned educational roles for the pets were teaching about animals (care and habits), responsibility, and sex, reproduction, and the life cycle. Caring for someone else, providing a nonthreatening relationship, and entertainment were the most frequently mentioned therapeutic roles.

Table 51 illustrates that the units which keep pets now are similar to those that kept pets in the past in terms of the presence or absence of an educational role and a therapeutic role for the pets.

Table 50

## Educational and Therapeutic Roles of the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Role of the Pet	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
<u>Educational</u>				
animal knowledge (care, habits	23	3	5	31
responsibility	13	4	4	21
sex, reproduction, life cycle	10	0	1	11
cooperation and sharing	3	2	1	6
routine	3	0	0	3
respect for living things	2	0	0	2
models for love, affection, behavior	2	0	0	2
learning process	2	0	0	2
language	0	0	1	1
health and hygiene	1	0	0	1
mathematics	1	0	0	1
business knowledge	1	0	0	1
other	1	0	1	2
educational role not described	1	1	2	4
no educational role for the pet	21	9	1	31
<u>Therapeutic</u>				
caring for others	9	1	0	10
nonthreatening relationship	9	0	0	9
entertainment	8	0	1	9
companionship	5	1	1	7
stimulus for important feelings	4	1	1	6
improvement of the unit milieu	1	1	3	5
warmth, comfort, security	4	0	0	4
sense of ownership	1	1	0	2
teach a skill	2	0	0	2
affection object for older children	1	0	0	1
acceptance and tolerance	1	0	0	1
improvement of self-image	1	0	0	1
development of trust	1	0	0	1
drawing out a withdrawn child	1	0	0	1
conversation piece or stimulus	1	0	0	1
positive reinforcement in behaviour therapy	1	0	0	1
distraction from physical illness	0	0	1	1
overcoming a fear of animals	1	0	0	1
other	1	0	0	1
therapeutic role not described	3	2	2	7
no therapeutic role	22	6	3	31

Table 51

Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Roles of the Pet by the Keeping of Pets

Type of Role	Keeping of Pets		Total	$\chi^2$ *	Level of Significance
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past			
Educational					
Yes	32	6	38	1.23	.27
No	21	9	30		
TOTAL	53	15	68		
Therapeutic					
Yes	31	7	38	0.00	1.00
No	22	6	28		
TOTAL	53	13	66		

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

d f = 1

Problems with the pets. Although this variable was not included in Hypothesis 2, the responses warranted a statistical analysis of the data. The types of problems encountered by those who have experience with pets or anticipated by those who might consider keeping pets in the future are summarized in Table 52. The types of problems mentioned most frequently concern the children and the pets. The most frequently mentioned problem was abuse or mistreatment of the pets by the children. This was the most common problem reported by those in the units which had kept pets in the past and one of the most common problems anticipated by those who might keep pets in the future. The most common

Table 52  
Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Problems	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
<u>Care of the Pets</u>				
inadequate or inconsistent care	1	3	1	5
children would not assume responsibilities	3	1	0	4
someone needed when whole unit vacationed	2	0	0	2
staff had to assume duties during children's vacations	1	0	0	1
care of pets became a burden	0	1	0	1
difficult to care for pets in winter	0	1	0	1
<u>Staff</u>				
no one would accept responsibility for care	0	2	0	2
not all staff approved of the pets work schedules made assigning duties difficult	1	1	0	2
0	2	0	2	
<u>Children</u>				
some children abused or mistreated the pets	3	5	2	10
some children were allergic to the pets	2	0	2	4
pets caused jealousy among the children	0	1	2	3
some children had a fear of animals	1	1	0	2
some needed supervision to prevent abuse of pets	1	0	0	1
abuse of pets upset those who didn't abuse	0	1	0	1
children hid food in their drawers for pets	0	1	0	1
children lost interest in the pets	0	1	0	1
<u>Facility</u>				
facility not suitable for the pets regulations prohibited pets or restricted them	1	1	0	2
1	0	1	2	
<u>Pets</u>				
pets messed or damaged the unit	4	1	0	5
pets bothered the neighbours	3	1	0	4
excessive reproduction of the pets	3	0	0	3
pets wandered, ran away or escaped enclosures	2	0	0	2
pets died	1	1	0	2
pets misbehaved	0	1	0	1
food, care, veterinarian costs expensive	0	1	0	1
pets had to get used to different children	1	0	0	1
pets became ill	1	0	0	1
poachers or predators took the pets	1	0	0	1
<u>Other</u>				
Problem not described	0	1	1	2
1	0	0	1	
No problems encountered	33	2	4	39

response from those units which keep pets now was that the pets messed or damaged the unit. All three types of units mentioned inadequate or inconsistent care as a problem. Those units which may keep pets in the future did not anticipate a number of the problems mentioned by those units experienced with pets (i.e., problems with the children and staff assuming responsibility for the care of the pets, and the pets damaging the facility, excessively reproducing, or dying).

The presence or absence of problems with the pet program was analyzed. Table 53 illustrates that more units which kept pets in the past reported problems with the pet program than those which keep pets now,  $\chi^2(1) = 9.33$ ,  $p = .002$ .

Table 53

Problems or No Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Total
Problems Using Pets			
Yes	20	13	33
No	33	2	35
TOTAL	54	15	68

Missing Observations = 2       $\chi^2 = 9.33$       d f = 1       $p = .002$

A statistical analysis was also conducted on the presence or absence of the different types of problems. Significantly more units which have kept pets in the past experienced problems with the care of

the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.32$ ,  $p = .038$ ; the staff,  $\chi^2(1) = 10.12$ ,  $p = .002$ ; and the children,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.34$ ,  $p = .037$ , than those units which keep pets now (see Table 54). There were no significant differences between these two types of units in terms of problems concerning the pets. Problems concerning the facility were not analyzed due to the expected frequency of one cell being less than one.

Table 54

Chi Square Analyses of the Types of Problems with the Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Problem	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Total	$\chi^2$ *	Level of Signif- icance
Care of the pets					
Yes	4	5	9	4.32	.038
No	50	11	61		
Staff					
Yes	1	5	6	10.12	.002
No	53	11	64		
Children					
Yes	6	6	12	4.34	.037
No	48	10	58		
Facility					
Yes	2	1	3	X	X
No	52	15	67		
Pets					
Yes	12	4	16	0.00	1.00
No	42	12	54		

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

df = 1

X-No statistical analysis as the expected frequency of one cell was less than one.

Table 55

## Reasons Why Pets No Longer Kept by the Keeping of Pets

Reasons	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
<u>Problems with the Care of the Pets</u>			
inadequate care	2	3	5
children would not assume responsibilities	4	1	5
pets were difficult to care for	1	1	2
care in winter difficult	0	1	1
inconsistent care	1	0	1
<u>Problems with the Staff</u>			
not all staff dedicated to the pet program	1	0	1
new staff did not want to keep the pets	0	1	1
<u>Problems with the Children</u>			
children abused or mistreated the pets	3	5	8
children lost interest in the pets	3	1	4
some children were allergic to the pets	3	0	3
some children needed supervision to prevent abuse	1	0	1
<u>Problems with the Facility</u>			
geographic location not suitable for the pets	2	0	2
facility not suitable for the pets	1	0	1
<u>Problems with the Pets</u>			
pets died	5	2	7
pets wandered, ran away or escaped enclosures	3	1	4
pets messed or damaged the unit	2	2	4
pets disturbed the neighbours	1	1	2
care of the pets was expensive	1	1	2
pets misbehaved	1	0	1
pets harmed someone	1	0	1
pets had to get used to different children	0	1	1
pets were too much trouble	0	1	1
person who owned the pet left the facility	1	0	1
pets were incompatible with each other	1	0	1
poachers or predators took the pets	0	1	1
pets were a health hazard	0	1	1

Those units which kept pets in the past and those which keep pets now but which kept other pets in the past were asked why these pets were no longer kept. Table 55 presents a summary of these reasons. Again, the abuse or mistreatment of the pets by the children was the reason most frequently mentioned by those units which had kept pets in the past. Those units which keep pets now cited most frequently that the pets had died. The reasons mentioned most frequently by both types of units concerned the pets.

#### Comparison of Pet Use Among those Units Which Keep Pets Now

Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant differences among those units which keep pets now, with respect to eleven aspects of the use of pets, i.e., variables 3(a) to 3(k).

Thirty-six variables describing the use of pets in the unit were compared with each other for those units which keep pets now. Thirty significant relationships were found. These significant relationships involved five of the 12 areas examined: the type of pets, the access of the children to the pets, the supervision of the children with the pets, the planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the residence, and the role of the pet in the residence. The variables compared, the chi square values, and the levels of significance are presented in Appendix I. The thirty significant relationships are presented in the following discussion of Hypothesis 3, variables (a) to (k).

3(a) Type of pets used. Type of pets used was examined in terms of the size of the pets kept and on the presence or absence of the five most popular types of pets (i.e., fish, birds, rodents, cats, and dogs).

The size of the pets is significantly related to four types of housing of the pets, as shown in Table 56. Giving the pets a free run of the inside of the residence is not allowed in any of the units with small pets only, whereas it is allowed in almost one-half of the units with large pets only and in one-third of the units with both sizes of pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.76$ ,  $p = .008$ . None of the units with small pets only and only one with large pets only keep their pets in an animal shelter outside the residence, whereas almost half of the units with both sizes of pets house the animals this way,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.02$ ,  $p = .02$ . Pets are housed in a playroom or a lounge in almost half of the units with small pets only and in only three of the units with both sizes of pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.09$ ,  $p = .05$ . The classroom houses pets from almost half of the units with small pets only, whereas none of units with large pets only and only one of the units with both sizes of pets reported this type of housing,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.51$ ,  $p = .009$ .

A significant relationship also exists between the size of the pets and the supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(4) = 11.50$ ,  $p = .02$ . As table 57 illustrates, when both sizes of pets are kept most of the units reported that certain children are supervised, whereas in those units with large pets the majority of the units reported that none of the children are supervised. There is little difference in the three types of supervision in those units with small pets.

There is also a significant relationship between the size of the pets and the position of the person who introduced the pet to the unit,  $\chi^2(2) = 12.58$ ,  $p = .002$  (see Table 58). In those units with large pets only, the introduction was made by someone in a management position (with the exception of one unit), whereas in those units with

Table 56

## Size of the Pets by the Type of Housing of the Pet

Type of Housing of the Pet	Size of the Pets			Total
	Small Pets Only	Large Pets Only	Both Sizes	
<hr/>				
Free run inside the residence				
Yes	0	7	5	12
No	16	8	18	42
TOTAL	16	15	23	54
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 9.76$	<u>d f</u> = 2		<u>p</u> = .008
Animal shelter outside the residence				
Yes	0	1	7	8
No	16	14	16	46
TOTAL	16	15	23	54
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 8.02$	<u>d f</u> = 2		<u>p</u> = .02
Playroom or lounge				
Yes	5	0	3	8
No	11	15	20	46
TOTAL	16	15	23	54
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 6.09$	<u>d f</u> = 2		<u>p</u> = .05
Classroom				
Yes	5	0	1	6
No	11	15	22	48
TOTAL	16	15	23	54
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 9.51$	<u>d f</u> = 2		<u>p</u> = .009

Table 57

Size of the Pet by the Children Who were Supervised with the Pets

Children Who were Supervised with the Pets	Size of the Pet			Total
	Small Pets Only	Large Pets Only	Both Sizes	
No children	4	7	2	13
Some children	3	3	13	19
All children	5	2	5	12
TOTAL	12	12	20	44

Missing Observations = 10       $\chi^2 = 11.50$       df = 4      p = .02

Table 58

Size of the Pets by the Position of the Person Who Introduced the Pets to the Unit

Position of the Introducer	Size of the Pets			Total
	Small Pets Only	Large Pets Only	Both Sizes	
Management	2	11	7	20
Other staff	9	1	6	16
TOTAL	11	12	13	36

Missing Observations = 18       $\chi^2 = 12.58$       df = 2      p = .002

small pets only, staff in other positions made the introductions most often. For those units with both types of pets, the pets were introduced almost equally by staff in either types of positions.

Table 59 presents the significant relationships between the size of the pets and the presence or absence of an educational role,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.55$ ,  $p = .02$ , and a therapeutic role for the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 16.99$ ,  $p = .0002$ . Most units with both sizes of pets reported having an educational role and a therapeutic role for the pets. More units with large pets reported no educational role whereas more units with small pets reported no therapeutic role.

Table 59

## Size of the Pet by the Role of the Pet in the Unit

Role of the Pet	Size of the Pets			Total
	Small Pets Only	Large Pets Only	Both Sizes	
<hr/>				
Educational				
Yes	8	6	18	32
No	8	9	4	21
TOTAL	16	15	22	53
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2 = 7.55$	<u>d f</u> = 2	$p = .02$	
Therapeutic				
Yes	3	8	20	31
No	12	7	3	22
TOTAL	15	15	23	53
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2 = 16.99$	<u>d f</u> = 2	$p = .0002$	

The presence or absence of fish as pets is found to be significantly related to the position of the person who introduced the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 6.56$ ,  $p = .01$ . As shown in Table 60, the fish tended to be introduced significantly more often by staff in positions other than management.

Keeping fish as pets is also significantly related to whether or not a child's pet from home may visit the residence,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.62$ ,  $p = .04$ . Table 61 illustrates that fish are kept as pets in all the units that allow some types of pets to visit, in slightly more of the

Table 60

Keeping Fish as Pets by the Position of the Person Who Introduced the Pets

Position of the Introducer	Fish Kept as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Management	8	12	20
Other staff	14	2	16
TOTAL	22	14	36
Missing Observations = 18	$\chi^2 = 6.56$	$d f = 1$	$p = .01$

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

units which do not allow any types of pets to visit, and in slightly fewer of the units which allow all pets to visit.

No significant relationships are found between keeping birds as pets and the other 35 variables examined.

Keeping small rodents as pets is significantly related to whether

Table 61

Keeping Fish as Pets by Whether or Not a Child's Pet Can Visit  
the Residence

Pets Which Can Visit	Fish Kept as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
All animals	11	13	24
Some animals	7	0	7
No animals	8	5	13
TOTAL	26	18	44

Missing Observations = 10       $\chi^2 = 6.62$       df = 2      p = .04

changes were made to the facility in preparation for the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.61$ , p = .003; alterations were made often in units with small rodents as pets than those without (see Table 62).

Table 62

Keeping Small Rodents as Pets by Making Alterations to the  
Facility for the Pets

Alterations to the Facility	Small Rodents Kept as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	6	2	8
No	4	24	28
TOTAL	10	6	36

Missing Observations = 18       $\chi^2^* = 3.61$       df = 1      p = .003

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Cats are kept as pets significantly more often in units which allow the pets a free run of the inside of the residence than in units which do not, as shown in Table 63,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.29$ ,  $p = .04$ .

Table 63

Keeping Cats as Pets by Giving the Pets a Free Run of the Inside of the Residence

Free Run of the Residence	Cats Kept as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	8	4	12
No	12	30	42
TOTAL	20	34	54
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 4.29$	<u>df</u> = 1	<u>p</u> = .04

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

Table 64 demonstrates that units that keep cats as pets tend to keep dogs also,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.24$ ,  $p = .02$ .

Keeping dogs as pets is significantly related to having a therapeutic role for the pet in the unit,  $\chi^2(1) = 12.98$ ,  $p = .0003$  (see Table 65).

Table 64

## Keeping Cats as Pets by Keeping Dogs as Pets

Dogs Kept as Pets	Cats Kepts as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	16	15	31
No	4	19	23
TOTAL	20	34	54
Missing Observations = 0	$\chi^2 = 5.24$	<u>d f = 1</u>	<u>p = .02</u>

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Table 65

## Keeping Dogs as Pets by the Presence or Absence of a Therapeutic Role for the Pet

Therapeutic Role for the Pet	Keeping Dogs as Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	25	6	31
No	6	16	22
TOTAL	31	22	53
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2 = 12.98$	<u>d f = 1</u>	<u>p = .0003</u>

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

3(b) Ownership of the pets. No relationships were examined due to expected frequencies of less than one in one or more cells.

3(c) Access of the children to the pets. Access of the children to the pets was examined in terms of the type of access the children had to the pets, restrictions on the access of the children to the pets, and the different types of housing of the pets.

The amount of access the children had to the pets is not found to be related to any of the other 35 variables.

Restrictions on the access of the children to the pets is found to be significantly related to whether the unit experienced problems with the children as a result of keeping pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.86$ ,  $p = .05$ . Table 66 shows that those units which have problems with the children tend to restrict the access of the children to the pets.

Table 66

Restrictions on the Access of the Children to the Pets by  
Problems with the Children

Problems with the Children	Restrictions on Access		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	4	2	6
No	9	36	45
TOTAL	13	38	51
Missing Observations = 3	$\chi^2^* = 3.86$	<u>d f</u> = 1	<u>p</u> = .05

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

None of the 35 variables are found to be significantly related to whether or not the pets had a free run inside and outside the residence.

As indicated in Tables 56 and 63 respectively, allowing the pets

a free run of the residence is related to the size of the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.76$ ,  $p = .008$ , and to whether or not cats are kept,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.29$ ,  $p = .04$ .

Housing the pets in animal shelters outside the residence is significantly related to the size of the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.02$ ,  $p = .02$  (Table 56) and whether or not the pets play an educational role in the residence,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.39$ ,  $p = .04$  (Table 67). All the units which reported housing pets in animal shelters indicated an educational role for the pet. There is little difference in the presence or absence of an educational role in those units which do not house pets this way.

Table 67

Housing the Pets in Animal Shelters by Having an Educational Role for the Pets

Educational Role for the Pet	Housing the Pets in Animal Shelters		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	8	24	32
No	0	21	21
TOTAL	8	45	53

Missing Observations = 1       $\chi^2 = 4.39$       df = 1      p = .04

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Significant relationships are found between keeping the pets in the playroom and lounge of the residence and the size of the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.09$ ,  $p = .05$  (Table 56) and the supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.82$ ,  $p = .01$  (Table 68). Units which house the pets in the playroom or lounge reported supervising all or some

of the children when they are with the pets.

Table 68

Housing the Pets in a Playroom or Lounge by Supervision of the Children with the Pets

Supervision of the Children	Housing the Pets in a Playroom or Lounge		Total
	Yes	No	
No children	0	13	13
Some children	2	17	19
All children	5	7	12
TOTAL	7	37	44

Missing Observations = 10       $\chi^2 = 8.82$       d f = 2      p = .01

There are no significant relationships between keeping the pets in the children's rooms and the other 35 variables.

Housing the pets in rooms in the residence other than the children's rooms or the playroom/lounge is found to be significantly related to the supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.12$ , p = .02 (Table 69) and the presence or absence of a therapeutic role for the pet,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.82$ , p = .03 (Table 70). Some or all the children are supervised with the pets in those units which keep pets in these rooms.

Table 69

Housing the Pets in Other Rooms in the Residence by Supervision of the Children with the Pets

Supervision of the Children	Housing of the Pets in Other Rooms		Total
	Yes	No	
No children	0	13	13
Some children	7	12	19
All children	1	11	12
TOTAL	8	36	44

Missing Observations = 10       $\chi^2 = 8.12$       d f = 2      p = .02

Table 70 shows that all the units that house pets in these other rooms have a therapeutic role for the pets. There is little difference between the presence and absence of this type of role for those units which did report this type of housing.

As indicated in Table 56 there is a significant relationship between the size of the pets and housing the pets in a classroom,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.51, p = .009$ .

Table 70

Housing of the Pets in Other Rooms in the Residence by Whether or  
Not there is a Therapeutic Role for the Pet

Therapeutic Role for the Pet	Housing of the Pets in Other Rooms		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	8	23	31
No	0	22	22
TOTAL	8	45	53

Missing Observations = 1       $\chi^2 = 4.82$       d f = 1      p = .03

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

3(d) Supervision of the children with the pets. As indicated previously, the supervision of the children with the pets is found to be significantly related to the size of the pets,  $\chi^2(4) = 11.50$ , p = .02 (Table 57) and housing the pets in the playroom or lounge,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.82$ , p = .01 (Table 68) or in other rooms (excluding the children's rooms) in the residence,  $\chi^2(2) = 8.12$ , p = .02 (Table 69).

A significant relationship is also found between supervision of the children with the pets and the person who cares for the pets,  $\chi^2(4) = 16.11$ , p = .003. As Table 71 illustrates, the children care for the pets primarily in those units where none of the children are supervised with the pets, whereas the staff care for the pets in the units where all the children are supervised. In the majority of the units where the care of the pets is shared, supervision of some of the children is required.

Table 71

Supervision of the Children with the Pets by the Person Who Cares  
for the Pets

Person Who Cares for the Pets	Supervision of the Children			Total
	No Children	Some Children	All Children	
Children alone	4	1	1	6
Staff alone	0	0	4	4
Children and staff	9	18	7	34
TOTAL	13	19	12	44

Missing Observations = 10       $\chi^2 = 16.11$       d f = 4      p = .003

Supervision of the children is also related to whether or not there was any planning involved in the introduction of the pets to the unit,  $\chi^2(2) = 17.33$ , p = .0002. Table 72 illustrates that planning was conducted more often when some or all the children must be supervised with the pets.

Table 72

Supervision of the Children with the Pets by Whether the  
Introduction of the Pets was Planned

Pet's Introduction Planned	Supervision			Total
	No Children	Some Children	All Children	
Yes	2	16	8	26
No	11	2	4	17
TOTAL	13	18	12	43

Missing Observations = 11       $\chi^2 = 17.33$       d f = 2      p = .0002

Significant relationships also exist between the supervision of the children with the pets and the roles the pets play in the unit (see Table 73). Those units which supervise some of the children tend to have an educational role for the pet, whereas those units which supervise none of the children tend to have no such role,  $\chi^2(2) = 11.09$ ,  $p = .004$ . Those units supervising some of the children tend to have a therapeutic role for the pets, whereas the units which supervise none of the children or all of the children are almost equally divided between those with a therapeutic role and those without,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.70$ ,  $p = .008$ .

Table 73

Supervision of the Children with the Pets by the Role of the Pet in the Unit

Role of the Pet	Supervision			Total
	No Children	Some Children	All Children	
<hr/>				
Educational				
Yes	4	17	6	27
No	8	2	6	16
TOTAL	12	19	12	43
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 11		$\chi^2 = 11.09$	<u>d f</u> = 2	<u>p</u> = .004
<hr/>				
Therapeutic				
Yes	6	17	5	28
No	7	2	7	16
TOTAL	13	19	12	44
<hr/>				
Missing Observations = 10		$\chi^2 = 9.70$	<u>d f</u> = 2	<u>p</u> = .008

3(e) The person who cares/cared for the pets. Significant relationships are found between the person who cares for the pets and supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(4) = 16.11$ ,  $p = .003$  (Table 71) and whether or not the pet plays an educational role in the residence  $\chi^2(2) = 10.35$ ,  $p = .006$  (Table 74). The pets have an educational role in all but two of the units in which the care of the pets is shared, but in none of the units in which the staff care for the pets. There is little difference in the presence or absence of an educational role in those units in which the children provide the care.

Table 74

Person Who Cares for the Pets by Whether or Not the Pet  
has an Educational Role

Educational Role for the Pet	Person Who Cares for the Pet			Total
	Children	Staff	Both	
Yes	3	0	29	32
No	4	5	12	21
TOTAL	7	5	41	53
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2 = 10.35$	$d f = 2$	$p = .006$	

3(f) The planning conducted before the pets were introduced to the facility. The planning conducted was investigated in terms of whether or not specific types of planning had occurred (i.e., an inquiry into the nature of care required for the pets, preparation of the children and the pets, and changes made to the facility to accommodate the pets). Table 72 shows that there is a significant relationship between whether or not planning was conducted and the supervision

of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 17.33$ ,  $p = .0002$ .

Planning the introduction of the pets is also related to having an educational role for the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.44$ ,  $p = .02$  (see Table 75).

Inquiring into the nature of care required for the pets is found to be significantly related to preparing the children for the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.13$ ,  $p = .02$  (see Table 76). All but one of the units which made an inquiry into the care of the pets reported that the children were prepared for the pets.

Table 75

Planning the Introduction of the Pet to the Unit by an Educational Role for the Pet

Educational Role for the Pet	Planning the Introduction		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	25	6	31
No	9	11	20
TOTAL	34	17	51
Missing Observations = 3	$\chi^2^* = 5.44$	$d f = 1$	$p = .02$

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Table 76

Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by Preparation of the  
Children for the Pets

Preparation of the Children	Inquiry into the Care of the Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	17	5	22
No	1	5	6
TOTAL	18	10	28

Missing Observations = 26       $\chi^2 = 5.13$       df = 1      p = .02

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Allowing a child's pet from home to visit the residence is also found to be significantly related to inquiring into the care required for the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.18$ , p = .03. As Table 77 illustrates, all those units which allow some types of animals to visit the children made some inquiry into the care required. Those units which allow all types of pets to visit also tended to make this type of preparation, whereas those which do not allow any pets to visit tended not to make such inquiries.

Table 77

Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by Whether a Child's Pet  
Can Visit the Residence

Pet Which Can Visit	Inquiry into the Care of the Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
All animals	9	6	15
Some animals	5	0	5
No animals	2	6	8
TOTAL	16	12	28

Missing Observations = 26       $\chi^2 = 7.18$       d f = 2      p = .03

Planning the care of the pet is also significantly related to having an educational role for the pet,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.66$ , p = .02. As shown in Table 78, all but one of the units which planned the care of the pets has an educational role for the pets.

Table 78

Inquiry into the Care Required by the Pets by an Educational  
Role for the Pets

Educational Role for the Pets	Inquiry into the Care of the Pets		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	17	6	23
No	1	6	7
TOTAL	18	12	30

Missing Observations = 24       $\chi^{2*} = 5.66$       d f = 1      p = .02

\* Chi square with yates' correction.

Preparation of the staff for the introduction of the pets was not analyzed as there was only one value present for this variable.

As Table 76 has shown, the preparation of the children for the introduction of the pets is significantly related to inquiring into the nature of care required for the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.13$ ,  $p = .02$ .

Preparation of the facility for the pets has been shown to be related to keeping small rodents as pets in Table 62,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.61$ ,  $p = .003$ .

3(g) The professional orientation of the person who introduced the pets to the facility. There is found to be no significant relationships between the professional orientation of the person who introduced the pets to the facility and the other 35 variables.

3(h) The position of the person who introduced the pets to the facility. The position of the introducer of the pets is found to be significantly related to the size of the pets, as shown in Table 58,  $\chi^2(2) = 12.58$ ,  $p = .002$ , and to the keeping of fish as pets, as illustrated in Table 60,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.56$ ,  $p = .01$ .

3(i) The allowance of a child to bring his pet from home to stay at the facility. All but one of the relationships could not be analyzed because the expected frequencies in one or more cells were less than one.

3(j) The allowance of a child's pet from home to visit the facility. The allowance of all, some, or none of the children's pets from home to visit the facility is found to be significantly related to keeping fish as pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 6.62$ ,  $p = .04$  (Table 61) and inquiring

into the care required by the pets before they were introduced to the residence,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.18$ ,  $p = .03$  (Table 77).

3(k) The role of the pet in the facility. The presence or absence of an educational role for the pet has been shown to be significantly related to the size of the pets in the unit,  $\chi^2(2) = 7.55$ ,  $p = .02$  (Table 59), the supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 11.09$ ,  $p = .004$  (Table 73), the person who cares for the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 10.35$ ,  $p = .006$  (Table 74), the planning conducted before the pets were introduced,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.44$ ,  $p = .02$  (Table 75), and inquiring into the care required by the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.66$ ,  $p = .02$  (Table 78).

Educational role is also found to be significantly related to therapeutic role,  $\chi^2(1) = 8.45$ ,  $p = .004$ . As illustrated in Table 79, those units that have an educational role for the pet also tend to have a therapeutic role.

Table 79  
Having an Educational Role for the Pets by Having  
a Therapeutic Role for the Pets

Therapeutic Role	Educational Role		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	24	6	30
No	8	14	22
TOTAL	32	20	52
Missing Observations = 2	$\chi^2^* = 8.45$	$df = 1$	$p = .004$

\*Chi square with Yates' correction.

The presence or absence of a therapeutic role for the pet has been shown to be significantly related to the size of the pet,  $\chi^2(2) = 16.99$ ,  $p = .0002$  (Table 59), keeping dogs as pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 12.98$ ,  $p = .0003$  (Table 65), the supervision of the children with the pets,  $\chi^2(2) = 9.70$ ,  $p = .008$  (Table 73), and the presence or absence of an educational role for the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 8.45$ ,  $p = .004$  (Table 79).

Therapeutic role is also found to be significantly related to whether or not the unit experienced problems with the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.38$ ,  $p = .02$ . As Table 80 shows, all but one of the units that have experienced problems with the pets reported a therapeutic role for the pet. Those units which have had no problems with their pets were almost equally divided between those with an educational role and those without.

Table 80

## Therapeutic Role for the Pets by Problems with the Pets

Problems with the Pets	Therapeutic Role		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	11	1	12
No	20	21	41
TOTAL	31	22	53
Missing Observations = 1	$\chi^2^* = 5.38$	$d f = 1$	$p = .02$

\* Chi square with Yates' correction.

Problems with the pets. Problems with the pets was analyzed in terms of whether or not there were problems with the pet program in general, and more specifically in terms of problems with the care of

the pets, the staff, the children, the facility, and the pets. Problems in general and problems with the care of the pets are not significantly related to any of the other 35 variables; problems with the staff and problems with the facility could not be analyzed (i.e., there were expected cell frequencies less than one). However, problems with the children is related to restrictions on the access of the children to the pets,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.86$ ,  $p = .05$  (Table 66), and problems with the pets is related to having a therapeutic role for the pet,  $\chi^2(1) = 5.38$ ,  $p = .02$  (Table 80).

#### Additional Information on the Use of Pets

Advice on the use of pets. Respondents experienced with pets were asked what advice they would give anyone wanting to introduce pets to their facility. Their responses are summarized in Table 81. Forty percent of those who were asked for advice mentioned that they had no advice to offer. Other respondents, however, were quite generous with their advice, with one unit offering nine items. The advice offered varied. Only six items were mentioned by more than two respondents. These items were: designate one person to supervise the care of the pets, ensure that the staff are willing to assume the care of the pets after the initial enthusiasm has worn off for the children, determine if any of the children are allergic to the pet before it is obtained, make sure there is adequate space for the pet, and determine beforehand how many and what types of pets will be allowed.

Those who might keep pets in the future were asked what type of information they felt was needed before setting up a pet program. As Table 82 illustrates, allergies of the children in care, cost of

Table 81

## Advice on Pet Programs Given by Respondents by the Keeping of Pets

Advice	Keeping of Pets		Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	
<u>Care of the Pets</u>			
designate one person to supervise the care of pets	4	0	4
evaluate the difficulty and amount of care pets will require	2	0	2
set guidelines for the care of the pets	1	1	2
decide who will care for the pets beforehand	1	0	1
determine who will care for pets during vacations	1	0	1
must be committed to providing a home for the pet	1	0	1
all staff and children should feel responsible for the pet	1	0	1
<u>Staff</u>			
staff should be willing to assume the care of pets	2	1	3
staff should be interested in and comfortable with pets	1	1	2
staff must understand their duties for pet's care	2	0	2
staff should be prepared for fights and jealousy over pets	1	0	1
all staff should be in favor of the pets	1	0	1
house parents should own the pet in a group home	1	0	1
<u>Children</u>			
determine if any of the children are allergic beforehand	3	0	3
prepare the children for the responsibility of having a pet	2	1	3
children must understand their duties for pet's care	2	0	2
all children should be able to handle the pet	0	2	2
always supervise emotionally disturbed with the pets	1	1	2
the children should want the pet	1	0	1
let a child request a pet more than once	1	0	1
involve the children from the planning stages	1	0	1
should understand pet will be removed if not cared for	1	0	1
prepare children for possibility of pet's death	1	0	1
14-16 year olds should have sole responsibility for pet	1	0	1
<u>Facility</u>			
make sure there is adequate space for the pet	2	1	3
pets should fit into existing routine and program	1	0	1
<u>Pets</u>			
determine how many and what types allowed	2	1	3

Continued

Table 81 (continued)

determine how quickly pets can reproduce	1	0	1
decide what will be done with any offspring	1	0	1
have only one pet at a time	1	0	1
if more than one pet, make sure they are compatible	1	0	1
do not introduce pets that could be abused with emotionally disturbed	1	0	1
dogs are more functional than fish or cats	1	0	1
fish are interesting to watch	1	0	1
<u>Program</u>			
what pet will best achieve the purpose of the program	2	0	2
calculate the costs of total care of the pet	2	0	2
determine the purpose of introducing a pet	1	0	1
determine if the expectations are reasonable	1	0	1
plan introduction of the pets carefully	1	0	1
be prepared to spend more money and time than expected	0	1	1
allow time for children, staff and pets to get acquainted	0	1	1
pets are more appropriate where there are few children	0	1	1
do not allow children to bring pets from home into a group home	1	0	1
do not allow children to have individual pets	1	0	1
pets help to normalize residential living	1	0	1
Other	3	0	3
Do not introduce pets	1	1	2
No advice to offer	23	5	28

care for the pets (food, veterinary fees), information on the proper care of the pet, and diseases that the pet might contact or carry were mentioned most frequently.

Table 82

## Information Felt Needed by Those Considering Pet Programs in the Future

Information Needed	Total
<u>Care of the pets</u>	
information on the proper care of the pet	2
<u>Staff</u>	
allergies of the staff	1
<u>Children</u>	
allergies of the children	3
phobias of the children	1
<u>Pets</u>	
diseases that the pet might contact or carry	2
reproduction process of the pet	1
different types of breeds or species available	1
reaction of the pets towards children	1
appropriate pets for different type of children	1
<u>Program</u>	
cost of care (foods, veterinary fees)	3
will pet be a help or hindrance to the children	1
<u>Facility</u>	
adequacy of the facility for the pet	1
Other	1

Plans for the future. The majority (81%) of the respondents reported that they had no plans for the future regarding pets. As Table 83 indicates, this response occurred in all three types of units.

Table 83

## Definite Plans for the Future for Pets by the Keeping of Pets

Response	Keeping of Pets			Total
	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	
Yes	11	1	1	13
No	43	14	8	65
No answer	0	1	1	2
TOTAL	54	16	10	80

Those units that would never keep pets. Those units that responded that they had never and would never keep pets were asked for their reasons. The respondents were asked to rank their reasons in order of importance, but as only a few complied, the reasons are presented in Table 84 in frequency only. A fear that the children would harm the animals was the most frequent response, followed by inadequate space. Five respondents said that keeping pets would have no benefits for the children.

Table 84

## Reasons Pets Would Never Be Kept in Some Units

Reasons	Total
Children may harm the animals	8
Inadequate space	6
Inadequate number of staff	5
Animals may pose health problems	5
Policy of the facility	5
No benefits to the children	5
Animals may harm the children	3
Cost of care	3
Staff are inexperienced	2
Short-term stays of the children	2
Pets are inappropriate for this type of facility	2
Pets are prohibited by health regulations	1
Landlord or owner of facility prohibits pets	1
Allergies of the staff or children	1

The second question posed to this group was whether or not they thought there were any advantages to a child having a pet. Three respondents said that there was no advantage. An additional three stated that pets had no advantages to a child in an institutional setting. Table 85 presents the educational and therapeutic advantages that these respondents reported. Teaching about responsibility and animals and providing a nonthreatening relationship were the advantages most frequently mentioned.

Table 85

Advantages of a Child Having a Pet as Seen by Those Who Would  
Never Keep Pets in Their Unit

Advantages	Total
<u>Educational</u>	
teaches responsibility	6
teaches about animals (care, habits, handling)	4
pets serve as models for human emotions and behavior	2
teaches about life and death	1
teaches respect for living things	1
<u>Therapeutic</u>	
pet provide a nonthreatening, affectionate relationship	4
companionship	2
care for others	1
Advantage not described	1
No advantage to a child in an institutional setting	3
No advantage to a child	3

These respondents were also asked if they would consider implementing a pet program if a facility similar to theirs found that keeping pets on the premises had beneficial results for the children. One-third of the units said that they would consider implementing such a program. For those that responded "no", inadequate space and an inadequate number of staff were the reasons mentioned most frequently (see Table 86).

Table 86

Reasons Pets Would Never Be Kept Even if a Similar Facility Found  
Pets Beneficial for Children

Reason	Total
Inadequate space	5
Inadequate number of staff	4
Pets pose health problems	1
Children may harm the pets	1
Pets may harm the children	1
Insufficient funds	1
No benefits to the children	1
Pets are incompatible the facility's program and/or philosophy	1
Urban setting is not conducive to the proper care of the pets	1
Landlord or owner of the facility prohibits pets	1
Reason for not keeping pets not given	1
Would consider implementing a pet program	6

## Chapter IV

### DISCUSSION

This study was designed to explore the use of pets in Canadian residential care facilities for children. Previous research in this area is limited to four studies (Levinson, 1968; Sundaram, 1969; Levinson, 1971; Corson et al., 1975), all of which involved facilities in the United States. This investigation concentrated on four areas: 1) the relationship between type of pet use and twelve characteristics of the facilities and the individual units, 2) the difference in the use of pets between those units which keep pets now and those which had kept them in the past, 3) the relationships between the various aspects of pet use in those units which keep pets now, and 4) descriptive information on future plans for the use of pets, advice for those wishing to introduce pets into their facility, and the responses from those units which have never and will never keep pets.

The confidence that can be put in the results of the study is limited by the large number of analyses that were conducted. The comparison of the three types of units (those that keep pets now, those that kept pets in the past, and those that never kept pets) on the characteristics of the facilities and the units (Hypothesis 1) found significant differences for only two (6%) of the 36 analyses conducted. The use of the pets was found to differ significantly between those units that keep pets now and those that kept pets in the past for five (14%) of the 36 variables examined (Hypothesis 2). These 36 variables were compared with

each other for those units that keep pets now (Hypothesis 3); only 752 of these crosstabulations could be statistically analyzed, the remaining having either expected frequencies of less than one in one or more cells, or only one value present for one of the variables. Thirty (4%) significant relationships were found between these variables, all of which involved five of the twelve areas examined. It should be kept in mind, therefore, that it is quite possible the significant relationships that were found could have occurred by chance.

It was thought that the keeping of pets might be related to characteristics of the facilities and the units. However, only two characteristics, the number of children in the unit and whether the children in the unit are from one age group or mixed ages, appear to be related to pet keeping. The keeping of pets appears to be influenced by the number of children in the unit, rather than by the number in the facility as a whole or by the capacity of the facility. Levinson (1972) also found that the number of children in the training schools that he studied had no relationship to the keeping of pets. However, he did not examine the individual living units.

The units which never kept pets tend to serve medium (8-12) or large (13 and over) numbers of children, those which kept pets in the past tend to serve a medium number, whereas those presently keeping pets tend to serve small (1-7) or large numbers of children. It is difficult to interpret this data. Perhaps the small units are trying to simulate a family group by providing full-time houseparents for the children. Pets may be introduced to these settings to enhance the family atmosphere and to provide the children with the benefits that are cited for the child in the home (e.g., Bowley, 1951; Kugelmass, 1959; Ginott, 1965; Levinson,

1972; Spock, 1972). On the other hand, pets have been successfully used in large units, such as a children's psychiatric ward (Yates, 1973; Corson et al., 1975) and a children's home (Burmeister, 1960; Brill and Thomas, 1964).

Why then do those units which kept pets in the past tend to serve a medium number of children and those which never kept pets tend to serve medium or large numbers? Perhaps this was just a chance finding, but it is possible that those units with a medium number of children may also be trying to provide a family atmosphere for the children and may have thought that a pet would be beneficial. However, the very presence of the larger number of children in the unit may require shifts of workers rather than full-time house-parents. This difference in the two types of units may also explain why a higher proportion of those units which kept pets in the past experienced problems with the staff, resulting in the discontinuance of the pet program in some cases. Because the units which never kept pets tend to be larger than a family-style group home, it may not have occurred to the staff as readily that a pet could have a beneficial role in their unit.

The age of the children is not found to be related to the keeping of pets. This finding supports Levinson who described in his book, Pets and Human Development (1972), how pets can be beneficial to people at all stages of the life cycle. The keeping of pets is related, however, to whether or not the children in the unit are of one age group or a mixture of ages. The children in those units which have experience with pets tend to be from different age groups. There is no support in the literature for this finding. It may be that the factors that cause the children to be grouped according to age may also discourage the keeping of

pets in the unit.

The keeping of pets is also not related to the sex of the children in care. It was expected that such a relationship might exist as residential care facilities for boys often incorporate farm work into their programs. However, most of the facilities and units responding to the study served both sexes of children. The small number serving one sex of children showed no significant differences in their keeping of pets, although among those facilities and units keeping pets now twice as many were for males only as for females only.

It was expected that the reason for the child being in care might influence the keeping of pets, but no relationship was found. This is in disagreement with Levinson (1968), who found that residential schools for mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed/socially maladjusted children were more likely to allow the children to own pets than those schools for the blind/partially sighted or the deaf/hard of hearing. It should be noted, however, that Levinson's findings may have been difficult to replicate in the present study as many of the facilities responding served a heterogeneous group of children in care for a variety of reasons, rather than the homogeneous groups that Levinson encountered.

It may be that the categories provided in the questionnaire for the type of children in care were too restrictive. Sundaram (1969) has identified both positive (withdrawn or emotionally deprived) and negative (aggressive or abusive children) situations for children in care due to emotional problems. Matching the personalities of the patient and the pet were an important aspect of the programs conducted by Corson et al. (1975) and Lowie (undated). These studies suggest that the keeping of pets may be influenced more by personally characteristics that exist

across the reasons for being in care than by the reasons themselves. Some support is given to the importance of the children's personalities, as more units which kept pets in the past reported problems with the children in their pet programs, especially in terms of abuse of the pets, than those units that keep pets now. Further research is necessary to clarify this relationship. In-depth interviews with the staff of the residential care facilities might be a more useful method than a survey questionnaire for gathering information on the type of children who were in care.

A shortage of staff, money, indoor and outdoor space, and proper facilities (Levinson, 1968; Sundaram, 1969; Bate, 1979) were reasons cited in the literature for not keeping pets. It was expected, therefore, that the keeping of pets might be related to the child/staff ratio, the budgeted cost per child, the housing style, the children per sleeping unit, the outdoor area, and the pet-related features of the unit. As no significant differences were found, it may be that those factors seen as obstacles to keeping pets in some units are overcome in others. Alternately, the obstacle to keeping pets may not be just one problem but a combination, which could not be determined by the analyses conducted.

It was expected that those units that keep pets now and those that kept pets in the past would differ in their use of pets. However, significant differences were found on only two of the 12 aspects of pet use that were examined, i.e., position of the person who introduced the pet and problems with the pets.

In those units which keep pets now the pets were introduced more often by someone in a management position, whereas in those units where pets were kept in the past the introducer was most often someone in an-

other staff position. One explanation of these findings is that many of those defined as management were houseparents who, being the only staff members in the unit, would probably not have introduced the pets if they did not feel comfortable with or committed to such a program. It may also be that in the larger units there is more commitment to the pet program by the administration when the pets are introduced by someone in a management position. This commitment could be in terms of planning the pet program, allocating sufficient resources (i.e., money, staff, facilities) to the program, or allowing sufficient time for the program to work out any problems before discontinuing it. For example, before Skeezer was introduced to a children's psychiatric ward by the head nurse, an engineering feasibility study was conducted (Dishon, 1970). Further investigation into these aspects of the pet program would have to be conducted before these explanations could be substantiated.

Significantly more units that kept pets in the past experienced problems with their pet programs than those which keep pets now. The problem areas concern the care of the pets, the staff, and the children rather than the pets themselves. Certain problems with the care of the pets and the staff (i.e., the care of the pet being difficult, the staff not wanting to accept responsibility for the care of the pets, and the work schedules of the staff making it difficult to assign pet care duties) were not even mentioned by those units which keep pets now.

Abuse of the pets by the children was the most common problem reported by those that kept pets in the past (reported by 31%) and was the most reported reason for discontinuing a pet program. Most of the comments on abuse of the pets mentioned that the children involved were emotionally disturbed. The description of the problems experienced by

one respondent illustrates the type of problems that can occur:

"... animals were harmed e.g., some children ate the fish, stepped on or crushed turtles, mutilated hamsters. This caused tremendous upset to other children in the unit who were not abusive to the animals."

Respondents from units which keep pets now also reported abuse of the pets in their present program and with pets that are no longer kept, however, the proportion reporting this problem (6%) was much smaller. Abuse was reported in both studies by Levinson (1968, 1971) and as a reason for discontinuing the pet program by Bate (1979).

There is no data regarding the length of time pets have been kept in those units presently keeping pets, or how long the pet programs were allowed to continue in those units which kept pets in the past. This makes it difficult to have confidence in any explanation of these findings as it is possible that those units presently keeping pets have not yet met with problems or that those who kept pets in the past did not allow their programs to continue long enough to work out their problems. It is also possible that those who kept pets in the past had some of the characteristics which lead to problems.

The types of problems on which the two types of units differ may reflect a difference in the children and/or the staff in these units. The comments of the respondents suggest that more units which kept pets in the past have abusing children in care than those which keep pets now. As the questionnaire was not designed to identify the characteristics of the children in care, further research is needed to support this suggestion. The problems with the care of the pets and the staff imply that

the pets were an inconvenience for the staff in those units that kept pets in the past. However, further research, such as interviews with the staff members, would be necessary to determine whether there is an insufficient number of staff for the type of children in care, with the pets being an extra burden to an already heavy workload, or whether these comments actually reflect a negative attitude towards the pet program.

The other types of pet use examined do not seem to have any relationship to whether pets are kept now or in the past. Fish, birds, small rodents, dogs, and cats were the most popular pets in both types of units as well as in Levinson's studies of residential schools for exceptional children (1968) and training schools (1971).

The pets in the unit were owned more often by the facility or the staff than by the children. Only 18.8% of the units in the study allowed the children to own pets compared to 40.7% of the residential schools for exceptional children and 41% of the training schools studied by Levinson (1968, 1971). These differences may reflect a difference in the types of facilities studied. Levinson's studies were conducted on residential schools and training schools where the children were most likely enrolled for a certain length of time; many of the facilities in this study were group homes and residential treatment centres which keep the children for short terms or indefinite lengths of time. The staff may be more willing to allow a child to own a pet when they know how long the child will be in the facility.

Although few of the units permitted the children to own pets, the majority allowed them access to the pets in their free time. It was thought that where the pets were housed would influence the amount of exposure the children had to the pets. Although only one-quarter of the

units housed the pets in the children's rooms, the majority housed them inside the residence, with 15 allowing the pets a free run of the unit. Levinson (1971) reported that over half of the training schools he studied housed the pets in the children's rooms but this difference might be attributed to the structure of the units; the children's rooms may have been the most suitable area to house the pets in the training schools.

The literature revealed that pets were no longer kept or were never kept because of the actual or feared problems of the children abusing the pets or the pets harming the children (Levinson, 1968; Levinson, 1971; Sundaram, 1969; Bate, 1979). This suggested that there might be a difference in the supervision of the children with the pets between those units which keep pets now and those which kept pets in the past and also between the different types of children in the unit. No differences were found, however, even though more units that kept pets in the past experienced problems with the children abusing the pets.

In 80% of the units, the care of the pets was shared by the children and the staff. This is in agreement with Ginott (1965) who stressed that the care of the pet should be shared with the adult assuming the final responsibility. Levinson (1968, 1971), however, found that in half of the residential schools that he studied, the staff took care of the pets and in the other half, the children provided the care. In the training schools, almost half of the schools indicated that the children took care of the pets, whereas in the other half the care was shared by the children and the staff. It may be that the staff in Levinson's studies did not interpret supervising the children in their care of the pets as sharing the care.

As both Levinson (1969) and Burmeister (1960) have stressed that

the introduction of the pet to the facility should be planned, it was expected that there would be a difference on this variable between those units that keep pets now and those units that had discontinued keeping pets. However, no significant difference was found. Those that did not plan the introduction of the pets stated that they did not experience any problems due to a lack of planning. It is difficult to explain these results. Perhaps the planning was not consciously done by some of the units which reported making no preparations for the pet, or maybe planning makes no difference in determining whether a unit will keep their pet program.

The literature has indicated a great variety in the professional orientation of the people using pets with children in residential care. This study also revealed a variety, with education being the most frequent. No relationship, however, was found between the keeping of pets and professional orientation. It seems that the keeping of the pets is not due to a specific professional training but rather to some other factors not studied in this investigation (i.e., the past experience of the staff).

Levinson has suggested that allowing a child's pet from home to stay at the facility or to visit it can be beneficial to the child. This study revealed that the majority (64%) of the units surveyed would not allow the pets to stay at the facility, but over half (53%) would allow some or all pets to visit. Levinson (1968) found a slightly higher percentage (76%) of the residential schools he surveyed allowed pets to visit. It would be interesting to investigate the reasons given by those who do allow pets to stay or visit and those who do not.

The respondents in this study reported a number of educational and therapeutic roles for their pets. Knowledge about animals was the

most frequently mentioned educational role, followed by teaching the children about responsibility; sex education, reproduction, and the life cycle; and cooperation and sharing. The therapeutic roles mentioned most frequently are helping the child to care about others, providing a non-threatening relationship, entertainment, and companionship. All these roles have been cited in the literature. Levinson (1968), in his survey of residential schools for exceptional children, reported that the pets were used more as an educational rather than a therapeutic tool. In this study, however, a similar number of units reported each type of role. Educational roles may have been predominate in Levinson's study because the facilities sampled were schools.

Some of the respondents gave very insightful descriptions of the therapeutic roles of their pets, suggesting that a lot of thought has been given to this subject. Two of these comments are:

"The large dog supplies a comfort and reality far removed from probing authoritarian teachers, counsellors and psychologists."

"We have found that our dog has taken the responsibility of assisting a new child to break some of his/her barriers in relating to our staff and their peers. Also when no one understands our dog manages to be there for comfort. Older children may not talk to or hug a teddy bear but they lavish a lot of affection on our dog."

One-third of the respondents indicated that there was no educational role for their pets and one-third indicated that there was no therapeutic role. Twenty-one of the units stated that there was neither an educational role nor a therapeutic role for their pets. These units

may have misunderstood the word, "role", thinking that it meant a formally defined duty for the pet. It is also possible that the respondents may not have assessed the value of having a pet in their unit.

The number of units reporting roles for their pets was more than expected. Sundaram (1969) found that the use of pets was usually unplanned and circumstantial. It is not known whether the roles reported were part of a planned program or were noticed after the pet was introduced or after the questionnaire forced the respondent to consider the issue.

An exploratory analysis was conducted comparing the pet use variables with each other for those units which keep pets now. Although the literature offers little explanation for these results, some suggestions will be offered to explain the 30 significant relationships that were found.

Fourteen significant relationships involve the type of pets kept, in terms of the size of the pet and the keeping of certain types of pets (i.e., fish, small rodents, cats, and dogs).

Four types of housing appear to be used mainly by certain sizes of pets. A free run of the inside of the residence was reported by only those units with large pets or both sizes of pets because cats and dogs are the only pets in the study allowed this type of housing. It is for this reason that keeping cats as pets is also related to allowing the pets a free run of the inside of the residence. Similarly, animal shelters house mostly rabbits and farm animals. The playroom or lounge and the classroom are reserved almost exclusively for the small animals.

Small animals tend to be introduced by the staff and large pets tend to be introduced by management. The staff may introduce small pets because the extra care and cost required by the larger animals would need

approval, resulting in the management receiving credit for introducing the pet, or the staff not wanting to bother with the red tape involved and opting for a smaller animal instead. Fish, a relatively easy to care for and inexpensive type of pet, were introduced significantly more by staff than management, offering some support to these suggestions.

Supervision of the children with the pets is often required to protect the children from the pets (i.e., bites or scratches) or to protect the pets from physical or sexual abuse by the children. Large animals are better able to protect themselves from physical abuse but are more susceptible to sexual abuse and can inflict more severe injuries on the children than the smaller animals. It is also easier to supervise the children with the smaller pets as they can be housed in a cage or a tank which can be kept in a locked room, if necessary. It is difficult to say whether the type of pet chosen was determined by the amount of supervision required. Those units which serve children who are able to handle a pet may have felt freer to acquire a large pet than those in which some or all of the children would have to be supervised. The other units with large pets may not have realized until after the pet was acquired that some of the children could not handle a pet or may have felt that the benefits derived from having a large pet outweighed the extra work involved in supervising the children.

Educational and therapeutic roles for the pets are reported by most of the units that keep both sizes of pets, whereas those units which keep large pets only tend not to have an educational role for the pet, and those units which keep small pets only tend not to have a therapeutic role. These findings suggest that small pets tend to play an educational role whereas large pets tend to play a therapeutic role, and that many

units keep both types of pets for these purposes. The literature includes many references to the educational value of small animals in the classroom (e.g., Healer, 1972; Reed, 1973; Roswell, 1974; Toll, 1974; Caras, 1976). Large pets (especially dogs and cats) are mentioned most frequently in articles on the therapeutic value of pets (e.g., Lowie, undated; Burmeister, 1960; Levinson, 1969; Levinson, 1971; Yates, 1973; Corson et al., 1975). Small animals are ideal for classroom situations as they are easily observed in their tank or cage, require relatively little care, and have short gestation periods. However, they are not able to take as active a part in the child's life as dogs and cats can.

Dogs are the animals mentioned most frequently in the literature as therapeutic aides for children (e.g., Levinson, 1969; Levinson, 1972; Yates, 1973; Corson et al., 1975). It is not surprising, therefore, that a significant relationship was found in this study between keeping dogs as pets and having a therapeutic role for the pet. Corson et al. (1975) chose dogs for their study in pet-facilitated psychotherapy because, "Dogs exhibit a wide spectrum and richness of emotional reactions comparable to those shown by humans." (p. 279) Two prominent qualities of dogs, "their ability to offer love and tactile reassurance without criticism and their perpetual innocent dependence that may stimulate our natural tendency to offer support and protection", tend to foster human-dog relationships (Corson et al., 1975, p. 277). In addition to these emotional qualities, dogs have therapeutic value as seeing-eye dogs for the blind and hearing-ear dogs for the deaf.

The keeping of dogs is also related to the keeping of cats as pets, with 80% of the units with cats also keeping a dog. However, only half of the dog owners keep cats. It is difficult to suggest a reason

for this relationship other than it is fairly common for people to keep both a dog and a cat as pets. These two types of pets are quite different in terms of dependence and temperament and Fox (1975) has suggested that their owners may keep them for different reasons. Dog owners tend to be "other-directed" and attracted to having the dog as a dependent companion, whereas cat owners tend to be "inner-directed" people who appreciate the cat's independence and are attracted to its aesthetic qualities. Keeping both types of pets would provide satisfaction for both types of people in the unit. It is difficult to explain why more cat owners keep dogs than dog owners keep cats without more information about their reasons for keeping these pets.

Keeping fish as pets is related to the allowance of the children's pets from home to visit the unit. All those units which allow some types of pets to visit keep fish as pets. Further information is needed to determine if the pets allowed to visit must also be enclosed in a tank or a cage. It may be that the reasons for keeping fish are similar to the reasons for not allowing all pets to visit (i.e., policy of the facility against keeping larger animals, fear that the children would abuse or not be able to properly handle a larger type of pet).

Small rodents are kept as pets in most of the units which reported preparing the facility for their pets. The comments on the questionnaires revealed that these preparations involved building cages for the rodents. All or some of the children are supervised when the pets are housed in a playroom or lounge, or in a room other than the children's rooms. This may be because, as some respondents reported, these rooms are open only when a staff member is present.

The staff are most likely to care for the pets in the units

where all the children must be supervised because the children are probably unable to care for a pet. Similarly, in those units where the children are trusted alone with the pets, they are also trusted with their care. The staff and children may share the care of the pets in those units where some of the children are supervised in order to allow the children to benefit from the experience of caring for the pet, while at the same time protecting the children and the pets.

Planning the introduction of the pet to the unit is related to the supervision of the children with the pets, with two-thirds of the units which supervise all the children and 89% of the units which supervise some of the children conducting some planning, compared to only 15% of those units in which there is no supervision. The obvious explanation is that the presence of children in the unit who might harm or be harmed by the pets required the staff to plan their pet program. Planning appears to be even more important in the units where only some of the children are supervised because it is distressing to the other children if the pet is abused and has to be removed from the unit for this or another reason (e.g., allergic reactions to the pet). It may also be that the staff supervise the children when they are with the pets and planned the pet's introduction to the unit because they are committed to the pet program.

Most of the units that supervise some of the children with the pets reported an educational role for the pet, whereas only about one-half of the units that supervise all the children and one-third of the units that provide no supervision reported such a role. It may be easier to observe the roles that the pets play when only certain children are supervised; these roles may not be noticed as readily when the children

are not supervised or when the staff's attention is drawn elsewhere by the demands of supervising all the children. An alternate suggestion is that the pet may have been planned as an educational tool for certain problem children. Some support is offered for this latter suggestion in that the pet's introduction to the unit was planned by most of the units that supervise some of the children and by most of the units that have an educational role for the pet. This view is further supported by the data indicating that a therapeutic role for the pet is reported by most of the units which supervise some of the children, compared to less than half of the units that supervise all or none of the children.

Restrictions on the access of the children to the pets are reported by two-thirds of the units whose problems with the pet programs concern the children. This is a common way of handling such a problem. The analysis does not reveal, however, whether the restrictions were for the child's sake (i.e., allergies or a fear of animals) or for the pet's sake (i.e., abuse).

All the units which reported housing the pets in animal shelters also reported having an educational role for the pet. It is not known, however, whether the educational role reported was for the pet kept in the shelter or for another pet kept on the premises. Rabbits and farm animals are the main types of pets housed this way. One unit in the study keeps chickens and allows the children to sell the eggs for business experience. Also, rabbits are frequently mentioned as good pets for teaching sex and reproduction (e.g., Anderson, 1974).

Housing the pets in rooms in the residence other than the playroom, lounge, or children's rooms is related to the supervision of the children with the pets and having a therapeutic role for the pet. All

the units which house pets in rooms other than the playroom, lounge, or children's rooms reported a therapeutic role for their pets. Again, it is difficult to say whether these roles refer specifically to the pets housed in these other rooms. The types of other rooms mentioned are the kitchen, dining room, and basement, and the animals housed this way are fish, birds, small rodents, rabbits, cats, and dogs. The literature has suggested therapeutic roles for all these types of pets.

The introduction of the pets to the unit was planned in most of the units which reported an educational role for the pet. The planning was mainly concerned with the care required by the pets. This information would be necessary if the educational role of the pet was to teach the children about the animal's care and habits and about responsibility. This is quite likely as these are the two most frequently mentioned educational roles for the pets. Those units which inquired into the care of the pets also prepared the children for the pets. This was probably also in relation to the educational role planned for the pet.

Inquiring into the care of the pets is also related to allowing some or all types of pets from the children's homes to visit the facility. It is difficult to explain this relationship other than to suggest that the inquiry into the care required gave the staff a better perspective on their pets and enabled them to feel more secure in allowing the pets to visit.

Having an educational role for the pets has been shown to be related to planning in general and to inquiring into the care of the pets. It is also related to the person(s) who care(s) for the pets. The care of the pets involves the children when there is an educational role for the pet; most of the units reported that the care is shared by

the staff and children, with the children alone providing the care in the remaining units. This relationship suggests that the education received from keeping pets is learned through caring for them.

The units tend to report both an educational and a therapeutic role for the pets or no role at all. It is difficult to say whether this relationship represents the actual situation; the ability of the respondent to recognize these roles and the time and effort put into answering the questionnaire may have affected these results. In addition, there is no way of knowing whether these roles were planned, or whether they were noticed after the pet was introduced to the facility or when the question was asked in the survey.

All but one of the units which experienced problems with the pets reported a therapeutic role for the pets. This relationship may be due to improper planning, as having a therapeutic role was not found to be related to planning the pet program. The fact that these units still have these pets suggests that their therapeutic value outweighs their inconvenience, or that the staff have a high tolerance for the problems that the pets cause. For example, one respondent wrote, "Our dog digs large holes in the backyard, occasionally chews on the children's shoes and sometimes bothers the neighbours with his barking. We do not consider these serious problems but they are annoying."

Interesting descriptive data was obtained on advice for those wishing to set up a pet program and on the reasons why some units will never keep pets. The respondents offered a wide variety of advice for those wishing to set up a pet program. The suggestions made by those units which kept pets in the past reflect their negative experiences with the pets (i.e., the staff should be interested in the program and com-

fortable with the pets, the children should be able to handle a pet or be well supervised with the pet, and the costs could exceed what is expected). Respondents from those units that keep pets now showed a more positive view of pet-keeping by offering a number of suggestions on aspects of the program that should be investigated before the pets are introduced (e.g., designate one staff member to supervise the care of the pets, and determine if any of the children are allergic, if there is adequate space, and what types and how many pets will be allowed).

The information felt needed by those considering pet programs in the future was of a practical nature (i.e., care of the pets, allergies of the staff and the children, diseases, and cost). Only one respondent reported that information would be needed on whether the pet program would be beneficial to the children; the others may have felt that this was understood and that the question referred to what information would be needed after this had been determined.

Those units that will never keep pets stated most frequently that the reasons were a fear that the children would abuse the pets, inadequate or inexperienced staff, and inadequate space. These reasons were given more often than there being no benefits to the children. Even if a facility similar to theirs found pets to be beneficial to the children, two-thirds stated that the problems of inadequate space and staff would still prohibit a pet program. It would be interesting to investigate whether these respondents interpreted "pets" to include such small, easily cared for pets as fish, birds, and hamsters. Most of these respondents felt that pets could be beneficial to children; the benefits reported, however, were more educational than therapeutic. There seems to be a possibility that pet programs could be introduced into some of these units since one-

third of the respondents are open to the idea of a pet program and most already see some value in pet keeping.

There appears to be an interest in the topic of this research as evidenced by the comments of some respondents and requests for pamphlets summarizing the study. Some of the comments suggest a very favourable attitude towards the keeping of pets in residential care facilities for children. One respondent wrote, "Pets are a major component of normalized residential living. As long as there are no medical reasons not to have pets, they are a must." Pets are an essential part of another unit -- "All staff are encouraged to keep pets. Allergies is the only reason to exclude pets from a particular child or staff."

As Appendix H shows, the proportion of respondents requesting pamphlets was fairly high for the sample as a whole (77%), and for the individual regions (62 - 100%). Pamphlets were requested by respondents in each of the four categories on the keeping of pets. It is hoped that these pamphlets were requested because of an interest in the study rather than because they were a free offer. However, if the latter is the case, perhaps reading the pamphlet will generate an interest in the topic.

This study was an exploratory investigation of the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada. Based on the results of the survey it may be concluded that pets are being used in residential care facilities in Canada in a variety of educational and therapeutic roles. However, the survey does not provide an indication of the extent of pet use. It is quite possible that the response rate is biased in favor of those units which keep pets now.

The extent of pet use in residential care facilities for children

in Canada could be determined by a survey of all the facilities in the population asking the subjects only one question -- "Does your facility keep pets on its premises?" The respondents could be asked to return a postcard with their answer checked off. The ease of answering this type of survey should result in a good response rate and provide a good indication of the situation in Canada. The size of the questionnaire in this study and the time required to complete it (one-half hour) contributed to the fairly low response rate.

The findings of this study cannot be generalized to other residential care facilities. With very little information available on the characteristics of these facilities in Canada, it is not possible to determine if the sample of this study is representative of the population. The lack of an adequate directory of these facilities in Canada made the selection of the sample and the distribution of the questionnaire difficult. The Health and Welfare publication, Listing of Homes for Special Care by Municipality, March, 1978, was a major source of information; unfortunately this directory does not provide addresses for the listings and was not up to date. As a result, 26 sampled facilities were replaced before the questionnaires were distributed because complete addresses could not be found, and 47 facilities were replaced after mailing because the address was wrong, or the facility had moved, or did not meet the sample criteria (see Appendix C).

The low response rate also prohibits generalization. Although suggestions made by Moser and Kalton (1972), Fox (1969), and Statistics Canada (undated) were implemented into the questionnaire to increase responses, the response rate for the data-producing sample was only 27.7% (see Appendix B). The desired response rate (30%) was surpassed in four

regions, with the Maritimes (42.9%) and the Prairies (46.7%) responding especially well; British Columbia (15.2%) and Quebec (15.3%) lowered the overall average. Problems with British Columbia stemmed from not having addresses for most of the facilities and therefore having to rely on the Regional Coordinators to distribute the questionnaires. It is suspected that the poor response rate for Quebec was partly due to the tension between this province and the rest of Canada and partly to the French translation of the questionnaire. Two respondents commented that the translation was poor -- the problem may have been due to regional differences in dialect, as one of the translators was Manitoba French Canadian and the other was Parisian.

The scope of the study did not allow many of the suggested explanations for the findings to be proven. It is suggested that further investigation, through such techniques as in-depth interviews with the staff of the facility and Corson, Corson, and Gwynne's (1975) technique of videotaping the interaction between the pet and the residents of a facility, would provide the type of information needed.

Despite these problems and limitations, the survey did provide useful descriptive information on the benefits and problems of pet keeping in residential care facilities for children, as well as advice for those wishing to set up such a program. This information was compiled into a pamphlet (see Appendix J) to provide some guidelines for those interested in using pets in their facility.

Statistical analysis has suggested two additional conclusions. First, it appears that different types of pets are used for different purposes. Small animals tend to be used for educational purposes whereas large animals, especially dogs, are used as therapeutic aides. The

educational benefits of pets are derived primarily through the children's care of the pets.

Secondly, the type of problems experienced by those units which discontinued their pet programs suggests that the success of a pet program in a residential care facility for children is largely determined by the attitude of the staff and the children towards the pets.

## Chapter V

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to explore the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada.

By combining the listings of a number of directories and government publications, 928 facilities were identified. To be eligible, a facility had to serve children under sixteen years of age who were in care due to specific problems in their development, learning, behavior, and/or family situation. Homes for unwed mothers and private boarding schools primarily for "normal" children were excluded from this study. These facilities were categorized by region (Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, British Columbia and the North) and size. A proportional random sample of 316 was then drawn. A five-part questionnaire was sent to the executive director or administrator of each facility in the sample, asking for information on the facility and the use of pets. Those facilities with more than one residential unit under their auspices were asked to complete as many parts on the use of pets as they had types of pet use.

Eighty-six facilities returned usable questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 27.2%. From these 86 facilities, there were responses from 98 units - 54 keep pets now, 16 kept pets in the past, 10 would consider keeping pets in the future and 18 would never consider keeping pets. The difference between these types of units was analyzed using chi-square, with a significance level of  $p = .05$ . Those units that would consider keeping pets in the future and those that

would never consider keeping pets were combined into one group, pets never kept, for statistical analysis.

There were found to be significant differences ( $p = .03$ ) between those units that keep pets now, that kept pets in the past, and that never kept pets, in terms of the number of children in the unit. Those units that keep pets now tended to have small (1-7) or large (13 and over) numbers of children, those which kept pets in the past tended to have a medium number of children (8-12), and those which never kept pets tended to have medium or large numbers. Also, significantly more units ( $p = .05$ ) which had never kept pets served only one age group, whereas there was an almost equal proportion of units serving one age group as serving a mixed age group when those units experienced with pets were examined. There were no significant differences, however, between the units on the other characteristics of the facility that were examined (capacity and present number of children in the facility, age and sex of the children in the facility, reasons for the children being in care, training of the principal caregivers, child/staff ratio, budgeted cost per child, housing style, number of children per sleeping unit, lot size, other features on the premises, and geographic location).

When compared on their use of pets, significantly more of the units ( $p = .002$ ) that kept pets in the past experienced problems than those units that keep pets now. The difference in the number of units experiencing problems concerned problems with the care of the pets, with the children and especially with the staff members. The person who introduced the pet to the unit was significantly more often ( $p = .03$ ) in a management position in those units keeping pets now and more often in another staff position in those units which kept pets in the past.

No significant differences were found in the use of pets on the other characteristics examined (type of pets, ownership of the pets, access to the pets, housing of the pets, supervision of the children with the pets, person who cares for the pets, planning conducted before the pets were introduced, training of the person who introduced the pets to the unit, the allowance of a child's pet from home to visit or stay at the unit, and the roles the pet played.

Thirty-six characteristics of pet use were compared to each other for those units which keep pets now; thirty significant relationships were found between the variables. The relationships all involved five of the twelve areas examined (i.e., type of pets, supervision of the children with the pets, access of the children to the pets, the planning conducted, and the role of the pet).

It was concluded that pets are being used in Canadian residential care facilities for children in various educational and therapeutic roles. Small animals tend to be used for educational purposes whereas large animals, especially dogs, are used as therapeutic aides. The type of problems experienced by those units which discontinued their pet programs suggests that the success of the program may be largely determined by the attitude of the staff and the children towards the pets.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, M. Can pets help the emotionally disturbed? Instructor, 1974, 84, 76.
- Bate, C. Personal communication, March 14, 1979.
- Blalock, H.M. Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Bossard, J.H. The mental hygiene of owning a dog. Mental Hygiene, 1944, 27, 408-413.
- Bowlby, J. Child care and the growth of love. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1953.
- Bowley, A.H. Child care: A handbook on the care of the child deprived of a normal home life. Edinburgh: E. & S. Livingstone, 1951.
- Bradley, D.R., Bradley, T.D., McGrath, S.G., & Cutcomb, S.D. Type I error rate of the Chi-square test of independence in R X C tables that have small expected frequencies. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86 (6), 1290-1297.
- Brill, K. & Thomas, R. Children in homes. London: Victor Gollancz, 1964.
- Burmeister, E. The professional houseparent. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Canada. Health and Welfare Canada, Welfare Information Systems Branch. Listing of homes for special care by municipality, March 31, 1973. Ottawa, 1973.
- Canada. Health and Welfare Canada, Welfare Information Systems Branch. Listing of homes for special care by municipality, March 31, 1978. Ottawa, 1978.

- Canada. Statistics Canada. Mail surveys: Improving response rates.  
(undated)
- Caras, R. A snake in your classroom? Instructor, October 1976, 86,  
48.
- Child Welfare League of America, Committee on Standards for Residential  
Group Care. Standards for services of child welfare institutions.  
New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1964.
- Corson, S.A., Corson, E. O'L., & Gwynne, P.H. Pet-facilitated psycho-  
therapy. In R.S. Anderson (Ed.), Pet animals and society. London:  
Bailliere Tindall, 1975.
- Dangaard, C. Hard to stay delinquent when pet's a tiger. Winnipeg  
Free Press, April 20, 1977, p. 25.
- Dishon, C. Skeezer: The canine child therapist. Today's Health, 1970  
48, 16-18.
- Duncan, E.S. Parent's Magazine book of baby care: A mother's guide  
to the first six years. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
- Fales, E.D. Can pets help people get well - and stay well? Today's  
Health, 1960, 38, 56-66.
- Fox, D.J. The research process in education. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart,  
& Winston, 1969.
- Fox, M.W. Pet-owners relations. In R.S. Anderson (Ed.), Pet animals  
and society. London: Bailliere Tindall, 1975.
- Friedman, A.S. Implications of the home setting for family treatment.  
In A.S. Friedman (Ed.), Psychotherapy for the whole family. New  
York: Springer Publishing, 1965.
- Gil, D.G. Institutions for children. In A.L. Schorr (Ed.), Children  
and decent people. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

- Ginott, H.G. Between parent and child. New York: Avon Books, 1965.
- Healer, C.P. Rent-a-pet. Science and Children, April 1972, 6.
- Hepworth, H.P. Personal social services in Canada: A review. (Vol. 4: Residential services for children in care). Ottawa: The Canadian Council on Social Development, 1975.
- Huck, S.W., Cormier, W.H., & Bounds, W.G. Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Hylton, L.F. The residential treatment centre: Children, programs and costs. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1964.
- Katz, B. How to be a better parent: Understanding yourself and your child. New York: Ronald Press, 1953.
- Klein, A.F. The professional child care worker: A guide to skills, knowledge, techniques and attitudes. New York: Association Press, 1975.
- Konopka, G. What houseparents should know. In R.J.N. Tod (Ed.), Papers on residential work: Children in care. London: Longmans, Green & Company, 1968.
- Kugelmass, I.N. Complete child care in body and mind. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1959.
- Levinson, B.M. The dog as a "co-therapist". Mental Hygiene, 1962, 46, 59-65.
- Levinson, B.M. Pets: A special technique in child psychotherapy. Mental Hygiene, 1964, 48 (2), 243-248.
- Levinson, B.M. The pet and the child's bereavement. Mental Hygiene, 1967, 51 (2), 197-200.
- Levinson, B.M. Household pets in residential schools: Their therapeutic potential. Mental Hygiene, 1968, 52 (3), 411-414.

- Levinson, B.M. Pet-oriented child psychotherapy. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.
- Levinson, B.M. Household pets in training schools serving delinquent children. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28 (2), 475-481.
- Levinson, B.M. Pets and human development. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.
- Lowie, L.C. Cats and people. Berkeley, California: Berkeley Humane Society. (undated)
- Mason, E.M. The importance to a child of his family. In R. J. N. Tod (Ed.), Papers on residential work: Children in care. London: Longmans, Green & Company, 1968.
- Mayer, M.F., Richman, L.H., and Balcerzak, E.A. Group care of children: Crossroads and transitions. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1977.
- Moser, C.A. and Kalton, G. Survey methods in social investigation. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Ontario. Institutions for children and youth, 1974.
- Rae-Grant, Q. and Moffat, P.J. Children in Canada: Residential care. Toronto: The Canadian Mental Health Association, 1971.
- Reed, J.A. A survey of living animals recommended for elementary school science. School Science and Mathematics, 1973, 73 (7), 535-548.
- Roswell, H.C. Canada's experience with student use of living animals. American Biology Teacher, 1974, 36 (1), 31-36.
- San Diego Unified School District. Zoo project for handicapped children. Final project report. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Dept. of Education, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 098 773)

- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioural sciences.  
Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Spock, B. Children and pets. Redbook, 1972, 138 (3), pp. 26; 29-30.
- Sundaram, S. An exploratory study of the feasibility of utilizing pets as a psychotherapeutic modality in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children. Unpublished master's thesis, Boston University, 1969.
- Toll, D. A home for Miss Muffet. Teacher, December 1974, 92, 51-52.
- Trasler, G. The consequences of separation. In R.J.N. Tod (Ed.), Papers on residential work: Children in care. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1968.
- United States. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.  
Children's Bureau. Institutions serving delinquent children: Guides and goals. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Wolins, M. Group care: Friend or foe? In M. Wolins (Ed.), Successful group care: Explorations in the powerful environment. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1974.
- Yates, E. Dog with a mission. Good Housekeeping, 1973, 176, 80-86.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Sources for the Facilities in the Population

## Sources for the Facilities in the Population

Directories

Directory for exceptional children (7th ed.). Boston: Porter Sargent, 1972.

Directory of Canadian welfare services. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1976.

Directory of correctional services in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Criminology and Corrections Association, 1974.

Directory of juvenile and adult correctional departments, institutions, agencies and paroling authorities. United States and Canada.

Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1978.

Ellingston, C., and Cass, J. Directory of facilities for the learning disabled and handicapped. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Rae-Grant, Q., and Moffat, P.J. Children in Canada: Residential Care. Toronto: Canadian Mental Health Association, 1971.

Residences accommodating over 30 people by province. Downsview, Ont.: NIMR, 1978. (mimeographed copy)

Residential services: Community housing options for handicapped people. Downsview, Ont.: NIMR, 1975.

Schools and classes for the deaf in Canada. American Annals of the Deaf, 1979, 124 (2), 185-189.

Government Listings

Alberta. Social Services and Community Health. Social Care Facilities Licensing. Children's institutions operating in the province of

- Alberta. January, 1979. (mimeographed copy)
- Belford, Joan, Program Executive: Family Services, Community Services Division, Manitoba Department of Health and Community Services. Personal Communication, April 19, 1979.
- Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare, Research and Statistics Division. Health Care Series #24. Survey of residential and in-patient centres for emotionally disturbed children, Canada, 1968, and directory of participating treatment centres. Ottawa, 1970.
- Canada. Health and Welfare Canada. Welfare Information Systems Branch. Listing of homes for special care by municipality, March 31, 1978. Ottawa, 1978.
- Kehoe, M., Placement and Support Services Supervisor, Yukon Department of Human Resources. Personal communication, April 17, 1979.
- Mair, James B., Coordinator of Children in Care, Prince Edward Island Department of Social Services. Personal Communication, April 24, 1979.
- Mathers, Evelyn, Coordinator of Program Review and Development, Office of Residential Care, Manitoba Department of Health and Social Development. Personal communication, May 4, 1979.
- New Brunswick. Department of Health and Welfare. Study of health facilities in the province of New Brunswick, 1970 (Vol. 1).
- Newfoundland and Labrador. Department of Social Services. Division of Juvenile Corrections. Untitled. (a photocopied list of residential facilities for children with special needs)
- Nova Scotia. Department of Public Welfare. Directory of welfare personnel and resources in Nova Scotia, 1972.

Nova Scotia: Department of Social Services. Directory of social services personnel and resources in Nova Scotia, 1973.

Ontario. Institutions for children and youth, 1974.

Québec. Ministère des Affaires sociales. Direction générale de la programmation. Liste des centres de readaption pour handicapés physiques. (no date)

Québec. Ministère des Affaires sociales. Direction générale des programmes de services sociaux. Liste des centres de readaption pour handicapés mentaux. (no date)

Québec. Ministère des Affaires sociales. Direction générale des programmes de services sociaux. Liste des centres de readaption pour mesadaptés sociaux. (no date)

Usher, Trudy, Chief of Family and Children's Services, Northwest Territories Department of Social Services. Personal communication, April 30, 1979.

APPENDIX B

Description of the Population and the Sample

Table B <sub>1</sub>	Residential Care Facilities for Children -- Population and Sample Sizes
Table B <sub>2</sub>	Response Rate by Region and Keeping of Pets

Table B<sub>1</sub>  
RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN  
POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES

PROVINCE	1-9	10-24	25-49	50-99	100-199	200-299	300-499	500	NO SIZE	TOTAL
Newfoundland	8	4	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	21
P. E. I.	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Nova Scotia	8	8	9	5	1	2	0	0	0	33
New Brunswick	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	7
MARITIMES	19 (7)	13 (4)	14 (5)	10 (3)	4 (1)	3 (1)	0	0	0	63 (21)
QUEBEC	6 (2)	28 (9)	31 (11)	52 (18)	51 (17)	8 (3)	6 (2)	4 (1)	26 (9)	212 (72)
ONTARIO	101 (34)	62 (21)	26 (9)	16 (6)	20 (7)	4 (1)	2 (1)	4 (1)	4 (1)	239 (81)
Manitoba	35	3	7	1	3	1	0	1	0	51
Saskatchewan	11	10	4	3	1	0	1	1	4	35
Alberta	38	24	10	11	3	0	0	1	1	88
PRAIRIES	84 (28)	37 (13)	21 (7)	15 (5)	7 (2)	1 (1)	1 (1)	3 (1)	5 (2)	174 (60)
BRITISH COLUMBIA	173 (58)	33 (11)	11 (4)	3 (1)	3 (1)	0	2 (1)	1 (1)	7 (2)	233 (79)
N. W. T.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Yukon	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
NORTH	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7 (3)
POPULATION TOTAL	387	175	103	98	86	16	11	12	42	928
SAMPLE TOTAL	(129)	(58)	(36)	(33)	(28)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(14)	(313 + 3)

N.B. ( ) denotes sample size

Table B<sub>2</sub>

## Response Rate by Region and Keeping of Pets

Region	Response Rate of the Facilities			Units Responding by Keeping of Pets				Total
	Number Sent	Number <sup>*</sup> Returned	Percent Returned	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Kept Never	
Maritimes	21	9	42.9	7	0	0	2	9
Quebec	72	9	12.5	2	3	3	3	11
Ontario	81	27	33.3	18	5	3	6	32
Prairies	60	28	46.7	19	4	3	5	31
British Columbia	79	12	15.2	7	3	0	2	12
North	3	1	33.3	1	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	316	86	27.2	54	16	10	18	98

\*There were an additional 9 questionnaires returned which were incomplete.

APPENDIX C

Replacements of the Sampled Facilities

Table C<sub>1</sub> Number of Sampled Facilities Replaced Before Mailing  
Because a Complete Address could not be Found by Size  
and Region of the Facility

Table C<sub>2</sub> Number of Questionnaires Returned and their Facilities  
Replaced by Size and Region of the Facility

Table C<sub>1</sub>

Number of Sampled Facilities Replaced Before Mailing Because a Complete Address could not be Found  
by Size\* and Region of the Facility

Size	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	British Columbia	North	Total
1-9	0	0	2	1	4	0	7
10-24	0	5	2	1	0	0	8
25-49	0	3	0	1	1	0	5
50-99	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
100-199	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
200-299	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
300-499	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
500 <sup>+</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No size	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
TOTAL	0	13	4	4	5	0	26

\* Size in terms of the number of children served, as indicated in the list of origin.

Table C<sub>2</sub>

Number of Questionnaires Returned and their Facilities Replaced by Size\* and Region of the Facility

Size	Maritimes	Quebec	Ontario	Prairies	British Columbia	North	Total
1-9	0	1	4	4	7	0	16
10-24	2	2	6	2	1	0	13
25-49	0	2	1	0	1	0	4
50-99	1	0	1	0	1**	0	3
100-199	0	1	2	0	2**	0	5
200-299	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
300-499	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
500 <sup>+</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No size	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
TOTAL	3	9	16	7	12	0	47
<u>Reason for Replacement</u>							
Wrong address, moved, closed permanently or for summer	2	4	8	3	7	0	24
Facility did not meet sample criteria	1	5	8	4	5	0	23

\*Size in terms of the number of children served, as indicated in the list of origin.

\*\*These replacements were not made because there were no more facilities in the category.

APPENDIX D

English Version of the Questionnaire

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS ASKED ONLY TO IDENTIFY WHICH FACILITIES HAVE RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY THOSE COMPLETING IT. THIS SHEET WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHEN IT IS RECEIVED TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY.

NAME OF FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION OF THE PERSON COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE:  
\_\_\_\_\_

DOES YOUR FACILITY PROVIDE RESIDENTIAL CARE TO CHILDREN UNDER 16 YEARS OF AGE?

- Yes      If yes, please complete Part One of the questionnaire. At the end of this part, directions will be given indicating which part to complete next.
- No        If no, then your facility does not meet the criteria set up for this study, which are that the facilities must provide residential care to children under sixteen years of age. Please mail the uncompleted questionnaire in the stamped return envelope provided. Thank you for your cooperation.

PART ONE. GENERAL INFORMATION - TO BE COMPLETED BY ALL RESPONDENTS.PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS AS THEY APPLY TO ONLY THOSE WHO ARE IN RESIDENTIAL CARE.

1. Number of children served by the total facility at present \_\_\_\_\_

Total capacity of the facility \_\_\_\_\_

2. What are the ages of the children served by this facility? Please check the categories which apply.

 under two years 2 - 4 years 5 - 11 years 12 years and over

3. Please check the sex of the children served by this facility.

 Males only Females only Both males and females

4. Please check the type(s) of children served by your facility.

 mentally retarded:  profound  severe  educable blind and/or partially sighted deaf and/or hard of hearing physically handicapped emotionally disturbed socially maladjusted or delinquent multiple handicapped relatively normal children with disturbed or unfit families relatively normal children with stable families who are unable to provide care, or no family other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

What is the professional orientation of the majority of the principal caregivers? For the purpose of this study, the principal caregivers would be the staff who have the most day-to-day contact with the children. PLEASE CHECK ONE.

- no formal training in child care or development
- no formal training, but informal in-service training
- technical or community college diploma in child care or residential care
- education
- home economics
- nursing (L.P.N. or R.N.)
- psychology
- social work
- sociology
- theology
- other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

What is the child/staff ratio in terms of:

number of children / total staff \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

number of children / principal caregivers \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

For the last fiscal year, what was the approximate budgeted cost per child in residential care in your facility?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ / child in residential care

How are the children housed?

- rooms, dormitories, or wards in a large institution
- cottages (a number of single dwelling units situated in one area)
- house (a single dwelling unit)
- other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

9. How many children sleep together in one room (eg. bedroom, dormitory)? If the number varies, please give the average number.

\_\_\_\_\_ children / bedroom

\_\_\_\_\_ children / dormitory or ward

10. What is the approximate outdoor area of the facility in terms of lot size(s) or acreage? (Include all residential units under your auspices.)

\_\_\_\_\_

11. Please check which of the following features are on your premises.

\_\_\_\_\_ living room, recreation room or common room

\_\_\_\_\_ gymnasium

\_\_\_\_\_ school

\_\_\_\_\_ hospital

\_\_\_\_\_ animal shelters (eg. barn)

\_\_\_\_\_ other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

12. What is the geographic location of your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ rural (basic economy is farming)

\_\_\_\_\_ town (basic economy is a mixture of farming and industry)

\_\_\_\_\_ urban (basic economy is industry and business)

13. Does this facility have more than one residential unit under its auspices? (eg. a number of group homes or a number of cottages)

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please answer Question 14 on page W4. Do not answer Question 15.

\_\_\_\_\_ No If no, please answer Question 15 on page W6. Do not answer Question 14.

COMPLETE ONLY IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED YES TO QUESTION 13.

For the purpose of this questionnaire, PETS will refer to animals (including birds and fish) which provide some sort of pleasure to the residents of a facility. This does not exclude their use for other purposes as well. (eg. work animal, source of food)

(a) Are there any residential units in which pets are kept?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      How many residential units? \_\_\_\_\_  
Average number of children per unit \_\_\_\_\_  
Age range of the children \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE GIVE PART TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO A STAFF MEMBER IN ONE OF THESE RESIDENTIAL UNITS. IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE UNIT IN THIS CATEGORY, PLEASE CHOOSE THE UNIT THAT CAN SUPPLY THE MOST EXTENSIVE INFORMATION.  
(Part Two is the pink pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No

(b) Are there any residential units in which pets were kept in the past, but are not kept now?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      How many residential units? \_\_\_\_\_  
Average number of children per unit \_\_\_\_\_  
Age range of the children \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE GIVE PART THREE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO A STAFF MEMBER IN ONE OF THESE RESIDENTIAL UNITS. IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE UNIT IN THIS CATEGORY, PLEASE CHOOSE THE UNIT THAT CAN SUPPLY THE MOST EXTENSIVE INFORMATION.  
(Part Three is the blue pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No

(c) Are there any residential units in which pets are not kept now, but which might consider their use in the future?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      How many residential units? \_\_\_\_\_  
Average number of children per unit \_\_\_\_\_  
Age range of the children \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE GIVE PART FOUR OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO A STAFF MEMBER IN ONE OF THESE RESIDENTIAL UNITS. IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE UNIT IN THIS CATEGORY, PLEASE CHOOSE THE UNIT THAT CAN SUPPLY THE MOST EXTENSIVE INFORMATION.  
(Part Four is the yellow pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No



COMPLETE ONLY IF YOU HAVE ANSWERED NO TO QUESTION 13.

For the purpose of this questionnaire, PETS will refer to animals (including birds and fish) which provide some sort of pleasure to the residents of a facility. This does not exclude their use for other purposes as well. (eg. work animals, sources of food)

(a) Are there any pets kept on your premises at the present time?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      If yes, please turn to Part Two of the questionnaire now and answer the questions. (pink pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No        If no, please answer question 15 (b).

(b) Have there ever been any pets kept on the premises of your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      If yes, please turn to Part Three of the questionnaire now and answer the questions. (blue pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No        If no, please answer question 15 (c).

(c) Would you ever consider keeping pets on your premises in the future?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes      If yes, please turn to Part Four of the questionnaire now and answer the questions. (yellow pages)

\_\_\_\_\_ No        If no, please turn to Part Five of the questionnaire now and answer the questions. (green pages)

PART TWO. TO BE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO KEEP PETS ON THEIR PREMISES AT THE PRESENT TIME.

1. Which type of pets do you keep on your premises at the present time?

- insects (eg. ant farms, caterpillars, bees)
- tropical fish
- turtles
- other reptiles (eg. snakes, lizards)
- amphibians (eg. frogs, toads)
- small domesticated birds (eg. budgies, parakeets, canaries)
- small rodents (eg. white mice, hamsters, gerbils, guinea pigs)
- rabbits
- cats
- small dogs (eg. toy breeds, miniature breeds, terriers)
- medium dogs (eg. spaniel, beagle, border collie)
- large dogs (eg. labrador, collie, German shepherd)
- small farm animals (eg. ducks, chickens)
- medium farm animals (eg. goats, pigs, sheep)
- large farm animals (eg. cows, horses)
- tamed wild animals
- others. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

(a) Who owns these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by staff members, to which  
the children have access \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by the facility, for the  
children to share \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by specific groups of  
children (eg. the pet of a specific  
cottage or ward) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by individual children  
(ie. a certain child would have sole  
ownership of the pet) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Does this type of ownership apply to all the pets kept on the premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. All pets are kept in this way.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Different pets are owned in different ways. PLEASE  
INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF ANIMAL AFTER THE  
APPROPRIATE OWNERSHIP ABOVE.

(c) Are all the children in the facility allowed the same type of ownership  
privileges for these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

3. (a) When are the children permitted access to these pets?

- any time day or night \_\_\_\_\_
- any time during their free time  
(ie. time not scheduled for eating,  
classes, sleeping and other planned  
activities) \_\_\_\_\_
- only at scheduled times \_\_\_\_\_
- never \_\_\_\_\_
- other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Does this type of access apply to all the pets kept on the premises?

- Yes. The access to all pets is the same.
- No. The children have different access to different pets. PLEASE  
INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF ANIMAL AFTER THE  
APPROPRIATE ACCESS ABOVE.

(c) Are all the children in the facility allowed the same access to these pets?

- Yes.
- No. Please elaborate in the space below.

Where do these pets live? (eg. children's quarters, dog house outside the building, barn)

Do the children require supervision when with the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Does this apply to all the children?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

Does this apply to all types of pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Who cares for these pets? (eg. feeding, grooming)

\_\_\_\_\_ the children alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the staff alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the children and staff share the responsibility

7. Was there planning involved in the introduction of the pets to the facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. (a) Was there an inquiry into the nature of care required for the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(b) Were the staff prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(c) Were the children prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(d) Were changes made in the physical facility to accommodate these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Did any problems occur due to a lack of planning?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

In respect to the person(s) who introduced the pets to the facility, what was:

(a) their job and/or professional training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) their position? \_\_\_\_\_

If a child has a pet in his own home, is that pet allowed to visit the child at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals are allowed. Please specify which types  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If a child has a pet in his own home, is he permitted to bring it to live at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals are allowed. Please specify which types  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Do these pets have an educational role in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets are used for educational purposes in terms of: (a) type of educational program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet used  
(d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

12. Do these pets have a therapeutic role in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets are used for therapeutic purposes in terms of: (a) type of treatment program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet used  
(d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Are there any other roles (in addition to the educational and therapeutic ones) which these pets play in your facility?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets are used in terms of:
- (a) type of program
  - (b) type of child (age, sex, problem)
  - (c) type of pet used
  - (d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Have you encountered any problems as a result of keeping pets on your premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on the problems that you have encountered.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

15. Do you have any advice for anyone wanting to introduce pets to their facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

16. Does your facility have any plans for the future regarding pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Are there any types of pets that were kept on your premises in the past that are not kept now?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please specify which types of pets were kept in the past and why they are not kept now.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

TO BE ANSWERED BY ONLY THOSE RESPONDENTS WHOSE FACILITY HAS MORE THAN ONE RESIDENTIAL UNIT UNDER ITS AUSPICES. OTHER RESPONDENTS GO TO QUESTION 19.

With respect to your residential unit:

How many children reside there? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the age range of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the sex of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

18. continued

What is the name of the facility to which your residential unit belongs?

---

What is the position of the person completing the questionnaire?

---

THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS ASKED ONLY TO IDENTIFY WHICH FACILITIES HAVE RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY THOSE COMPLETING IT. THIS SHEET WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHEN IT IS RECEIVED TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY.

19. THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS IT APPLIES TO YOUR FACILITY.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. A summary of this study will be prepared in pamphlet form and distributed to those who are interested. If you would like a copy of these results, please fill in the following form. This form will be detached from the rest of the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality. If you prefer, this form may be detached from the rest of the questionnaire and mailed separately. PLEASE PRINT.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

POSTAL CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RETURN ONLY THE COMPLETED PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED RETURN ENVELOPE. THE BLANK PARTS MAY BE DISCARDED.

PART THREE.

TO BE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO DO NOT KEEP PETS ON THEIR PREMISES AT THE PRESENT TIME BUT WHO HAVE IN THE PAST.

## 1. Which type of pets did you keep on your premises?

- insects (eg. ant farms, caterpillars, bees)  
 tropical fish  
 turtles  
 other reptiles (eg. snakes, lizards)  
 amphibians (eg. frogs, toads)  
 small domesticated birds (eg. budgies, parakeets, canaries)  
 small rodents (eg. white mice, hamsters, gerbils, guinea pigs)  
 rabbits  
 cats  
 small dogs (eg. toy breeds, miniature breeds, terriers)  
 medium dogs (eg. spaniel, beagle, border collie)  
 large dogs (eg. labrador, collie, German shepherd)  
 small farm animals (eg. ducks, chickens)  
 medium farm animals (eg. goats, pigs, sheep)  
 large farm animals (eg. cows, horses)  
 tamed wild animals  
 others. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Why are these animals no longer kept on the premises?

(a) Who owned these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by staff members, to which  
the children had access \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by the facility, for the  
children to share \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by specific groups of  
children (eg. the pet of a specific  
cottage or ward) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ pets owned by individual children  
(ie. a certain child would have had  
sole ownership of the pet) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Did this type of ownership apply to all the pets on the premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. All pets were owned in this way.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Different pets were owned in different ways. PLEASE  
INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF PET AFTER THE  
APPROPRIATE OWNERSHIP ABOVE.

(c) Were all the children in the facility allowed the same type of ownership  
privileges for these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

3. (a) When were the children permitted access to these pets?

<input type="checkbox"/>	any time day or night	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	any time during their free time (ie. time not scheduled for eating, classes, sleeping and other planned activities)	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	only at scheduled times	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	never	_____
<input type="checkbox"/>	other. Please specify _____	_____
		_____
		_____

(b) Did this type of access apply to all the pets kept on the premises?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes.	The access to all pets was the same.
<input type="checkbox"/>	No.	The children had different access to different pets. PLEASE INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF ANIMAL AFTER THE APPROPRIATE ACCESS ABOVE.

(c) Were all the children in the facility allowed the same access to these pets?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	No.	Please elaborate in the space below.

Where did these pets live? (eg. children's quarters, dog house outside the building, barn)

Did the children require supervision when with the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Did this apply to all the children?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

Did this apply to all types of pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Who cared for these pets? (eg. feeding, grooming)

\_\_\_\_\_ the children alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the staff alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the children and staff shared the responsibility

7. Was there planning involved in the introduction of the pets to the facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. (a) Was there an inquiry into the nature of care required for the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(b) Were the staff prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(c) Were the children prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(d) Were changes made in the physical facility to accommodate these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Did any problems occur due to a lack of planning?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

In respect to the person(s) who introduced the pets to the facility, what was:

(a) their job and/or professional training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) their position? \_\_\_\_\_

If a child had a pet in his own home, was that pet allowed to visit the child at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals were allowed. Please specify which types  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If a child had a pet in his own home, was he permitted to bring it to live at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals were allowed. Please specify which type  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Did these pets have an educational role in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

Please elaborate on how these pets were used for educational purposes in terms of: (a) type of educational program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet used  
(d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

12. Did these pets have a therapeutic role in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

Please elaborate on how these pets were used for therapeutic purposes in terms of: (a) type of treatment program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet used  
(d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Were there any other roles (in addition to the educational and therapeutic ones) which these pets played in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets were used in terms of:  
(a) type of program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet used  
(d) degree of success obtained

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Did you encounter any problems as a result of keeping pets on your premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on the problems that you encountered.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

15. Do you have any advice for anyone wanting to introduce pets to their facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

16. Does your facility have any plans for the future regarding pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

TO BE ANSWERED BY ONLY THOSE RESPONDENTS WHOSE FACILITY HAS MORE THAN ONE RESIDENTIAL UNIT UNDER ITS AUSPICES. OTHER RESPONDENTS GO TO QUESTION 18.

With respect to your residential unit:

How many children reside there? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the age range of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the sex of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

## 17. CONTINUED

What is the name of the facility to which your residential unit belongs?

---

What is the position of the person completing the questionnaire?

---

THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS ASKED ONLY TO IDENTIFY WHICH FACILITIES HAVE RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY THOSE COMPLETING IT. THIS SHEET WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHEN IT IS RECEIVED TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY.

## 18. THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS IT APPLIES TO YOUR FACILITY.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. A summary of this study will be prepared in pamphlet form and distributed to those who are interested. If you would like a copy of these results, please fill in the following form. This form will be detached from the rest of the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality. If you prefer, this form may be detached from the rest of the questionnaire and mailed separately. PLEASE PRINT.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

POSTAL CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RETURN ONLY THE COMPLETED PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PART FOUR.

TO BE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO DO NOT KEEP PETS ON THEIR PREMISES AT THE PRESENT TIME BUT WHO WOULD CONSIDER DOING SO IN THE FUTURE.

## 1. Which type of pets would you keep on your premises?

- insects (eg. ant farms, caterpillars, bees)
  - tropical fish
  - turtles
  - other reptiles (eg. snakes, lizards)
  - amphibians (eg. frogs, toads)
  - small domesticated birds (eg. budgies, parakeets, canaries)
  - small rodents (eg. white mice, hamsters, gerbils, guinea pigs)
  - rabbits
  - cats
  - small dogs (eg. toy breeds, miniature breeds, terriers)
  - medium dogs (eg. spaniel, beagle, border collie)
  - large dogs (eg. labrador, collie, German shepherd)
  - small farm animals (eg. ducks, chickens)
  - medium farm animals (eg. goats, pigs, sheep)
  - large farm animals (eg. cows, horses)
  - tamed wild animals
  - others. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 
-

(a) Who would own these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ pets would be owned by staff members,  
to which the children would have access

\_\_\_\_\_ pets would be owned by the facility,  
for the children to share

\_\_\_\_\_ pets would be owned by specific groups  
of children (eg. the pet of a specific  
cottage or ward)

\_\_\_\_\_ pets would be owned by individual  
children (ie. a certain child would  
have sole ownership of the pet)

(b) Would this type of ownership apply to all the pets on the premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. All pets would be owned in this way.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Different pets would be owned in different ways. PLEASE  
INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF PET AFTER THE  
APPROPRIATE OWNERSHIP ABOVE.

(c) Would all the children in the facility be allowed the same type of ownership  
privileges for these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

3. (a) When would the children be permitted access to these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ any time day or night \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ any time during their free time  
(ie. time not scheduled for eating,  
classes, sleeping and other planned  
activities) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ only at scheduled times \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ never \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Would this type of access apply to all the pets kept on the premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. The access to all the pets would be the same.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. The children would have different access to different pets.  
PLEASE INDICATE THIS BY WRITING THE TYPE OF ANIMAL AFTER  
THE APPROPRIATE ACCESS ABOVE.

(c) Would all the children in the facility be allowed the same access to these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

Where would these pets live? (eg. children's quarters, dog house outside the building, barn)

Would the children require supervision when with the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.      Would this apply to all the children?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

Would this apply to all types of pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Who would care for these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ the children alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the staff alone

\_\_\_\_\_ the children and staff would share the responsibility

7. Would there be planning involved in the introduction of the pets to the facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. (a) Would there be any inquiry into the nature of care required for the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(b) Would the staff be prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(c) Would the children be prepared for the introduction of the pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

(d) Would changes have to be made in the physical facility to accommodate these pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

In respect to the person(s) who would introduce the pets to the facility, what would be:

(a) their job and/or professional training? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) their position? \_\_\_\_\_

If a child has a pet in his own home, would that pet be allowed to visit the child at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals would be allowed. Please specify which types:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If a child has a pet in his own home, would he be permitted to bring it to live at your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

\_\_\_\_\_ Only certain types of animals would be allowed. Please specify which types:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Would these pets have an educational role in your facility?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets would be used for educational purposes in terms of:
- (a) type of educational program
  - (b) type of child (age, sex, problem)
  - (c) type of pet that would be used

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

12. Would these pets have a therapeutic role in your facility?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets would be used for therapeutic purposes in terms of:
- (a) type of treatment program
  - (b) type of child (age, sex, problem)
  - (c) type of pet that would be used

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Would there be any other roles (in addition to the educational and therapeutic ones) which these pets might play in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on how these pets would be used in terms of  
(a) type of program  
(b) type of child (age, sex, problem)  
(c) type of pet that would be used

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

Would you anticipate any problems as a result of keeping pets on your premises?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate on the problems that you would anticipate.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

15. What types of information do you feel that you would need before setting up a program involving pets? Please elaborate in the space below.

16. Has your facility made any definite plans for the future regarding pets?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. Please elaborate in the space below.

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

TO BE ANSWERED BY ONLY THOSE RESPONDENTS WHOSE FACILITY HAS MORE THAN ONE RESIDENTIAL UNIT UNDER ITS AUSPICES. OTHER RESPONDENTS GO TO QUESTION 18.

With respect to your residential unit:

How many children reside there? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the age range of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the sex of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

## 17. CONTINUED

What is the name of the facility to which your residential unit belongs?

---

What is the position of the person completing the questionnaire?

---

THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS ASKED ONLY TO IDENTIFY WHICH FACILITIES HAVE RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY THOSE COMPLETING IT. THIS SHEET WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHEN IT IS RECEIVED TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY.

## 18. THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS IT APPLIES TO YOUR FACILITY.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. A summary of this study will be prepared in pamphlet form and distributed to those who are interested. If you would like a copy of these results, please fill in the following form. This form will be detached from the rest of the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality. If you prefer, this form may be detached from the rest of the questionnaire and mailed separately. PLEASE PRINT.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

POSTAL CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RETURN ONLY THE COMPLETED PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN

PART FIVE. TO BE ANSWERED BY THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER KEPT PETS ON THEIR PREMISES  
AND WHO WOULD NOT CONSIDER DOING SO IN THE FUTURE.

1. Why would you never consider keeping pets on your premises?  
(Please check the appropriate reason. If more than one reason applies, please  
number your reasons in order of importance, ie. put "1" in front of the most  
important reason, put "2" in front of the second most important reason, etc.)

- inadequate number of staff to care for the animals
- staff are inexperienced about the care of animals
- animals pose health problems
- the children may harm the animals
- the animals may harm the children (ie. biting, scratching)
- inadequate space on the premises (indoor or outdoor)
- cost of care for the animals (eg. veterinary fees, food)
- policy of the facility
- the keeping of pets on the premises would not have important  
benefits for the children
- other. Please specify \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you think that there are any advantages to a child having a pet?

- Yes      What would these advantages be? Please elaborate in the  
space below.
- No

If a facility similar to yours (eg. types of children served, size of the premises, budget) found that keeping pets on the premises had beneficial results for the children, would you consider implementing such a program in your facility?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No      Why not? Please elaborate in the space below.

TO BE ANSWERED BY ONLY THOSE RESPONDENTS WHOSE FACILITY HAS MORE THAN ONE RESIDENTIAL UNIT UNDER ITS AUSPICES. OTHER RESPONDENTS GO TO QUESTION #5.

With respect to your residential unit:

How many children reside there? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the age range of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

What is the sex of these children? \_\_\_\_\_

4. CONTINUED

What is the name of the facility to which your residential unit belongs?

---

What is the position of the person completing the questionnaire?

---

THE ABOVE INFORMATION IS ASKED ONLY TO IDENTIFY WHICH FACILITIES HAVE RESPONDED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE TYPES OF POSITIONS HELD BY THOSE COMPLETING IT. THIS SHEET WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHEN IT IS RECEIVED TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY.

5. THIS IS THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS IT APPLIES TO YOUR FACILITY.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. A summary of this study will be prepared in pamphlet form and distributed to those who are interested. If you would like a copy of these results, please fill in the following form. This form will be detached from the rest of the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality. If you would prefer, this form may be detached from the rest of the questionnaire and mailed separately. PLEASE PRINT.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITY: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

POSTAL CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE RETURN ONLY THE COMPLETED PARTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED RETURN ENVELOPE. THE BLANK PARTS MAY BE DISCARDED.

APPENDIX E

French Version of the Questionnaire

QUESTION SUIVANTE EST DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES  
PERSONNES ONT REPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÈTENT  
ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DÉTACHÉE DU QUESTIONNAIRE  
APRÈS LA RÉCEPTION.

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

LA PERSONNE COMPLÉTANT LE QUESTIONNAIRE:

\_\_\_\_\_

EST-CE QUE VOTRE FACILITÉ FOURNIT LES SOINS RÉSIDEN-  
TIELS AUX ENFANTS DE MOINS DE SEIZE ANS?

Oui. Si oui, veuillez compléter la 1<sup>ière</sup> Partie du questionnaire.  
A la fin de cette partie, des instructions seront données  
pour indiquer quelle partie vous devez ensuite compléter.

Non. Si non, votre facilité ne répond pas aux critères désignés  
pour cette étude. Il faut que les facilités fournissent  
les soins résidentiels aux enfants qui ont moins de seize  
ans. S'il vous plaît, expédiez le questionnaire blanc dans  
l'enveloppe de l'expéditeur ci-jointe. Merci pour votre  
coopération.

L'INFORMATION SUIVANTE EST DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES FACILITÉS ONT REPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÈTENT POUR ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DÉTACHÉE DU QUESTIONNAIRE DÈS LA RÉCEPTION.

NOM DE LA FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

EMPLOI DE LA PERSONNE COMPLÉTANT LE QUESTIONNAIRE:  
\_\_\_\_\_

EST-CE QUE VOTRE FACILITÉ FOURNIT LES SOINS RÉSIDENITIELS AUX ENFANTS DE MOINS DE SEIZE ANS?

\_\_\_\_ Oui. Si oui, veuillez compléter la 1<sup>ière</sup> Partie du questionnaire. A la fin de cette partie, des instructions seront données pour indiquer quelle partie vous devez ensuite compléter.

\_\_\_\_ Non. Si non, votre facilité ne répond pas aux critères désignés pour cette étude. Il faut que les facilités fournissent les soins résidentiels aux enfants qui ont moins de seize ans. S'il vous plaît, expédiez le questionnaire blanc dans l'enveloppe de l'expéditeur ci-jointe. Merci pour votre coopération.

Quelle est l'orientation professionnelle de la majorité des principaux donneurs de soins? Pour le but de cette étude les principaux donneurs de soins seraient les membres du personnel qui ont le plus de contact quotidien avec les enfants. COCHEZ SEULEMENT UNE RÉPONSE S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

- pas de formation spéciale en soins des enfants ou développement des enfants
- pas de formation spéciale mais formation informelle durant le travail
- un diplôme de collège technique ou communautaire en soins des enfants ou soins résidentiels
- éducation
- science domestique
- allaitement
- psychologie
- travail social
- sociologie
- théologie
- autre. Spécifier s'il vous plaît \_\_\_\_\_

Quelle est la proportion enfants/personnel en terme de:

- nombre d'enfants / personnel total \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- nombre d'enfants / principaux donneurs de soins \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Pour la dernière année fiscale, quel était le prix budgétaire approximatif par enfant en soins résidentiels dans votre facilité?

\$ \_\_\_\_\_ / enfant en soins résidentiels

Comment les enfants sont-ils logés?

- chambres, dortoirs, ou salles dans une grosse institution
  - cottages (un nombre d'habitations individuelles situées dans le même quartier)
  - maison (une habitation individuelle)
  - autre. Spécifier s'il vous plaît \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

1ère PARTIE

INFORMATION GÉNÉRALE - DOIT ÊTRE REMPLIE PAR TOUS.

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT RÉPONDEZ À TOUTES LES QUESTIONS TELLES QU'ELLES S'APPLIQUENT À CEUX QUI SONT DANS LE SOIN RÉSIDENTIEL SEULEMENT.

1. Nombre d'enfants servis par l'ensemble de la facilité actuellement \_\_\_\_\_

Capacité totale de la facilité \_\_\_\_\_

2. Quel âge ont les enfants servis par cette facilité? S'il vous plaît cocher les catégories qui conviennent.

\_\_\_\_\_ moins de deux ans

\_\_\_\_\_ 2 - 4 ans

\_\_\_\_\_ 5 - 11 ans

\_\_\_\_\_ douze ans et plus

3. S'il vous plaît cocher le sexe des enfants servis par cette facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ mâles seulement

\_\_\_\_\_ femelles seulement

\_\_\_\_\_ mâles et femelles

4. S'il vous plaît cocher le(s) type(s) d'enfants servis par votre facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ les déficients mentaux: \_\_\_\_\_ profonds \_\_\_\_\_ sévères \_\_\_\_\_ éducatibles

\_\_\_\_\_ les aveugles et/ou partiellement aveugles

\_\_\_\_\_ les sourds et/ou partiellement sourds

\_\_\_\_\_ les handicapés physiques

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants à problèmes émotionnels

\_\_\_\_\_ les inadaptés sociaux ou délinquents

\_\_\_\_\_ les handicaps multiples

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants relativement normaux de familles troublées ou inaptes

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants relativement normaux sans famille ou de familles stables qui sont incapables de fournir les soins nécessaires

\_\_\_\_\_ autre. Spécifier s'il vous plaît \_\_\_\_\_

EMPLÉTEZ SEULEMENT SI VOUS AVEZ RÉPONDU OUI À LA QUESTION 13.

our le but de ce questionnaire, "ANIMAUX FAVORIS" se rapporte aux animaux y compris les oiseaux et les poissons) qui fournissent quelques types de plaisir aux résidents de la facilité. Ceci n'exclut pas leur usage à d'autres fins (eg. un animal de trait, une source de nourriture).

a) Est-ce qu'il y a des unités résidentielles dans lesquelles les animaux favoris sont gardés?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Combien d'unités résidentielles ya-t-il? \_\_\_\_\_

Le nombre moyen d'enfants par unité \_\_\_\_\_

L'éventail d'âge des enfants \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT DONNEZ LA 2<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À UN MEMBRE DU PERSONNEL DANS UNE DE CES UNITÉS RÉSIDENTIELLES. S'IL Y A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ DANS CETTE CATÉGORIE, CHOISISSEZ L'UNITÉ QUI PEUT FOURNIR L'INFORMATION LA PLUS ÉTENDUE. (La 2<sup>ième</sup> Partie correspond aux pages roses.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

b) Est-ce qu'il y a des unités résidentielles dans lesquelles les animaux favoris ont été gardés au paravant, mais dans lesquelles ils ne sont plus gardés actuellement?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Combien d'unités résidentielles ya-t-il? \_\_\_\_\_

Le nombre moyen d'enfants par unité \_\_\_\_\_

L'éventail d'âge des enfants \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT DONNEZ LA 3<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À UN MEMBRE DU PERSONNEL DANS UNE DE CES UNITÉS RÉSIDENTIELLES. S'IL Y A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ DANS CETTE CATÉGORIE, CHOISISSEZ L'UNITÉ QUI PEUT FOURNIR L'INFORMATION LA PLUS ÉTENDUE. (La 3<sup>ième</sup> Partie correspond aux pages bleues.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

c) Est-ce qu'il y a des unités résidentielles dans lesquelles on ne garde pas d'animaux favoris actuellement mais qui pourraient éventuellement le faire?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Combien d'unités résidentielles ya-t-il? \_\_\_\_\_

Le nombre moyen d'enfants par unité \_\_\_\_\_

L'éventail d'âge des enfants \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT DONNEZ LA 4<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À UN MEMBRE DU PERSONNEL DANS UNE DE CES UNITÉS RÉSIDENTIELLES. S'IL Y A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ DANS CETTE CATÉGORIE, CHOISISSEZ L'UNITÉ QUI PEUT FOURNIR L'INFORMATION LA PLUS ÉTENDUE. (La 4<sup>ième</sup> Partie correspond aux pages jaunes.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

9. Combien d'enfants dorment ensemble dans une chambre (eg. une chambre à coucher, un dortoir)? Si le nombre varie, donnez le nombre moyen s'il vous plaît.
- \_\_\_\_\_ enfants / chambre à coucher
- \_\_\_\_\_ enfants / dortoir ou salle
10. Quelle est la surface approximative extérieure de la facilité en termes des dimensions du/des lot(s) ou de superficie? (Tenez compte de toutes les unités résidentielles sous vos auspices.)
- \_\_\_\_\_
11. Cochez parmi les particularités suivantes celles qui sont sur votre lieu s'il vous plaît.
- \_\_\_\_\_ salon, salle de récréation, ou salle commune
- \_\_\_\_\_ gymnase
- \_\_\_\_\_ école
- \_\_\_\_\_ hôpital
- \_\_\_\_\_ abri d'animaux (eg. grange)
- \_\_\_\_\_ autre. Spécifier s'il vous plaît \_\_\_\_\_
12. Quelle est la location géographique de votre facilité?
- \_\_\_\_\_ rurale (l'économie fondamentale est l'agriculture)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ville (l'économie fondamentale est un mélange agriculture/industrie)
- \_\_\_\_\_ urbain (l'économie fondamentale est les industries et le commerce)
13. Est-ce que la facilité a plus d'une unité résidentielle sous ses auspices? (eg. un nombre de foyers de groupe ou un nombre de cottages)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Si oui, répondez à Question 14 sur la page W4, s'il vous plaît. Ne répondez pas à Question 15.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Non. Si non, répondez à Question 15 sur la page W6, s'il vous plaît. Ne répondez pas à Question 14.

COMPLÉTEZ SEULEMENT SI VOUS AVEZ RÉPONDU NON À LA QUESTION 13.

Pour le but de ce questionnaire, "ANIMAUX FAVORIS" se rapportera aux animaux (y compris les oiseaux et les poissons) qui fournissent quelques types de plaisir aux résidents de la facilité. Ceci n'exclut pas leur usage à d'autres fins. (eg. un animal de trait, une source de nourriture)

(a) Est-ce qu'il y a des animaux favoris gardés sur votre terrain actuellement?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Si oui, reportez-vous à la 2<sup>ième</sup> Partie du questionnaire et répondez aux questions s'il vous plaît. (pages roses)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Si non, répondez à la question 15(b) s'il vous plaît.

(b) Est-ce qu'il y avait déjà des animaux favoris gardés sur votre terrain?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Si oui, reportez-vous à la 3<sup>ième</sup> Partie du questionnaire et répondez aux questions s'il vous plaît. (pages bleues)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Si non, répondez à la question 15(c) s'il vous plaît.

(c) Envisageriez-vous de garder des animaux favoris sur votre terrain dans le futur?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Si oui, reportez-vous à la 4<sup>ième</sup> Partie du questionnaire et répondez aux questions s'il vous plaît. (pages jaunes)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Si non, reportez-vous à la 5<sup>ième</sup> Partie du questionnaire et répondez aux questions s'il vous plaît. (pages vertes)

## 14. SUITE

- (d) Est-ce qu'il y a des unités résidentielles dans lesquelles on ne garde pas d'animaux favoris actuellement et qui ne les garderont pas dans le futur?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Combien d'unités résidentielles ya-t-il? \_\_\_\_\_

Le nombre moyen d'enfants par unité \_\_\_\_\_

L'éventail d'âge des enfants \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT DONNEZ LA 5<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À UN MEMBRE DU PERSONNEL DANS UNE DE CES UNITÉS RÉSIDENTIELLES. S'IL Y A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ DANS CETTE CATÉGORIE, CHOISISSEZ L'UNITÉ QUI PEUT FOURNIR L'INFORMATION LA PLUS ÉTENDUE. (La 5<sup>ième</sup> Partie correspond aux pages vertes.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

CECI EST LA FIN DE LA 1<sup>ière</sup> PARTIE, TELLE QU'ELLE S'APPLIQUE À VOTRE FACILITÉ. DISTRIBUEZ LE RESTE DU QUESTIONNAIRE SELON LES INSTRUCTIONS, S'IL VOUS PLAÎT. ATTACHEZ UNE DES ENVELOPPES D'EXPÉDITEUR CI-JOINTE À CHAQUE PARTIE DU QUESTIONNAIRE. DISTRIBUÉ POUR QUE CHAQUE PERSONNE PUISSE RETOURNER SA PARTIE À SA CONVENANCE. VOUS POUVEZ RETOURNER LA 1<sup>ière</sup> PARTIE MAINTENANT. MERCI POUR VOTRE COOPÉRATION.

Un sommaire de cette étude sera préparé en un pamphlet et sera distribué à ceux qui sont intéressés. Si vous désirez une copie de ces résultats, complétez le formulaire suivant s'il vous plaît. Ce formulaire sera détaché du reste du questionnaire pour assurer la confidentialité. Si vous préférez, ce formulaire peut être détaché du reste de questionnaire et posté séparément. IMPRIMER S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

NOM: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

ADRESSE: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLE & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

CODE POSTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

(a) À qui appartiennent ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ les membres du personnel appartiennent  
les animaux favoris aux quels les enfants  
ont accès \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ la facilité appartient les animaux  
favoris pour que les enfants se les  
partagent \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des groupes spécifiques d'enfants  
appartiennent les animaux favoris  
(eg. l'animal favori d'un cottage  
spécifique ou d'une salle spécifique) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des enfants individuels appartiennent  
les animaux favoris (ie. un certain  
enfant aurait seul la possession de  
l'animal favori) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Ce type de possession s'applique-t-il à tous les animaux favoris qui  
sont gardés sur les lieux?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Tous les animaux favoris sont appartenus de cette manière.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Des animaux favoris différents sont appartenus de  
différentes manières. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ CECI EN  
ÉCRIVANT LE TYPE D'ANIMAL APRÈS LA POSSESSION APPROPRIÉE  
CI-DESSUS.

(c) Tous les enfants dans la facilité bénéficient-ils des mêmes types de  
privileges en ce qui concerne la possession de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

2<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLIE SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI GARDENT DES ANIMAUX FAVORIS SUR LEUR TERRAIN ACTUELLEMENT.

1. Quel type d'animaux favoris gardez-vous sur votre terrain actuellement?

\_\_\_\_\_ insectes (eg. fourmis de ferme, chenilles, abeilles)

\_\_\_\_\_ poissons tropicaux

\_\_\_\_\_ tortues

\_\_\_\_\_ autres reptiles (eg. serpents, lézards)

\_\_\_\_\_ amphibiens (eg. grenouilles, crapauds)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits oiseaux domestiques (eg. perruches, canaris)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits rongeurs (eg. souris blanches, hamsters, cobayes)

\_\_\_\_\_ lapins

\_\_\_\_\_ chats

\_\_\_\_\_ petits chiens (eg. chiens de salon, terriers)

\_\_\_\_\_ chiens moyens (eg. épagneul, bigle)

\_\_\_\_\_ gros chiens (eg. colley, Berger allemand)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits animaux de ferme (eg. canards, poulets)

\_\_\_\_\_ animaux de ferme moyens (eg. chèvres, cochons, moutons)

\_\_\_\_\_ gros animaux de ferme (eg. vaches, chevaux)

\_\_\_\_\_ animaux sauvages qui ont été apprivoisés

\_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. (a) À qui appartiennent ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ les membres du personnel appartiennent  
les animaux favoris aux quels les enfants  
ont accès \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ la facilite appartient les animaux  
favoris pour que les enfants se les  
partagent \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des groupes spécifiques d'enfants  
appartiennent les animaux favoris  
(eg. l'animal favori d'un cottage  
spécifique ou d'une salle spécifique) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des enfants individuels appartiennent  
les animaux favoris (ie. un certain  
enfant aurait seul la possession de  
l'animal favori) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Ce type de possession s'applique-t-il à tous les animaux favoris qui  
sont gardés sur les lieux?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Tous les animaux favoris sont appartenus de cette manière.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Des animaux favoris différents sont appartenus de  
différentes manières. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ CECI EN  
ÉCRIVANT LE TYPE D'ANIMAL APRÈS LA POSSESSION APPROPRIÉE  
CI-DESSUS.

(c) Tous les enfants dans la facilite bénéficient-ils des mêmes types de  
privilèges en ce qui concerne la possession de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

3. (a) Quand les enfants ont-ils accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heure de la journée ou de la nuit \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heure durant leur temps libre (ie. \_\_\_\_\_  
en dehors des repas, des cours, du  
sommeil et des autres activités proposées)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement à heures fixes \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ jamais \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Est-ce que ce type d'accès s'applique à tous les animaux favoris gardés sur votre lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. L'accès à tous les animaux favoris est le même.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Les enfants ont des accès différents selon les différents animaux favoris. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ PAR ÉCRIT LE TYPE D'ANIMAUX APRÈS LE TYPE D'ACCÈS APPROPRIÉE CI-DESSUS.

(c) Est-ce que tous les enfants dans la facilité ont le même droit d'accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

4. Où est-ce que ces animaux demeurent? (eg. dans la chambre des enfants, dans la niche du chien dehors, grange)

5. Est-ce que les enfants sont surveillés quand ils sont avec les animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Est-ce que cela s'applique à tous les enfants?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

Est-ce cela s'applique à tous les types d'animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

6. Qui prend soin de ces animaux favoris? (eg. les nourrit, les entretient)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement les enfants

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement le personnel

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants et le personnel partagent la responsabilité

7. Est-ce que l'introduction des animaux favoris dans la facilité a été planifiée?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. (a) Est-ce qu'une enquête a été faite dans la nature en ce qui concerne les soins exigés pour ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(b) Est-ce que le personnel était préparé pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(c) Est-ce que les enfants étaient préparés pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(d) Est-ce que des changements matériels ont été nécessaires pour accommoder ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Est-ce qu'il y a eu des problèmes causés par un manque de planification?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

8. En ce qui concerne la/les personne(s) qui a/ont introduit les animaux favoris dans la facilité, quel était:

(a) leur travail et/ou formation professionnelle? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) leur position? \_\_\_\_\_

9. Si un enfant avait un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet animal favori avait le droit de visiter l'enfant dans votre facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux étaient autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. Si un enfant avait un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet enfant avait le droit de l'apporter à la facilité pour vivre avec lui?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux étaient autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Est-ce que ces animaux favoris jouent un rôle éducatif dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle éducatif de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes éducatifs
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori utilisé
  - (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

12. Est-ce que ces animaux favoris jouent un rôle thérapeutique dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle thérapeutique de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes thérapeutiques
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori utilisé
  - (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

13. Les animaux favoris jouent-ils d'autres rôles (autres qu'éducatifs ou thérapeutiques) dans la facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le(s) rôle(s) de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:

- (a) types de programmes
- (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
- (c) le type d'animal favori utilisé
- (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

14. Est-ce que vous avez rencontré des problèmes du fait d'avoir gardé des animaux favoris sur votre lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. S'il vous plaît, élaborer sur les problèmes que vous avez rencontrés.

15. Est-ce que vous avez des suggestions pour ceux qui veulent introduire des animaux favoris dans leur facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

16. Est-ce que votre facilité a des plans pour le futur concernant des animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

Non .

Est-ce que vous avez gardé des animaux favoris sur votre lieu dans le passé vous ne gardez pas actuellement?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui      Spécifier quels types d'animaux favoris étaient gardés auparavant et pourquoi ils ne sont pas gardés actuellement?

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLI SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI APPARTIENNENT À UNE FACILITÉ QUI A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ RÉSIDENTIELLE SOUS CES AUSPICES.

En ce qui concerne votre unité résidentielle:

Combien d'enfants y résident? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'éventail d'âge de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est le sexe de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

## 18. SUITE

Quel est le nom de la facilité à laquelle votre unité résidentielle appartient?

\_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'emploi de la personne complétant le questionnaire?

\_\_\_\_\_

CETTE INFORMATION A ÉTÉ DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES FACILITÉS ONT RÉPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÈTENT. POUR ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DÉTACHÉE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À LA RECEPTION.

## 19. CECI EST LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE TEL QU'IL S'APPLIQUE À VOTRE FACILITÉ.

Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération. Un sommaire de cette étude sera préparé en un pamphlet et sera distribué à ceux qui sont intéressés. Si vous désirez une copie de ces résultats, complétez le formulaire suivant s'il vous plaît.

Ce formulaire sera détaché du reste du questionnaire pour assurer la confidentialité. Si vous préférez, ce formulaire peut être détaché du reste du questionnaire et posté séparément.

IMPRIMER S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

NOM: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

ADRESSE: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLE & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

CODE POSTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT POURRIEZ-VOUS REMETTRE SEULEMENT LES PARTIES COMPLÉTÉES DU QUESTIONNAIRE DANS L'ENVELOPPE DE L'EXPÉDITEUR CI-INCLUSE. LES PARTIES NON-COMPLÉTÉES PEUVENT ÊTRE JETÉES.

3<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLIE SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI NE GARDENT PAS DES ANIMAUX FAVORIS SUR LEUR TERRAIN ACTUELLEMENT, MAIS ENT AVAIENT GARDÉ AU PARAVANT.

1. Quel types d'animaux favoris gardiez-vous auparavant?

- \_\_\_\_\_ insectes (eg. fourmis de ferme, abeilles, chenilles)
- \_\_\_\_\_ poissons tropicaux
- \_\_\_\_\_ tortues
- \_\_\_\_\_ autres reptiles (eg. serpents, lézards)
- \_\_\_\_\_ amphibiens (eg. grenouilles, crapauds)
- \_\_\_\_\_ petits oiseaux domestiques (eg. perruches, canaris)
- \_\_\_\_\_ petits rongeurs (eg. souris blanches, hamsters, cobayes)
- \_\_\_\_\_ lapins
- \_\_\_\_\_ chats
- \_\_\_\_\_ petits chiens (eg. chiens de salon, terriers)
- \_\_\_\_\_ chiens moyens (eg. épagneul, bigle)
- \_\_\_\_\_ gros chiens (eg. colley, Berger allemand)
- \_\_\_\_\_ petits animaux de ferme (eg. canards, poulets)
- \_\_\_\_\_ animaux de ferme moyens (eg. chèvres, cochons, moutons)
- \_\_\_\_\_ gros animaux de ferme (eg. vaches, chevaux)
- \_\_\_\_\_ animaux sauvages qui ont été apprivoisés
- \_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

Pourquoi ne gardez-vous plus ces animaux favoris sur votre terrain?

a) À qui appartenait ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ les membres du personnel appartenait  
les animaux favoris aux quels les enfants  
eurent accès \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ la facilité appartenait les animaux  
favoris pour que les enfants se les  
partagent \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des groupes spécifiques d'enfants  
appartenaient les animaux favoris  
(eg. l'animal favori d'un cottage  
spécifique ou d'une salle spécifique) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des enfants individuels appartenait  
les animaux favoris (ie. un certain  
enfant aurait seul la possession de  
l'animal favori) \_\_\_\_\_

b) S'appliquait-il ce type de possession à tous les animaux favoris qui  
étaient gardés sur le lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui Tous les animaux favoris étaient appartenus de cette manière.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non Des animaux favoris étaient appartenus de différentes manières.  
S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ CECI EN ÉCRIVANT LE TYPE D'ANIMAL  
APRÈS LA POSSESSION APPROPRIÉE CI-DESSUS.

c) Tous les enfants dans la facilité bénéficiaient-ils des mêmes types de  
privilèges en ce qui concerne la possession de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

3. (a) Quand les enfants avaient-ils accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heure de la journée ou de la nuit \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heure durant leur temps libre (ie. \_\_\_\_\_  
en dehors des repas, des cours, du  
sommeil et des autres activités proposées)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement à heures fixes \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ jamais \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Ce type d'accès s'appliquait-il à tous les animaux favoris gardés sur votre lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. L'accès à tous les animaux favoris était le même.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Les enfants avaient des accès différents selon les différents animaux favoris. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ PAR ÉCRIT LE TYPE D'ANIMAUX APRÈS LE TYPE D'ACCÈS APPROPRIÉE CI-DESSUS.

(c) Tous les enfants avaient-ils le même droit d'accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

4. Où est-ce que ces animaux demeuraient? (eg. dans la chambre des enfants, dans la niche du chien dehors, grange)

5. Est-ce que les enfants étaient surveillés quand ils étaient avec les animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui                      Cela s'appliquait-il à tous les enfants?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non                      Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

Cela s'appliquait-il à tous les types d'animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non                      Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

6. Qui prenait soin de ces animaux favoris? (eg. les nourrit, les entretient)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement les enfants

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement les personnel

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants et le personnel partageaient la responsabilité

7. Est-ce que l'introduction des animaux favoris dans la facilité a été planifiée?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. (a) Est-ce qu'une enquête a été faite dans la nature en ce qui concerne les soins exigés pour ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(b) Est-ce que le personnel était préparé pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(c) Est-ce que les enfants étaient préparés pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(d) Est-ce que des changements matériels ont été nécessaires pour accommoder ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Est-ce qu'il y a eu des problèmes causés par un manque de planification?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

En ce qui concerne la/les personne(s) qui a/ont introduit les animaux favoris dans la facilité, quel était:

(a) leur travail et/ou formation professionnelle? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) leur position? \_\_\_\_\_

Si un enfant a un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet animal favori a le droit de visiter l'enfant dans votre facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux sont autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Si un enfant a un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet enfant a le droit de l'apporter à la facilité pour vivre avec lui?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux sont autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Ces animaux favoris jouaient-ils un rôle éducatif dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle éducatif de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes éducatifs
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori utilisé
  - (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

12. Ces animaux favoris jouaient-ils un rôle thérapeutique dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle thérapeutique de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes thérapeutiques
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori utilisé
  - (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

Ces animaux favoris jouaient-ils d'autres rôles (autres qu'éducatifs ou thérapeutiques) dans votre facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le(s) rôle(s) de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animaux favori utilisé
  - (d) degré de succès atteint

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

Est-ce que vous avez rencontré des problèmes du fait d'avoir gardé des animaux favoris sur votre lieu?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. S'il vous plaît, élaborer sur les problèmes que vous avez rencontrés.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

15. Est-ce que vous avez des suggestions pour ceux qui veulent introduire des animaux favoris dans leur facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui      Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

16. Est-ce que votre facilité a des plans pour le futur concernant des animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui      Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLI SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI APPARTIENNENT À UNE FACILITÉ QUI A PLUS  
D'UNE UNITÉ RÉSIDENIELLE SOUS CES AUSPICES.

En ce qui concerne votre unité résidentielle:

Combien d'enfants y résident? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'éventail d'âge de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est le sexe de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

## 17. SUITE

Quel est le nom de la facilité à laquelle votre unité résidentielle appartient?

\_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'emploi de la personne complétant le questionnaire?

\_\_\_\_\_

CETTE INFORMATION A ÉTÉ DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES FACILITÉS ONT RÉPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÉMENT. POUR ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DETACHÉE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À LA RECEPTION.

## 18. CECI EST LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE TEL QU'IL S'APPLIQUE À VOTRE FACILITÉ.

Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération. Un sommaire de cette étude sera préparé en un pamphlet et sera distribué à ceux qui sont intéressés. Si vous désirez une copie de ces résultats, complétez le formulaire suivant s'il vous plaît. Ce formulaire sera détaché du reste du questionnaire pour assurer la confidentialité. Si vous préférez ce formulaire peut être détaché du reste du questionnaire et posté séparément. IMPRIMER S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

NOM: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

ADRESSE: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLE & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

CODE POSTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT POURRIEZ-VOUS REMETTRE SEULEMENT LES PARTIES COMPLÉTÉES DU QUESTIONNAIRE DANS L'ENVELOPPE DE L'EXPÉDITEUR CI-INCLUSE. LES PARTIES NON-COMPLÉTÉES PEUVENT ÊTRE JETÉES.

4<sup>ième</sup> PARTIE

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLIE SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI NE GARDE PAS DES ANIMAUX FAVORIS SUR LEUR TERRAIN ACTUELLEMENT, MAIS ENVISAGERIENT EN GARDER.

1. Quel type d'animaux favoris garderiez-vous sur leur terrain dans le futur?

\_\_\_\_\_ insectes (eg. fourmis de ferme, chenilles, abeilles)

\_\_\_\_\_ poissons tropicaux

\_\_\_\_\_ tortues

\_\_\_\_\_ autres reptiles (eg. serpents, lézards)

\_\_\_\_\_ amphibiens (eg. grenouilles, crapauds)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits oiseaux domestiques (eg. perruches, canaris)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits rongeurs (eg. souris blanches, hamsters, cobayes)

\_\_\_\_\_ lapins

\_\_\_\_\_ chats

\_\_\_\_\_ petits chiens (eg. chiens de salon, terriers)

\_\_\_\_\_ chiens moyens (eg. épagneul, bigle)

\_\_\_\_\_ gros chiens (eg. colley, Berger allemand)

\_\_\_\_\_ petits animaux de ferme (eg. canards, poulets)

\_\_\_\_\_ animaux de ferme moyens (eg. chèvres, cochons, moutons)

\_\_\_\_\_ gros animaux de ferme (eg. vaches, chevaux)

\_\_\_\_\_ animaux sauvages qui ont été apprivoisés

\_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(a) À qui appartiendraient ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ les membres du personnel appartiendraient  
les animaux favoris aux quels les enfants  
auraient accès \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ la facilité appartiendrait les animaux  
favoris pour que les enfants se les  
partagent \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des groupes spécifiques d'enfants  
appartiendraient les animaux favoris  
(eg. l'animal favori d'un cottage  
spécifique ou d'une salle spécifique) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ des enfants individuels appartiendraient  
les animaux favoris (ie. un certain enfant  
aurait seul la possession de l'animal  
favori) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Ce type de possession s'appliquerait-il à tous les animaux favoris qui sont gardés sur les lieux?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Tous les animaux favoris seraient appartenus de cette manière.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Des animaux favoris différents seraient appartenus de  
différentes manières. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ CECI EN  
ÉCRIVANT LE TYPE D'ANIMAL APRÈS LA POSSESSION APPROPRIÉE  
CI-DESSUS.

(c) Tous les enfants dans la facilité bénéficieraient-ils des mêmes types de privilèges en ce qui concerne la possession de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

3. (a) Quand les enfants auraient-ils accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heures de la journée ou de \_\_\_\_\_  
la nuit

\_\_\_\_\_ à toute heure durant leur temps libre (ie. \_\_\_\_\_  
en dehors des repas, des cours, du  
sommeil, et des autres activités proposées)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement à heures fixes \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ jamais \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(b) Est-ce que ce type d'accès s'appliquerait à tous les animaux favoris gardés sur votre lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. L'accès à tous les animaux favoris serait le même.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Les enfants auraient des accès différents selon les différents animaux favoris. S'IL VOUS PLAÎT INDIQUEZ PAR ÉCRIT LE TYPE D'ANIMAUX APRÈS LE TYPE D'ACCÈS APPROPRIÉE CI-DESSUS.

(c) Est-ce que tous les enfants dans la facilité auraient le même droit d'accès à ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Élaborer dans l'espace ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

4. Où est-ce que ces animaux favoris demeureraient? (eg. dans la chambre des enfants dans la niche du chien dehors, grange)

5. Est-ce que les enfants seraient surveillés quand ils seraient avec les animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui Est-ce que cela s'appliquerait à tous les enfants?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

Est-ce cela s'appliquerait à tous les types d'animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

6. Qui prendrait soin de ces animaux favoris? (eg. les nourrit, les entretient)

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement les enfants

\_\_\_\_\_ seulement le personnel

\_\_\_\_\_ les enfants et le personnel partageraient la responsabilité

## 7. L'introduction de ces animaux favoris impliquerait-elle une planification?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. (a) Est-ce qu'une enquête aurait faite dans la nature en ce qui concerne les soins exigés pour ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(b) Est-ce que le personnel serait préparé pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(c) Est-ce que les enfants seraient préparés pour l'introduction de ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

(d) Est-ce que des changements matériels seraient nécessaires pour accommoder ces animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

En ce qui concerne la/les personne qui introduirait/introduiraient les animaux favoris dans la facilité, quel serait:

(a) leur travail et/ou formation professionnelle? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(b) leur position? \_\_\_\_\_

Si un enfant a un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet animal favori aurait le droit de visiter l'enfant dans votre facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux seraient autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Si un enfant a un animal favori dans sa maison, est-ce que cet enfant aurait le droit de l'apporter à la facilité pour vivre avec lui?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui

\_\_\_\_\_ Non

\_\_\_\_\_ Seulement certains types d'animaux seraient autorisés. Spécifier lesquels s'il vous plaît.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

11. Est-ce que ces animaux favoris joueraient un rôle éducatif dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle éducatif de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes éducatifs
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori serait utilisé

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

12. Est-ce que ces animaux favoris joueraient un rôle thérapeutique dans la facilité?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le rôle thérapeutique de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:
- (a) types de programmes thérapeutique
  - (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
  - (c) le type d'animal favori serait utilisé

Ces animaux favoris joueraient-ils d'autres rôles (autres, qu'éducatifs ou thérapeutiques) dans la facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Veuillez élaborer sur le(s) rôle(s) de ces animaux favoris à partir de ce qui suit:

- (a) types de programmes
- (b) le type d'enfant (âge, sexe, problème)
- (c) le type d'animal favori serait utilisé

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

anticiperiez-vous des problèmes du fait d'avoir gardé des animaux favoris sur votre lieu?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. S'il vous plaît, élaborer sur les problèmes que vous anticiperiez.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non.

15. Quels types d'information penseriez-vous avoir besoin avant d'introduire un programme concernant des animaux favoris? Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

16. Est-ce que votre facilité a fait des plans définitifs eu ce qui concerne le futur pour les animaux favoris?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui. Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non .

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLI SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI APPARTIENNENT À UNE FACILITÉ QUI A PLUS  
D'UNE UNITÉ RÉSIDENTIELLE SOUS CES AUSPICES.

En ce qui concerne votre unité résidentielle:

Combien d'enfants y résident? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'éventail d'âge de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est le sexe de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

## 17. SUITE

Quel est le nom de la facilité à laquelle votre unité résidentielle appartient?

\_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'emploi de la personne complétant le questionnaire?

\_\_\_\_\_

CETTE INFORMATION A ÉTÉ DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES FACILITÉS ONT RÉPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÈTENT. POUR ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DÉTACHÉE DU QUESTIONNAIRE À LA RECEPTION.

## 18. CECI EST LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE TEL QU'IL S'APPLIQUE À VOTRE FACILITÉ.

Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération. Un sommaire de cette étude sera préparé en un pamphlet et sera distribué à ceux qui sont intéressés. Si vous désirez une copie de ces résultats, complétez le formulaire suivant s'il vous plaît. Ce formulaire sera détachée du reste du questionnaire pour assurer la confidentialité. Si vous préférez, ce formulaire peut être détaché du reste du questionnaire et posté séparément. IMPRIMER S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

NOM: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

ADRESSE: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLE & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

CODE POSTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT POURRIEZ-VOUS REMETTRE SEULEMENT LES PARTIE COMPLÉTÉES DU QUESTIONNAIRE DANS L'ENVELOPPE DE L'EXPÉDITEUR CI-INCLUSE. LES PARTIES NON-COMPLÉTÉES PEUVENT ÊTRE JETÉES.

5ième PARTIE

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLIE PAR CEUX QUI N'ONT JAMAIS GARDÉ D'ANIMAUX FAVORIS SUR LEUR LIEU ET CEUX QUI N'ENVISAGEAIENT PAS DE LE FAIRE.

1. Pourquoi n'envisageriez-vous jamais de garder des animaux favoris sur votre lieu? (Cocher la raison appropriée. S'il y a plus d'une raison, pourriez-vous numérotter vos raisons par ordre d'importance, ie. mettez "1" devant la raison la plus importante, mettez "2" devant la deuxième raison la plus importante, etc.)

- nombre inadéquat du personnel pour prendre soin des animaux
- personnel inexpérimenté en ce qui concerne le soin des animaux
- les animaux posent des problèmes d'hygiène
- les enfants peuvent faire du tort aux animaux
- les animaux peuvent faire du tort aux enfants (ie. mordre, griffer)
- espace inadéquat sur le lieu (à l'intérieur ou à l'extérieur)
- coût pour prendre soin des animaux (eg. nourriture, rétribution des vétérinaires)
- politique de la facilité
- garder des animaux favoris sur le lieu n'aurait pas d'avantage important pour les enfants
- autres. Spécifier s'il vous plaît \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

2. Pensez-vous qu'il y a des avantages pour des enfants d'avoir un animal favori?

- Oui      Quels seraient ces avantages? Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous, s'il vous plaît.
- Non

Si une facilité comme la vôtre (eg. types d'enfants servis, dimension du lieu, budget) pensait que le fait de garder des animaux favoris sur les lieux avait des résultats avantageux pour les enfants, envisageriez-vous un tel programme dans votre facilité?

\_\_\_\_\_ Oui.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non. Pourquoi pas? Élaborer dans l'espace indiqué ci-dessous s'il vous plaît.

DOIT ÊTRE REMPLI SEULEMENT PAR CEUX QUI APPARTIENNENT À UNE FACILITÉ QUI A PLUS D'UNE UNITÉ RÉSIDENTIELLE SOUS CES AUSPICES.

En ce qui concerne votre unité résidentielle:

Combien d'enfants y résident? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'éventail d'âge de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

Quel est le sexe de ces enfants? \_\_\_\_\_

## 4. SUITE

Quel est le nom de la facilité à la quelle votre unité résidentielle appartient?

\_\_\_\_\_

Quel est l'emploi de la personne complétant le questionnaire?

\_\_\_\_\_

CETTE INFORMATION A ÉTÉ DEMANDÉE SEULEMENT POUR IDENTIFIER QUELLES FACILITÉS ONT RÉPONDU AU QUESTIONNAIRE ET L'EMPLOI DE CEUX QUI LE COMPLÈTENT. POUR ASSURER LA CONFIDENTIALITÉ, CETTE PAGE SERA DÉTACHÉ DU QUESTIONNAIRE À LA RÉCEPTION.

## 5. CECI EST LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE TEL QU'IL S'APPLIQUE À VOTRE FACILITÉ.

Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération. Un sommaire de cette étude sera préparé en un pamphlet et sera distribué à ceux qui sont intéressés. Si vous desirez une copie de ces résultats, complétez le formulaire suivant s'il vous plaît. Ce formulaire sera détaché du reste du questionnaire pour assurer la confidentialité. Si vous préférez, ce formulaire peut être détaché du reste du questionnaire et posté séparément. IMPRIMER S'IL VOUS PLAÎT.

NOM: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

FACILITÉ: \_\_\_\_\_

ADRESSE: \_\_\_\_\_

VILLE & PROVINCE: \_\_\_\_\_

CODE POSTAL: \_\_\_\_\_

S'IL VOUS PLAÎT POURRIEZ-VOUS REMETTRE SEULEMENT LES PARTIES COMPLÉTÉES DU QUESTIONNAIRE DANS L'ENVELOPPE DE L'EXPÉDITEUR CI-INCLUSE. LES PARTIES NON-COMPLÉTÉES PEUVENT ÊTRE JETÉES.

APPENDIX F

Letter of Introduction

English Version

French Version



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS

WINNIPEG, CANADA R3T 2N2

TELEPHONE 204 474-9432

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

This letter is to ask for your assistance in a research project in which I am involved for my master's thesis (M.Sc. in Human Development, Department of Family Studies). I am investigating the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada. Your comments would be most appreciated, whether or not your facility keeps pets on the premises. This survey is being funded by the summer resources fund of the Health Promotion Directorate, Health and Welfare Canada.

Although this questionnaire has been sent to the executive director or the administrator of the facility, it should be completed by the staff person who has the most knowledge of the use of pets in your facility. In those facilities where there is more than one residential unit under the auspices of one organization, the director or administrator should fill out Part One of the questionnaire and distribute the remaining part(s) to staff in the residential units, as directed in the questionnaire.

The attached questionnaire may look rather lengthy, but you will be requested to answer only one or two of the five parts. Those who have completed the questionnaire have found that it takes less than one-half hour to complete. Please answer Part One, which requests general information about your facility. The second last question in this section will direct you to the remaining section that is the most appropriate for your facility.

All replies will be kept strictly confidential. The information that you give will be reported only as part of a larger, common pool of information. The names of individual facilities will not be mentioned.

A prompt reply would be most appreciated. Please return only the completed parts of the questionnaire, in the envelope(s) provided, by

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Heather Ferguson  
Graduate Student



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
 FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS  
 WINNIPEG, CANADA R3T 2N2  
 TELEPHONE 204 474-9432

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

Cette lettre est pour demander votre assistance pour une recherche dans laquelle je suis engagée pour ma thèse de M.Sc. en "Développement Humain", département des "Family Studies". Je fais une enquête sur l'utilisation d'animaux favoris dans les facilités résidentielles pour les soins des enfants au Canada. Vos commentaires seraient très appréciés, que votre facilité garde des animaux favoris sur les lieux ou non. Cette étude est patronnée par la Direction de la Promotion de Santé et Bien-être Social Canada.

Quoique ce questionnaire ait été expédié au directeur exécutif ou l'administrateur de la facilité, il doit être complété par le membre du personnel qui a la plus grande connaissance de l'utilisation des animaux favoris dans votre facilité. Dans les facilités où il y a plus d'une unité résidentielle sous les auspices d'une organisation, le directeur ou l'administrateur doit compléter la 1<sup>ère</sup> Partie du questionnaire et distribuer la (les) section(s) restante(s) au personnel dans les unités résidentielles, comme indiqué dans le questionnaire.

Le questionnaire ci-joint peut paraître plutôt long, mais on vous demandera de répondre à une ou deux des cinq parties seulement. Ceux qui ont complété le questionnaire, ont trouvé qu'il ne faut pas plus d'une demi-heure pour remplir. Répondez s'il vous plaît à la 1<sup>ère</sup> Partie, qui vous demande une information générale sur votre facilité. L'avant-dernière question de cette section vous indique la section restante la plus appropriée à votre facilité.

Toutes les réponses seront strictement confidentielles. L'information que vous donnez sera rapportée seulement comme une partie d'un plus grand ensemble commun d'information. Le nom des facilités individuelles ne seront pas mentionnées.

Une réponse rapide serait très appréciée. Renvoyez, s'il vous plaît, seulement les parties complétées du questionnaire dans les enveloppes fournies, avant le

Merci pour votre coopération.

Sincèrement,

Heather Ferguson  
 Étudiant Diplômé

APPENDIX G

Letter of Reminder

English Version

French Version



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS  
WINNIPEG, CANADA R3T 2N2  
TELEPHONE 204 474-9432

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

Approximately two weeks ago you were sent a questionnaire on the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada. Your reply has not yet been received.

Your comments on the subject would be most appreciated, whether or not your facility keeps pets on the premises. The questionnaire may look rather lengthy, but you are requested to answer only one or two of the five parts. Those who have completed the questionnaire have found that it takes less than one-half hour to complete.

All replies will be kept strictly confidential. The information that you give will be reported only as part of a larger, common pool of information. The names of individual facilities or respondents will not be mentioned.

If you require another copy of the questionnaire or if you have any questions or concerns about this research project, please feel free to contact me at (204) 269-5459.

It would be most appreciated if the completed parts of the questionnaire could be returned, in the envelope(s) provided, by

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Heather Ferguson,  
Graduate Student



THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF HOME ECONOMICS

WINNIPEG, CANADA R3T 2N2

TELEPHONE 204 474-9432

DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES

Approximativement deux semaines passées, vous étiez expédié un questionnaire sur l'utilisation d'animaux favoris dans les facilités résidentielles pour les soins des enfants au Canada. Votre réponse n'ait été pas reçue jusqu'ici.

Vos commentaires seraient très appréciés, que votre facilité garde des animaux favoris sur les lieux ou non. Le questionnaire ci-joint peut paraître plutôt long, mais on vous demandera de répondre à une ou deux des cinq parties seulement. Ceux qui ont complété le questionnaire ont trouvé qu'il ne faut pas plus d'une demi-heure pour remplir.

Toutes les réponses seront strictement confidentielles. L'information que vous donnez sera rapportée seulement comme une partie d'un plus grand ensemble commun d'information. Le nom des facilités individuelles ne seront pas mentionnées.

Si vous avez besoin d'une autre copie du questionnaire ou si vous avez des questions ou des soucis pour cette recherche, téléphonez-moi, s'il vous plaît, à (204) 269-5459.

Une réponse rapide serait très appréciée. Renvoyez, s'il vous plaît, seulement les parties complétées du questionnaire, dans les enveloppes fournies, avant

Merci beaucoup pour votre coopération.

Sincèrement,

Heather Ferguson,  
Étudiant Diplômé

APPENDIX H

Table H

Requests for Pamphlets by Region and the Keeping of Pets

Table H  
Requests for Pamphlets by Region and the Keeping of Pets

Region	Facilities Requesting Pamphlets <sup>*</sup>		Pamphlet Requests by the Keeping of Pets			
	Number	Percent of Facilities Responding	Pets Kept Now	Pets Kept in Past	Pets Kept in Future	Pets Kept Never
Maritimes	9	90	8	0	0	2
Quebec	9	75	2	3	3	3
Ontario	22	76	16	3	3	4
Prairies	24	80	20	3	2	3
British Columbia	8	62	4	2	0	2
North	1	100	1	0	1	0
TOTAL	73	77	51	11	9	14

<sup>\*</sup>These figures include requests from the 9 facilities who returned incomplete questionnaires.

N.B. There were pamphlet requests from more than one respondent in some facilities.

APPENDIX I

Levels of Significance and Chi-Square Values of  
the Relationships Between the Hypothesis 3 Variables

## Size of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.84	0.34
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.19	3.29
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.008 <sup>c</sup>	9.76
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.09	4.93
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	8.02
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.048 <sup>c</sup>	6.09
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.27	2.59
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.25	2.75
classroom (yes/no)	0.009 <sup>c</sup>	9.51	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	11.50
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.70	2.17
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.054	5.82
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.32	2.27
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.14	3.89
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.35	2.08
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.72	2.10
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.002 <sup>c</sup>	12.58
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.16	6.59
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	7.55
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.0002 <sup>c</sup>	16.99
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.17	3.52
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.63	0.93
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.76	0.54
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.54	1.25

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Fish kept as pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.17	1.86*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.35	0.86*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
Ownership of the pets	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.63	0.24*
	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	1.00	6.25
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.45	0.56*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.28	1.15*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.17	1.88*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.61	0.27*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
Supervision of the children with the pets	classroom (yes/no)	0.09	2.94*
	no, some, all children	0.08	9.70
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.64	0.90
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.19	1.76*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.69	0.16*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.29	1.11*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	paraprofessional/professional	0.54	1.22
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	6.56*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	6.62
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.31	1.03*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.72	0.13*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.07	3.38*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.08	3.03*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Birds kept as pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.17	1.86*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.59	0.30*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.44	0.59*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.50	0.45*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.13	2.28*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.77	0.09*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.14	4.00
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.22	3.01
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.10	2.71*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.52	0.42*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.45	0.58*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.28	2.58
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.77	0.09*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies  
less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Rodents kept as pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.35	0.86*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.47	0.512*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.29	1.14*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.22	1.48*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.51	0.44*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.24	1.39*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.55	1.20
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.44	1.65
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.18	1.82*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.003 <sup>c</sup>	8.61*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.56	1.15
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.84	0.04*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.10	4.66
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.20	1.66*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.16	2.02*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.98	0.0004*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Cats kept as pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.47	0.51*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.24*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	0.08	6.82
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.36	0.85*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	4.29*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.71	0.13*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
classroom (yes/no)	0.12	2.38*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.72	0.65
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.25	2.79
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.58	0.31*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.94	0.01*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.56	0.33*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.48	0.50*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.06	5.57
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.08	3.11*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.83	0.38
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.99	0.0003*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.30	1.07*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.58	0.31*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.98	0.0004*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.97	0.001*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Dogs kept as pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	-	-
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.63	0.24*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.29	1.14*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.24*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	-	-
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	0.07	7.14
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.94	0.005*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.36	0.85*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.29	1.14*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.07	3.24*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.48	0.49*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.11	2.63*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.54	0.38*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.32	0.97*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.09	2.90*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.14	3.97*
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.71	0.70*
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.37	0.82*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.59	0.28*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.82	0.05*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.60	1.03
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.11	2.60*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.61	1.00
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.43	0.62*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.0003 <sup>c</sup>	12.98*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Owners of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	a	a
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	-	-
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	a	a
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	a	a
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	a	a
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	a	a
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$ 

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Access to the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	a	a
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.10	6.25
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.08	6.82
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.07	7.14
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	-	-
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.47	2.55
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.14	5.56
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.64	1.70
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.97	0.26
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Restrictions on Access

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.84	0.34
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.45	0.56*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.59	0.30*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.36	0.85*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.94	0.005*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time) restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	-	-
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.31	1.04*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.74	0.11*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.98	0.001*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.49	1.44
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.34	2.17
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.18	1.83*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.42	0.65*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.45	0.58*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.97	0.05
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.93	0.01*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.13	4.12
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.52	0.41*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.57	0.33*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.049 <sup>c</sup>	3.86*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

Pets have a free run inside and outside

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.19	3.29
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.36	0.85*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	-	-
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.56	0.34*
	classroom (yes/no)	a	a
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.24	2.82
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.71	0.14*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.48	0.49*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.38	0.76*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.83	0.04*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies  
less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets have a free run inside

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.008 <sup>c</sup>	9.76
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.28	1.15*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.44	0.59*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	4.29*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.29	1.14*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.31	1.04*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	-	-
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.07	3.35*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
classroom (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.46	1.54*
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.23	2.98
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.44	0.59*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.76	0.54
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.15	2.12*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.36	2.07
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.32	0.97*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.51	0.43*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.51	0.43*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets have a free run outside

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.09	4.93
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.22	1.48*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.07	3.24*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	-	-
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*	
	classroom (yes/no)	a	a
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.76	0.56
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	1.00	0.00*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.83	0.04*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets kept in animal shelters outside

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	8.02
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.51	0.44*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.48	0.49*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	-	-
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.46	0.55*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.70	0.15*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.26	2.71
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.43	0.62*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	1.00	0.00*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	4.39*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.16	2.01*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.70	0.15*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets kept in a playroom or lounge

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.048 <sup>c</sup>	6.09
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.17	1.88*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.24	1.39*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.71	0.13*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.11	2.63*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.46	0.55*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	-	-
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.20	1.63
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	8.82
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.83	0.05*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.13	2.25*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.45	0.56*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.39	1.88
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.09	2.88*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies  
less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets kept in children's rooms

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.27	2.59*
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.61	0.27*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.50	0.45*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.54	0.38*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.74	0.11*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.07	3.35*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.70	0.15*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.20	1.63*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	-	-
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.15	2.03*
classroom (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.92	0.16*
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.051	5.93
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.56	0.35*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.45	0.58*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.49	1.44*
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.47	0.51*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.79	0.07*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies  
less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets kept in other rooms in the residence

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.25	2.75
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.13	2.28*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.90	0.02*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.32	0.97*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.56	0.34*
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.91	0.34*
other rooms inside (yes/no)	-	-	-
	classroom (yes/no)	0.08	3.04*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	8.12
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.07	3.36*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.23	1.41*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.64	0.21*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.85	0.32
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.88	0.02*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.54	1.24
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.43	0.64*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.03 <sup>c</sup>	4.8*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.56	0.34*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.66	0.19*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Pets kept in a classroom

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	9.51
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.09	2.94*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.77	0.09*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.12	2.38*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.09	2.90*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.98	0.0009*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.08	3.04*
classroom (yes/no)	-	-	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.85	0.33
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.60	0.28*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.51	0.44*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.15	3.78
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.16	2.00*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.44	0.60*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Supervision of the Children with the Pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	11.50
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.08	5.11
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.14	4.00
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.55	1.20
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.72	0.65
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.14	3.97
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.49	1.44
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.24	2.82
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.46	1.54
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.76	0.56
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.26	2.71
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	8.82
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.92	0.16
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	8.12
classroom (yes/no)	0.85	0.33	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	-	-
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.003 <sup>c</sup>	16.11
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.0002 <sup>c</sup>	17.33
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.37	4.27
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.18	3.41
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.67	2.35
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.004 <sup>c</sup>	11.09
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.008 <sup>c</sup>	9.70
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.17	3.54
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.32	2.26
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.23	2.95
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.32	2.26

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Person who Cares for the Pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.70	2.17
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.64	0.90
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.22	3.01
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.44	1.65
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.25	2.79
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.70	0.71
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.34	2.17
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.23	2.98
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.051	5.93
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.003 <sup>c</sup>	16.11
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	-	-
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.06	5.55
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.37	4.27
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.006 <sup>c</sup>	10.35
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.10	4.67
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.19	3.35
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.36	2.07

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Planning the introduction of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.054	5.82
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.19	1.76*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.10	2.71*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.58	0.31*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.37	0.82*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	0.47	2.55
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.18	1.83*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.44	0.59*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.43	0.62*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.83	0.05*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.07	3.36*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.60	0.28*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.0002 <sup>c</sup>	17.33
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.06	5.55
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	-	-
	nature of care required (yes/no)	-	-
	staff prepared (yes/no)	-	-
	children prepared (yes/no)	-	-
	facility prepared (yes/no)	-	-
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.15	3.86
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.76	0.10*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.94	0.12
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.44*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.11	2.62*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.45	0.59*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.65	0.20*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies  
less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Planning the care of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.32	2.27
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.69	0.16*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.25	1.31*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.94	0.01*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.59	0.28*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.42	0.65*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.71	0.14*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.13	2.25*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.56	0.35*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
classroom (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	-	-
	nature of care required (yes/no)	-	-
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.13*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.40	0.70*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.50	d
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.03 <sup>c</sup>	7.18
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.66*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.69	0.16*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.97	0.002*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.38	0.76*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.71	0.14*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.56	0.35*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Preparing the Staff for the Pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	b	b
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	b	b
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	b	b
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	b	b
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	b	b
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	b	b
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	b	b
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	b	b
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	b	b
	free run in & out (yes/no)	b	b
	free run inside (yes/no)	b	b
	free run outside (yes/no)	b	b
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	b	b
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	b	b
	children's rooms (yes/no)	b	b
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	b	b
classroom (yes/no)	b	b	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	b	b
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	b	b
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	-	-
	nature of care required (yes/no)	b	b
	staff prepared (yes/no)	-	-
	children prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	facility prepared (yes/no)	b	b
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	b	b
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	b	b
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	b	b
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	b	b
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	b	b
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	b	b
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	b	b
	care of the pets (yes/no)	b	b
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	children were a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	b	b

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Preparing the children for the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.14	3.89
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.29	1.11*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.18	1.82*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.56	0.33*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.82	0.05*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.45	0.58*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.23	1.41*
classroom (yes/no)	0.51	0.44*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	-	-
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.13*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	-	-
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.31	1.05*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.31	1.04*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.07	3.21*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.77	0.08
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.41	0.67*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.70	0.15*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Facility prepared for the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.35	2.08
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.52	0.42*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.003 <sup>c</sup>	8.61*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.48	0.50*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.64	0.21*
classroom (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	-	-
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.40	0.70*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.31	1.05*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	-	-
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.37	2.00
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.10	4.70
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.52	0.42*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.99	0.0001*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.20	1.62*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.16	1.93*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Professional Orientation of the introducer of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.72	2.10
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.54	1.22
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.56	1.15
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.06	5.57
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.60	1.03
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.97	0.05
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.76	0.54
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.85	0.32
classroom (yes/no)	0.15	3.78	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.37	4.27
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.15	3.86
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.38	2.00
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	-	-
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.54	1.22
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.051	5.95
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.44	1.65
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	b	b
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Position of the introducer of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.002 <sup>c</sup>	12.58
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	6.56*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.45	0.58*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.08	3.11*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.11	2.60*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.93	0.01*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.48	0.49*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.15	2.12*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.45	0.56*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.45	0.58*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.88	0.02*
classroom (yes/no)	0.16	2.00*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.18	3.41
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.76	0.10*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.50	d
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.31	1.04*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	-	-
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.59	1.06
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	0.37	0.79
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.43	0.63*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.19	1.71*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.84	0.04*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Allowance of Pet from home to visit facility

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.16	6.59
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	6.62
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.28	2.58
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.10	4.66
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.83	0.38
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.61	1.00
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.13	4.12
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.36	2.07
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.39	1.88
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.49	1.44
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.54	1.24
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.67	2.35
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.94	0.12
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.03 <sup>c</sup>	7.18
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.10	4.70
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.59	1.06
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	-	-
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.34	2.15
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.17	3.54
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.34	2.17
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.30	2.38

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Allowance of a child's pet from home to stay at the facility

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	a	a
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	a	a
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.37	0.79
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	-	-
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	a	a
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	a	a
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	a	a
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Educational role for the pet

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	7.55
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.31	1.03*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.20	1.66*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.99	0.0003*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.43	0.62*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	0.14	5.56
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.62	0.25*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.04 <sup>c</sup>	4.39*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.64	0.43*
classroom (yes/no)	0.44	0.60*	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.004 <sup>c</sup>	11.09
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.006 <sup>c</sup>	10.35
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.44*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.66*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.07	3.21*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.52	0.42*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.54	1.22
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.43	0.63*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.34	2.15
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	-	-
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.004 <sup>c</sup>	8.45*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.13	2.25*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.25	1.33*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.44	0.60*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.13	2.29*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

Therapeutic role for the pets			
Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.0002 <sup>c</sup>	16.99
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.72	0.13*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.16	2.02*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.30	1.07*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	0.0003 <sup>c</sup>	12.98*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	0.64	1.70
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.38	0.76*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.32	0.97*
	free run outside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.16	2.01*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.09	2.88*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.47	0.51*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.03 <sup>c</sup>	4.82*
	classroom (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.01 <sup>c</sup>	9.70
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.10	4.67
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.11	2.62*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.69	0.16*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.77	0.08*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.99	0.0002*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.0511	5.95
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.19	1.71*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.17	3.54
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.004 <sup>c</sup>	8.45*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	-	-
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	0.26	1.28*
	care of the pets (yes/no)	0.22	1.50*
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	0.99	0.0001*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.38*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

Problems encountered			
Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.17	3.52
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.07	3.38*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.98	0.0004*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.58	0.31*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	0.97	0.26
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.52	0.41*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	0.83	0.04*
	free run inside (yes/no)	0.51	0.43*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.83	0.04*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.73	0.15*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	0.34	0.91*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.79	0.07*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	classroom (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.17	3.54
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.19	3.35
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.97	0.002*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.41	0.66*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.20	1.62*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	0.44	1.65
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.62	0.25*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.34	2.17*
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.13	2.24*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.26	1.28*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	-	-
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	children were a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	-	-

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one  
 b - only one value present for one variable  
 c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test  
 \* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Problems with the care of the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.63	0.93
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.98	0.004*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.57	0.33*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.51	0.43*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.32	2.26
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.38	0.76*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.84	0.04*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.25	1.33*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.22	1.50*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	-	-
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one  
 b - only one value present for one variable  
 c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test  
 \* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Problems with the staff

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	a	a
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	a	a
	nature of care required (yes/no)	b	b
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	facility prepared (yes/no)	b	b
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	a	a
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	a	a
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

Problems with the children			
Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.76	0.54
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.96	0.002*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	0.77	0.09*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	0.39	0.75*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.80	0.06*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched. time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	0.049 <sup>c</sup>	3.86*
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	0.56	0.34*
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.23	2.95
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.45	0.59*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.71	0.14*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	1.00	0.00*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.44	0.60*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.99	0.0001*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one  
 b - only one value present for one variable  
 c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test  
 \* - chi-square with Yates' correction

Problems with the facility			
Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	a	a
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	a	a
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
Access to the pets	access (anytime, free time, sched.time)	a	a
	restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
	free run in & out (yes/no)	a	a
	free run inside (yes/no)	a	a
	free run outside (yes/no)	a	a
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	a	a
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	a	a
	children's rooms (yes/no)	a	a
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	a	a
classroom (yes/no)	a	a	
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	a	a
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	a	a
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	a	a
	nature of care required (yes/no)	a	a
	staff prepared (yes/no)	a	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	a	a
	facility prepared (yes/no)	a	a
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	b	b
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	a	a
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	a	a
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	a	a
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	-	-
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	a	a

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

## Problems with the pets

Variable	Measurement	Level of Significance	$\chi^2$
Type of pets used	size of pets (small, large, mixed)	0.54	1.25*
	fish kept as pets (yes/no)	0.08	3.03*
	birds kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	rodents kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	cats kept as pets (yes/no)	0.97	0.001*
	dogs kept as pets (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
Ownership of the pets	owners (staff, facility, groups children, individual children, more than one type)	a	a
	access (anytime, free time, sched.time) restrictions on access (yes/no)	a	a
Access to the pets	free run in & out (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	free run outside (yes/no)	0.51	0.43*
	animal shelter outside (yes/no)	0.86	0.03*
	playroom or lounge (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	children's rooms (yes/no)	0.80	0.07*
	other rooms inside (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	classroom (yes/no)	0.66	0.19*
		1.00	0.00*
Supervision of the children with the pets	no, some, all children	0.32	2.26*
Person who cares for the pets	children, staff, both	0.36	2.07
Planning conducted	planning (yes/no)	0.65	0.20*
	nature of care required (yes/no)	0.56	0.35*
	staff prepared (yes/no)	b	b
	children prepared (yes/no)	0.70	0.15*
	facility prepared (yes/no)	0.16	1.93*
Professional orientation of person who introduced pets	paraprofessional/professional	a	a
Position of the person who introduced the pets	management/other staff	0.96	0.002*
Pets visit the facility	all, some, no pets	0.30	2.38*
Pets stay at the facility	all, some, no pets	a	a
Role of the pet	educational role (yes/no)	0.13	2.29*
	therapeutic role (yes/no)	0.02 <sup>c</sup>	5.38*
Problems with the pet program	problems encountered (yes/no)	-	-
	care of the pets (yes/no)	a	a
	staff were a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	children were a problem (yes/no)	1.00	0.00*
	facility was a problem (yes/no)	a	a
	pets were a problem (yes/no)	-	-

a - one or more cells with expected frequencies less than one

b - only one value present for one variable

c -  $p \leq .05$

d - Fisher's Exact Test

\* - chi-square with Yates' correction

APPENDIX J

Pamphlet Summarizing the Study

## Suggested Readings

Anderson, R. S. (Ed.) Pet animals and society. London: Baillière Tindall, 1975.

Brill, K. & Thomas, R. Children in homes. London: Victor Gollancz, 1964.

Burmeister, E. The professional houseparent. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Corson, S. A., Corson, E. O'L., Gwynne, P. H. & Arnold, L. E. Pet-facilitated psychotherapy in a hospital setting. In J. H. Masserman (Ed.), Current Psychiatric Therapies, Vol. 15. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1975, 277-286.

Curtis, P. Animals that care for people. New York Times Magazine, May 20, 1979.

Levinson, B. M. Household pets in residential schools: Their therapeutic potential. Mental Hygiene, 1968, 52(3), 411-414.

Levinson, B. M. Pet-oriented child psychotherapy. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.

Levinson, B. M. Household pets in training schools serving delinquent children. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28(2), 475-481.

Levinson, B. M. Pets and human development. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.

Sundaram, S. An exploratory study of the feasibility of utilizing pets as a psychotherapeutic modality in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children. Unpublished master's thesis, Boston University, 1969.

Yates, E. Skeezzer: Dog with a mission. New York: Harvey House Inc., 1973. A summary of this book is found in E. Yates, Dog with a mission. Good Housekeeping, 1973, 176, 80-86.

This list refers only to the major readings on the use of pets in residential care facilities for children. For further readings in this area and on the use of pets in other settings and with other age groups, please refer to the Final Report of this project, available from the Health Promotion Directorate, Health and Welfare Canada.

## The Use of Pets in Canadian Residential Care Facilities for Children



A STUDY OF THE CANADIAN SITUATION  
SUPPLEMENTED BY RELEVANT INFORMATION  
FROM THE LITERATURE

BY

HEATHER FERGUSON  
DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA  
WINNIPEG, CANADA

This project was funded by  
Summer Resources Fund  
Health Promotion Directorate  
Health and Welfare Canada  
Grant #1216-6-117

## Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the use of pets in residential care facilities for children in Canada.

By combining the listings of a number of directories and government publications, 928 facilities were identified. To be eligible, a facility had to serve children under sixteen years of age who were in care due to specific problems in their development, learning, behaviour and/or family situation. Homes for unwed mothers and private boarding schools primarily for "normal" children were excluded from this study. These facilities were categorized by region (Maritimes, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, British Columbia and the North) and size. A proportional random sample of 316 was then drawn. A five-part questionnaire was sent to the executive director or administrator of each facility in the sample, asking for information on the facility and the use of pets. Those facilities with more than one residential unit under their auspices were asked to complete as many parts on the use of pets as they had types of pet use.

Eighty-six facilities returned usable questionnaires, resulting in a response rate of 27.2%. From these 86 facilities, there were responses from 98 units - 54 keep pets now, 16 kept pets in the past, 10 would consider keeping pets in the future and 18 would never consider keeping pets. The difference between these types of units was analyzed using chi-square, with a significance level of  $p \leq .05$ . Those units that would consider keeping pets in the future and those that would never consider keeping pets were combined into one group, pets never kept, for statistical analysis.

There were found to be significant differences ( $p \leq .03$ ) between those units that keep pets now, that kept pets in the past and that never kept pets, in terms of the number of children in the unit. Those units that keep pets now tended to have small (1-7) or large (13 and over) numbers of children, those which kept pets in the past tended to have a medium number of children (8-12), and those which never kept pets tended to have medium or large numbers. Also, significantly more units ( $p \leq .05$ ) which had never kept pets served only one age group, whereas there was an almost equal proportion of units serving one age group as serving a mixed age group when those units experienced with pets were examined. There were no significant differences, however, between the units on the other characteristics of the facility that were examined (capacity and present number of children in the facility, age and sex of the children in the facility, reasons for the children being in care, training of the principal caregivers, child/staff ratio, budgeted cost per child, housing style, number of children per sleeping unit, lot size, other features on the premises, and geographic location).

When compared on their use of pets, significantly more units ( $p \leq .002$ ) that kept pets in the past experienced problems than those units that keep pets now. The difference in the number of units experiencing problems concerned problems with the care of the pets, with the children and especially with the staff members. The person who introduced the pet to the unit was significantly more often ( $p \leq .03$ ) in a management position in those units keeping pets now and more often in another staff position in those units which kept pets in the past. No significant differences were found in the use of pets on the other characteristics examined (type of pets, ownership of pets, access to the pets, housing of the pets, supervision of the children with the pets, person who cares for the pets, planning conducted before the pets were introduced, training of the person who introduced the pets to the unit, the allowance of a child's pet from home to visit or stay at the unit, and the roles the pet played).

Thirty-five characteristics of pet use were compared to each other for those units which keep pets now. Twenty significant relationships were found between the variables. One set of relationships involved the size of the pets kept and the roles the pet played in the unit. Those units with both sizes of pets reported significantly more often ( $p \leq .02$ ) that there was an educational role for the pets, whereas those with large pets tended to report no such role. Regarding a therapeutic role for the pets, those units with both sizes of pets again reported significantly more often ( $p \leq .0002$ ) a therapeutic role, whereas the units with small pets tended to report no therapeutic role. Keeping a dog as a pet was found to be significantly related to having a therapeutic role for the pet ( $p \leq .0003$ ). Educational roles and therapeutic roles were found to be present or absent together ( $p \leq .004$ ).

These results suggest that perhaps it was the attitude of the children and the staff towards the pets and their care that was the important element in whether pet programs would be introduced and continued. Except for the number of children in the unit and whether one age group or a mixed group were served, the characteristics of the facility and the aspects of the pet program that were examined had no significant influences.

On the reverse side of this pamphlet are the descriptive results of the study. The responses given by participants in the study are supplemented by relevant information from the literature.

This pamphlet is only intended as a summary of the study. For more detailed information, please refer to the Final Report of this project, available from the Health Promotion Directorate, Health and Welfare Canada, or the M.Sc. thesis of the same title and author, available from the University of Manitoba.

## Types of Children

- \* mentally retarded
- \* physically handicapped
- \* blind
- \* deaf
- \* learning disabled
- \* infirmed
- \* emotionally disturbed
- \* socially maladjusted / delinquent
- \* multiply handicapped
- \* children who have no family or whose families are disturbed or otherwise unable to care for them

## Types of Settings

- \* group home
- \* group cottage
- \* institution
- \* hospital ward
- \* residential school for exceptional children
- \* classroom

## Types of Pets

- \* insects
- \* tropical fish
- \* reptiles (eg. turtles, snakes)
- \* amphibians (eg. frogs, toads)
- \* small domesticated birds (eg. budgies, parakeets)
- \* small rodents (eg. white mice, hamsters, guinea pigs)
- \* rabbits
- \* cats
- \* dogs
- \* farm animals (eg. ducks, pigs, horses)
- \* tamed wild animals (eg. crow, wild turkey)

## Benefits of Using Pets

### EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS:

- \* animals and their care, handling and habits
- \* sex, reproduction and the life cycle
- \* health and hygiene
- \* responsibility
- \* cooperation and sharing
- \* respect for living things
- \* learning process
- \* importance of routine
- \* language
- \* mathematics
- \* business (eg. selling offspring to pet stores)
- \* models for love, affection and behavior

### THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS:

- \* companionship
- \* sense of ownership
- \* a pet is nonthreatening. Some children can be affectionate and develop a relationship with a pet before they can relate to other people
- \* something for older children to lavish affection on when they feel that they are too old to hug or talk to a teddy bear or a doll
- \* a stimulus for important feelings in the child that need to be brought out and processed
- \* acceptance and tolerance, in contrast to the probing and disciplining staff
- \* a chance for the child to care for and think about someone other than himself
- \* an improvement in the child's self-image
- \* warmth, comfort and security
- \* a trusted friend who will keep a child's secrets
- \* a stimulus to draw out a withdrawn child
- \* an improvement in the atmosphere of the facility
- \* entertainment of the residents
- \* a conversation piece
- \* a distraction for a hospitalized child, helping to take his mind off his illness
- \* a chance for a child to overcome his fear of animals
- \* a form of positive reinforcement in behavior therapy
- \* the means for teaching a skill (eg. horseback riding, dog obedience training)

### ADDITIONAL BENEFITS CITED IN THE LITERATURE:

- \* lifting, patting and playing with a pet can exercise a sick child's muscles
- \* a motivation for a child to get well
- \* a motivation for learning
- \* a social aid for a shy child or a child new to a group
- \* continuity of contact for the children in facilities where the staff work shifts or have a high turnover rate

## Problems with Using Pets

### CARE OF THE PETS:

- \* inconsistent or inadequate care
- \* the children would not assume responsibility for the care of the pets, leaving it to the staff to provide all the care
- \* the staff had to assume all the care of the pets when the children went on vacation
- \* someone was needed to look after the pets when staff & children went on vacation
- \* care was difficult, especially in winter

### STAFF:

- \* no one on staff would accept responsibility for the care of the pets
- \* the staff disapproved of the pets or were not dedicated to the program
- \* the work schedules of the staff made it difficult to assign and/or carry out the duties regarding the care of the pets
- \* the new staff did not want to keep the pets

### CHILDREN:

- \* abuse of the pet was the most frequently mentioned problem. It was upsetting to those children who were not abusive and it required supervising those who were
- \* allergies to the pets
- \* the pets caused jealousy among some children
- \* fear of animals
- \* some children would withdraw from other people and spend all their time with the pets
- \* some children lost interest in the pets

### FACILITY:

- \* the facility was not suitable for the pet
- \* urban location was not suitable for the pet
- \* regulations prohibited pets or restricted their movements

### PETS:

- \* too many pets were acquired
- \* excessive reproduction of the pets
- \* wandered away or escaped from enclosures
- \* bothered the neighbours
- \* messed or damaged the facility
- \* pets misbehaved or harmed someone
- \* care, food and veterinarian costs were expensive
- \* pets became ill or died
- \* pets had to get used to different children
- \* poachers or predators killed the pets
- \* pets were incompatible with each other
- \* pets were a health hazard

### ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS CITED IN THE LITERATURE:

- \* inadequate number of staff
- \* disturbance of the facility's routine

## Guide Lines for Programs

### CARE OF THE PETS:

- \* evaluate the amount, difficulty and cost of care required for the pets
- \* set guidelines for the care of the pets and make sure the staff and children understand their responsibilities
- \* decide who will care for the pets
- \* designate one staff person to supervise the care
- \* determine who will care for the pets when the staff and children are on vacation
- \* all the staff and children should feel that they own the pet and are responsible for it

### STAFF AND CHILDREN:

- \* all staff and children should be in favor of the pets
- \* staff should be willing to assume responsibility for the pets after the initial enthusiasm of the children has worn off
- \* staff should be prepared for fights & jealousy among the children over the pets
- \* determine if there are any allergies to the pets
- \* determine if any of the children fear animals
- \* involve the staff and children in the pet program from the planning stages
- \* determine if all the children can handle a pet and be willing to supervise those who cannot
- \* prepare the children for the possibility of the pet dying
- \* in a group home setting, the pet should belong to the houseparents and leave the home with them, as the new houseparents may not appreciate or want the pet

### FACILITY:

- \* make sure there is adequate space for the pets
- \* determine if the pets will disrupt the routine

### PETS:

- \* determine how many and what types of pets will be allowed
- \* determine what type of pet would be appropriate for the children in the facility
- \* plan the introduction of the pet carefully
- \* determine how quickly the pets reproduce and what will be done with any offspring
- \* have only one pet at a time - if there is more than one make sure the pets are compatible
- \* determine the types of diseases the pet could carry
- \* determine whether the children can have individual pets and whether they may bring pets from home

### ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES FROM THE LITERATURE:

- \* determine how much responsibility can be given to the children re: the pet's care
- \* determine if the introduction of a pet will disrupt established relationships between the children in the facility